

“Mark,

Please distribute this to the other interested CWAG (or NEWAG) members.

I recently made public comment at the March 20th joint meeting of the Northeast Waterfront Advisory Group (NEWAG) and Central Waterfront Advisory Group (CWAG). I have received word through Mahesh Khatwani of [REDACTED] that a copy of what I said would be appreciated by members of these groups.

Unfortunately, my passionate comments that night were from the heart of the moment and I have no written version. I have however tried to re-create my message below. I hope these comments are sufficient.

‘Hello my name is Alan Dundas, and I have been living at [REDACTED] for over 10 years. I want to speak directly to the members of these working groups whose responsibility it is to provide feedback directly to the SF Port Commission and to the Mayor.

The Port of San Francisco has the difficult task of taking care of our Waterfront. As an owner within the Watermark, I have taken direct advantage of the decisions made by the Port and seen the long term challenges and victories the Port has accomplished including how the monies from the development of the Watermark helped complete the Brannan Wharf Park years after the agreement was established.

On February 26th 2019, the SF Port Commission for the first time voted to hear RFP's for the development of the Port's most valuable undeveloped property SWL330 without the previous dependency of developing piers 30/32. **Eight days later the mayor announced her plan to use this land for a Navigation Center.**

San Francisco has a number of different needs that have to be met and homelessness is one of these, but so are housing and the needs of the Port, including improvements in our seawall and maintaining the deep berth maritime access that pier 30/32 provides.

In my opinion, the proposed Fast-Track legislation and the pressure from the mayor is not allowing the Port of San Francisco to consider those RFP's for the use of SWL330 that they only just allowed themselves to consider. This property was estimated by the Port Commission to be worth \$35M.

SWL330 is zoned exclusively for housing. The SF Mira project nearby at Folsom and Spear has established a 40% BMR rate. A similar rate required for building a prop B compliant building on SWL330 would make a HUGE impact on the housing problem in this city, including housing for our vital but lower income residents. At the same time such a building would further add to the strength and character of the neighborhood.

35 Million could do a lot of immediate value for the Port of San Francisco, and while not enough to re-habilitate piers 30/32 outright, this amount could be used to either secure a portion of these piers to maintain the deep berth use, or construct an adjacent smaller pier next to pier 30/32 for this purpose.

While the mayor's proposal is supposed to be limited in duration, the unknown changes to the job market or the economy could cause the Port to lose this opportunity. Dealing with the construction, teardown or damages caused by occupants of the Navigation Center could make it very difficult to capitalize on any subsequent RFP opportunities.

My plea as a resident of the Port of San Francisco is to let your RFP process complete as planned, include the Mayor's proposal as part of that process. I truly expect you will have better offers for this land. I favor a win-win solution where the port gets the full value of what some consider the most valuable piece of property in the city. A solution that provides a larger percentage of BMR housing units will have a major positive impact on this neighborhood.”

-Alan Dundas

“Hi Elaine and Mark,

I am writing to inquire whose responsibility it is to get the City to engage at a more granular level to open their proposal up for neighborhood discussion on its fundamentals, and how CWAG can move beyond the general venting sessions that were needed at the 3/12 meetings, but which will not be productive going forward?

I believe it is the City’s responsibility—as with any sole source applicant to the Port—to make their case about why this development needs to go in this particular location at this particular time, and why no where else (on Port property or otherwise) will do. It is insufficient for the City to say, as they have to date, “Trust us, we’ve analyzed everything and this is the most viable solution.” It may well be the best, but until the neighbors can be walked through the evaluation process, there will be no common points of understanding and no platform from which to move to management and mitigation planning.

Our neighborhood—and indeed ANY neighborhood—needs to know:

- If this proposed site is one among several,
 - how many total sites are targeted?
 - where are these sites (at minimum, which neighborhoods or districts)?
 - how do these sites align with the distribution of homeless populations based on the City’s annual homeless counts? Provide data
 - what is the timeline to open each of the sites, or each cohort if projects can be grouped?

- why is it critical that this (seawall) site be opened before others?
- what are the factors, if any, that would kill implementation of any of the proposed sites?

- What other sites in the area were identified?
 - Why, specifically, was each site rejected?
 - What is the min/max occupancy for existing centers and what for new centers?
 - Are there **portions** of Piers 30/23 (or Pier 48 or 50 or any other pier deemed seismically unsafe overall) that could be rated OK for occupancy for this use if sized to serve min or up to max occupancy)? e.g. the center portion of 30/32 is sounder than the perimeter; could it meet code?

- What is the plan to scale police and other City service support when **all** new centers are added?
 - How can the Captain Lazar's 40-person police unit provide and sustain the level of support promised to each neighborhood accepting a center?

Once the above is clarified so that any site designation is supportable—or at least understood--by consensus, it is imperative that

- baseline, existing condition data be established and agreed upon, incorporating 311 data and any other verified data resource
- metrics be established for what constitutes success in neighborhood safety, cleanliness and any other benchmark conditions
- an endgame plan be established for failure to comply with benchmarked standards (above)
- an agreement be in place that caps duration of this short-term use, and also gives the Port the option for early termination based on successful project approval for sale/long-term lease of this site as outlined in updated waterfront plan

I don't know if the above can be achieved in a meeting setting, or whether a smaller working group or an all-day charrette is needed, but I feel that it's important that some progression framework be developed so that subsequent meetings build on one another. And it would seem important to work closely with Supervisor Haney's office so that everyone is pouring their efforts into a common pipeline.

I have not had a chance to broach these ideas to the CWAG co-chairs, but have copied them here (and send my apologies). Of course I defer to their and staff's experience in managing such discussions. I just feel strongly that the above points need to be addressed before we can get to

Yes, or at least to a position where the neighborhood understands and validates the range of factors that shape this project and can engage in meaningful mitigation measure planning. No one is questioning the need.”

-Alice Rogers
WLUP Land Use Committee Chair

“We have SO many problems confronting our valuable tourism sector — this is moronic. And to fast track this? C’mon.”

-Allen Weinberg

“Hi Mark,

I am writing to express grave concern regarding the plan to build a Navigation Center on Lot 330 on the Embarcadero. I firmly believe that this plan will have extremely negative consequences on the safety / crime of the surrounding neighborhood and am extremely concerned for both myself and my family's safety, having personally endured an experience of having been physically accosted near a Navigation Center on 5th / Bryant.

I believe there are many logical reasons as to why this location is a very sub-optimal choice for a the Navigation Center. It would create an extremely unsightly environment in a highly visible juncture which experiences high foot traffic by residents and tourists, which would further damage perception of the city. I also believe that it could potentially impact traffic / congestion as this area currently serves as an important conduit for traffic heading to Oracle Park, Mission Bay, and other areas, and can see foot traffic potentially avoiding the area due to an increase in crime / decrease in safety. In short, I feel that there should be much better places to build an additional Navigation Center aside from a location which is so central and key to transportation. Additionally, I have to believe that there could be much better economic uses of this land given its geographical location, which means that it would be better served generating funds which could be deployed towards homeless initiatives. Having lived in the area for almost five years, I have seen many positive developments and also witnessed this part of the Embarcadero developing into a vibrant place for both residents and tourists, facilitating the flow of foot traffic between the Ferry Building / Bay Bridge to Oracle Park, Mission Bay, dogpatch, and other

surrounding areas. I strongly feel like building this Navigation Center would greatly derail progress made in further developing the area into a safe, vibrant neighborhood.

Additionally, there is an issue of unfairness with regards to opening another Navigation Center in district 6 when there are already other Navigation Centers in the district (while many other districts have not even opened a single navigation center). Matt Haney campaigned on getting other districts to share the burden of homelessness, and even gave an interview to the Chronicle right after taking office saying that he wanted Mayor Breed to select a site in every district for a homeless Navigation Center rather than continuing to build only in Districts Six, Nine and Ten. Instead of making concerted efforts to follow through on these campaign promises, I am extremely disappointed to see him compromising the trust placed in him by diverting his attention to allowing another Navigation Center to be build in the district, and disregarding the safety and well-being of those he should be representing.

I would greatly appreciate it if the Port Commission and the leaders of our city could kindly consider the above arguments in coming to the conclusion that this is not the right place for the Navigation Center. While I firmly do agree that tackling the homeless issue should be one of the top priorities, I do not believe it should override all other logic or reason and believe that there are much better areas for a Navigation center to be built, such as in districts which experience less foot traffic, are less densely populated, and do not already currently have a Navigation Center. I appreciate your time and consideration and your continued efforts in improving this city which we all love.”

-Benjamin Shen

“Dear Mark,

I was born and raised in San Francisco where respect and responsibility were the golden rules. Now we have a homeless population where disrespect and irresponsibility reign. How many of the homeless are actually from San Francisco, worked and pay taxes here, probably not many and what we’ve being doing to resolve the homeless crisis has never worked. We are creating a system that attracts homelessness and a bureaucracy of homelessness which is unsustainable. We will never be able to resolve this problem on a local level and there needs to be federal help. National wire services will pick up the story of a navigation center on the Embarcadero send it out to newspapers around the country and people will say let’s go to San Francisco they will house us, feed us, allow us to panhandle, do drugs on the street, medical is free and the weather is great. There is very little recourse for bad behavior, they can’t catch us breaking into cars or damaging property, basically no sit lie or littering laws, they don’t prosecute even if we’re caught and if worse comes to worse they’ll give us a free ticket back home.

It would cost billions of dollars to do this right and we will never ever be able to afford it or resolve this on a local level.

Now you want to put all of this on the Embarcadero, a tourist area which just shouts out to the world look at our problems and by the way don't trip over the trash. The homeless don't need views and a great location they just need a location.

We need compassion without codependency computer engineered problem solving applied to homelessness not applied politics, empathy and work ethics not entitlements."

-Dr. Robert Bernie

"Hi Mark,

Thanks for speaking with me today and allowing me to share your email. Please add my comments below to the record. I own a home at [REDACTED].

Wallace, Vika, Andrew; Mark indicated that those who were unable to attend the meeting today could email him and he would pass the comments along to The Waterfront Advisory Group. Please share his email for those who wish to comment and were unable to attend the session tonight.

Supervisor Haney, I'm not sure you recognize the depth of animosity your constituents feel about this issue.

The proposed homeless encampment is a travesty- a top 10 +2...

1. This neighborhood is primarily residential with a focus on tourism and recreation—this is no place for a city sponsored ghetto.
2. The homeless population in the neighborhood will multiply – by design- with folks occupying parks and stores that now serve the community. Bryant and the Embarcadero will become a no go zone
3. Crime will increase
4. Drug use will increase
5. A valuable city asset will be lost to better development
6. Property values will decrease
7. Existing businesses will leave, new businesses will elect to start elsewhere
8. Fleet Week will now feature a display of San Francisco's failure to manage their city effectively
9. SF Giants fans will wade through a sea of needles and feces on their way to a game
10. Matt Haney will be defeated in landslide proportions. Howard Street bike paths will not compensate for his abandonment of his constituency on this issue

11. The City will be embroiled in years of lawsuits which they will ultimately lose—to the detriment of all.
12. Any circumvention of the normal approval process is an abomination. One can disagree with my negative forecast but not deny this will have huge impact on the neighborhood. All processes must be followed.”

-Dale McConnell

“Dear Mr. Paez,

The text below is based on 30+ years of experience in mental health with people of all social and economic backgrounds. I do hope you will read it.

1-To label San Francisco’s homeless problem, as a housing problem is misleading.

2-Those who are urinating in the city fountains, defecating on the sidewalks, and leaving contaminated syringes on the streets and in the parks, are not people who are simply down on their luck and need a helping hand.

3-The majority of the homeless population on our streets are people with chronic social, psychiatric, and addiction issues.

4-The schizophrenic tormented by paranoid hallucinations and delusions will not feel safe being herded into a shelter with 200+ strangers and will still be on the streets screaming at random people he/she believes are the source of his/her torment.

5-Despite providing housing, the chronic alcoholic will still be panhandling on the streets to support their addiction, and passing out on the sidewalks before making it to the “Safe Navigation Center.”

6-The heroin addict will also still be panhandling on the streets and leaving contaminated syringes on the sidewalks.

7-Many of those people have homes they could go back to if they accepted treatment. As a physician, I’ve counseled tearful families who had finally said enough and turned away the family members who due to addiction and/or mental illness have continued to refuse help and thus endangered their families.

8-We encourage families not to be Enablers. Does the city of San Francisco want to be the Grand Enabler?

Housing without mandated treatment is a farce and serves only as to attract more homeless to the city especially the waterfront area that is easily accessible by public transit, has an entertaining tourist population and Farmer's market, and nicer weather.

I hope that the Port Authority will not become yet another enabler.”

-Jenan Almufti, MD

“Must Read re: Navigation Centers

Monday, March 25, 2019 3:34:00 PM · Elenor Mak in Topics > General

Passing on this comprehensive and informative report regarding Navigation Centers, for those who haven't already received it this morning. <https://sfresidents.com/report>

It was published by Wallace Lee & the SF Residents team-- and an EYE OPENER for me, with the many facts it provides about existing Navigation Centers. After reading this, I am that much more convinced it is imperative for our safety that this Center does NOT happen in our backyard. For those from Watermark involved in this report, a heartfelt thank you. Also, I found out about their efforts through another Watermark resident posting. Was great to sign up and get connected. <https://sfresidents.com/about>”

-Kambiz Yeganegi

“Dear Mr. Paez,

My wife and I are resident/owners of [REDACTED]. We adamantly oppose the truly preposterous choice of location by this mayor which has not been elected due to the following reasons:

- 1) From a structural point of view two prominent architects have testified that it requires a costly and well calculated infrastructural plan and implementation even for a temporary structure.
- 2) From an economical point of view this piece of land is one of the most expensive properties in SF estimated to be worth around \$30 mill, and it generates about \$800k just

in parking fees right now. A boutique hotel and/or shops and cafes were originally planned for this site. With its unbelievably magnificent view it could generate millions of \$ for the Port Authority. Therefore the cost of utilizing it for 230 people would add up to millions of dollars per individual temporary resident and the enormous opportunity loss for the Port and the city is humongous. It just makes no sense to use this location for such a purpose. It will also have a tremendous negative effect on the price of property for hundreds and possibly thousands of owners and renters in the 6th District.

3) From a social point of view this center will pose quite a bit of danger, concern, and limitation on the freedom of hundreds of residents and families with small children and elderly citizens in the neighborhood. It is no secret that the majority of potential residents in this center will be addicts and mentally disturbed. The disposal of syringes and other paraphernalia in the neighborhood pollutes the neighborhood and poses a danger for the health and well being of residents. A recent report has concluded that homeless crimes have increased considerably in the past year. There has been attacks on seniors and parents in this neighborhood during the past year, and that by a handful of homeless that reside there. Just imagine what could be possible if a few hundred are gathered in one place where usage of drugs is permitted.

4) The City is concerned about the increase in the number of homeless in SF!! Have they asked themselves why in this full employment economy and prosperous times so many homeless are on the streets of SF? Maybe it's because we've made it attractive for the homeless from other parts of the state and country to migrate here!!

5) I know this sort of conversation may come from indifferent or careless individuals. We want you to know that we've donated quite a bit to homeless centers and missions and volunteer a few times a year to serve at these centers. So there's no shortage of compassion in our part, but a quick fix idiotic project such as this not only does not help the homeless on the long run it will encourage and attract more homeless to our city.

6) We think providing temporary quarters for the unfortunate is a wonderful idea, but it's not a one way street. The City authorities must also be as concerned if not more for the millions of law abiding citizens who work hard, pay the taxes to support the existence of our cities, elect the officials, and do not deserve to have their neighborhoods be ridden by crime, unsanitary surroundings, and have their various other basic rights be violated by officials that are short sighted and impose their will on the people as this mayor does. To provide shelter for a few hundred and pose so much danger, financial burden, and inconvenience for thousands of such citizens is truly preposterous.

7) This location is the pathway for many people who visit the area as tourists or fans who walk to AT&T park or the new Warriors stadium. It is the jewel of SF. I ask you is this the proper location for such a center???

8) Our District 6 already has two other Nav Centers and most other districts in SF have NONE! How does this make any sense?

9) Police response in our building has been on an average of about 20 minutes. With the definite increase of trouble and crime due to this idiotic choice many citizens will be endangered and in one of the meetings with the Officer in charge of this project no satisfactory results were arrived at due to his vague and uncertain response.

In essence this location will be a disaster for the residents and businesses and the Port and the City although it obviously is an ideal location for a few hundred of the homeless with a grand view of the Bay! We are certain that there are many many more locations that could end up being a win/win choice and not a win for a few hundred and a loss for thousands of residents businesses and passerbyers and tourists. Of course there's always other means to stop this including ballot boxes, but for now we're asking you to do your best to oppose the choice of this location and to do what you were elected to do which is to serve the taxpayers and residents of this district as well as maintain the high value and civility of our Port and it's properties."

-Kam & Homa Yeganegi

"Central Waterfront Advisory Group and Supervisor Haney,

I wasn't able to attend the CWAG community on March 20, but as someone who lives and works in the neighborhood, I want to voice my support for the SAFE navigation center.

We aren't doing well by all the people who live in our city right now, and I want our district and neighborhood to be an example for other areas in San Francisco. It's dangerous for us as a city to deny assistance to people who ask for it and need it.

I'd be happy to voice my support at the next community meeting. I got notice of this one pretty late in the day today through my building's newsletter. What's the best way to stay informed about what's happening with the navigation center?"

-Sarah Li
District 6 & [REDACTED] building resident

Mr. Paez,

I would like to submit these comments to CWAG since I didn't get the opportunity to speak directly Wednesday night.

My wife, 4 year old child and I live at [REDACTED]. We walk these streets every day multiple times a day. If the navigation center is built with the number they're proposing there is no doubt we will be moving immediately.

Please consider the following:

1. There aren't 200+ homeless near the site. There might be 30 max within 4 blocks and rarely a tent set up which is moved quickly. The center is for sleeping and they will be hanging out in the neighborhood all day. Why ship in 200 homeless to a tourist-friendly residential neighborhood?
2. If trying to solve for the homeless near the ferry building, they are in District 3 and a center should be built in that district before a 3rd one is put in District 6.
3. District 6 has built and is building more than 1000 affordable housing units near the site. Multiples more than any other district.
4. It will introduce significant potential drug use into an area. Delancey Street rehabilitation center has vulnerable addicts working on recovery. Head of HSH estimated that 30% of homeless struggle with addiction. That's 60+ new drug addicts in the neighborhood.
5. 200+ homeless will be in direct contact with Giants fans on 81+ days each year as they walk the Embarcadero to and from the ballpark. Same with future Warriors games.
6. This is a navigation center and resources for mental health and addiction aren't provided on-site. They're referred to Howard/Mission and 10th St. What are the chances they'll get there?
7. Why on prime waterfront real estate in one of the most expensive cities in the world? Why not rent it out and pay for 5 more navigation centers where the homeless actually are? The homeless are definitely in District 6, just not this part of District 6.

In summary, wrong site and way too large. I'm sure the community would fully support a center that would serve the homeless that exist in the immediate area instead of shipping more homeless into the area. The mayor's campaign promise of 1000 beds is the reason for this and she happens to be up for re-election in the fall. Each of you know that is why it's getting shoved down our throats and you have the ability to adjust it to something that makes sense."

-Tom Leugers
20 year resident

“Mr. Paez:

I didn't have an opportunity to attend the meeting, and wanted to share my comments in opposition of the proposal via email.

I've been a resident of South Beach since 2004, and my kids have been born and raised here. My family has always been deeply committed to the neighborhood. I organized a very first mom group, our international community of young families and children spending time every Friday at Crossroads. After our second child was born, we didn't move even though raising two kids in an area with no public schools, surrounded by Bay Bridge and games traffic wasn't a small feat. But we felt that benefits of urban environment and our love for the community of South Beach outweighed the difficulties.

Over the years, I watched our neighbors and friends move out, some after having one child, others after a second one was born or kids hit kindergarten age. The local press and even NYT portrayed San Francisco as a **the most child unfriendly city**. Our family stayed. Delayed construction projects in Downtown, in particular completely broken down pothole-riddled Brannan street on top of never ending MUNI tunnel on 4th, have taken a tremendous toll on us as we have to drive our kids to school outside of SOMA 5 days a week, and return to FIDi for work. Our commute just to the kids' school extended from 20 min to almost an hour; even worse for the commute back. This cut into the time kids could have been using for sports or other activities. Still, we have stayed.

But the area continued to deteriorate. Open illegal drug use is happening within a few blocks of our house. My children see piles of trash, feces, needles... And then they go to school to learn how to care about the environment. They see tents, they see mentally ill people and going off high drug users screaming on the streets or pacing around aimlessly. All of those stopped being educational moments for us long time ago. At this point, my one all consuming worry is the safety of my children. And this is not unwarranted.

My teenage son and I were recently attacked on Embarcadero and Townsend on Sunday late afternoon. In the broad daylight, a large man with signs of mental disturbance started screaming obscenities and ran towards us. 911 was called, eventually SFPD got the attacker. This incident resulted in my son being scared of walking alone in South Beach. He was forced to quit YMCA swim team because he no longer felt safe walking 4 blocks to Embarcadero Y. This is not the only story of altercations my family had with the homeless addicted individuals, But this one shows you the impact lack of safety has on ANY and ALL parts of our day to day life.

You may want to dismiss this as a "first world problems". It is not. I am an immigrant and a refugee escaping discrimination; my husband is a war refugee escaping bombs that fell on his city. We know UNSAFE. We came here looking for safety for us, safety for our children, and

safety for our elderly parents. We've been gradually losing the safety. And now, with the decision to put a 200+ bed Navigation Center, with no mandatory treatment program for addicts, with a completely incompetent HSH vouching for running the mega center in a manner that "won't impact the community", and with Mayor's complete disregard to any real impact or proper process, we know you are forcing us out. **My immigrant refugee family looking for a safer life for our kids is no longer welcome here, we simply do not exist.**

It is evident that Mayor Breed making "take no prisoners" approach with the navigation center because somehow she is seeing it as a pillar for her reelection. I campaigned for Mayor Breed, and got my and my husband's family to vote for her. Over 10 FIRST TIME votes went to Breed because of me. And now her policies, specifically as it relates to having safe streets, are the only reason we have to move out of the city. She sees this project as an appeasement to small vocal special interests group, and uses vulnerable segments such as immigrants, children, elderly as a sacrifice. And you are being an accomplice for supporting it.

You understand as well as well all do that putting 200 hard to reach street residents under one roof is going to create problems inside the center. HSH has a clear track record of inability to control those problems and they lack any experience handling the location of such scale. Once uncontrolled, the problems such as drug use, violent behavior and theft will quickly spill over into the neighborhood. SFPD seemed to promise to help. I have not seen anything from Southern station. And the homeless outreach team is always citing how overwhelmed they are handling Tenderloin. The promise brings me no comfort. In addition, this parking lot is cut off by heavy traffic on Embarcadero, Beale and Brannan. So just mere geography make this location a very challenging one to deal with in a timely banner when problems start arising. I am appalled that no one is looking at the impact based on real life scenarios. The center is open 24/7, and with most residents using drugs regularly but unable to use inside, where would they be? on the Waterfront. Where would they buy illegal drugs? On the Waterfront. Where will the dealers come to sell to users? To the Waterfront. There's no mandatory treatment, there's no consequence for openly using meth or heroin, and there are very little consequences of dealing. So WHAT WILL STOP THIS FROM HAPPENING?

Please do what you can to prevent this from happening before it is too late. Give my family a chance to continue living in San Francisco.”

-Victoria Boyko

-----April 2019-----

Respected SF Port Commissioners:


By now you have heard the many valid concerns of South Beach and Rincon Hill residents among others about the proposed location for the new Navigation Center, so I will not repeat them here. You have also heard from other SF residents, who mostly don't live or work anywhere near Seawall Lot 330, about their support of this location and their disgraceful demonization of the residents who oppose it (again I will not repeat what they say here).

The question I would like you to think about as you consider Seawall Lot 330 for the Navigation center is **why didn't the locations of the previous Nav centers create anywhere near as much controversy as this one?**

The answer is clear at least to me. The locations of previous Navigation centers made sense for both residents and the homeless. Seawall Lot 330 doesn't make sense for anybody (for all the reasons you heard from many residents). **The mere fact that this proposal has been creating such unhealthy divisions between the residents of our city on an issue we all agree on, which is to find good solutions for homelessness, clearly demonstrates that it is a poor choice.**

I beg you to vote against it.

--

Abbas El Gamal


Hi mark

What, if anything, am I do with this? I received a hard copy at my home address as well (which I wasn't thrilled about).

Is not responding acceptable?

CAW

CHRISTOPHER S. WASNEY AIA
PRINCIPAL



www.cawarchitects.com

ARCHITECTS

Begin forwarded message:

From: Christy Scrivano <[REDACTED]>
Date: April 2, 2019 at 2:30:49 PM PDT
To: csw@cawarchitects.com
Subject: **Your influence is needed**

Dear Mr. Wasney, Member of the Central Waterfront Advisory Group:

My name is Christy Scrivano, I live at [REDACTED], and I thank you for listening to me and the residents of District 6 during the CWAG/NEWAG meeting on Wednesday, March 20th.

As I stated in my comments during that meeting, my entire household objects to Mayor Breed's proposal to build a Navigation Center on Seawall Lot 330 (SWL 330), directly across from the Portside building that has been my home for the last eight years and is 20 yards from my 3-year old son's bedroom. **I know that it is within your power to help influence the decision of the Port Commission and make a recommendation that they vote this proposal down at their [April 23rd](#) meeting, and I urge you to do so.**

I am a working mother who walks to and from work each day, usually in the dark, and the risk to public safety—particularly the safety of children and families in the neighborhood—is what I am most concerned about and why I am opposed to the Mayor's proposal.

The area around SWL 330, including my own building, is home to many residents with young families, whose physical safety would be threatened by the gathering of large congregations of homeless, some of who are mentally ill, intoxicated with alcohol, high on chemical substances, or with criminal or violent histories. To place children directly in the path of a large homeless population is dangerous, irresponsible, and wrong.

Over the last eight years since I have lived at Portside, the increase in the number of families in our neighborhood has skyrocketed, along with the number of children's facilities, daycares, and schools in the area. There are currently at least 25 schools and daycare providers within walking distance of the proposed Navigation Center.

Mayor Breed has stated that navigation centers "will make a real difference in our neighborhoods." Unfortunately the difference will be a **negative** impact on our safety, increase in crime, and increase in illegal activity that will particularly affect the well-being and health of children in the neighborhood, as well as children who visit the city to enjoy our playgrounds, children's museum, and ballpark all within walking distance of the proposed navigation center.

To get a better understanding of what it would be like for my son to grow up near a homeless center, I recently visited the area around the Civic Center Navigation Center, including the [300 block at Hyde Street](#) in the Tenderloin. And what I saw confirms my decision that if this SOMA

Navigation Center is built as proposed, right outside my doorstep, then I will be forced to move out of this city.

It was obvious to me during my visit to the existing center that the entire area is a containment zone, and we are now seeking to import those behaviors into my own neighborhood. I will not risk living in an environment that exposes my child to what saw on Hyde Street:

- Men defecating on the street,
- Unsheltered drug users camping along sidewalks,
- Users shooting up in plain sight on the street,
- Drug dealers peddling what I suspect was cocaine and heroin,
- Used needles littering the streets—can you imagine your child picking one up and destroying their life by touching it and contracting HIV or Hepatitis C? (An alarming stat: the San Francisco Public Health Department retrieves **over 165,000 needles a month** across the city)

I can't imagine exposing my son to this day in and day out, seeing these images whenever he looks out the window, walks outside his home to take the muni to school, runs around on the neighborhood playgrounds, and falls asleep in his bed to be woken up in the middle of the night by sounds of profanity, brawls, and street conflict. **His bedroom is 20 yards away from where this center would go up.**

During the CWAG/NEWAG meeting on March 20th, the HSH shared further details about the mayor's proposal, and I am alarmed by what I heard—particularly the fact that the HSH **recognizes** that in order to keep the area around the center safe, police will patrol the streets **4 times a day**—directly in front of my building.

I cannot risk raising my child in such an unsafe environment, knowing that he would be exposed daily to what the HSH **already expects** could endanger our neighborhood if this center is built. What happens when the police patrol misses a shift and doesn't show up as promised? I was told by an SF police officer that they currently do not have enough officers to regularly patrol the existing navigation centers already in place within our city.

While a few people outside my district suggest “it will all be fine”, I am one of countless parents who is not willing to take this risk on my own child. I already made the choice to live in this current, safe neighborhood to raise my son. The city is forcing families out with this proposal, and losing the contributions to the city that hardworking parents like myself have made to make San Francisco.

[The proposal](#) was sprung on my community with very little notice and it seems as though public officials are racing to put it through before most neighbors in my district find out about it. It's clear this navigation center is being pushed ahead without proper due diligence on the neighborhood, and civic leaders are neglecting to truly understand the impact it will have on such a large population of families in the area.

I urge you to please reflect on the impact this Navigation Center could have, particularly on families and children. **It is within your power to help halt this fast-paced progress,** and recommend to the Port Commission that they vote down the proposal, or at least pause to conduct the necessary due diligence in order to determine the lasting effects this center would have around Seawall Lot 330—before it is too late.

Sincerely,

Christy Scrivano



Dear Mark,

My name is Devin Hexner.

I respect you, your time, your energy, and your precarious situation regarding the proposed Navigation Center on Seawall Lot 330. I understand that whatever opinion and action you take, you will have detractors. I do not wish to be an enemy, I wish to be a person who wants to share with you, and I ask for you to pause and consider my thoughts.

I understand there is a pressing homelessness crisis with a reported 3,500 homeless people living unsheltered in San Francisco (Source: Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing). I am supportive of passionate efforts by city officials to make our community a better, healthier, more thriving place by helping support and rejuvenate the homeless population.

I live in the [REDACTED], where I have lived since 2014. This building is adjacent to the proposed Seawall Lot 330 Navigation Center. I am skeptical and oppose the Navigation Center in this location, and I request that you step back for a few moments to consider:

This is a Lose-Lose-Lose situation. The proposed location is bad for the homeless population, bad for the Port of San Francisco, and bad for current neighborhood residents.

1) *How is this bad for the homeless?*

I believe that every person has the ability to thrive, including people who are struggling the most in society. I have personally struggled with mental health problems, and after 5 years of recovery, my life has completely turned around for the better. I am incredibly grateful to certain government services and hospitals that supported me in recovering through challenging times. I think the proposed navigation center is in the wrong location for a person to struggling to survive and thrive in their recovery. Many important services are not nearby Seawall Lot 330, such as hospitals, government services, food distribution centers, and mental health support.

The neighborhood environment is already chaotic with thousands of commuters, tourists, and event-goers daily. Thousands of cars are commuting across the bay bridge, with on-ramps and exits thirty seconds away from Seawall Lot 330. There are thousands of tourists walking on The Embarcadero, as well as thousands of event-goers rushing to see the professional baseball and soon-to-be basketball games. It is also very windy, with particularly cold air coming directly off the waters of San Francisco Bay.

This environment, with the combination of thousands of commuters, thousands of tourists, and thousands of event-goers, would be overwhelming and chaotic for a new homeless population moving into the proposed 200+ bed Navigation Center. In my mental health recovery, I would not have thrived in this environment.

2) How is this bad for the Port of San Francisco?

The Port of San Francisco will have a new, ongoing, and challenging project to manage with this Navigation Center, when the organization is already spread thin.

The Port already struggles to manage homeless encampments at Warm Water Cove, Islais Creek, Justin Herman Plaza, Brannan Street Wharf, and Fisherman's Wharf. There is a likelihood that this Navigation Center would become a magnet for more encampments on The Embarcadero, which would further tax the Port with more crime and liability.

Seawall Lot 330 is also an environmentally insecure location, currently existing as an asphalt parking lot that is not retrofitted for a significant earthquake which is imminent in San Francisco. The Port would be putting hundreds of people at risk by allowing this Navigation Center to be built quickly.

3) How is this bad for the neighborhood residents?

The South Beach neighborhood surrounding Seawall Lot 330 is in a complicated position politically. If there is any resistance by neighbors, they will be deemed as cold and unsympathetic to the concerns of society's poor (i.e. NIMBY, "not in my neighborhood" supporters).

South Beach is in District 6 which already has multiple navigation centers, and already has a track record of being YIMBY supporters (i.e. "yes in my neighborhood"). We support these centers and also support the nearby Delancey Street Foundation, a stellar organization that rehabilitates various struggling populations. We are already a neighborhood and district that says "Yes in My Backyard."

At what point are other districts going to play their part to support YIMBY efforts, like district 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7?

Additionally, as stated previously, the South Beach neighborhood is already bustling from numerous factors including traffic, tourism, and events. The neighborhood also has a high residential population, including many families with children; adding a navigation center that lacks adequate logistical support nearby can cause significant trauma in a variety of respects, ranging from crime, drug use, and mental un-health involving existing residents as well as new potential inhabitants of the navigation center.

This project is being fast-tracked without competent environmental, social, and security reviews taking place. The Navigation Center would be constructed quickly on a liquefaction zone with likely chemicals near the surface of the asphalt, from industrial businesses in the 18-1900's. This proposed project, seemingly rushed without true consideration and input from the community, sets up the project for failure - negativity will likely surround the construction, setup, and maintenance of the project if this is approved. The results may be extremely sad.

If you were asking me for my input on the homelessness crisis and a proposed navigation center on Seawall Lot 330, I would suggest two solutions. First, look at other districts to join the YIMBY team. The city and each district has smart individuals working, people who should be able to find alternative sites for new navigation centers. Second, Emily Cohen - homelessness policy advisor to Mayor Breed - has cited that 120 individuals become homeless in San Francisco every week, with 40 coming from other bay area counties, and an undetermined amount coming from other cities outside the bay area; given this situation, my next solution would be to resource other counties for support in rehabilitating our whole society's homeless population, so that our entire state and national society can thrive.

I am a human being that cares about other human beings. I support Navigation Centers and passionate efforts for extending care and resources to those in need. I also think it is important to look at the facts of this location, and see that geographically this is a no-win zone.

This homelessness crisis has, and will be a long term problem. There are no short-term fixes, and a 200-bed facility in the wrong location will cause more problems than solutions.

I sincerely hope that you can pause for a few moments, and consider that there are other solutions out there that can and will be better to pursue and forgo this site as an option.

I would appreciate you carving out 10 minutes to chat over the phone, and I will continue to message until I hear from you.

Thank you,
Devin Justis Hexner

[REDACTED]

Central Waterfront Advisory Group
c/o Mark Paez
Port of San Francisco
Pier 1, the Embarcadero
San Francisco, CA 94111

Subject: Opposition to Proposed Navigation Center on Seawall Lot 330

Dear Advisory Group Members,

My name is Shailendra Yeda. I am a resident of [REDACTED]. I oppose locating the proposed navigation center on SWL 330 directly across the street, a block away from, (state how close to SWL 330) from our residential community. While Portside shares the commitment of the City and Port to reduce homelessness, the location of the proposed navigation center at SWL 330 poses many unmitigable problems and unacceptable outcomes for our neighborhood, including increased risks to public safety, property crime, and public nuisance; degradation of neighborhood quality of life and livability; and perhaps most importantly, non-compliance of land use with the SF Port's own Waterfront Plan and City plans.

RESIDENT AND NEIGHBORHOOD ISSUES

Magnet for Homeless Outside Center

It is inevitable that the proposed navigation center will attract large congregations of street people outside. It has been documented in published reports that areas that border on homeless shelters have more problems with crime, violence, drug use, loitering, and other criminal activities. These conditions will have a negative impact upon pedestrians and attendees of Giants games walking along the Embarcadero, and our neighborhood in general.

Fails to Integrate with Community

No land use could be more distinctly out of character for the South Beach community of high-end residential and office use than the proposed navigation center's temporary structures and tents. Any development which requires 24/7 police protection around its perimeter has no place

in a thriving residential neighborhood. It is clearly an improper, unsuitable, and incompatible use within our residential neighborhood.

Risks to Public Safety

Our building is home to many residents with young families, whose physical safety would be threatened by the inevitable gathering of homeless outside the center, some of who are mentally ill, intoxicated with alcohol, high on chemical substances, or with criminal or violent histories. To place children directly in the path of a large homeless population is dangerous, irresponsible, and wrong.

Increase in Property Crime

The surrounding streets of Bryant, Main, Harrison and the Embarcadero have some of the highest rates of vehicle break-ins in the City, with many of these crimes proven to be committed by the homeless. Locating the proposed navigation center so close to our residences, businesses, and property will make an untenable situation worse and degrade our quality of life.

Degradation of Quality of Life

Our building's residents—and our neighborhood in general—already endure continuous periods of gridlocked traffic throughout the day which negatively impacts our area. We see no value—nor justice—in compounding the existing problems of our neighborhood with the proposed navigation center and the crime, violence, drug use, loitering, and criminal activities it will bring.

Disproportionate Use of District 6 for Homeless

District 6 already has an 84-bed navigation center at 5th and Bryant Streets, in close proximity to the proposed site on SWL 330. Locating another navigation center so close to 5th and Bryant places a disproportionate and undue burden of homelessness upon our residential neighborhood. Other districts must do their fair share to ease the homelessness problem by accommodating navigation centers.

Navigation Centers Belong in Non-Residential Areas

It makes no sense to destroy a safe, upscale, desirable neighborhood for the sake of a political agenda. Intelligent city planning is about context. Navigation centers, due to their temporary nature, should be located in industrial/commercial areas, where they will not pose a threat to the safety of established residential communities and families. Why place it at SWL 330, in the middle of a thriving residential community?

Fallacy of Locating Centers Where Homeless Are

Also, it is not about placing navigation centers where the homeless are—navigation center admittance is by referral only. Locating a navigation center in a residential neighborhood by definition brings homeless to that area—ours—who were not there before. If the Port's goal is to reduce homelessness on Port property, the proposed navigation center will do the exact opposite.

PLANNING AND LAND USE ISSUES

As an engaged citizen who has dutifully participated in and commented upon the numerous Port Workshops on the development of SWL 330 for over two decades, I am also deeply troubled by

the City and Port proposing a navigation center at this location.

Inappropriate Land Use per Community Input

Engaged citizens of the area contributed their valuable time to participate in many input sessions and workshops with both Port and City officials regarding potential land use for SWL 330. Never has our community supported a navigation center as an appropriate land use for the site. It is out of place, out of character, and inappropriate for our residential neighborhood. If community input is to be disregarded, why have we attended, participated in, and commented upon all these sessions?

Impedes Public Access to Waterfront

SB815, approved by the State Legislature in 2007, allows development of non-trust residential, office, and commercial uses that complement the land use character of the South Beach neighborhood, generate revenue for historic rehabilitation, and public access. The proposed navigation center at SWL 330, in addition to being a land use that is distinctly out of character with the South Beach neighborhood, will do the opposite of promoting public access to the Waterfront—by forcing pedestrians and Giants attendees to cross the street or stay away from the area altogether to avoid being accosted by the inevitable homeless activity surrounding the shelter.

Fails to Comply with SF Port Waterfront Plan—or Any Plans

The use of SWL 330 for a proposed navigation center fails to comply with the SF Port Waterfront Plan or any other adopted plans, including the Rincon Hill, Better Streets, and Eastern Neighborhoods Plans. If the use is non-compliant with any approved Plans that citizens took time out their working day to contribute to and comment upon, why have any Plans at all? Why should the mayor be allowed to to subvert the will of the residents most adversely affected by the location of the proposed navigation center?

Disregards All Waterfront Plan Update Recommendations

Land use of SWL 330 as a proposed navigation center is in direct opposition to all Working Group Recommendations stated in the most recent SF Port Waterfront Plan Update of June 22, 2018 for improving use and development of SWL 330:

- “Complement the character of surrounding neighborhoods;”

The proposed navigation center is distinctly out of character for the South Beach community of high-end residential and office use.

- “Provide a pleasing transition from the City-side to the Bay, and ground floor activation to enhance the pedestrian environment;”

To the contrary, the proposed portable structures and tents will be a visual and architectural blight upon the most scenic and symbolic thoroughfare of the city as an improper, unsuitable, and incompatible use. Pedestrians and Giants attendees will be forced to cross the street to avoid being harassed by the homeless outside the shelter.

- and “Generate revenues for Port capital improvements.”

The loss of the \$700,000 currently generated at SWL 330 will be greatly detrimental to the Port’s efforts to fund much-needed capital improvements.

“FAST TRACK” LEGISLATION ISSUES

Removal of Planning, Permitting, and Other Regulatory Review

Any attempt to “fast track” approval of the navigation center through proposed legislation eliminating planning, permitting and other regulatory review is a blatant attempt to subvert the will of the people. The legislation puts the Mayor’s goal of building 1000 new shelter beds ahead of all other legitimate considerations. It will ignore critical planning and environmental safeguards built into the process to protect citizens, stifle essential community input and discussion, and essentially defy the will of citizens in the residential neighborhood most adversely affected by the proposed navigation center.

Dangerous Precedent for Individual Districts

The legislation will not only affect SWL 330, but sets a dangerous precedent for navigation centers to be located in densely populated residential family neighborhoods, ignoring the adverse impacts upon each district and its constituents, and ceding critical legislative power to the executive branch at the expense of individual district voters.

Lack of Responsibility and Accountability

This proposed legislation will only serve to diminish our neighborhood’s faith in government responsibility and accountability to the citizens it purports to represent and serve. To “fast track” a project this problematic and controversial is irresponsible, short-sighted, and wrong.

CONCLUSION

I remain hopeful that you, as fellow citizens and members of the Central Waterfront Advisory Group, will fulfill your responsibilities to put the interests of the neighborhood who will be most adversely affected by the navigation center—and the citizens they represent—above politics. For the many important reasons stated above, I respectfully request that you oppose the location of the proposed navigation center on SWL 330 and any “fast-track” legislation designed to railroad its approval. This is not what our residential neighborhood needs, wants, or represents.

Respectfully,
Shailendra Yeda



Apologies for taking up more time, but just wanted to share an email below from my wife who is very excited to learn that a facility in Presidio Heights is in the works. I stand corrected and misinformed. Please confirm.

Hello, I am [REDACTED] who has mentioned in the past that I’ve been assaulted multiple times by the homeless. I had a couple of other requests if possible. It’d be quite helpful to see statistics

on the efficacy of navigation centers so that people can stop complaining that the beds don't work. I assume that since this is such a well thought out plan that a lot of studies have been done to support your hypothesis. Also people keep fretting that other homeless will be increasingly attracted to SF if more facilities are built. Thus data showing that providing more beds reduces the influx of other homeless would also be great.

Lastly my husband saw the tweet below which I assume means that Benioff is helping build a navigation center in Presidio Heights immediately! That is fantastic news! I'm with Benioff and him and SF building a facility in Presidio Heights for sure. I think this endorsement needs much more press. Please spread the word!

<https://twitter.com/benioff/status/1112037704936546304?s=12>

Thank you!

Susie

On Mar 31, 2019, at 10:49 AM, Victor Masaya <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Fellow residents, I just came across the disturbing below post on Nextdoor and urge each and everyone of you to please openly respond via a press release to stop the lies and highlight that the below is a misuse of data and is directionally wrong! From everything I've heard from the government including agencies, **ALL areas within SF are participating** and have signed off including **Sea Cliff and Presidio Heights**. Please let everyone know that plans for navigation centers in **Sea Cliff and Presidio Heights have already been approved**.

It is very defeating to see articles like these that I assume are **factually incorrect**?

Please provide **announcements that Sea Cliff, Presidio Heights and the Marina are all on board and that navigation centers will be built immediately** in those respective less diverse areas. As articulated numerous times now to a number of folks on this email, when folks spread lies that the likes of Sea Cliff and Presidio Heights are not having navigation centers built, that only builds skepticism and distrust. It also leads to assumptions that we are living within a city that has an administration that is authoritarian, builds physical barriers that are inconsistent with the will of the people, only governs to achieve political agendas, and spreads fake news. That can't be true, correct? Only the Trump administration would do such a thing and I know that SF is better than that...or maybe not...

District 6 has 65% of the shelter beds in San Francisco and 73% of Permanent Supportive Housing

Jack Dorsey lives in Sea Cliff with sweeping views of the Golden Gate Bridge, Marin Headlands, and the Pacific Ocean. Sea Cliff, located in District 1, has 2.9% of homeless services in their district and 0.3% of Permanent Supportive Housing. The City has announced no plans to place a Navigation Center in the Sea Cliff Neighborhood and Jack Dorsey has not publicly called for a Navigation Center in his Neighborhood. Jack Dorsey has donated \$25,000 to the Coalition for Homelessness in support of the Mega Navigation Center to be built on the Embarcadero, a 25-minute drive across town from his home. It's fair to say Jack Dorsey is a NIMBY. It's wonderful he is donating to a charity (you should too!), but he isn't inviting a Navigation Center into his neighborhood.

Marc Benioff lives in one of the toniest neighborhoods in San Francisco, Presidio Heights with beautiful views of the Presidio Park. Presidio Heights of District 2 has 0% (zero percent) of homeless services, no shelter beds in their district and 1.9% of Permanent Supportive Housing. The City has announced no plans to place a Navigation Center in the Presidio Heights Neighborhood and Marc Benioff has not publicly called for a Navigation Center in his Neighborhood. Marc Benioff has donated \$10,000 to the Coalition for Homelessness in support of the Mega Navigation Center to be built on the Embarcadero, a 20-minute drive across town from his home. It's fair to say Marc Benioff, while a hero to the City in many ways is still (technically) a NIMBY (even though we love him). It's wonderful he is donating to a charity (everyone should!), but he isn't inviting a Navigation Center into his neighborhood.

William Fitzgerald who started the rival "troll" GoFundMe page lives in the Richmond District, District 1, near Golden Gate Park according to his interview on KRON4 on March 30th. The Richmond District has 2.9% of homeless services in their district and 0.3% of Permanent Supportive Housing. The City has announced no plans to place a Navigation Center in the Richmond Neighborhood of San Francisco. William Fitzgerald *has* publicly called for a Navigation Center in his Neighborhood and has helped to raise \$138,000 (and counting) for the Coalition for Homelessness in support of the Mega Navigation Center to be built on the Embarcadero, a 20-minute drive across town from his home. Perhaps, all of the money from his fundraiser could go to scouting locations in District 1 near his home? Win!

Perhaps, London Breed could work with William to place the next Navigation Center in his neighborhood? He's ready to go to the fences for you London and has the support of several Tech Billionaires to boot! While all of these wonderful gentlemen are supporting an open drug policy Mega Shelter, 20 minutes away from their clean tree-lined streets – the folks over in District 6 are the true supporters of homelessness. And, it is not fair to say any of these folks in D6 are NIMBYs. District 6 carries by far over and above the average of all of the homeless services in the City of San Francisco. Over 65%, yes, 65% of the shelter beds and 73%, yes you read that right, 73% of all of San Francisco's Permanent Supportive Housing are in District 6. District 6 also, already has a Navigation Center – check out the needle encrusted streets surrounding it – Sam Brock of NBC shot some video of the area surrounding this SAFE Navigation Center on March 29th – which made the 6 o'clock news. So, again – no one here is a NIMBY. Perhaps, NIMFY (Not in My Front Yard) or NAIMBY (Not All in My Back Yard). So, before you demonize working-class families living in apartments (not the houses of the donors in District 1 and District 2 receiving the accolades) – perhaps, you should dig into the story the news media isn't reporting because it doesn't get the clicks, the shares or the tune-ins. We all

want the same thing for our children and ourselves. And, we all want the same thing for the homeless as well. We want them to be safe, and sheltered and to get the services they need with Permanent Supportive Housing. We all also, in tandem, want safety for our children and a sense of security when we walk down the street. The residents of District 6 want a sense of security while walking on the promenade that most of us consider our public park – the Embarcadero. We walk it on the way to work and on the weekends for leisure with our family and friends, push our kids in strollers, walk alongside our kids learning to ride their bikes, and smile at the tourists walking by while they enjoy this crown jewel of the City. This area has been years in the making in terms of the revitalization efforts for the Embarcadero, thank you San Francisco, it looks beautiful! We love it! We love the arrow sculpture in the grass, the lights of the Bay Bridge, walking to the Ball Park for Giants Games, the Ferry Building on Saturday for our Farmer's Market, Pier 23, and Fisherman's Wharf. Perhaps, by mistake, but perhaps not, Mayor Breed didn't do any outreach to the community and residents – instead, neighbors read about this in the newspaper with all indications it was a done deal. The area where the City has proposed the Mega Navigation Center is currently a low-crime area and residents feel safe. If you walk over to 5th & Bryant, you'll get a taste of what is to come of this area if this SAFE (translation: drug use friendly) Mega Navigation Center is built in the "front yard" of 10,000 residents living here. And, so we may end with numbers in a visual format: If you walk the stretch from the Giants Ball Park all the way to Crissy Field, you'll count 12 to 15 homeless people. I've done this walk twice since the announcement was made by London Breed. This leads to further confusion for us D6 folks, there aren't the numbers here to support 225 homeless beds in this neighborhood. Perhaps, London should take a page out of the Mayor of LA's playbook? Navigation Centers will be spread out in every district in LA. No questions asked. No arguments. For all the NIMBY narrative spreaders, we have one already – have you seen it? And, we have St. Vincent de Paul, the Sanctuary, MCS, Glide, Delancey Street – the list goes on and on. We also have almost all of the Permanent Supportive Housing – 73% of it. Where do you live? I'll send you your stats. Are the large donations a call from Marc Benioff, Jack Dorsey, Nat Friedman, and the other tech billionaires to put the Navigation Centers in their front yards? There is a large parking lot adjacent the waterfront on Marina Green. "It's just a parking lot," to quote some of the comments surrounding this issue. Perhaps, we'll make YIMBYs of them after all. -A resident of D6 who loves the Embarcadero and would like the non-factual NIMBY narrative to cease. It's not true.

Victor Masaya <[REDACTED]>

Wed, Mar 27, 5:33 PM (4 days ago)

to mark.paez, Smush

Hi Mark, my name is Victor Masaya and I'm a resident on Townsend, near the potential site of the navigation center. As you can imagine the neighborhood is very upset with what's likely going to transpire but if you don't mind I would like to ask you a few questions as a neighbor suggested folks reach out to you. As an FYI I'm now resigned to the fact that this will be built so just had some follow-up questions.

- Given this center is part of a larger plan of the Mayor's, can you confirm that the Marina, Pac Heights, Presidio Heights or Seacliff have signed off on a center to be built in their neighborhood? Our understanding from the Mayor is that other neighborhoods have all signed off and that all of SF is going to participate. From a messaging standpoint I think if you and Mayor Breed communicated the timing of the construction of a center in one of those specific locations and that they have already signed off, that would be fantastic! Currently residents in District 6 assume that **the wealthy and less diverse are excluded** so confirmation that those affluent neighborhoods are indeed participating as part of the larger plan would undoubtedly assuage folks' concerns. I personally would be super excited if a center was built there first and then **NO NEIGHBORHOOD in SF could use NIMBY** as an excuse.

- Why doesn't SF **build vertically from existing centers**? Wouldn't it make sense from a cost and synergies standpoint to just build additional floors to existing facilities and then invest in medical resources to treat the mentally ill. With scale within a single location comes meaningful synergies one would think?

- Obviously **physical assault and murder is a concern, especially with kids in close proximity**. How many more SFPD personnel will be manning the neighborhood. I hate to sound paranoid but my wife and I are expecting in late April and May. My wife Susie (copied on this email) has already been **assaulted multiple times by the homeless** as have her co-workers so we're hoping that if the center is going to be built, can we also **add a wall** to enclose all of the homeless with a lot of police personnel so that no homeless are lingering outside and no homeless can escape the navigation center.

I've emailed so many officials and no one wants to give straight answers so I would GREATLY APPRECIATE it if you could just say you're unable to answer any of the above questions rather than pasting in a template response that doesn't answer the question. In addition if my questions are moronic, please do say so. I'd much rather have someone be direct with me and call me an idiot rather than send a canned response that is infuriating. I have thick skin so if you think any of what I wrote is unfounded, fake news, or outright stupid, I'm good with that if you let me know. I would sincerely respect that type of direct feedback. If better, happy to jump on a call.

Thanks much for your time.

Best,
Victor

[REDACTED]

From: Susie Masaya <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Thursday, March 21, 2019 8:41:26 PM

To: Victor Masaya

Cc: Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS); Quesada, Amy (PRT); Quezada, Randolph (PRT); Haneystaff (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Bruss, Andrea (MYR); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); DSHS (HOM)

Subject: Re: Homeless Shelter

Dear fellow SF residents,

I am deeply upset about the news of the shelter going up. I have been assaulted by a homeless person on multiple occasions and my co-workers have as well, and while reported to the Police, they have done NOTHING.

If you ask the homeless person why they are not in a shelter they state they don't want to follow the rules of the shelter so choose not to be in one. I don't believe our homeless problem is as much of a bed issue as it is a drug and mental issue. I feel like we need to address this first! Adding more beds is NOT going to fix the problem.

I went to the Townhall and i would say over 95% of the individuals who spoke were against the shelter.

I feel like our voices are not being heard and that that you will just do as you please and this greatly concerns me as a Taxpayer - Shame on you!

Also having more police in the neighborhood is NOT a solution. If you want to make a statement with the shelter then I believe this should first go up in the more affluent neighborhoods such as the SeaCliff, Presidio Heights, and Pacific Heights - if built there and other districts can see that it is running well I am sure other districts will fall in line. As you stated at the Townhall "no district is exempt" but I feel like that is a LIE.

and why is it OKAY for the Mayor to fast-track her agendas without listening to the citizens of this city. I thought this was a democracy and that you were for the People but I guess that was a LIE too.

I don't believe much thought was put into this and I also don't understand why we just don't better the shelters that are already in place; why can't we just give them an upgrade and build more beds within existing shelters and hire better staff to run and provide the support of what they really need instead of wasting our tax dollars, that we know will cost more to run this then that is being estimated.

Thank you,
Susie Masaya
Concerned Citizen

On Thu, Mar 21, 2019 at 8:29 PM Victor Masaya <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Hi Courtney, thanks again for your previous reply. I've been out of town but someone informed me yesterday that Mayor Breed is now suggesting that there is a "shelter crisis" to pass legislation for the homeless shelter. I assume that this is fake news because no true democratic leader would act in authoritarian manner to create a physical barrier in a racially diverse area, would one? It'd be quite disappointing to have a President who only caters to his base and a mayor in our city that acts in a similar manner.

I hate to repeat this but why not open a large medical facility in Pac Heights, Presidio Heights, Seacliff or the Marina? That would accomplish a couple of things: 1) rather than having a useless facility that the homeless probably won't be interested in anyway, the homeless can get real medical help that they need and 2) if the more affluent and less diverse areas in SF can get comfortable with a homeless medical facility, everyone else in SF will as well.

Ultimately if the mayor acts against the will of the people and uses emergency powers or executive orders to meet one of her promises, there's nothing we can do. Hopefully no lives are lost as a result.

Respectfully,
Victor Masaya

On Tue, Mar 12, 2019 at 5:12 PM Victor Masaya <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Courtney, thanks for getting back to me. For some reason no one that I reach out to can address why this location of all locations is the optimal place to have a shelter. This is ridiculous to me but I just live here. It doesn't seem like a complicated question. If this is the ideal spot, that's great but what is the reason for it? Is being close to the water helpful for curing mental illnesses? Is being in a residential area with kids nearby and tourists walking through healthy for the homeless because they can have a footprint in an area where people may give them money? Homelessness is clearly the biggest issue for the city of SF but nobody can articulate why this is the best spot.

As someone who is not sophisticated at all, logic to me would dictate that this shelter should be in very close proximity to hospitals, medical professionals, or close to existing shelters such as the one on 5th and Mission to take advantage of synergies. That way folks can get real medical help and not be milling around near the water.

Hopefully one of these days someone can pronounce why this is the best next step for the city? This seems like a complete waste of money. If the optimal location is indeed a scenic area with foot traffic and the like, shouldn't this be in the Marina? Or why not Pac Heights or Presidio Heights where folks are more affluent.

Any reasoning as to why this is the best location and why the aforementioned more affluent and less diverse areas are not would be super helpful to us and the rest of the D6 community.

Lastly isn't the government aware of homeless people acting aggressively towards others? I would think that anecdotally we're all aware of someone who has been punched, kicked, shoved or hit by a homeless person. Not to sound cynical but maybe being close to residential and tourists is a sound political move because if there is another Kate Steinle episode and someone were to get murdered that could kickstart a campaign to obtain more resources from corporations including the Giants, Warriors, and Salesforce, to try to truly address this issue. Could that be the reason? Again absent any data or other evidence demonstrating why this area is the best place to have this shelter, can't help but think the worst.

Best,

Victor

On Mar 12, 2019, at 4:21 PM, Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS) <courtney.mcdonald@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Victor and Susie,

Thanks for reaching out about this. We hear you, and are committed to addressing needles, mental illness, feces, etc. The goal of the Navigation Center in part would be to make sure that type of activity is not happening on our streets. Supervisor Haney asked me to share some of this initial thoughts with you, as we also just learned about the proposal within the past 2 weeks:

Homelessness is an urgent concern in San Francisco with over 4,000 people currently unsheltered on our streets. The crisis is increasingly impacting the waterfront and our Rincon Hill, South Beach and Mission Bay communities. The status quo of people living in tents or on our streets and under the freeway is completely unacceptable, and Navigation Centers can be part of the solution to immediately get people off the streets and into shelter and services.

I also have some questions and concerns about the proposed Navigation Center, as our office just found out about the proposal and has not yet received the full details. Like you, I am listening and eager to learn more as the terms and design are drafted. I would love to set up a phone call with you to discuss further with me or my staff. Please let me know a good time to call, or call my staff directly at (415) 554-7972.

Here's what I am advocating for at a minimum based on conversations with the community, and I hope you will support my asks of Mayor Breed and Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing:

- The goal of the Navigation Center must be to directly **address homelessness in the neighborhood** and make a major improvement in Rincon Hill, South Beach, and Mission Bay. People will be invited to the Navigation Center *only* from neighborhood Homeless Outreach Teams and there will be no lines of people waiting outside to access services.
- There should be dedicated foot patrols around the perimeter and 24/7 security to ensure **public safety**.
- There should be outdoor spaces for people staying in the Navigation Center that remain separate from the public space so **there aren't people gathering outside**.

- Intensive services must be offered in order to replicate the success of the 6 current Navigation Centers, which have worked to quickly place people in housing or help people get out of San Francisco to stay with friends or family elsewhere through the Homeward Bound program.
- **The Mayor should immediately propose an additional Navigation Center in another part of the City, before this one is approved.** We can't keep concentrating these services solely in District 6. This week, I proposed an amendment to the Shelter Crisis Ordinance to add a commitment to build Navigation Centers in a majority of the Supervisorial districts.
- **The Navigation Center will be temporary.** I am advocating for a shorter lease, likely 2 years, with a potential lease extension only if this works for the neighborhood and shows demonstrable, positive improvements and outcomes for the neighborhood and for people who receive services at the center.

The Mayor and Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing are holding an important community meeting on today (Tuesday, March 12th) about their proposal. We hope you can join us and express your opinions:

- March 12th from 6-7:30pm; Delancey Street Foundation (600 Embarcadero)

The proposal will also be presented on during the Port Commission meeting this afternoon—no action will be taken until their April meeting:

- Today at 3:15pm; Ferry Building, 2nd Floor (Port Commission Hearing Room)

I appreciate and need your continued advocacy.

Our collective long-term goal as a City is to end homelessness and get everyone housed. In the meantime Navigation Centers, if done right, and only if done right, can be an integral first step in the City's strategy to get people off the streets and immediately connected to services.

Thank you again for reaching out. I look forward to talking soon.

Supervisor Matt Haney

From: Victor Masaya [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2019 11:15 PM
To: Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS) <courtney.mcdonald@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: Homeless Shelter

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi Courtney, as noted in an email to Supervisor Haney and staff, my name is Victor Masaya and I've copied in my wife Susie Masaya. We are homeowners in District 6 and have lived in the area since 2005.

We are writing to you (also left a voicemail) as we are extremely concerned about the proposal to have a homeless shelter built in the district. As a couple that is expecting our first child in late April / early May, this is of extreme concern. We don't need to tell anyone about needles, observed mental illness, human feces, etc. and we all know that the problem is getting worse. Going to Safeway and seeing one homeless carrying knives in line and another inserting pliers up his rectum is one thing but having a shelter nearby to exacerbate the problem is another. While our voices don't matter in this city, it'd be great if we could at least get some form of justification of why it makes sense to have it so close to the Ferry Building, FiDi, the Embarcadero, the Giants and the future home of the Warriors. While good economic times will continue (e.g. Lyft IPO, soon to be followed by Uber and other minotaurs), worsening the problem in the district makes it very difficult to raise a child. I realize I am not yet a parent so I am completely speculating that it's not healthy for kids to interact with homeless and come across needles but maybe the data proves otherwise.

On the economics side, it is clearly in homeowners' interest, including ours, to not have a homeless shelter close to us and I fully acknowledge that. But I would still think that would be outweighed by concern for folks that already live in the district, including children. Assuming the project does go through (and even if it doesn't), we will most certainly move out of SF.

Best,

A concerned resident

Victor Masaya



April 8, 2019
Central Waterfront Advisory Group
c/o Mark Paez
Port of San Francisco
Pier 1, the Embarcadero
San Francisco, CA 94111

Subject: Opposition to Proposed Navigation Center on Seawall Lot 330

Dear Advisory Group Members,

I'd like to thank you for your work in the Central Waterfront Advisory group and your service to the community. My name is Tina Hua. I previously served as a federal prosecutor for 11 years, working at the US Attorney's Office in the Civic Center in the San Francisco Tenderloin neighborhood. While I worked there, I faced firsthand what working in a community close to homelessness is like. Due to concerns for my safety, I learned to avoid certain streets and certain times, e.g. when the homeless people would line up in front of the entire block at the post office to pick up their government subsidy checks. I've witnessed aggressive behavior directed at me simply because I walked on the same side of the street, sometimes with a homeless man or woman screaming obscenities, getting into fights, and repeatedly request money. I've witnessed used drug needles, condoms, and defecation on the streets. I also know a federal agent colleague who stepped on a used needle, and had to rush to the emergency room to be treated in case the needle was contaminated with AIDS or other diseases. I made it a point never to walk alone after dark and if I had to work late, I would make sure to drive and move my car into the federal building after hours, which we were allowed to do for our safety.

As a long time public servant, I have been dismayed to see that a necessary conversation about the proposed navigation center at SWL 330 turn into a media circus of the "greedy" vs homeless -- as opposed to a real conversation about the impact to all members of the community, including but not limited to current tenants, owners, businesses, Delancy Street residents, tourists, Giants fans, commuters (to the various highways in the area as well as Caltrain), and the homeless. I am an owner of Portside #702 at 38th Bryant Street. After reviewing the study presented by the Mayor "Navigation Centers: What do Neighbors Have to Fear and learning as much as I can about both sides of the debate, I believe that the proposal is too rushed, and has not adequately considered the impact of the proposed navigation center on SWL 330 directly across the street from ours and several other residential communities. Even the report used by proponents of building the navigation center at SWL 330 raises many concerns and suggested areas for additional study that have not been addressed by proponents of the center. The failure to address obvious safety, crime, visible homelessness, drug

use, and lowered property value concerns, on top of passing legislation to fast-track the building of this center, indicate that the plan to build the center has been too rushed and the serious ramifications of such a center to the neighborhood have not been well thought out.

The proposed center is much larger than prior navigation centers and the proposal is to place it in one of the densest residential areas in San Francisco. The proponents do not adequately address how the large size of the proposed center – more than double some of the prior navigation center sizes – and the characteristic of the existing neighborhood would impact the safety, visibility of the center, and surrounding property value, which is a legitimate concern in light of the fact that many Bay Area home owners see the majority of their net worth in their home value. The report discusses how neighbors of other navigation centers “don’t really feel it” but also discuss how one of the other navigation centers is not in a residential area. In contrast, the intended Navigation Center is not only a lot larger than the prior navigation centers that have been built but are also directly adjacent to four different large complexes with several additional residential buildings very close by. Similarly, the report even states that the property value of neighborhoods within 1-2 blocks of navigation centers may be affected and “it will take further study to determine whether such properties experience decreases in value.” Without additional study into the impact of the proposed center in the existing densely residential neighborhood, and how it is waterfront on a major pathway connecting the city to a pier used for special events, the ballpark, the Caltrain hub, the freeway, the new Warrior’s stadium, and the financial district, the impact to city planning and transportation plans could be detrimental.

Furthermore, the proponents have not studied the impact of the center to Delancy Street or other centers and homeless shelters in the district. Mimi Silbert, President of Delancey Street, has expressed concern about housing active drug users at a navigation center next door to recovering drug addicts. Without studying and addressing the impact of the center to Delancy Street and other homeless shelters is too rash and unnecessarily rushed in light of the potential devastating impact to the neighborhood and overall city planning. While Portside shares the commitment of the City and Port to reduce homelessness, the location of the proposed navigation center at SWL 330 poses many unmitigable problems and unacceptable outcomes for our neighborhood, including increased risks to public safety, property crime, and public nuisance; degradation of neighborhood quality of life and livability; and perhaps most importantly, non-compliance of land use with the SF Port’s own Waterfront Plan and City plans.

I do not want to see the area around my home see the same problems that I saw firsthand when working in the Tenderloin. We purchased the apartment because we love the location and would love to retire here. We love the walkability to my husband’s work, public transit, the Ferry Building, the Giant’s ballpark, and soon to be Warrior’s new home. I currently walk with my children after hours in the area without any concerns for our safety. For these reasons and the specific reasons stated below, I oppose the navigation center at SWL 330.

RESIDENT AND NEIGHBORHOOD ISSUES

Magnet for Homeless Outside Center

It is inevitable that the proposed navigation center will attract large congregations of street people outside. It has been documented in published reports that areas that border on homeless shelters have more problems with crime, violence, drug use, loitering, and other criminal activities. These conditions will have a negative impact upon pedestrians and attendees of Giants games walking along the Embarcadero, and our neighborhood in general.

Fails to Integrate with Community

No land use could be more distinctly out of character for the South Beach community of high-end residential and office use than the proposed navigation center's temporary structures and tents. Any development which requires 24/7 police protection around its perimeter has no place in a thriving residential neighborhood. It is clearly an improper, unsuitable, and incompatible use within our residential neighborhood.

Risks to Public Safety

Our building is home to many residents with young families and elderly couples and singles, whose physical safety would be threatened by the inevitable gathering of homeless outside the center, some of who are mentally ill, intoxicated with alcohol, high on chemical substances, or with criminal or violent histories. To place children and the elderly directly in the path of a large homeless population is dangerous, irresponsible, and wrong.

Increase in Property Crime

The surrounding streets of Bryant, Main, Harrison and the Embarcadero have some of the highest rates of vehicle break-ins in the City, with many of these crimes proven to be committed by the homeless. Locating the proposed navigation center so close to our residences, businesses, and property will make an untenable situation worse and degrade our quality of life.

Degradation of Quality of Life

Our building's residents—and our neighborhood in general—already endure continuous periods of gridlocked traffic throughout the day which negatively impacts our area. We see no value—nor justice—in compounding the existing problems of our neighborhood with the proposed navigation center and the crime, violence, drug use, loitering, and criminal activities it will bring.

Disproportionate Use of District 6 for Homeless

District 6 already has an 84-bed navigation center at 5th and Bryant Streets, in close proximity to the proposed site on SWL 330. Locating another navigation center so close to 5th and Bryant places a disproportionate and undue burden of homelessness upon our residential neighborhood. Other districts must do their fair share to ease the homelessness problem by accommodating navigation centers.

Navigation Centers Belong in Non-Residential Areas

It makes no sense to destroy a safe, upscale, desirable neighborhood for the sake of a political agenda. Intelligent city planning is about context. Navigation centers, due to their temporary nature, should be located in industrial/commercial areas, where they **will not** pose a threat to the safety of established residential

communities and families. Why place it at SWL 330, in the middle of a thriving residential community?

Fallacy of Locating Centers Where Homeless Are

Also, it **is not** about placing navigation centers where the homeless are—navigation center admittance is by referral only. Locating a navigation center in a residential neighborhood by definition brings homeless to that area—**ours**—who were not there before. If the Port’s goal is to reduce homelessness on Port property, the proposed navigation center will do the exact opposite.

PLANNING AND LAND USE ISSUES

Inappropriate Land Use per Community Input

Engaged citizens of the area contributed their valuable time to participate in many input sessions and workshops with both Port and City officials regarding potential land use for SWL 330. Never has our community supported a navigation center as an appropriate land use for the site. It is out of place, out of character, and inappropriate for our residential neighborhood. If community input is to be disregarded, why have we attended, participated in, and commented upon all these sessions?

Impedes Public Access to Waterfront

SB815, approved by the State Legislature in 2007, allows development of nontrust residential, office, and commercial uses that complement the land use character of the South Beach neighborhood, generate revenue for historic rehabilitation, and public access. The proposed navigation center at SWL 330, in addition to being a land use that is distinctly out of character with the South Beach neighborhood, will do the opposite of promoting public access to the Waterfront—by forcing pedestrians and Giants attendees to cross the street or stay away from the area altogether to avoid being accosted by the inevitable homeless activity surrounding the shelter.

Fails to Comply with SF Port Waterfront Plan—or Any Plans

The use of SWL 330 for a proposed navigation center fails to comply with the SF Port Waterfront Plan or any other adopted plans, including the Rincon Hill, Better Streets, and Eastern Neighborhoods Plans. If the use is non-compliant with any approved Plans that citizens took time out their working day to contribute to and comment upon, why have any Plans at all? Why should the mayor be allowed to to subvert the will of the residents most adversely affected by the location of the proposed navigation center?

Disregards All Waterfront Plan Update Recommendations

Land use of SWL 330 as a proposed navigation center is in direct opposition to all Working Group Recommendations stated in the most recent SF Port Waterfront Plan Update of June 22, 2018 for improving use and development of SWL 330:

- *“Complement the character of surrounding neighborhoods;”*

The proposed navigation center is distinctly out of character for the South Beach community of high-end residential and office use.

- *“Provide a pleasing transition from the City-side to the Bay, and ground floor activation to enhance the pedestrian environment;”*

To the contrary, the proposed portable structures and tents will be a visual and

architectural blight upon the most scenic and symbolic thoroughfare of the city as an improper, unsuitable, and incompatible use. Pedestrians and Giants attendees will be forced to cross the street to avoid being harassed by the homeless outside the shelter.

• and *“Generate revenues for Port capital improvements.”*

The loss of the \$700,000 currently generated at SWL 330 will be greatly detrimental to the Port’s efforts to fund much-needed capital improvements.

“FAST TRACK” LEGISLATION ISSUES

Removal of Planning, Permitting, and Other Regulatory Review

Any attempt to “fast track” approval of the navigation center through proposed legislation eliminating planning, permitting and other regulatory review is a blatant attempt to subvert the will of the people. The legislation puts the Mayor’s goal of building 1000 new shelter beds ahead of all other legitimate considerations. It will ignore critical planning and environmental safeguards built into the process to protect citizens, stifle essential community input and discussion, and essentially defy the will of citizens in the residential neighborhood most adversely affected by the proposed navigation center.

Dangerous Precedent for Individual Districts

The legislation will not only affect SWL 330, but sets a dangerous precedent for navigation centers to be located in densely populated residential family neighborhoods, ignoring the adverse impacts upon each district and its constituents, and ceding critical legislative power to the executive branch at the expense of individual district voters.

Lack of Responsibility and Accountability

This proposed legislation will only serve to diminish our neighborhood’s faith in government responsibility and accountability to the citizens it purports to represent and serve. To “fast track” a project this problematic and controversial is irresponsible, short-sighted, and wrong.

CONCLUSION

I remain hopeful that you, as fellow citizens and members of the Central Waterfront Advisory Group, will fulfill your responsibilities to put the interests of the neighborhood who will be most adversely affected by the navigation center—and the citizens they represent—above politics. For the many important reasons stated above, I respectfully request that you oppose the location of the proposed navigation center on SWL 330 and any “fast-track” legislation designed to railroad its approval. This is not what our residential neighborhood needs, wants, or represents.

Respectfully,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and name of the author.

Fellow residents, I just came across the disturbing below post on Nextdoor and urge each and everyone of you to please openly respond via a press release to stop the lies and highlight that the below is a misuse of data and is directionally wrong! From everything I've heard from the government including agencies, **ALL areas within SF are participating** and have signed off including **Sea Cliff and Presidio Heights**. Please let everyone know that plans for navigation centers in **Sea Cliff and Presidio Heights have already been approved**.

It is very defeating to see articles like these that I assume are **factually incorrect**?

Please provide **announcements that Sea Cliff, Presidio Heights and the Marina are all on board and that navigation centers will be built immediately** in those respective less diverse areas. As articulated numerous times now to a number of folks on this email, when folks spread lies that the likes of Sea Cliff and Presidio Heights are not having navigation centers built, that only builds skepticism and distrust. It also leads to assumptions that we are living within a city that has an administration that is authoritarian, builds physical barriers that are inconsistent with the will of the people, only governs to achieve political agendas, and spreads fake news. That can't be true, correct? Only the Trump administration would do such a thing and I know that SF is better than that...or maybe not...

District 6 has 65% of the shelter beds in San Francisco and 73% of Permanent Supportive Housing

Jack Dorsey lives in Sea Cliff with sweeping views of the Golden Gate Bridge, Marin Headlands, and the Pacific Ocean. Sea Cliff, located in District 1, has 2.9% of homeless services in their district and 0.3% of Permanent Supportive Housing. The City has announced no plans to place a Navigation Center in the Sea Cliff Neighborhood and Jack Dorsey has not publicly called for a Navigation Center in his Neighborhood. Jack Dorsey has donated \$25,000 to the Coalition for Homelessness in support of the Mega Navigation Center to be built on the Embarcadero, a 25-minute drive across town from his home. It's fair to say Jack Dorsey is a NIMBY. It's wonderful he is donating to a charity (you should too!), but he isn't inviting a Navigation Center into his neighborhood. Marc Benioff lives in one of the toniest neighborhoods in San Francisco, Presidio Heights with beautiful views of the Presidio Park. Presidio Heights of District 2 has 0% (zero percent) of homeless services, no shelter beds in their district and 1.9% of Permanent Supportive Housing. The City has announced no plans to place a Navigation Center in the Presidio Heights Neighborhood and Marc Benioff has not publicly called for a Navigation Center in his Neighborhood. Marc Benioff has donated \$10,000 to the Coalition for Homelessness in support of the Mega Navigation Center to be built on the Embarcadero, a 20-minute drive across town from his home. It's fair to say Marc Benioff, while a hero to the City in many ways is still (technically) a NIMBY (even though we love him). It's wonderful he is donating to a charity (everyone should!), but he isn't inviting a Navigation Center into his neighborhood. William Fitzgerald who started the rival "troll" GoFundMe page lives in the Richmond District, District 1, near Golden Gate Park according to his interview on KRON4 on March 30th. The Richmond District has 2.9% of homeless services in their district and 0.3% of Permanent Supportive Housing.

The City has announced no plans to place a Navigation Center in the Richmond Neighborhood of San Francisco. William Fitzgerald *has* publicly called for a Navigation Center in his Neighborhood and has helped to raise \$138,000 (and counting) for the Coalition for Homelessness in support of the Mega Navigation Center to be built on the Embarcadero, a 20-minute drive across town from his home. Perhaps, all of the money from his fundraiser could go to scouting locations in District 1 near his home? Win! Perhaps, London Breed could work with William to place the next Navigation Center in his neighborhood? He's ready to go to the fences for you London and has the support of several Tech Billionaires to boot! While all of these wonderful gentlemen are supporting an open drug policy Mega Shelter, 20 minutes away from their clean tree-lined streets – the folks over in District 6 are the true supporters of homelessness. And, it is not fair to say any of these folks in D6 are NIMBYs. District 6 carries by far over and above the average of all of the homeless services in the City of San Francisco. Over 65%, yes, 65% of the shelter beds and 73%, yes you read that right, 73% of all of San Francisco's Permanent Supportive Housing are in District 6. District 6 also, already has a Navigation Center – check out the needle encrusted streets surrounding it – Sam Brock of NBC shot some video of the area surrounding this SAFE Navigation Center on March 29th – which made the 6 o'clock news. So, again – no one here is a NIMBY. Perhaps, NIMFY (Not in My Front Yard) or NAIMBY (Not All in My Back Yard). So, before you demonize working-class families living in apartments (not the houses of the donors in District 1 and District 2 receiving the accolades) – perhaps, you should dig into the story the news media isn't reporting because it doesn't get the clicks, the shares or the tune-ins. We all want the same thing for our children and ourselves. And, we all want the same thing for the homeless as well. We want them to be safe, and sheltered and to get the services they need with Permanent Supportive Housing. We all also, in tandem, want safety for our children and a sense of security when we walk down the street. The residents of District 6 want a sense of security while walking on the promenade that most of us consider our public park – the Embarcadero. We walk it on the way to work and on the weekends for leisure with our family and friends, push our kids in strollers, walk alongside our kids learning to ride their bikes, and smile at the tourists walking by while they enjoy this crown jewel of the City. This area has been years in the making in terms of the revitalization efforts for the Embarcadero, thank you San Francisco, it looks beautiful! We love it! We love the arrow sculpture in the grass, the lights of the Bay Bridge, walking to the Ball Park for Giants Games, the Ferry Building on Saturday for our Farmer's Market, Pier 23, and Fisherman's Wharf. Perhaps, by mistake, but perhaps not, Mayor Breed didn't do any outreach to the community and residents – instead, neighbors read about this in the newspaper with all indications it was a done deal. The area where the City has proposed the Mega Navigation Center is currently a low-crime area and residents feel safe. If you walk over to 5th & Bryant, you'll get a taste of what is to come of this area if this SAFE (translation: drug use friendly) Mega Navigation Center is built in the "front yard" of 10,000 residents living here. And, so we may end with numbers in a visual format: If you walk the stretch from the Giants Ball Park all the way to Crissy Field, you'll count 12 to 15 homeless people. I've done this walk twice since the announcement was made by London Breed. This leads to further confusion for us D6 folks, there aren't the numbers here to support 225 homeless beds

in this neighborhood. Perhaps, London should take a page out of the Mayor of LA's playbook? Navigation Centers will be spread out in every district in LA. No questions asked. No arguments. For all the NIMBY narrative spreaders, we have one already – have you seen it? And, we have St. Vincent de Paul, the Sanctuary, MCS, Glide, Delancey Street – the list goes on and on. We also have almost all of the Permanent Supportive Housing – 73% of it. Where do you live? I'll send you your stats. Are the large donations a call from Marc Benioff, Jack Dorsey, Nat Friedman, and the other tech billionaires to put the Navigation Centers in their front yards? There is a large parking lot adjacent the waterfront on Marina Green. "It's just a parking lot," to quote some of the comments surrounding this issue. Perhaps, we'll make YIMBYs of them after all. -A resident of D6 who loves the Embarcadero and would like the non-factual NIMBY narrative to cease. It's not true.

Victor Masaya <[REDACTED]>

Wed, Mar 27, 5:33 PM (4 days ago)

to mark.paez, Smush

Hi Mark, my name is Victor Masaya and I'm a resident on Townsend, near the potential site of the navigation center. As you can imagine the neighborhood is very upset with what's likely going to transpire but if you don't mind I would like to ask you a few questions as a neighbor suggested folks reach out to you. As an FYI I'm now resigned to the fact that this will be built so just had some follow-up questions.

- Given this center is part of a larger plan of the Mayor's, can you confirm that the Marina, Pac Heights, Presidio Heights or Seacliff have signed off on a center to be built in their neighborhood? Our understanding from the Mayor is that other neighborhoods have all signed off and that all of SF is going to participate. From a messaging standpoint I think if you and Mayor Breed communicated the timing of the construction of a center in one of those specific locations and that they have already signed off, that would be fantastic! Currently residents in District 6 assume that **the wealthy and less diverse are excluded** so confirmation that those affluent neighborhoods are indeed participating as part of the larger plan would undoubtedly assuage folks' concerns. I personally would be super excited if a center was built there first and then **NO NEIGHBORHOOD in SF could use NIMBY** as an excuse.

- Why doesn't SF **build vertically from existing centers**? Wouldn't it make sense from a cost and synergies standpoint to just build additional floors to existing facilities and then invest in medical resources to treat the mentally ill. With scale within a single location comes meaningful synergies one would think?

- Obviously **physical assault and murder is a concern, especially with kids in close proximity**. How many more SFPD personnel will be manning the neighborhood. I hate to sound paranoid but my wife and I are expecting in late April and May. My wife Susie (copied on this email) has already been **assaulted multiple times by the homeless** as have her co-workers so we're hoping that if the center is going to be built, can we also **add a wall** to enclose all of the homeless with a lot of police personnel so that no homeless are lingering outside and no homeless can escape the navigation center.

I've emailed so many officials and no one wants to give straight answers so I would GREATLY APPRECIATE it if you could just say you're unable to answer any of the above questions rather than pasting in a template response that doesn't answer the question. In addition if my questions are moronic, please do say so. I'd much rather have someone be direct with me and call me an idiot rather than send a canned response that is infuriating. I have thick skin so if you think any of what I wrote is unfounded, fake news, or outright stupid, I'm good with that if you let me know. I would sincerely respect that type of direct feedback. If better, happy to jump on a call.

Thanks much for your time.

Best,
Victor

[REDACTED]

From: Susie Masaya [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, March 21, 2019 8:41:26 PM
To: Victor Masaya
Cc: Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS); Quesada, Amy (PRT); Quezada, Randolph (PRT); Haneystaff (BOS); Breed, Mayor London (MYR); Elsbernd, Sean (MYR); Bruss, Andrea (MYR); Forbes, Elaine (PRT); DSHS (HOM)
Subject: Re: Homeless Shelter

Dear fellow SF residents,

I am deeply upset about the news of the shelter going up. I have been assaulted by a homeless person on multiple occasions and my co-workers have as well, and while reported to the Police, they have done NOTHING.

If you ask the homeless person why they are not in a shelter they state they don't want to follow the rules of the shelter so choose not to be in one. I don't believe our homeless problem is as much of a bed issue as it is a drug and mental issue. I feel like we need to address this first! Adding more beds is NOT going to fix the problem.

I went to the Townhall and i would say over 95% of the individuals who spoke were against the shelter.

I feel like our voices are not being heard and that that you will just do as you please and this greatly concerns me as a Taxpayer - Shame on you!

Also having more police in the neighborhood is NOT a solution. If you want to make a statement with the shelter then I believe this should first go up in the more affluent neighborhoods such as the SeaCliff, Presidio Heights, and Pacific Heights - if built there and other districts can see that it is running well I am sure other districts will fall in line. As you stated at the Townhall "no district is exempt" but I feel like that is a LIE.

and why is it OKAY for the Mayor to fast-track her agendas without listening to the citizens of this city. I thought this was a democracy and that you were for the People but I guess that was a LIE too.

I don't believe much thought was put into this and I also don't understand why we just don't better the shelters that are already in place; why can't we just give them an upgrade and build more beds within existing shelters and hire better staff to run and provide the support of what they really need instead of wasting our tax dollars, that we know will cost more to run this then that is being estimated.

Thank you,
Susie Masaya
Concerned Citizen

On Thu, Mar 21, 2019 at 8:29 PM Victor Masaya <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Hi Courtney, thanks again for your previous reply. I've been out of town but someone informed me yesterday that Mayor Breed is now suggesting that there is a "shelter crisis" to pass legislation for the homeless shelter. I assume that this is fake news because no true democratic leader would act in authoritarian manner to create a physical barrier in a racially diverse area, would one? It'd be quite disappointing to have a President who only caters to his base and a mayor in our city that acts in a similar manner.

I hate to repeat this but why not open a large medical facility in Pac Heights, Presidio Heights, Seacliff or the Marina? That would accomplish a couple of things: 1) rather than having a useless facility that the homeless probably won't be interested in anyway, the homeless can get real medical help that they need and 2) if the more affluent and less diverse areas in SF can get comfortable with a homeless medical facility, everyone else in SF will as well.

Ultimately if the mayor acts against the will of the people and uses emergency powers or executive orders to meet one of her promises, there's nothing we can do. Hopefully no lives are lost as a result.

Respectfully,
Victor Masaya

On Tue, Mar 12, 2019 at 5:12 PM Victor Masaya <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Courtney, thanks for getting back to me. For some reason no one that I reach out to can address why this location of all locations is the optimal place to have a shelter. This is ridiculous to me but I just live here. It doesn't seem like a complicated question. If this is the ideal spot, that's great but what is the reason for it? Is being close to the water helpful for curing mental illnesses? Is being in a residential area with kids nearby and tourists walking through healthy for the homeless because they can have a footprint in an area where people may give them money? Homelessness is clearly the biggest issue for the city of SF but nobody can articulate why this is the best spot.

As someone who is not sophisticated at all, logic to me would dictate that this shelter should be in very close proximity to hospitals, medical professionals, or close to existing shelters such as the one on 5th and Mission to take advantage of synergies. That way folks can get real medical help and not be milling around near the water.

Hopefully one of these days someone can pronounce why this is the best next step for the city? This seems like a complete waste of money. If the optimal location is indeed a scenic area with foot traffic and the like, shouldn't this be in the Marina? Or why not Pac Heights or Presidio Heights where folks are more affluent.

Any reasoning as to why this is the best location and why the aforementioned more affluent and less diverse areas are not would be super helpful to us and the rest of the D6 community.

Lastly isn't the government aware of homeless people acting aggressively towards others? I would think that anecdotally we're all aware of someone who has been punched, kicked, shoved or hit by a homeless person. Not to sound cynical but maybe being close to residential and tourists is a sound political move because if there is another Kate Steinle episode and someone were to get murdered that could kick start a campaign to obtain more resources from corporations including the Giants, Warriors, and Salesforce, to try to truly address this issue. Could that be the reason? Again absent any data or other evidence demonstrating why this area is the best place to have this shelter, can't help but think the worst.

Best,
Victor

On Mar 12, 2019, at 4:21 PM, Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS) <courtney.mcdonald@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Victor and Susie,

Thanks for reaching out about this. We hear you, and are committed to addressing needles, mental illness, feces, etc. The goal of the Navigation Center in part would be to make sure that type of activity is not happening on our streets. Supervisor Haney asked me to share some of this initial thoughts with you, as we also just learned about the proposal within the past 2 weeks:

Homelessness is an urgent concern in San Francisco with over 4,000 people currently unsheltered on our streets. The crisis is increasingly impacting the waterfront and our Rincon Hill, South Beach and Mission Bay communities. The status quo of people living in tents or on our streets and under the freeway is completely unacceptable, and Navigation Centers can be part of the solution to immediately get people off the streets and into shelter and services.

I also have some questions and concerns about the proposed Navigation Center, as our office just found out about the proposal and has not yet received the full details. Like you, I am listening and eager to learn more as the terms and design are drafted. I would love to set up a phone call with you to discuss further with me or my staff. Please let me know a good time to call, or call my staff directly at (415) 554-7972.

Here's what I am advocating for at a minimum based on conversations with the community, and I hope you will support my asks of Mayor Breed and Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing:

- The goal of the Navigation Center must be to directly **address homelessness in the neighborhood** and make a major improvement in Rincon Hill, South Beach, and Mission Bay. People will be invited to the Navigation Center *only* from neighborhood Homeless Outreach Teams and there will be no lines of people waiting outside to access services.
- There should be dedicated foot patrols around the perimeter and 24/7 security to ensure **public safety**.
- There should be outdoor spaces for people staying in the Navigation Center that remain separate from the public space so **there aren't people gathering outside**.
- Intensive services must be offered in order to replicate the success of the 6 current Navigation Centers, which have worked to quickly place people in housing or help people get out of San Francisco to stay with friends or family elsewhere through the Homeward Bound program.
- **The Mayor should immediately propose an additional Navigation Center in another part of the City, before this one is approved.** We can't keep concentrating these services solely in District 6. This week, I proposed an amendment to the Shelter Crisis Ordinance to add a commitment to build Navigation Centers in a majority of the Supervisorial districts.
- **The Navigation Center will be temporary.** I am advocating for a shorter lease, likely 2 years, with a potential lease extension only if this works for the neighborhood and shows demonstrable, positive improvements and outcomes for the neighborhood and for people who receive services at the center.

The Mayor and Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing are holding an important community meeting on today (Tuesday, March 12th) about their proposal. We hope you can join us and express your opinions:

- March 12th from 6-7:30pm; Delancey Street Foundation (600 Embarcadero)

The proposal will also be presented on during the Port Commission meeting this afternoon—no action will be taken until their April meeting:

- Today at 3:15pm; Ferry Building, 2nd Floor (Port Commission Hearing Room)

I appreciate and need your continued advocacy.

Our collective long-term goal as a City is to end homelessness and get everyone housed. In the meantime Navigation Centers, if done right, and only if done right, can be an integral first step in the City's strategy to get people off the streets and immediately connected to services.

Thank you again for reaching out. I look forward to talking soon.

Supervisor Matt Haney

From: Victor Masaya [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2019 11:15 PM
To: Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS) <courtney.mcdonald@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: Homeless Shelter

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi Courtney, as noted in an email to Supervisor Haney and staff, my name is Victor Masaya and I've copied in my wife Susie Masaya. We are homeowners in District 6 and have lived in the area since 2005.

We are writing to you (also left a voicemail) as we are extremely concerned about the proposal to have a homeless shelter built in the district. As a couple that is expecting our first child in late

April / early May, this is of extreme concern. We don't need to tell anyone about needles, observed mental illness, human feces, etc. and we all know that the problem is getting worse. Going to Safeway and seeing one homeless carrying knives in line and another inserting plyers up his rectum is one thing but having a shelter nearby to exacerbate the problem is another. While our voices don't matter in this city, it'd be great if we could at least get some form of justification of why it makes sense to have it so close to the Ferry Building, FiDi, the Embarcadero, the Giants and the future home of the Warriors. While good economic times will continue (e.g. Lyft IPO, soon to be followed by Uber and other minotaurs), worsening the problem in the district makes it very difficult to raise a child. I realize I am not yet a parent so I am completely speculating that it's not healthy for kids to interact with homeless and come across needles but maybe the data proves otherwise.

On the economics side, it is clearly in homeowners' interest, including ours, to not have a homeless shelter close to us and I fully acknowledge that. But I would still think that would be outweighed by concern for folks that already live in the district, including children. Assuming the project does go through (and even if it doesn't), we will most certainly move out of SF.

Best,

A concerned resident

Victor Masaya



-----April 2019-----

Respected SF Port Commissioners:

By now you have heard the many valid concerns of South Beach and Rincon Hill residents among others about the proposed location for the new Navigation Center, so I will not repeat them here. You have also heard from other SF residents, who mostly don't live or work anywhere near Seawall Lot 330, about their support of this location and their disgraceful demonization of the residents who oppose it (again I will not repeat what they say here).

The question I would like you to think about as you consider Seawall Lot 330 for the Navigation center is **why didn't the locations of the previous Nav centers create anywhere near as much contro=San Francisco, CA 94105**

Hi mark

What, if anything, am I do with this? I received a hard copy at my home address as well (which I wasn't thrilled about).

Is not responding acceptable?

CAW

CHRISTOPHER S. WASNEY AIA

ARCHITECTS

Begin forwarded message:

From: Christy Scrivano <[REDACTED]>
Date: April 2, 2019 at 2:30:49 PM PDT
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: **Your influence is needed**

Dear Mr. Wasney, Member of the Central Waterfront Advisory Group:

My name is Christy Scrivano, I live at [REDACTED], and I thank you for listening to me and the residents of District 6 during the CWAG/ NEWAG meeting on Wednesday, March 20th.

As I stated in my comments during that meeting, my entire household objects to Mayor Breed's proposal to build a Navigation Center on Seawall Lot 330 (SWL 330), directly across from the Portside building that has been my home for the last eight years and is 20 yards from my 3-year old son's bedroom. **I know that it is within your power to help influence the decision of the Port Commission and make a recommendation that they vote this proposal down at their [April 23rd](#) meeting, and I urge you to do so.**

I am a working mother who walks to and from work each day, usually in the dark, and the risk to public safety—particularly the safety of children and families in the neighborhood—is what I am most concerned about and why I am opposed to the Mayor's proposal.

The area around SWL 330, including my own building, is home to many residents with young families, whose physical safety would be threatened by the gathering of large congregations of homeless, some of who are mentally ill, intoxicated with alcohol, high on chemical substances, or with criminal or violent histories. To place children directly in the path of a large homeless population is dangerous, irresponsible, and wrong.

Over the last eight years since I have lived at [REDACTED], the increase in the number of families in our neighborhood has skyrocketed, along with the number of children's facilities, daycares, and schools in the area. There are currently at least 25 schools and daycare providers within walking distance of the proposed Navigation Center.

Mayor Breed has stated that navigation centers "will make a real difference in our neighborhoods." Unfortunately the difference will be a **negative** impact on our safety, increase in crime, and increase in illegal activity that will particularly affect the well-being and health of children in the neighborhood, as well as children who visit the city to enjoy our playgrounds, children's museum, and ballpark all within walking distance of the proposed navigation center.

To get a better understanding of what it would be like for my son to grow up near a homeless center, I recently visited the area around the Civic Center Navigation Center, including the [300 block at Hyde Street](#) in the Tenderloin. And what I saw confirms my decision that if this SOMA Navigation Center is built as proposed, right outside my doorstep, then I will be forced to move out of this city.

It was obvious to me during my visit to the existing center that the entire area is a containment zone, and we are now seeking to import those behaviors into my own neighborhood. I will not risk living in an environment that exposes my child to what saw on Hyde Street:

- Men defecating on the street,
- Unsheltered drug users camping along sidewalks,
- Users shooting up in plain sight on the street,
- Drug dealers peddling what I suspect was cocaine and heroin,
- Used needles littering the streets—can you imagine your child picking one up and destroying their life by touching it and contracting HIV or Hepatitis C? (An alarming stat: the San Francisco Public Health Department retrieves **over 165,000 needles a month** across the city)

I can't imagine exposing my son to this day in and day out, seeing these images whenever he looks out the window, walks outside his home to take the muni to school, runs around on the neighborhood playgrounds, and falls asleep in his bed to be woken up in the middle of the night by sounds of profanity, brawls, and street conflict. **His bedroom is 20 yards away from where this center would go up.**

During the CWAG/NEWAG meeting on March 20th, the HSH shared further details about the mayor's proposal, and I am alarmed by what I heard—particularly the fact that the HSH **recognizes** that in order to keep the area around the center safe, police will patrol the streets **4 times a day**—directly in front of my building.

I cannot risk raising my child in such an unsafe environment, knowing that he would be exposed daily to what the HSH **already expects** could endanger our neighborhood if this center is built. What happens when the police patrol misses a shift and doesn't show up as promised? I was told by an SF police officer that they currently do not have enough officers to regularly patrol the existing navigation centers already in place within our city.

While a few people outside my district suggest “it will all be fine”, I am one of countless parents who is not willing to take this risk on my own child. I already made the choice to live in this current, safe neighborhood to raise my son. The city is forcing families out with this proposal, and losing the contributions to the city that hardworking parents like myself have made to make San Francisco.

[The proposal](#) was sprung on my community with very little notice and it seems as though public officials are racing to put it through before most neighbors in my district find out about it. It's clear this navigation center is being pushed ahead without proper due diligence on the neighborhood, and civic leaders are neglecting to truly understand the impact it will have on such a large population of families in the area.

I urge you to please reflect on the impact this Navigation Center could have, particularly on families and children. **It is within your power to help halt this fast-paced progress**, and recommend to the Port Commission that they vote down the proposal, or at least pause to conduct the necessary due diligence in order to determine the lasting effects this center would have around Seawall Lot 330—before it is too late.

Sincerely,

Christy Scrivano

Dear Mark,

My name is Devin Hexner.

I respect you, your time, your energy, and your precarious situation regarding the proposed Navigation Center on Seawall Lot 330. I understand that whatever opinion and action you take, you will have detractors. I do not wish to be an enemy, I wish to be a person who wants to share with you, and I ask for you to pause and consider my thoughts.

I understand there is a pressing homelessness crisis with a reported 3,500 homeless people living unsheltered in San Francisco (Source: Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing). I am supportive of passionate efforts by city officials to make our community a better, healthier, more thriving place by helping support and rejuvenate the homeless population.

I live in the 501 Beale street building, where I have lived since 2014. This building is adjacent to the proposed Seawall Lot 330 Navigation Center. I am skeptical and oppose the Navigation Center in this location, and I request that you step back for a few moments to consider:

This is a Lose-Lose-Lose situation. The proposed location is bad for the homeless population, bad for the Port of San Francisco, and bad for current neighborhood residents.

1) How is this bad for the homeless?

I believe that every person has the ability to thrive, including people who are struggling the most in society. I have personally struggled with mental health problems, and after 5 years of recovery, my life has completely turned around for the better. I am incredibly grateful to certain government services and hospitals that supported me in recovering through challenging times. I think the proposed navigation center is in the wrong location for a person to struggling to survive and thrive in their recovery. Many important services are not nearby Seawall Lot 330, such as hospitals, government services, food distribution centers, and mental health support.

The neighborhood environment is already chaotic with thousands of commuters, tourists, and event-goers daily. Thousands of cars are commuting across the bay bridge, with on-ramps and exits thirty seconds away from Seawall Lot 330. There are thousands of tourists walking on The Embarcadero, as well as thousands of event-goers rushing to see the professional baseball and soon-to-be basketball games. It is also very windy, with particularly cold air coming directly off the waters of San Francisco Bay.

This environment, with the combination of thousands of commuters, thousands of tourists, and thousands of event-goers, would be overwhelming and chaotic for a new homeless population moving into the proposed 200+ bed Navigation Center. In my mental health recovery, I would not have thrived in this environment.

2) How is this bad for the Port of San Francisco?

The Port of San Francisco will have a new, ongoing, and challenging project to manage with this Navigation Center, when the organization is already spread thin.

The Port already struggles to manage homeless encampments at Warm Water Cove, Islais Creek, Justin Herman Plaza, Brannan Street Wharf, and Fisherman's Wharf. There is a likelihood that this Navigation Center would become a magnet for more encampments on The Embarcadero, which would further tax the Port with more crime and liability.

Seawall Lot 330 is also an environmentally insecure location, currently existing as an asphalt parking lot that is not retrofitted for a significant earthquake which is imminent in San Francisco. The Port would be putting hundreds of people at risk by allowing this Navigation Center to be built quickly.

3) How is this bad for the neighborhood residents?

The South Beach neighborhood surrounding Seawall Lot 330 is in a complicated position politically. If there is any resistance by neighbors, they will be deemed as cold and unsympathetic to the concerns of society's poor (i.e. NIMBY, "not in my neighborhood" supporters).

South Beach is in District 6 which already has multiple navigation centers, and already has a track record of being YIMBY supporters (i.e. "yes in my neighborhood"). We support these centers and also support the nearby Delancey Street Foundation, a stellar organization that rehabilitates various struggling populations. We are already a neighborhood and district that says "Yes in My Backyard."

At what point are other districts going to play their part to support YIMBY efforts, like district 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7?

Additionally, as stated previously, the South Beach neighborhood is already bustling from numerous factors including traffic, tourism, and events. The neighborhood also has a high residential population, including many families with children; adding a navigation center that lacks adequate logistical support nearby can cause significant trauma in a variety of respects, ranging from crime, drug use, and mental un-health involving existing residents as well as new potential inhabitants of the navigation center.

This project is being fast-tracked without competent environmental, social, and security reviews taking place. The Navigation Center would be constructed quickly on a liquefaction zone with likely chemicals near the surface of the asphalt, from industrial businesses in the 18-1900's. This proposed project, seemingly rushed without true consideration and input from the community, sets up the project for failure - negativity will likely surround the construction, setup, and maintenance of the project if this is approved. The results may be extremely sad.

If you were asking me for my input on the homelessness crisis and a proposed navigation center on Seawall Lot 330, I would suggest two solutions. First, look at other districts to join the YIMBY team. The city and each district has smart individuals working, people who should be able to find alternative sites for new navigation centers. Second, Emily Cohen - homelessness policy advisor to Mayor Breed - has cited that 120 individuals become homeless in San Francisco every week, with 40 coming from other bay area counties, and an undetermined amount coming from other cities outside the bay area; given this situation, my next solution would be to resource other counties for support in rehabilitating our whole society's homeless population, so that our entire state and national society can thrive.

I am a human being that cares about other human beings. I support Navigation Centers and passionate efforts for extending care and resources to those in need. I also think it is important to look at the facts of this location, and see that geographically this is a no-win zone.

This homelessness crisis has, and will be a long term problem. There are no short-term fixes, and a 200-bed facility in the wrong location will cause more problems than solutions.

I sincerely hope that you can pause for a few moments, and consider that there are other solutions out there that can and will be better to pursue and forgo this site as an option.

I would appreciate you carving out 10 minutes to chat over the phone, and I will continue to message until I hear from you.

Thank you,
Devin Justis Hexner

[REDACTED]

Subject: Opposition to Proposed Navigation Center on Seawall Lot 330

Dear Advisory Group Members,

My name is Shailendra Yeda. I am a resident of Baycrest at 201 Harrison street. I oppose locating the proposed navigation center on SWL 330 directly across the street, a block away from, (state how close to SWL 330) from our residential community. While Portside shares the commitment of the City and Port to reduce homelessness, the location of the proposed navigation center at SWL 330 poses many unmitigable problems and unacceptable outcomes for our neighborhood, including increased risks to public safety, property crime, and public nuisance; degradation of neighborhood quality of life and livability; and perhaps most importantly, non-compliance of land use with the SF Port's own Waterfront Plan and City plans.

RESIDENT AND NEIGHBORHOOD ISSUES

Magnet for Homeless Outside Center

It is inevitable that the proposed navigation center will attract large congregations of street people outside. It has been documented in published reports that areas that border on homeless shelters have more problems with crime, violence, drug use, loitering, and other criminal activities. These conditions will have a negative impact upon pedestrians and attendees of Giants games walking along the Embarcadero, and our neighborhood in general.

Fails to Integrate with Community

No land use could be more distinctly out of character for the South Beach community of high-end residential and office use than the proposed navigation center's temporary structures and tents. Any development which requires 24/7 police protection around its perimeter has no place in a thriving residential neighborhood. It is clearly an improper, unsuitable, and incompatible use within our residential neighborhood.

Risks to Public Safety

Our building is home to many residents with young families, whose physical safety would be threatened by the inevitable gathering of homeless outside the center, some of who are mentally ill, intoxicated with alcohol, high on chemical substances, or with criminal or violent histories. To place children directly in the path of a large homeless population is dangerous, irresponsible, and wrong.

Increase in Property Crime

The surrounding streets of Bryant, Main, Harrison and the Embarcadero have some of the highest rates of vehicle break-ins in the City, with many of these crimes proven to be committed by the homeless. Locating the proposed navigation center so close to our residences, businesses, and property will make an untenable situation worse and degrade our quality of life.

Degradation of Quality of Life

Our building's residents—and our neighborhood in general—already endure continuous periods of gridlocked traffic throughout the day which negatively impacts our area. We see no value—nor justice—in compounding the existing problems of our neighborhood with the proposed navigation center and the crime, violence, drug use, loitering, and criminal activities it will bring.

Disproportionate Use of District 6 for Homeless

District 6 already has an 84-bed navigation center at 5th and Bryant Streets, in close proximity to the proposed site on SWL 330. Locating another navigation center so close to 5th and Bryant places a disproportionate and undue burden of homelessness upon our residential neighborhood. Other districts must do their fair share to ease the homelessness problem by accommodating navigation centers.

Navigation Centers Belong in Non-Residential Areas

It makes no sense to destroy a safe, upscale, desirable neighborhood for the sake of a political agenda. Intelligent city planning is about context. Navigation centers, due to their temporary

nature, should be located in industrial/commercial areas, where they will not pose a threat to the safety of established residential communities and families. Why place it at SWL 330, in the middle of a thriving residential community?

Fallacy of Locating Centers Where Homeless Are

Also, it is not about placing navigation centers where the homeless are—navigation center admittance is by referral only. Locating a navigation center in a residential neighborhood by definition brings homeless to that area—ours—who were not there before. If the Port's goal is to reduce homelessness on Port property, the proposed navigation center will do the exact opposite.

PLANNING AND LAND USE ISSUES

As an engaged citizen who has dutifully participated in and commented upon the numerous Port Workshops on the development of SWL 330 for over two decades, I am also deeply troubled by the City and Port proposing a navigation center at this location.

Inappropriate Land Use per Community Input

Engaged citizens of the area contributed their valuable time to participate in many input sessions and workshops with both Port and City officials regarding potential land use for SWL 330. Never has our community supported a navigation center as an appropriate land use for the site. It is out of place, out of character, and inappropriate for our residential neighborhood. If community input is to be disregarded, why have we attended, participated in, and commented upon all these sessions?

Impedes Public Access to Waterfront

SB815, approved by the State Legislature in 2007, allows development of non-trust residential, office, and commercial uses that complement the land use character of the South Beach neighborhood, generate revenue for historic rehabilitation, and public access. The proposed navigation center at SWL 330, in addition to being a land use that is distinctly out of character with the South Beach neighborhood, will do the opposite of promoting public access to the Waterfront—by forcing pedestrians and Giants attendees to cross the street or stay away from the area altogether to avoid being accosted by the inevitable homeless activity surrounding the shelter.

Fails to Comply with SF Port Waterfront Plan—or Any Plans

The use of SWL 330 for a proposed navigation center fails to comply with the SF Port Waterfront Plan or any other adopted plans, including the Rincon Hill, Better Streets, and Eastern Neighborhoods Plans. If the use is non-compliant with any approved Plans that citizens took time out their working day to contribute to and comment upon, why have any Plans at all? Why should the mayor be allowed to to subvert the will of the residents most adversely affected by the location of the proposed navigation center?

Disregards All Waterfront Plan Update Recommendations

Land use of SWL 330 as a proposed navigation center is in direct opposition to all Working Group Recommendations stated in the most recent SF Port Waterfront Plan Update of June 22, 2018 for improving use and development of SWL 330:

- “Complement the character of surrounding neighborhoods;”

The proposed navigation center is distinctly out of character for the South Beach community of high-end residential and office use.

- “Provide a pleasing transition from the City-side to the Bay, and ground floor activation to enhance the pedestrian environment;”

To the contrary, the proposed portable structures and tents will be a visual and architectural blight upon the most scenic and symbolic thoroughfare of the city as an improper, unsuitable, and incompatible use. Pedestrians and Giants attendees will be forced to cross the street to avoid being harassed by the homeless outside the shelter.

- and “Generate revenues for Port capital improvements.”

The loss of the \$700,000 currently generated at SWL 330 will be greatly detrimental to the Port’s efforts to fund much-needed capital improvements.

“FAST TRACK” LEGISLATION ISSUES

Removal of Planning, Permitting, and Other Regulatory Review

Any attempt to “fast track” approval of the navigation center through proposed legislation eliminating planning, permitting and other regulatory review is a blatant attempt to subvert the will of the people. The legislation puts the Mayor’s goal of building 1000 new shelter beds ahead of all other legitimate considerations. It will ignore critical planning and environmental safeguards built into the process to protect citizens, stifle essential community input and discussion, and essentially defy the will of citizens in the residential neighborhood most adversely affected by the proposed navigation center.

Dangerous Precedent for Individual Districts

The legislation will not only affect SWL 330, but sets a dangerous precedent for navigation centers to be located in densely populated residential family neighborhoods, ignoring the adverse impacts upon each district and its constituents, and ceding critical legislative power to the executive branch at the expense of individual district voters.

Lack of Responsibility and Accountability

This proposed legislation will only serve to diminish our neighborhood’s faith in government responsibility and accountability to the citizens it purports to represent and serve. To “fast track” a project this problematic and controversial is irresponsible, short-sighted, and wrong.

CONCLUSION

I remain hopeful that you, as fellow citizens and members of the Central Waterfront Advisory Group, will fulfill your responsibilities to put the interests of the neighborhood who will be most adversely affected by the navigation center—and the citizens they represent—above politics. For the many important reasons stated above, I respectfully request that you oppose the location of the proposed navigation center on SWL 330 and any “fast-track” legislation designed to railroad its approval. This is not what our residential neighborhood needs, wants, or represents.

Respectfully,

Shailendra Yeda
San Francisco, CA, [REDACTED]

Apologies for taking up more time, but just wanted to share an email below from my wife who is very excited to learn that a facility in Presidio Heights is in the works. I stand corrected and misinformed. Please confirm.

Hello, I am [REDACTED] who has mentioned in the past that I've been assaulted multiple times by the homeless. I had a couple of other requests if possible. It'd be quite helpful to see statistics on the efficacy of navigation centers so that people can stop complaining that the beds don't work. I assume that since this is such a well thought out plan that a lot of studies have been done to support your hypothesis. Also people keep fretting that other homeless will be increasingly attracted to SF if more facilities are built. Thus data showing that providing more beds reduces the influx of other homeless would also be great.

Lastly my husband saw the tweet below which I assume means that Benioff is helping build a navigation center in Presidio Heights immediately! That is fantastic news! I'm with Benioff and him and SF building a facility in Presidio Heights for sure. I think this endorsement needs much more press. Please spread the word!

<https://twitter.com/benioff/status/1112037704936546304?s=12>

Thank you!

Susie

On Mar 31, 2019, at 10:49 AM, Victor Masaya <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Fellow residents, I just came across the disturbing below post on Nextdoor and urge each and everyone of you to please openly respond via a press release to stop the lies and highlight that the below is a misuse of data and is directionally wrong! From everything I've heard from the government including agencies, **ALL areas within SF are participating** and have signed off including **Sea Cliff and Presidio Heights**. Please let everyone know that plans for navigation centers in **Sea Cliff and Presidio Heights have already been approved**.

It is very defeating to see articles like these that I assume are **factually incorrect**?

Please provide **announcements that Sea Cliff, Presidio Heights and the Marina are all on board and that navigation centers will be built immediately** in those respective less diverse areas. As articulated numerous times now to a number of folks on this email, when folks spread lies that the likes of Sea Cliff and Presidio Heights are not having navigation centers built, that only builds skepticism and distrust. It also leads to assumptions that we are living within a city that has an administration that is authoritarian, builds physical barriers that are inconsistent with the will of the people, only governs to achieve political agendas, and spreads fake news. That can't be true, correct? Only the Trump administration would do such a thing and I know that SF is better than that...or maybe not...

District 6 has 65% of the shelter beds in San Francisco and 73% of Permanent Supportive Housing

Jack Dorsey lives in Sea Cliff with sweeping views of the Golden Gate Bridge, Marin Headlands, and the Pacific Ocean. Sea Cliff, located in District 1, has 2.9% of homeless services in their district and 0.3% of Permanent Supportive Housing. The City has announced no plans to place a Navigation Center in the Sea Cliff Neighborhood and Jack Dorsey has not publicly called for a Navigation Center in his Neighborhood. Jack Dorsey has donated \$25,000 to the Coalition for Homelessness in support of the Mega Navigation Center to be built on the Embarcadero, a 25-minute drive across town from his home. It's fair to say Jack Dorsey is a NIMBY. It's wonderful he is donating to a charity (you should too!), but he isn't inviting a Navigation Center into his neighborhood. Marc Benioff lives in one of the toniest neighborhoods in San Francisco, Presidio Heights with beautiful views of the Presidio Park. Presidio Heights of District 2 has 0% (zero percent) of homeless services, no shelter beds in their district and 1.9% of Permanent Supportive Housing. The City has announced no plans to place a Navigation Center in the Presidio Heights Neighborhood and Marc Benioff has not publicly called for a Navigation Center in his Neighborhood. Marc Benioff has donated \$10,000 to the Coalition for Homelessness in support of the Mega Navigation Center to be built on the Embarcadero, a 20-minute drive across town from his home. It's fair to say Marc Benioff, while a hero to the City in many ways is still (technically) a NIMBY (even though we love him). It's wonderful he is donating to a charity (everyone should!), but he isn't inviting a Navigation Center into his neighborhood. William Fitzgerald who started the rival "troll" GoFundMe page lives in the Richmond District, District 1, near Golden Gate Park according to his interview on KRON4 on March 30th. The Richmond District has 2.9% of homeless services in their district and 0.3% of Permanent Supportive Housing. The City has announced no plans to place a Navigation Center in the Richmond Neighborhood of San Francisco. William Fitzgerald *has* publicly called for a Navigation Center in his Neighborhood and has helped to raise \$138,000 (and counting) for the Coalition for Homelessness in support of the Mega Navigation Center to be built on the Embarcadero, a 20-minute drive across town from his home. Perhaps, all of the money from his fundraiser could go to scouting locations in District 1 near his home? Win! Perhaps, London Breed could work with William to place the next Navigation Center in his neighborhood? He's ready to go to the fences for you London and has the support of several Tech Billionaires to boot! While all of these wonderful gentlemen are supporting

an open drug policy Mega Shelter, 20 minutes away from their clean tree-lined streets – the folks over in District 6 are the true supporters of homelessness. And, it is not fair to say any of these folks in D6 are NIMBYs. District 6 carries by far over and above the average of all of the homeless services in the City of San Francisco. Over 65%, yes, 65% of the shelter beds and 73%, yes you read that right, 73% of all of San Francisco's Permanent Supportive Housing are in District 6. District 6 also, already has a Navigation Center – check out the needle encrusted streets surrounding it – Sam Brock of NBC shot some video of the area surrounding this SAFE Navigation Center on March 29th – which made the 6 o'clock news. So, again – no one here is a NIMBY. Perhaps, NIMFY (Not in My Front Yard) or NAIMBY (Not All in My Back Yard). So, before you demonize working-class families living in apartments (not the houses of the donors in District 1 and District 2 receiving the accolades) – perhaps, you should dig into the story the news media isn't reporting because it doesn't get the clicks, the shares or the tune-ins. We all want the same thing for our children and ourselves. And, we all want the same thing for the homeless as well. We want them to be safe, and sheltered and to get the services they need with Permanent Supportive Housing. We all also, in tandem, want safety for our children and a sense of security when we walk down the street. The residents of District 6 want a sense of security while walking on the promenade that most of us consider our public park – the Embarcadero. We walk it on the way to work and on the weekends for leisure with our family and friends, push our kids in strollers, walk alongside our kids learning to ride their bikes, and smile at the tourists walking by while they enjoy this crown jewel of the City. This area has been years in the making in terms of the revitalization efforts for the Embarcadero, thank you San Francisco, it looks beautiful! We love it! We love the arrow sculpture in the grass, the lights of the Bay Bridge, walking to the Ball Park for Giants Games, the Ferry Building on Saturday for our Farmer's Market, Pier 23, and Fisherman's Wharf. Perhaps, by mistake, but perhaps not, Mayor Breed didn't do any outreach to the community and residents – instead, neighbors read about this in the newspaper with all indications it was a done deal. The area where the City has proposed the Mega Navigation Center is currently a low-crime area and residents feel safe. If you walk over to 5th & Bryant, you'll get a taste of what is to come of this area if this SAFE (translation: drug use friendly) Mega Navigation Center is built in the "front yard" of 10,000 residents living here. And, so we may end with numbers in a visual format: If you walk the stretch from the Giants Ball Park all the way to Crissy Field, you'll count 12 to 15 homeless people. I've done this walk twice since the announcement was made by London Breed. This leads to further confusion for us D6 folks, there aren't the numbers here to support 225 homeless beds in this neighborhood. Perhaps, London should take a page out of the Mayor of LA's playbook? Navigation Centers will be spread out in every district in LA. No questions asked. No arguments. For all the NIMBY narrative spreaders, we have one already – have you seen it? And, we have St. Vincent de Paul, the Sanctuary, MCS, Glide, Delancey Street – the list goes on and on. We also have almost all of the Permanent Supportive Housing – 73% of it. Where do you live? I'll send you your stats. Are the large donations a call from Marc Benioff, Jack Dorsey, Nat Friedman, and the other tech billionaires to put the Navigation Centers in their front yards? There is a large parking lot adjacent the waterfront on Marina Green. "It's just a parking lot," to quote some of the

comments surrounding this issue. Perhaps, we'll make YIMBYs of them after all. -A resident of D6 who loves the Embarcadero and would like the non-factual NIMBY narrative to cease. It's not true.

To Mark Paez,

Hi Mark, my name is Victor Masaya and I'm a resident on Townsend, near the potential site of the navigation center. As you can imagine the neighborhood is very upset with what's likely going to transpire but if you don't mind I would like to ask you a few questions as a neighbor suggested folks reach out to you. As an FYI I'm now resigned to the fact that this will be built so just had some follow-up questions.

- Given this center is part of a larger plan of the Mayor's, can you confirm that the Marina, Pac Heights, Presidio Heights or Seacliff have signed off on a center to be built in their neighborhood? Our understanding from the Mayor is that other neighborhoods have all signed off and that all of SF is going to participate. From a messaging standpoint I think if you and Mayor Breed communicated the timing of the construction of a center in one of those specific locations and that they have already signed off, that would be fantastic! Currently residents in District 6 assume that **the wealthy and less diverse are excluded** so confirmation that those affluent neighborhoods are indeed participating as part of the larger plan would undoubtedly assuage folks' concerns. I personally would be super excited if a center was built there first and then **NO NEIGHBORHOOD in SF could use NIMBY** as an excuse.

- Why doesn't SF **build vertically from existing centers**? Wouldn't it make sense from a cost and synergies standpoint to just build additional floors to existing facilities and then invest in medical resources to treat the mentally ill. With scale within a single location comes meaningful synergies one would think?

- Obviously **physical assault and murder is a concern, especially with kids in close proximity**. How many more SFPD personnel will be manning the neighborhood. I hate to sound paranoid but my wife and I are expecting in late April and May. My wife Susie (copied on this email) has already been **assaulted multiple times by the homeless** as have her co-workers so we're hoping that if the center is going to be built, can we also **add a wall** to enclose all of the homeless with a lot of police personnel so that no homeless are lingering outside and no homeless can escape the navigation center.

I've emailed so many officials and no one wants to give straight answers so I would GREATLY APPRECIATE it if you could just say you're unable to answer any of the above questions rather than pasting in a template response that doesn't answer the question. In addition if my questions are moronic, please do say so. I'd much rather have someone be direct with me and call me an idiot rather than send a canned response that is infuriating. I have thick skin so if you think any of what I wrote is unfounded, fake news, or outright stupid, I'm good with that if you let me know. I would sincerely respect that type of direct feedback. If better, happy to jump on a call.

Thanks much for your time.

Best,
Victor

Dear fellow SF residents,

I am deeply upset about the news of the shelter going up. I have been assaulted by a homeless person on multiple occasions and my co-workers have as well, and while reported to the Police, they have done NOTHING.

If you ask the homeless person why they are not in a shelter they state they don't want to follow the rules of the shelter so choose not to be in one. I don't believe our homeless problem is as much of a bed issue as it is a drug and mental issue. I feel like we need to address this first! Adding more beds is NOT going to fix the problem.

I went to the Townhall and i would say over 95% of the individuals who spoke were against the shelter.

I feel like our voices are not being heard and that that you will just do as you please and this greatly concerns me as a Taxpayer - Shame on you!

Also having more police in the neighborhood is NOT a solution. If you want to make a statement with the shelter then I believe this should first go up in the more affluent neighborhoods such as the SeaCliff, Presidio Heights, and Pacific Heights - if built there and other districts can see that it is running well I am sure other districts will fall in line. As you stated at the Townhall "no district is exempt" but I feel like that is a LIE.

and why is it OKAY for the Mayor to fast-track her agendas without listening to the citizens of this city. I thought this was a democracy and that you were for the People but I guess that was a LIE too.

I don't believe much thought was put into this and I also don't understand why we just don't better the shelters that are already in place; why can't we just give them an upgrade and build more beds within existing shelters and hire better staff to run and provide the support of what they really need instead of wasting our tax dollars, that we know will cost more to run this then that is being estimated.

Thank you,
Susie Masaya

Concerned Citizen

On Thu, Mar 21, 2019 at 8:29 PM Victor Masaya <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi Courtney, thanks again for your previous reply. I've been out of town but someone informed me yesterday that Mayor Breed is now suggesting that there is a "shelter crisis" to pass legislation for the homeless shelter. I assume that this is fake news because no true democratic leader would act in authoritarian manner to create a physical barrier in a racially diverse area, would one? It'd be quite disappointing to have a President who only caters to his base and a mayor in our city that acts in a similar manner.

I hate to repeat this but why not open a large medical facility in Pac Heights, Presidio Heights, Seacliff or the Marina? That would accomplish a couple of things: 1) rather than having a useless facility that the homeless probably won't be interested in anyway, the homeless can get real medical help that they need and 2) if the more affluent and less diverse areas in SF can get comfortable with a homeless medical facility, everyone else in SF will as well.

Ultimately if the mayor acts against the will of the people and uses emergency powers or executive orders to meet one of her promises, there's nothing we can do. Hopefully no lives are lost as a result.

Respectfully,
Victor Masaya

On Tue, Mar 12, 2019 at 5:12 PM Victor Masaya <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Courtney, thanks for getting back to me. For some reason no one that I reach out to can address why this location of all locations is the optimal place to have a shelter. This is ridiculous to me but I just live here. It doesn't seem like a complicated question. If this is the ideal spot, that's great but what is the reason for it? Is being close to the water helpful for curing mental illnesses? Is being in a residential area with kids nearby and tourists walking through healthy for the homeless because they can have a footprint in an area where people may give them money? Homelessness is clearly the biggest issue for the city of SF but nobody can articulate why this is the best spot.

As someone who is not sophisticated at all, logic to me would dictate that this shelter should be in very close proximity to hospitals, medical professionals, or close to existing shelters such as the one on 5th and Mission to take advantage of synergies. That way folks can get real medical help and not be milling around near the water.

Hopefully one of these days someone can pronounce why this is the best next step for the city? This seems like a complete waste of money. If the optimal location is indeed a scenic area with foot traffic and the like, shouldn't this be in the Marina? Or why not Pac Heights or Presidio Heights where folks are more affluent.

Any reasoning as to why this is the best location and why the aforementioned more affluent and less diverse areas are not would be super helpful to us and the rest of the D6 community.

Lastly isn't the government aware of homeless people acting aggressively towards others? I would think that anecdotally we're all aware of someone who has been punched, kicked, shoved or hit by a homeless person. Not to sound cynical but maybe being close to residential and tourists is a sound political move because if there is another Kate Steinle episode and someone were to get murdered that could kickstart a campaign to obtain more resources from corporations including the Giants, Warriors, and Salesforce, to try to truly address this issue. Could that be the reason? Again absent any data or other evidence demonstrating why this area is the best place to have this shelter, can't help but think the worst.

Best,
Victor

On Mar 12, 2019, at 4:21 PM, Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS) <courtney.mcdonald@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Victor and Susie,

Thanks for reaching out about this. We hear you, and are committed to addressing needles, mental illness, feces, etc. The goal of the Navigation Center in part would be to make sure that type of activity is not happening on our streets. Supervisor Haney asked me to share some of this initial thoughts with you, as we also just learned about the proposal within the past 2 weeks:

Homelessness is an urgent concern in San Francisco with over 4,000 people currently unsheltered on our streets. The crisis is increasingly impacting the waterfront and our Rincon Hill, South Beach and Mission Bay communities. The status quo of people living in tents or on our streets and under the freeway is completely unacceptable, and Navigation Centers can be part of the solution to immediately get people off the streets and into shelter and services.

I also have some questions and concerns about the proposed Navigation Center, as our office just found out about the proposal and has not yet received the full details. Like you, I am listening and eager to learn more as the terms and design are drafted. I would love to set up a phone call with you to discuss further with me or my staff. Please let me know a good time to call, or call my staff directly at (415) 554-7972.

Here's what I am advocating for at a minimum based on conversations with the community, and I hope you will support my asks of Mayor Breed and Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing:

- The goal of the Navigation Center must be to directly **address homelessness in the neighborhood** and make a major improvement in Rincon Hill, South Beach, and Mission Bay. People will be invited to the Navigation Center *only* from neighborhood Homeless Outreach Teams and there will be no lines of people waiting outside to access services.
- There should be dedicated foot patrols around the perimeter and 24/7 security to ensure **public safety**.
- There should be outdoor spaces for people staying in the Navigation Center that remain separate from the public space so **there aren't people gathering outside**.
- Intensive services must be offered in order to replicate the success of the 6 current Navigation Centers, which have worked to quickly place people in housing or help people get out of San Francisco to stay with friends or family elsewhere through the Homeward Bound program.
- **The Mayor should immediately propose an additional Navigation Center in another part of the City, before this one is approved.** We can't keep concentrating these services solely in District 6. This week, I proposed an amendment to the Shelter Crisis Ordinance to add a commitment to build Navigation Centers in a majority of the Supervisorial districts.
- **The Navigation Center will be temporary.** I am advocating for a shorter lease, likely 2 years, with a potential lease extension only if this works for the neighborhood and shows demonstrable, positive improvements and outcomes for the neighborhood and for people who receive services at the center.

The Mayor and Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing are holding an important community meeting on today (Tuesday, March 12th) about their proposal. We hope you can join us and express your opinions:

- March 12th from 6-7:30pm; Delancey Street Foundation (600 Embarcadero)

The proposal will also be presented on during the Port Commission meeting this afternoon—no action will be taken until their April meeting:

- Today at 3:15pm; Ferry Building, 2nd Floor (Port Commission Hearing Room)

I appreciate and need your continued advocacy.

Our collective long-term goal as a City is to end homelessness and get everyone housed. In the meantime Navigation Centers, if done right, and only if done right, can be an integral first step in the City's strategy to get people off the streets and immediately connected to services.

Thank you again for reaching out. I look forward to talking soon.

Supervisor Matt Haney

Hi Courtney, as noted in an email to Supervisor Haney and staff, my name is Victor Masaya and I've copied in my wife Susie Masaya. We are homeowners in District 6 and have lived in the area since 2005.

We are writing to you (also left a voicemail) as we are extremely concerned about the proposal to have a homeless shelter built in the district. As a couple that is expecting our first child in late April / early May, this is of extreme concern. We don't need to tell anyone about needles, observed mental illness, human feces, etc. and we all know that the problem is getting worse. Going to Safeway and seeing one homeless carrying knives in line and another inserting pliers up his rectum is one thing but having a shelter nearby to exacerbate the problem is another. While our voices don't matter in this city, it'd be great if we could at least get some form of justification of why it makes sense to have it so close to the Ferry Building, FiDi, the Embarcadero, the Giants and the future home of the Warriors. While good economic times will continue (e.g. Lyft IPO, soon to be followed by Uber and other minotaurs), worsening the problem in the district makes it very difficult to raise a child. I realize I am not yet a parent so I am completely speculating that it's not healthy for kids to interact with homeless and come across needles but maybe the data proves otherwise.

On the economics side, it is clearly in homeowners' interest, including ours, to not have a homeless shelter close to us and I fully acknowledge that. But I would still think that would be outweighed by concern for folks that already live in the district, including children. Assuming the project does go through (and even if it doesn't), we will most certainly move out of SF.

Best,

A concerned resident

Victor Masaya

[REDACTED]

Dear Advisory Group Members,

I'd like to thank you for your work in the Central Waterfront Advisory group and your service to the community. My name is Tina Hua. I previously served as a federal prosecutor for 11 years, working at the US Attorney's Office in the Civic Center in the San Francisco Tenderloin neighborhood. While I worked there, I faced firsthand what working in a community close to homelessness is like. Due to concerns for my safety, I learned to avoid certain streets and certain times, e.g. when the homeless people would line up in front of the entire block at the post office to pick up their government subsidy checks. I've witnessed aggressive behavior directed at me simply because I walked on the same side of the street, sometimes with a homeless man or woman screaming obscenities, getting into fights, and repeatedly request money. I've witnessed used drug needles, condoms, and defecation on the streets. I also know a federal agent colleague who stepped on a used needle, and had to rush to the emergency room to be treated in case the needle was contaminated with AIDS or other diseases. I made it a point never to walk alone after dark and if I had to work late, I would make sure to drive and move my car into the federal building after hours, which we were allowed to do for our safety.

As a long time public servant, I have been dismayed to see that a necessary conversation about the proposed navigation center at SWL 330 turn into a media circus of the "greedy" vs homeless -- as opposed to a real conversation about the impact to all members of the community, including but not limited to current tenants, owners, businesses, Delancy Street residents, tourists, Giants fans, commuters (to the various highways in the area as well as Caltrain), and the homeless. I am an [REDACTED]. After reviewing the study presented by the Mayor "Navigation Centers: What do Neighbors Have to Fear and learning as much as I can about both sides of the debate, I believe that the proposal is too rushed, and has not adequately considered the impact of the proposed navigation center on SWL 330 directly across the street from ours and several other residential communities. Even the report used by proponents of building the navigation center at SWL 330 raises many concerns and suggested areas for additional study that have not been addressed by proponents of the center. The failure to address obvious safety, crime, visible homelessness, drug

use, and lowered property value concerns, on top of passing legislation to fast-track the building of this center, indicate that the plan to build the center has been too rushed and the serious ramifications of such a center to the neighborhood have not been well thought out.

The proposed center is much larger than prior navigation centers and the proposal is to place it in one of the densest residential areas in San Francisco. The proponents do not adequately address how the large size of the proposed center – more than double some of the prior navigation center sizes – and the characteristic of the existing neighborhood would impact the safety, visibility of the center, and surrounding property value, which is a legitimate concern in light of the fact that many Bay Area home owners see the majority of their net worth in their home value. The report discusses how neighbors of other navigation centers “don’t really feel it” but also discuss how one of the other navigation centers is not in a residential area. In contrast, the intended Navigation Center is not only a lot larger than the prior navigation centers that have been built but are also directly adjacent to four different large complexes with several additional residential buildings very close by. Similarly, the report even states that the property value of neighborhoods within 1-2 blocks of navigation centers may be affected and “it will take further study to determine whether such properties experience decreases in value.” Without additional study into the impact of the proposed center in the existing densely residential neighborhood, and how it is waterfront on a major pathway connecting the city to a pier used for special events, the ballpark, the Caltrain hub, the freeway, the new Warrior’s stadium, and the financial district, the impact to city planning and transportation plans could be detrimental.

Furthermore, the proponents have not studied the impact of the center to Delancy Street or other centers and homeless shelters in the district. Mimi Silbert, President of Delancey Street, has expressed concern about housing active drug users at a navigation center next door to recovering drug addicts. Without studying and addressing the impact of the center to Delancy Street and other homeless shelters is too rash and unnecessarily rushed in light of the potential devastating impact to the neighborhood and overall city planning.

While [REDACTED] shares the commitment of the City and Port to reduce homelessness, the location of the proposed navigation center at SWL 330 poses many unmitigable problems and unacceptable outcomes for our neighborhood, including increased risks to public safety, property crime, and public nuisance; degradation of neighborhood quality of life and livability; and perhaps most importantly, non-compliance of land use with the SF Port’s own Waterfront Plan and City plans.

I do not want to see the area around my home see the same problems that I saw firsthand when working in the Tenderloin. We purchased the apartment because we love the location and would love to retire here. We love the walkability to my husband’s work, public transit, the Ferry Building, the Giant’s ballpark, and soon to be Warrior’s new home. I currently walk with my children after hours in the area without any concerns for our safety. For these reasons and the specific reasons stated below, I oppose the navigation center at SWL 330.

RESIDENT AND NEIGHBORHOOD ISSUES

Magnet for Homeless Outside Center

It is inevitable that the proposed navigation center will attract large congregations of street people outside. It has been documented in published reports that areas that border on homeless shelters have more problems with crime, violence, drug use, loitering, and other criminal activities. These conditions will have a negative impact upon pedestrians and attendees of Giants games walking along the Embarcadero, and our neighborhood in general.

Fails to Integrate with Community

No land use could be more distinctly out of character for the South Beach community of high-end residential and office use than the proposed navigation center's temporary structures and tents. Any development which requires 24/7 police protection around its perimeter has no place in a thriving residential neighborhood. It is clearly an improper, unsuitable, and incompatible use within our residential neighborhood.

Risks to Public Safety

Our building is home to many residents with young families and elderly couples and singles, whose physical safety would be threatened by the inevitable gathering of homeless outside the center, some of who are mentally ill, intoxicated with alcohol, high on chemical substances, or with criminal or violent histories. To place children and the elderly directly in the path of a large homeless population is dangerous, irresponsible, and wrong.

Increase in Property Crime

The surrounding streets of Bryant, Main, Harrison and the Embarcadero have some of the highest rates of vehicle break-ins in the City, with many of these crimes proven to be committed by the homeless. Locating the proposed navigation center so close to our residences, businesses, and property will make an untenable situation worse and degrade our quality of life.

Degradation of Quality of Life

Our building's residents—and our neighborhood in general—already endure continuous periods of gridlocked traffic throughout the day which negatively impacts our area. We see no value—nor justice—in compounding the existing problems of our neighborhood with the proposed navigation center and the crime, violence, drug use, loitering, and criminal activities it will bring.

Disproportionate Use of District 6 for Homeless

District 6 already has an 84-bed navigation center at 5th and Bryant Streets, in close proximity to the proposed site on SWL 330. Locating another navigation center so close to 5th and Bryant places a disproportionate and undue burden of homelessness upon our residential neighborhood. Other districts must do their fair share to ease the homelessness problem by accommodating navigation centers.

Navigation Centers Belong in Non-Residential Areas

It makes no sense to destroy a safe, upscale, desirable neighborhood for the sake of a political agenda. Intelligent city planning is about context. Navigation centers, due to their temporary nature, should be located in industrial/commercial areas, where they **will not** pose a threat to the safety of established residential

communities and families. Why place it at SWL 330, in the middle of a thriving residential community?

Fallacy of Locating Centers Where Homeless Are

Also, it **is not** about placing navigation centers where the homeless are—navigation center admittance is by referral only. Locating a navigation center in a residential neighborhood by definition brings homeless to that area—**ours**—who were not there before. If the Port’s goal is to reduce homelessness on Port property, the proposed navigation center will do the exact opposite.

PLANNING AND LAND USE ISSUES

Inappropriate Land Use per Community Input

Engaged citizens of the area contributed their valuable time to participate in many input sessions and workshops with both Port and City officials regarding potential land use for SWL 330. Never has our community supported a navigation center as an appropriate land use for the site. It is out of place, out of character, and inappropriate for our residential neighborhood. If community input is to be disregarded, why have we attended, participated in, and commented upon all these sessions?

Impedes Public Access to Waterfront

SB815, approved by the State Legislature in 2007, allows development of nontrust residential, office, and commercial uses that complement the land use character of the South Beach neighborhood, generate revenue for historic rehabilitation, and public access. The proposed navigation center at SWL 330, in addition to being a land use that is distinctly out of character with the South Beach neighborhood, will do the opposite of promoting public access to the Waterfront—by forcing pedestrians and Giants attendees to cross the street or stay away from the area altogether to avoid being accosted by the inevitable homeless activity surrounding the shelter.

Fails to Comply with SF Port Waterfront Plan—or Any Plans

The use of SWL 330 for a proposed navigation center fails to comply with the SF Port Waterfront Plan or any other adopted plans, including the Rincon Hill, Better Streets, and Eastern Neighborhoods Plans. If the use is non-compliant with any approved Plans that citizens took time out their working day to contribute to and comment upon, why have any Plans at all? Why should the mayor be allowed to to subvert the will of the residents most adversely affected by the location of the proposed navigation center?

Disregards All Waterfront Plan Update Recommendations

Land use of SWL 330 as a proposed navigation center is in direct opposition to all Working Group Recommendations stated in the most recent SF Port Waterfront Plan Update of June 22, 2018 for improving use and development of SWL 330:

- *“Complement the character of surrounding neighborhoods;”*

The proposed navigation center is distinctly out of character for the South Beach community of high-end residential and office use.

- *“Provide a pleasing transition from the City-side to the Bay, and ground floor activation to enhance the pedestrian environment;”*

To the contrary, the proposed portable structures and tents will be a visual and

architectural blight upon the most scenic and symbolic thoroughfare of the city as an improper, unsuitable, and incompatible use. Pedestrians and Giants attendees will be forced to cross the street to avoid being harassed by the homeless outside the shelter.

• and *“Generate revenues for Port capital improvements.”*

The loss of the \$700,000 currently generated at SWL 330 will be greatly detrimental to the Port’s efforts to fund much-needed capital improvements.

“FAST TRACK” LEGISLATION ISSUES

Removal of Planning, Permitting, and Other Regulatory Review

Any attempt to “fast track” approval of the navigation center through proposed legislation eliminating planning, permitting and other regulatory review is a blatant attempt to subvert the will of the people. The legislation puts the Mayor’s goal of building 1000 new shelter beds ahead of all other legitimate considerations. It will ignore critical planning and environmental safeguards built into the process to protect citizens, stifle essential community input and discussion, and essentially defy the will of citizens in the residential neighborhood most adversely affected by the proposed navigation center.

Dangerous Precedent for Individual Districts

The legislation will not only affect SWL 330, but sets a dangerous precedent for navigation centers to be located in densely populated residential family neighborhoods, ignoring the adverse impacts upon each district and its constituents, and ceding critical legislative power to the executive branch at the expense of individual district voters.

Lack of Responsibility and Accountability

This proposed legislation will only serve to diminish our neighborhood’s faith in government responsibility and accountability to the citizens it purports to represent and serve. To “fast track” a project this problematic and controversial is irresponsible, short-sighted, and wrong.

CONCLUSION

I remain hopeful that you, as fellow citizens and members of the Central Waterfront Advisory Group, will fulfill your responsibilities to put the interests of the neighborhood who will be most adversely affected by the navigation center—and the citizens they represent—above politics. For the many important reasons stated above, I respectfully request that you oppose the location of the proposed navigation center on SWL 330 and any “fast-track” legislation designed to railroad its approval. This is not what our residential neighborhood needs, wants, or represents.

Respectfully,

Tina Hua



Fellow residents, I just came across the disturbing below post on Nextdoor and urge each and everyone of you to please openly respond via a press release to stop the lies and highlight that the below is a misuse of data and is directionally wrong! From everything I've heard from the government including agencies, **ALL areas within SF are participating** and have signed off including **Sea Cliff and Presidio Heights**. Please let everyone know that plans for navigation centers in **Sea Cliff and Presidio Heights have already been approved**.

It is very defeating to see articles like these that I assume are **factually incorrect**?

Please provide **announcements that Sea Cliff, Presidio Heights and the Marina are all on board and that navigation centers will be built immediately** in those respective less diverse areas. As articulated numerous times now to a number of folks on this email, when folks spread lies that the likes of Sea Cliff and Presidio Heights are not having navigation centers built, that only builds skepticism and distrust. It also leads to assumptions that we are living within a city that has an administration that is authoritarian, builds physical barriers that are inconsistent with the will of the people, only governs to achieve political agendas, and spreads fake news. That can't be true, correct? Only the Trump administration would do such a thing and I know that SF is better than that...or maybe not...

District 6 has 65% of the shelter beds in San Francisco and 73% of Permanent Supportive Housing

Jack Dorsey lives in Sea Cliff with sweeping views of the Golden Gate Bridge, Marin Headlands, and the Pacific Ocean. Sea Cliff, located in District 1, has 2.9% of homeless services in their district and 0.3% of Permanent Supportive Housing. The City has announced no plans to place a Navigation Center in the Sea Cliff Neighborhood and Jack Dorsey has not publicly called for a Navigation Center in his Neighborhood. Jack Dorsey has donated \$25,000 to the Coalition for Homelessness in support of the Mega Navigation Center to be built on the Embarcadero, a 25-minute drive across town from his home. It's fair to say Jack Dorsey is a NIMBY. It's wonderful he is donating to a charity (you should too!), but he isn't inviting a Navigation Center into his neighborhood. Marc Benioff lives in one of the toniest neighborhoods in San Francisco, Presidio Heights with beautiful views of the Presidio Park. Presidio Heights of District 2 has 0% (zero percent) of homeless services, no shelter beds in their district and 1.9% of Permanent Supportive Housing. The City has announced no plans to place a Navigation Center in the Presidio Heights Neighborhood and Marc Benioff has not publicly called for a Navigation Center in his Neighborhood. Marc Benioff has donated \$10,000 to the Coalition for Homelessness in support of the Mega Navigation Center to be built on the Embarcadero, a 20-minute drive across town from his home. It's fair to say Marc Benioff, while a hero to the City in many ways is still (technically) a NIMBY (even though we love him). It's wonderful he is donating to a charity (everyone should!), but he isn't inviting a Navigation Center into his neighborhood. William Fitzgerald who started the rival "troll" GoFundMe page lives in the Richmond District, District 1, near Golden Gate Park according to his interview on KRON4 on March 30th. The Richmond District has 2.9% of homeless services in their district and 0.3% of Permanent Supportive Housing.

The City has announced no plans to place a Navigation Center in the Richmond Neighborhood of San Francisco. William Fitzgerald *has* publicly called for a Navigation Center in his Neighborhood and has helped to raise \$138,000 (and counting) for the Coalition for Homelessness in support of the Mega Navigation Center to be built on the Embarcadero, a 20-minute drive across town from his home. Perhaps, all of the money from his fundraiser could go to scouting locations in District 1 near his home? Win! Perhaps, London Breed could work with William to place the next Navigation Center in his neighborhood? He's ready to go to the fences for you London and has the support of several Tech Billionaires to boot! While all of these wonderful gentlemen are supporting an open drug policy Mega Shelter, 20 minutes away from their clean tree-lined streets – the folks over in District 6 are the true supporters of homelessness. And, it is not fair to say any of these folks in D6 are NIMBYs. District 6 carries by far over and above the average of all of the homeless services in the City of San Francisco. Over 65%, yes, 65% of the shelter beds and 73%, yes you read that right, 73% of all of San Francisco's Permanent Supportive Housing are in District 6. District 6 also, already has a Navigation Center – check out the needle encrusted streets surrounding it – Sam Brock of NBC shot some video of the area surrounding this SAFE Navigation Center on March 29th – which made the 6 o'clock news. So, again – no one here is a NIMBY. Perhaps, NIMFY (Not in My Front Yard) or NAIMBY (Not All in My Back Yard). So, before you demonize working-class families living in apartments (not the houses of the donors in District 1 and District 2 receiving the accolades) – perhaps, you should dig into the story the news media isn't reporting because it doesn't get the clicks, the shares or the tune-ins. We all want the same thing for our children and ourselves. And, we all want the same thing for the homeless as well. We want them to be safe, and sheltered and to get the services they need with Permanent Supportive Housing. We all also, in tandem, want safety for our children and a sense of security when we walk down the street. The residents of District 6 want a sense of security while walking on the promenade that most of us consider our public park – the Embarcadero. We walk it on the way to work and on the weekends for leisure with our family and friends, push our kids in strollers, walk alongside our kids learning to ride their bikes, and smile at the tourists walking by while they enjoy this crown jewel of the City. This area has been years in the making in terms of the revitalization efforts for the Embarcadero, thank you San Francisco, it looks beautiful! We love it! We love the arrow sculpture in the grass, the lights of the Bay Bridge, walking to the Ball Park for Giants Games, the Ferry Building on Saturday for our Farmer's Market, Pier 23, and Fisherman's Wharf. Perhaps, by mistake, but perhaps not, Mayor Breed didn't do any outreach to the community and residents – instead, neighbors read about this in the newspaper with all indications it was a done deal. The area where the City has proposed the Mega Navigation Center is currently a low-crime area and residents feel safe. If you walk over to 5th & Bryant, you'll get a taste of what is to come of this area if this SAFE (translation: drug use friendly) Mega Navigation Center is built in the "front yard" of 10,000 residents living here. And, so we may end with numbers in a visual format: If you walk the stretch from the Giants Ball Park all the way to Crissy Field, you'll count 12 to 15 homeless people. I've done this walk twice since the announcement was made by London Breed. This leads to further confusion for us D6 folks, there aren't the numbers here to support 225 homeless beds

in this neighborhood. Perhaps, London should take a page out of the Mayor of LA's playbook? Navigation Centers will be spread out in every district in LA. No questions asked. No arguments. For all the NIMBY narrative spreaders, we have one already – have you seen it? And, we have St. Vincent de Paul, the Sanctuary, MCS, Glide, Delancey Street – the list goes on and on. We also have almost all of the Permanent Supportive Housing – 73% of it. Where do you live? I'll send you your stats. Are the large donations a call from Marc Benioff, Jack Dorsey, Nat Friedman, and the other tech billionaires to put the Navigation Centers in their front yards? There is a large parking lot adjacent the waterfront on Marina Green. "It's just a parking lot," to quote some of the comments surrounding this issue. Perhaps, we'll make YIMBYs of them after all. -A resident of D6 who loves the Embarcadero and would like the non-factual NIMBY narrative to cease. It's not true.

To Mark.Paez,

Hi Mark, my name is Victor Masaya and I'm a resident on Townsend, near the potential site of the navigation center. As you can imagine the neighborhood is very upset with what's likely going to transpire but if you don't mind I would like to ask you a few questions as a neighbor suggested folks reach out to you. As an FYI I'm now resigned to the fact that this will be built so just had some follow-up questions.

- Given this center is part of a larger plan of the Mayor's, can you confirm that the Marina, Pac Heights, Presidio Heights or Seacliff have signed off on a center to be built in their neighborhood? Our understanding from the Mayor is that other neighborhoods have all signed off and that all of SF is going to participate. From a messaging standpoint I think if you and Mayor Breed communicated the timing of the construction of a center in one of those specific locations and that they have already signed off, that would be fantastic! Currently residents in District 6 assume that **the wealthy and less diverse are excluded** so confirmation that those affluent neighborhoods are indeed participating as part of the larger plan would undoubtedly assuage folks' concerns. I personally would be super excited if a center was built there first and then **NO NEIGHBORHOOD in SF could use NIMBY** as an excuse.

- Why doesn't SF **build vertically from existing centers**? Wouldn't it make sense from a cost and synergies standpoint to just build additional floors to existing facilities and then invest in medical resources to treat the mentally ill. With scale within a single location comes meaningful synergies one would think?

- Obviously **physical assault and murder is a concern, especially with kids in close proximity**. How many more SFPD personnel will be manning the neighborhood. I hate to sound paranoid but my wife and I are expecting in late April and May. My wife Susie (copied on this email) has already been **assaulted multiple times by the homeless** as have her co-workers so we're hoping that if the center is going to be built, can we also **add a wall** to enclose all of the homeless with a lot of police personnel so that no homeless are lingering outside and no homeless can escape the navigation center.

I've emailed so many officials and no one wants to give straight answers so I would GREATLY APPRECIATE it if you could just say you're unable to answer any of the above questions rather than pasting in a template response that doesn't answer the question. In addition if my questions are moronic, please do say so. I'd much rather have someone be direct with me and call me an idiot rather than send a canned response that is infuriating. I have thick skin so if you think any of what I wrote is unfounded, fake news, or outright stupid, I'm good with that if you let me know. I would sincerely respect that type of direct feedback. If better, happy to jump on a call.

Thanks much for your time.

Best,
Victor

Dear fellow SF residents,

I am deeply upset about the news of the shelter going up. I have been assaulted by a homeless person on multiple occasions and my co-workers have as well, and while reported to the Police, they have done NOTHING.

If you ask the homeless person why they are not in a shelter they state they don't want to follow the rules of the shelter so choose not to be in one. I don't believe our homeless problem is as much of a bed issue as it is a drug and mental issue. I feel like we need to address this first! Adding more beds is NOT going to fix the problem.

I went to the Townhall and i would say over 95% of the individuals who spoke were against the shelter.

I feel like our voices are not being heard and that that you will just do as you please and this greatly concerns me as a Taxpayer - Shame on you!

Also having more police in the neighborhood is NOT a solution. If you want to make a statement with the shelter then I believe this should first go up in the more affluent neighborhoods such as the SeaCliff, Presidio Heights, and Pacific Heights - if built there and other districts can see that it is running well I am sure other districts will fall in line. As you stated at the Townhall "no district is exempt" but I feel like that is a LIE.

and why is it OKAY for the Mayor to fast-track her agendas without listening to the citizens of this city. I thought this was a democracy and that you were for the People but I guess that was a LIE too.

I don't believe much thought was put into this and I also don't understand why we just don't better the shelters that are already in place; why can't we just give them an

upgrade and build more beds within existing shelters and hire better staff to run and provide the support of what they really need instead of wasting our tax dollars, that we know will cost more to run this than that is being estimated.

Thank you,
Susie Masaya
Concerned Citizen

On Thu, Mar 21, 2019 at 8:29 PM Victor Masaya <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Hi Courtney, thanks again for your previous reply. I've been out of town but someone informed me yesterday that Mayor Breed is now suggesting that there is a "shelter crisis" to pass legislation for the homeless shelter. I assume that this is fake news because no true democratic leader would act in authoritarian manner to create a physical barrier in a racially diverse area, would one? It'd be quite disappointing to have a President who only caters to his base and a mayor in our city that acts in a similar manner.

I hate to repeat this but why not open a large medical facility in Pac Heights, Presidio Heights, Seacliff or the Marina? That would accomplish a couple of things: 1) rather than having a useless facility that the homeless probably won't be interested in anyway, the homeless can get real medical help that they need and 2) if the more affluent and less diverse areas in SF can get comfortable with a homeless medical facility, everyone else in SF will as well.

Ultimately if the mayor acts against the will of the people and uses emergency powers or executive orders to meet one of her promises, there's nothing we can do. Hopefully no lives are lost as a result.

Respectfully,
Victor Masaya

On Tue, Mar 12, 2019 at 5:12 PM Victor Masaya <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Courtney, thanks for getting back to me. For some reason no one that I reach out to can address why this location of all locations is the optimal place to have a shelter. This is ridiculous to me but I just live here. It doesn't seem like a complicated question. If this is the ideal spot, that's great but what is the reason for it? Is being close to the water helpful for curing mental illnesses? Is being in a residential area with kids nearby and tourists walking through healthy for the homeless because they can have a footprint in an area where people may give them money? Homelessness is clearly the biggest issue for the city of SF but nobody can articulate why this is the best spot.

As someone who is not sophisticated at all, logic to me would dictate that this shelter should be in very close proximity to hospitals, medical professionals, or close to existing shelters such as the one on 5th and Mission to take advantage of synergies. That way folks can get real medical help and not be milling around near the water.

Hopefully one of these days someone can pronounce why this is the best next step for the city? This seems like a complete waste of money. If the optimal location is indeed a scenic area with

foot traffic and the like, shouldn't this be in the Marina? Or why not Pac Heights or Presidio Heights where folks are more affluent.

Any reasoning as to why this is the best location and why the aforementioned more affluent and less diverse areas are not would be super helpful to us and the rest of the D6 community.

Lastly isn't the government aware of homeless people acting aggressively towards others? I would think that anecdotally we're all aware of someone who has been punched, kicked, shoved or hit by a homeless person. Not to sound cynical but maybe being close to residential and tourists is a sound political move because if there is another Kate Steinle episode and someone were to get murdered that could kick start a campaign to obtain more resources from corporations including the Giants, Warriors, and Salesforce, to try to truly address this issue. Could that be the reason? Again absent any data or other evidence demonstrating why this area is the best place to have this shelter, can't help but think the worst.

Best,
Victor

Hi Victor and Susie,

Thanks for reaching out about this. We hear you, and are committed to addressing needles, mental illness, feces, etc. The goal of the Navigation Center in part would be to make sure that type of activity is not happening on our streets. Supervisor Haney asked me to share some of this initial thoughts with you, as we also just learned about the proposal within the past 2 weeks:

Homelessness is an urgent concern in San Francisco with over 4,000 people currently unsheltered on our streets. The crisis is increasingly impacting the waterfront and our Rincon Hill, South Beach and Mission Bay communities. The status quo of people living in tents or on our streets and under the freeway is completely unacceptable, and Navigation Centers can be part of the solution to immediately get people off the streets and into shelter and services.

I also have some questions and concerns about the proposed Navigation Center, as our office just found out about the proposal and has not yet received the full details. Like you, I am listening and eager to learn more as the terms and design are drafted. I would love to set up a phone call with you to discuss further with me or my staff. Please let me know a good time to call, or call my staff directly at (415) 554-7972.

Here's what I am advocating for at a minimum based on conversations with the community, and I hope you will support my asks of Mayor Breed and Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing:

- The goal of the Navigation Center must be to directly **address homelessness in the neighborhood** and make a major improvement in Rincon Hill, South Beach, and Mission Bay. People will be invited to the Navigation Center *only* from neighborhood Homeless Outreach Teams and there will be no lines of people waiting outside to access services.
- There should be dedicated foot patrols around the perimeter and 24/7 security to ensure **public safety**.
- There should be outdoor spaces for people staying in the Navigation Center that remain separate from the public space so **there aren't people gathering outside**.
- Intensive services must be offered in order to replicate the success of the 6 current Navigation Centers, which have worked to quickly place people in housing or help people get out of San Francisco to stay with friends or family elsewhere through the Homeward Bound program.
- **The Mayor should immediately propose an additional Navigation Center in another part of the City, before this one is approved.** We can't keep concentrating these services solely in District 6. This week, I proposed an amendment to the Shelter Crisis Ordinance to add a commitment to build Navigation Centers in a majority of the Supervisorial districts.
- **The Navigation Center will be temporary.** I am advocating for a shorter lease, likely 2 years, with a potential lease extension only if this works for the neighborhood and shows demonstrable, positive improvements and outcomes for the neighborhood and for people who receive services at the center.

The Mayor and Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing are holding an important community meeting on today (Tuesday, March 12th) about their proposal. We hope you can join us and express your opinions:

- March 12th from 6-7:30pm; Delancey Street Foundation (600 Embarcadero)

The proposal will also be presented on during the Port Commission meeting this afternoon—no action will be taken until their April meeting:

- Today at 3:15pm; Ferry Building, 2nd Floor (Port Commission Hearing Room)

I appreciate and need your continued advocacy.

Our collective long-term goal as a City is to end homelessness and get everyone housed. In the meantime Navigation Centers, if done right, and only if done right, can be an integral first step in the City's strategy to get people off the streets and immediately connected to services.

Thank you again for reaching out. I look forward to talking soon.

Supervisor Matt Haney

Hi Courtney, as noted in an email to Supervisor Haney and staff, my name is Victor Masaya and I've copied in my wife Susie Masaya. We are homeowners in District 6 and have lived in the area since 2005.

We are writing to you (also left a voicemail) as we are extremely concerned about the proposal to have a homeless shelter built in the district. As a couple that is expecting our first child in late April / early May, this is of extreme concern. We don't need to tell anyone about needles, observed mental illness, human feces, etc. and we all know that the problem is getting worse. Going to Safeway and seeing one homeless carrying knives in line and another inserting plyers up his rectum is one thing but having a shelter nearby to exacerbate the problem is another. While our voices don't matter in this city, it'd be great if we could at least get some form of justification of why it makes sense to have it so close to the Ferry Building, FiDi, the Embarcadero, the Giants and the future home of the Warriors. While good economic times will continue (e.g. Lyft IPO, soon to be followed by Uber and other minotaurs), worsening the problem in the district makes it very difficult to raise a child. I realize I am not yet a parent so I am completely speculating that it's not healthy for kids to interact with homeless and come across needles but maybe the data proves otherwise.

On the economics side, it is clearly in homeowners' interest, including ours, to not have a homeless shelter close to us and I fully acknowledge that. But I would still think that would be outweighed by concern for folks that already live in the district, including children. Assuming the project does go through (and even if it doesn't), we will most certainly move out of SF.

Best,

A concerned resident

Victor Masaya