

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION



DRAFT – Meeting Minutes

Commission Chambers, Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Thursday, October 9, 2014
12:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT WU AT 12:12 p.m.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: John Rahaim – Planning Director, Sara Vellve, Marcelle Boudreaux, Diego Sanchez, Erika Jackson, Kanishka Burns, Jon Swae, Jeffrey Speirs, Chris Townes, and Jonas P. Ionin – Commission Secretary

SPEAKER KEY:

- + indicates a speaker in support of an item;
- indicates a speaker in opposition to an item; and
- = indicates a neutral speaker or a speaker who did not indicate support or opposition.

A. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONTINUANCE

The Commission will consider a request for continuance to a later date. The Commission may choose to continue the item to the date proposed below, to continue the item to another date, or to hear the item on this calendar.

1. 2013.0220X (R. SUCRÉ: (415) 575-9108)
815-825 TENNESSEE STREET - located at the southeast corner of 19th and Tennessee Streets, Lots 001A and 001B in Assessor's Block 4059 - **Request for a Large Project Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 329 for the new construction of a five-

story residential apartment building (measuring approximately 53-feet 10-inches high) with up to 69 dwelling units, 48 off-street parking spaces, 70 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, 5 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces and common open space. The dwelling unit mix would consist of 26 one-bedroom units, 38 two-bedroom units, and five three-bedroom units. Under the LPA, the project is seeking a modification to certain Planning Code requirements, including: 1) rear yard (Planning Code Section 134); 2) open space (Planning Code Section 135); 3) permitted obstructions over the street, setback, yard or useable open space (Planning Code Section 136); and, 4) street frontage (Planning Code Section 145.1). The subject property is located within the UMU (Urban Mixed-Use) Zoning District and 58-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt

(Proposed for Continuance to October 16, 2014)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to October 16, 2014
 AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Johnson, Moore, Richards,
 ABSENT: Hillis

2. 2014.0756D (J.SPEIRS: (415) 575-9106)
1912 20th STREET - on the north side between De Haro and Carolina Streets; Lot 014 in Assessor's Block 4071 - **Request for Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application No. 2013.02.11.9939, proposing to construct a new 6-story, two family dwelling on a down-sloping vacant lot within a RM-1 (Residential – Mixed –Low Density) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
 Staff Analysis: Full Discretionary Review
 Preliminary Recommendation: Pending
 (Continued from Regular Meeting of August 14, 2014)
(Proposed for Continuance to December 4, 2014)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Continued to December 4, 2014
 AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Johnson, Moore, Richards,
 ABSENT: Hillis

B. CONSENT CALENDAR

All matters listed hereunder constitute a Consent Calendar, are considered to be routine by the Planning Commission, and may be acted upon by a single roll call vote of the Commission. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a member of the Commission, the public, or staff so requests, in which event the matter shall be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered as a separate item at this or a future hearing

3. [2014.1111C](#) (M. BOUDREAUX: (415) 575-9140)
2240 TARAVAL STREET - north side between 32nd and 33rd Avenue; Lot 018 in Assessor's Block 2361 - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization**, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 781.1 to allow a change of use from a Limited Restaurant (d.b.a. Copper Kettle) to Restaurant (d.b.a. Copper Kettle) to seek a Type 41 on-sale ABC license, and to

remove condition No. 6 from Motion No.10529, within the Taraval Street NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District) Zoning District, Taraval Street Restaurant Subdistrict, and 50-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions
 AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Johnson, Moore, Richards,
 ABSENT: Hillis
 MOTION: 19253

4. [2014.1237Z](#) (D. SANCHEZ: (415) 575-9082)
INTENTION TO INITIATE DEPARTMENT-SPONSORED ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS TO AMEND THE ZONING MAP TO REZONE A PARCEL FROM C-M TO PDR-1-G - Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302, the Planning Commission will consider a **Resolution of Intent to Initiate Zoning Map Amendments** to Sectional Maps ZN11 and SU11 of the City and County of San Francisco. The amendment will rezone Lot 040 in Assessor's Block 5691 from C-M (Heavy Commercial) to PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution and Repair: General). This change is intended to correct a minor omission and to update the Zoning Map to reflect contemporary zoning districts.

Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution of Intent and schedule a public hearing

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Adopted a Resolution of Intent and scheduled a public hearing on November 6, 2014
 AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Johnson, Moore, Richards,
 ABSENT: Hillis
 RESOLUTION: 19254

5. [2014.0564C](#) (E. JACKSON: (415) 558-6363)
2527 MISSION STREET - east side of Mission Street, between 21st and 22nd Streets; Lot 026 in Assessor's Block 3615 - **Request for Conditional Use Authorization** to establish a new three-story approximately 6,800 square foot medical services building and accessory retail (dba Mosaddegh Vision Institute) and an Outdoor Activity area for an approximately 340 square foot roof deck along the rear property line on the third floor pursuant to Planning Code Sections 121.2, 145.2, and 303, within the Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT) Zoning District and 65-B Height and Bulk District. The project exceeds the use size limitation of 6,000 square feet in the Mission Street NCT Zoning District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: + Project Sponsor – Ophthalmology surgery
 + Gary Orr – Design
 ACTION: Approved with Conditions
 AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards,
 MOTION: 19255

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

6. Commission Comments/Questions

- Inquiries/Announcements. Without discussion, at this time Commissioners may make announcements or inquiries of staff regarding various matters of interest to the Commissioner(s).
- Future Meetings/Agendas. At this time, the Commission may discuss and take action to set the date of a Special Meeting and/or determine those items that could be placed on the agenda of the next meeting and other future meetings of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Antonini:

Go Giants! I had one other thing in addition to that. For the last six weeks or so, I'm almost at the end of it. I have a daily treatment I have to have and it's down at Oyster Point in South San Francisco. I come from my home in southwestern San Francisco and either return back there or return to my dental office, which is in Cow Hollow. The trip to Cow Hollow is infinitely more difficult, because my treatment time is like 7:30 and then I have hit all the traffic coming north. I was impressed with Oyster Point, because their access is so good. They have four different access routes to get into there, driving, including not only 101, but they also have Old Bayshore off of, from Brisbane. They have a way coming from South San Francisco and then you can go straight and you end up on Hillside and end up in Colma, so, when I have to go back to my home from there it's really a pretty quick trip. I think that is instructive for us, because we have a lot similarities with developments that are planned in the future, for Hunter's Point, Candlestick Point, and I think we have to, even though we are transit first, and are emphasizing public transit, we have to realize that most people will be coming by car and we have to improve the auto access to those areas, because businesses won't locate there unless people can get in and out of there. Particularly, we need to revisit the whole concept of not allowing auto traffic over the bridge conceived to be built over Yosemite Sleuth, and also make sure that we have a decent interchange on 101 and a bunch of other things, as well as on the transit issue of having light rail come directly into that area. We've already spent a lot of money the T-Line and it really should be extended into that area to make it really functional. So, anyway I think that we can learn from those around us, and one of the reasons, maybe why they have so much development on Oyster Point is the fact, that maybe, the development came first and the access second, but I wouldn't be surprised, if they had pretty good access and it helped to attract a lot of biotech firms to that area because they can get in and out.

Commissioner Richards:

I just want to bring up, I guess, the status on, what I call a running item action list. I think this is my fifth meeting, I believe. I just want to check and get a sense with the other Commissioners and then with staff on three items that I think we talked about before, and when we might be able have those scheduled on the calendar. First one being, the SF Heritage Legacy Businesses presentation, the second one being the Eastern Neighborhood status or implementation/informational, and then the Mayor's Office Housing Directive, the three work streams. I think that was from last meeting.

Commissioner Wu:

I believe that there is a running list that the Commission Secretary has. I think I saw on the advanced that the Heritage item is scheduled.

Jonas P. Ionin, Commission Secretary:

Yes, Commissioners we will certainly add these items to the list. The Heritage is already calendared on your Advance Calendar, I believe in November and the Eastern Neighborhood status, staff will be getting in contact with you actually. They may be offering you a walking tour.

D. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

7. Director's Announcements

Director Rahaim:

Good Afternoon Commissioners, I just wanted to bring to your attention and the public's attention, a slight change in some procedures. You've received a memo about this, I think last week, and it has to do with changes to our Preliminary Project Assessment process. If you recall, we instituted this program about three years ago. It is a process, whereby, projects above six units, apply from what is called the Primary Project Assessment or PPA and within 60 days the Department responds with a letter that is essentially a road map for how the project should be approved. The change we are making to this process, at least for a six month period, because the volume of projects, is to allow the project sponsor to submit their environmental application at the same time as the PPA application, and the reason we are doing that is because there is more than a two month or three month wait for staff assignment at this point, and rather than start that five or six month waiting period when the environmental application is submitted, after the PPA, you can simply use the PPA time as part of the waiting period. Also because of the sheer volume of projects coming in, we are asking for a six month period that the staff would have 90 days to respond to the letter as opposed to 60 days. Again, we are experiencing unprecedented volumes. When we started the PPA program three years ago we had about 35 PPA applications that year. This year we will have over 100 and so we are seeing an unprecedented number of large projects come forward. So, the bottom line is that this will allow the period while a project sponsor is waiting for the letter to be used as waiting time in the queue to be assigned a planner, so it will save two to three months off the time for a project and for small projects we think that's significant. Thank you. That concludes my presentation.

8. Review of Past Events at the Board of Supervisors, Board of Appeals and Historic Preservation Commission

LAND USE COMMITTEE:

- **140804. Planning Code - Arcades in the Haight Street Neighborhood Commercial District. Sponsors Breed and Wiener.** This Ordinance will principally permit amusement game arcades on the first and second floors in the Haight St NCD. This item was before Planning Commission on Sept 18, 2014. At that hearing staff recommended a modification that would treat Other Entertainment uses with 10 or fewer Mechanical Amusement Devices as Amusement Game Arcades allowing them to be principally permitted. The Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval with Staff's proposed modifications. At the Land Use hearing the committee incorporated the Planning commissions recommended amendments and voted unanimously to recommend the item to the Full BOS.

- **140806. Health, Building Codes - Ventilation Requirement for Urban Infill Development and Establishing Fees. Sponsor Cohen.** The item is related to amendments to the Enhanced Ventilation for Sensitive Use Projects (Article 38 of the Health Code). This Commission heard this item on September 18, 2014, and voted 7-0 to recommend approval to the Board. Supervisor Cohen, who is the sponsor of the legislation, introduced an amendment on Monday to the Ordinance that requires DPH, Fire, and DBI staff to review and evaluate possible technologies and policies that may meet the performance standards in the Ordinance. The Committee voted 3-0 in favor of the Ordinance. Other significant comments were related to future efforts needed to protect existing residents from air pollution.

FULL BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:

This past Tuesday, two significant events happened in San Francisco. The first was the Giant's win over the Nationals, advancing them to the National League Championship Series, and the other was the Board of Supervisor's hearing on Supervisor Chiu's Short-Term Rental Ordinance. The latter being more germane to my presentation.

Short-Term Rentals. Commissioners, you may recall that you heard this item on August 7. At that time you recommended approval with 16 amendments to be made to the legislation (deets below)¹, after a 6 hour hearing. The Board's Land Use Committee held two 7 hour hearings on the ordinance and made multiple amendments. This week the full board took up the matter. Even without public comment, the members of the Board spent close to 3 ½ hours discussing the matter and potential amendments.

1

1. Place short-term rental controls in the Planning Code so that the Planning Department is the agency responsible for enforcing on short-term rentals.
2. Modify the Ordinance so that the proposed city-run registry tracks the number of nights a unit has been rented.
3. Require any short-term rental platform or company doing business in San Francisco to provide information on the number of nights a property was rented. Information should be reported back to the city on a quarterly basis at a minimum.
4. Identify units that are on the proposed short-term registry in the Department's Property Information Map.
5. Amend the Ordinance so that a posting on a short-term rental site without first registering with the City constitutes a violation that can be assessed a penalty, even if the unit was not rented.
6. Require the registration number from the City-run registry to accompany all short-term rental postings.
7. Grant citation authority to the Planning Department if it is chosen to be the enforcement agency for short-term rentals, and provide for increased penalties for repeat violators.
8. Limit hosted rentals by nights rented, similar to the restrictions placed on non-hosted rentals, or by limiting the number of rooms that can be rented at any one time.
9. Limit single-family homes to the same restrictions as multi-unit buildings.
10. Require the property owner's consent in tenant occupied units and/or a 30-day notification by the Department to the owner prior to listing a unit on the short-term rental registry.
11. Prohibit SROs from being used as short-term rentals.
12. If the Planning Department is chosen as the enforcement agency, provide increased funding to the Planning Department for more enforcement staff to monitor short-term rentals.
13. Consider placing limits on allowing BMR (Below Market Rate) units to be used as short-term rentals.
14. Require the Planning Department to maintain a list of registered hosting platforms.
15. Prohibit units with outstanding Planning or Building Code violations from being listed on the short-term rental registry until those violations have been abated.
16. Conduct further investigation into the insurance requirements for short-term rental hosts.

In brief, here's a summary of the 12 amendments considered on Tuesday: Sup. Breed offered two amendments—both of which passed. 1) Planning would notify complainants within 30 days if no violation was found, enabling an individual complainant to request an administrative hearing if the alleged violation concerns a hosting platform. The Planning Director would then notify the hosting platform of the upcoming administrative hearing. 2) An accelerated avenue for certain non-profits to pursue private right of action when buildings have had an Ellis act evictions. 3) Supervisor Farrell introduced an amendment to include building owners as "interested parties" for private lawsuits. This was incorporated into the ordinance. 4) Supervisor Yee proposed that RH-1 and RH-1(d) be excluded from eligibility for STRs. This amendment failed. 5) Supervisor Yee then proposed an amendment where RH-1(d) properties would be limited to no more than 90 days' worth of rental and no more than 50% of the bedrooms. This amendment also failed. 6) Supervisor Wiener offered an amendment that would allow a quick adjustment of the fees and penalties by the Controller's Office after a PC hearing and would mandate that such a review happen within 6 months of the operative date of the law. This amendment passed. 7) Supervisor Wiener also successfully amended the ordinance to add notification requirements for CC&Rs and neighborhood associations who have asked to be notified. 8) Supervisor Mar offered an amendment to not allow in-law units to offer STRs. This amendment failed. 9) Supervisor Kim offered an amendment that would narrow who may file a lawsuit to nonprofits that have existed for 5 years; had by-laws that the purpose of the nonprofit includes protecting housing; that no damages could be sought by NPs and that nonprofits only be allowed to pursue private right of action for buildings with 3 or more units. This amendment was made to the ordinance. 10) Supervisor Avalos offered an amended that all STR (hosted and non) would be limited to no more than 90 days—that amendment failed. 11) Supervisor Campos proposed an amendment to delay implementation until back taxes were paid by all hosting platforms. This amendment failed. 12) Supervisor Campos also proposed an amendment that no rentals be allowed in buildings which had seen Ellis Act evictions during the past five years. This amendment was incorporated into the ordinance.

As this commission is aware, any substantive changes made by the Board that have not yet been considered by this commission will be sent back for another PC hearing. For this reason, the Board split the file allowing the parts of the law that this commission has considered to continue to move forward through the legislative process. The Board approved the Ordinance with the amendments that that you have already considered—this will have a second reading next week. The changes of the ordinance that are substantive will be forwarded to you for a hearing within three months. It appears that the new board file will include Breed's & Kim's amendments regarding private right of action for Ellis-evicted buildings and Campos' prohibition on STR in Ellis evicted buildings. This will be scheduled for a hearing before you later this year.²

Amending the Definition of a Residential Unit (Avalos). This ordinance would fix an unintentional error and ensure that SRO units would continue to be protected from conversion to student housing. Commissioners you heard this item on 9/18. At that time you recommended approval. This item passed its first reading at the Board this week.

² This is tentative; the CAO still needs to draft the final ordinances. Of course, the Commission can reconsider the entire law if they wish, not just the new amendments.

INTRODUCTIONS: Other than the duplicated file for the Short-Term Rental Ordinance there were no other introductions this week.

BOARD OF APPEALS:

No Report

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION:

No Report

E. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT – 15 MINUTES

At this time, members of the public may address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission except agenda items. With respect to agenda items, your opportunity to address the Commission will be afforded when the item is reached in the meeting. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to three minutes.

SPEAKERS: Grace Shanaghan – Clean building ordinance working group
Dino Adelfio – Tea party, Yerba mate
Anastasia Glitschten – Trees

F. REGULAR CALENDAR

The Commission Hearing Procedures provide for presentations by staff; followed by the project sponsor team; followed by public comment for and against the proposal. Please be advised that the project sponsor team includes: the sponsor(s) or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors.

9. [2014.1167T](#) (K. BURNS: (415) 575-9112)
INTENTION TO INITIATE PRIVATELY-SPONSORED PLANNING CODE AMENDMENT TO ALLOW EXEMPTIONS ABOVE THE HEIGHT LIMIT FOR HOSPITAL MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT - Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302, the Planning Commission will consider a **Resolution of Intent to Initiate a Planning Code Amendment**. The amendment will allow exemptions above the height limit for hospital mechanical equipment so long as it is 1) not higher than the highest point of the existing rooftop enclosure; 2) has minimal visual impact and maximum architectural integration; 3) is necessary for the function of the building; and 4) no other feasible alternatives exist. The Planning Code section proposed for amendment is Section 260.
Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution of Intent and schedule a public hearing

SPEAKERS: + Abby Yant – Sponsor presentation
ACTION: Adopted a Resolution of Intent and scheduled a public hearing on November 13, 2014
AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards
RESOLUTION: 19256

10. [2013.1517ME](#) (J. SWAE: (415) 575-9069)
URBAN FOREST MASTER PLAN (PHASE 1: STREET TREES) INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION & INITIATION HEARING - Staff will present the Urban Forest Plan Master Plan (Phase 1: Street

Trees) and request the Commission to consider adopting a **Resolution of Intention to Initiate an General Plan Amendment** to the Recreation & Open Space Element that will adopt by reference the San Francisco Urban Forest Plan Master Plan (Phase 1: Street Trees). In addition, staff will request the Commission to schedule a future public hearing to consider approval of the proposed General Plan amendment.
 Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution of Intent and schedule a public hearing

SPEAKERS: + Carla Short, DPW – Street trees
 + Edward Solomon – Endorse the plan
 + Doug Wildman – Phasing, street tree funding
 + Jimmy Shaw – Urban forest
 + Anastasia Glitschten – Removal of existing trees
 + Patricia DeVonte – We Plant Trees
 + Ruth Grovanis – Red tail haws, canopy envy
 = Frank Mason – Bumper sticker message?

ACTION: Adopted a Resolution of Intent and scheduled a public hearing on November 6, 2014

AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards

RESOLUTION: 19257

G. DISCRETIONARY REVIEW CALENDAR

The Commission Discretionary Review Hearing Procedures provide for presentations by staff; followed by the DR requestor team; followed by public comment opposed to the project; followed by the project sponsor team; followed by public comment in support of the project. Please be advised that the DR requestor and project sponsor teams include: the DR requestor and sponsor or their designee, lawyers, architects, engineers, expeditors, and/or other advisors.

11. [2014.0718D](#) (J. SPEIRS: (415) 575-9106)
333 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE - east side between 18th and 19th Streets; Lot 025 in Assessor's Block 4040 - **Request for Discretionary Review** of Building Permit Application No. 2013.06.12.9341 proposing new construction of a four-story over basement, two-family residential building on a vacant lot within a RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
 Staff Analysis: Full Discretionary Review
 Preliminary Recommendation: Pending
 (Continued from Regular Meeting of August 7, 2014)

SPEAKERS: - Robert Gonzalez – DR Requestor presentation
 - Sean Norman – DR requestor presentation
 + Jeff Burris – Project sponsor presentation

ACTION: Took DR conditioning the exterior rear stair be moved inside, and recognizing the Bird Safe Window requirement in the Code

AYES: Wu, Fong, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards

NAYES: Antonini

DRA No: 0384

12. [2014.0337D](#) (C. TOWNES: (415) 575-9195)
86 BRIDGEVIEW DRIVE - north side of Bridgeview Drive between Newhall Street and Topeka Avenue; Lot 027 in Assessor's Block 5337 - **Mandatory Discretionary Review**, pursuant to Planning Code Section 317, for an interior/exterior remodel to an existing single family residence involving the conversion of storage to a master bedroom at 1st floor, the addition of a rear deck at the 1st floor, and a rear balcony at the second floor, as well as, new windows and doors on the rear façade within the RH-1 (Residential, Home, One Unit per Lot) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. This action constitutes the Approval Action for the project for purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Staff Analysis: Abbreviated Discretionary Review

Preliminary Recommendation: Do Not Take DR and Approve as proposed

SPEAKERS: - Michael Cheng – DR presentation
 - Man Chenk Cheng – DR presentation
 + Henry Karnilowicz – Sponsor presentation

ACTION: No DR Approved as Proposed

AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards,

DRA No: 0385

13. [2014.0544D](#) (S. VELLVE: (415) 558-6263)
16-18 IRIS AVENUE - east side between Euclid Avenue and Mayfair Drive, Lot 028, in Assessor's Block 1043 - **Mandatory Discretionary Review** pursuant to Planning Code Section 317(e), of Building Permit Application No. 2014.04.16.3387 proposing to merge units 16 and 16A into one unit. Unit 18 is not proposed to be altered. The property is located within a RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. Planning Commission approval at the public hearing would constitute the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.04(h).

Preliminary Recommendation: Take Discretionary Review and Disapprove

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Continued to December 11, 2014

AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Johnson, Moore, Richards,

ABSENT: Hillis

H. PUBLIC COMMENT

At this time, members of the public may address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission except agenda items. With respect to agenda items, your opportunity to address the Commission will be afforded when the item is reached in the meeting with one exception. When the agenda item has already been reviewed in a public hearing at which members of the public were allowed to testify and the Commission has closed the public hearing, your opportunity to address the Commission must be exercised during the Public Comment portion of the Calendar. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to three minutes.

The Brown Act forbids a commission from taking action or discussing any item not appearing on the posted agenda, including those items raised at public comment. In response to public comment, the commission is limited to:

- (1) responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public; or
- (2) requesting staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting; or
- (3) directing staff to place the item on a future agenda. (Government Code Section 54954.2(a))

SPEAKERS: Evangelist La Vonne V. Meluhsh – Suspected fraud. Plethora of foolishness
 Harvey Lang – Hunter’s Point construction, fraud in construction new and old four
 retired mayor’s who stand to profit

ADJOURNMENT – 3:47 p.m.