

December 9, 2019

To: Helen Hale 1 South Van Ness Mayor's office of Housing rm. 5080

San Francisco, CA 94111

Mrs. Helen Hale:

In September 2013 the residents of the Sunnydale community received a letter stating that all units would be remodeled and upon completion the affected tenants would retain their addresses. This letter sent by Hope SF stated that the tenants would hear back from them. That did not happen. The tenants never retained their same addresses as the building they called their home was demolished.

As someone whose unit was one of those demolished, I am dismayed, disheartened and frankly, feel disrespected by the lack of transparency throughout this entire process. Through the years, we in the Sunnydale community have been kept out of the planning process and in the dark. Unlike our counterparts in Visitation Valley who have been allowed access into the process.

Hope SF's website states that Hope SF's "principles were established in collaboration with the community," from what I have seen Hope SF does not adhere to those principles. The way they have treated us over the years has been in direct opposition to those principles.

How can Hope SF speak of "reparation" and "explicitly acknowledge the systemic harm that government agencies have disproportionately inflicted on low-income communities of color." when they have taken our units from us, have not given us the opportunity to share ideas and information on how we would be re-housed? Nor have we been given a chance to discuss how this proposed building affects us in our day-to-day such as the bus route such as whether those of us - from the youngest to the oldest - who rely on it will be able to catch the bus with the same convenience?

Now come's word that Hope SF, Mercy Housing and their developers are constructing a five-story building in lieu of the old layout. If anything like the other multi-story buildings of Hope SF and Mercy Housing, this change will be triggering trauma from the historical harm of past policies - something Hope SF's guiding principles said it will endeavor to avoid. Multi-storied buildings that force tenants and their guests to have a check-in and check-out policy; rules about how long a guest can stay; all of our moves monitored. Our homes will now become a prison. These things bring back the memories of the failures of Geneva Towers and its degradation over the years. This proposed five-story building bring to mind non-working elevators, feces covered, and urine filled hallways - concerns that we in the community have found out to be the reality for those in the new multi-storied buildings.

Where is the "quality of life" for the tenants? Where are the open spaces for the children to play? Our units as they stood made it feel as if we had a home. By building a multi-storied building it is a return to the regretful days of "the projects" where buildings stood in disrepair as slumlords gave no consideration to the tenants.

It is clear to the community and affected tenants that Hope SF and the developers of this project had no intention of fulfilling their promises and only made these assurances in order to achieve their goal of taking the property from those most in need; stripping us of our voices. As of right now we are not converted to “RAD” the tenant association is still under the 24cfr 964.115 “A duly resident council shall be recognized as a voice of authority for the residents and our community”. Since Mercy housing not complying with HUD rules and regulations the tenants of Sunnydale would like to have them to be [removed.in](#) their plans they fail to have a Tenant association office in their new development. Also since there are talking about Visitation Valley is coincide with each other how come we cannot have townhouses build in our community?

With the cost of living in San Francisco and the excessively high rent, we feel that low income people of color have no recourse and no right to their environment as if we are being forced to just take Hope SF and Mercy Housing's decision

Beyond the housing situation, we have even seen a blatant disregard for the promise that those in the community who took training would be able to be a part on the construction site. Tenants took the trainings, but no jobs have come from it.

I am speaking on **and** speaking out against this issue not only as a resident leader but as a member **of** the community.

Sincerely,

Shelly Leonard / President of Sunnydale Tenant Association

24 CFR § 964.100 - Role of resident council

§ 964.100 Role of resident council.

The role of a resident council is to improve the quality of life and resident satisfaction and participate in self-help initiatives to enable residents to create a positive living environment for families living in public housing. Resident councils may actively participate through a working partnership with the HA to advise and assist in all aspects of public housing operations.

24 CFR § 964.115 - Resident council requirements

§ 964.115 Resident council requirements.

A resident council shall consist of persons residing in public housing and must meet each of the following requirements in order to receive official recognition from the HA/HUD, and be eligible to receive funds for resident council activities, and stipends for officers for their related costs for volunteer work in public housing:

(a) It may represent residents residing:

(1) In scattered site buildings;

(2) In areas of contiguous row houses; or

- (3) In one or more contiguous buildings;
- (4) In a development; or
- (5) In a combination of these buildings or developments;

(b) It must adopt written procedures such as by-laws, or a constitution which provides for the election of residents to the governing board by the voting membership of the residents residing in public housing, described in paragraph (b) of this section, on a regular basis but at least once every three (3) years. The written procedures must provide for the recall of the resident board by the voting membership. These provisions shall allow for a petition or other expression of the voting membership's desire for a recall election, and set the number of percentage of voting membership ("threshold") who must be in agreement in order to hold a recall election. This threshold shall not be less than 10 percent of the voting membership.