

**BALBOA RESERVOIR COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

# **MEETING MINUTES**

**City College of San Francisco  
Multi-Use Building, Room 140  
55 Phelan Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112  
Monday, March 13, 2017**

**6:15 PM**

**Regular Meeting**

**Please note:** Meeting minutes are only intended to serve as a summary of the meeting. For a full transcript of the meeting, refer to the audio recording of the meeting [Available online at [www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC](http://www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC)].

Documents received during this meeting are in a document titled balboareservoir\_CAC\_Public\_Documents\_Received\_and\_Emails-031317 available via the following link: [www.sf-planning.org/brcac](http://www.sf-planning.org/brcac)

**Committee Members Present:**

Howard Chung; Brigitte Davila; Christine Godinez; Robert Muehlbauer; Maurice Rivers; Lisa Spinali; Jon Winston

**Committee Members Absent:**

Michael Ahrens  
Rebecca Lee

**Staff/Consultants Present:**

Office of Economic and Workforce Development: Emily Lesk, Mike Martin, Phillip Wong, Tom Shanahan  
San Francisco Planning Department: Jeremy Shaw

- 1. Call to Order and Roll Call.**
- 2. Opening of Meeting.**

- a. Michael Ahrens, Conflict Disclosure [Written statement, read by Lisa Spinali]:

*When the names of the developers became public, I notified Lisa Spinali of the matters in this email. I later notified Ken Rich of these matters when we talked.*

*I retired as an equity partner of Sheppard Mullin at the end of 2015, and am now of counsel to the firm. When I learned the names of the various developers/contractors who participated in the three joint ventures that made responses to the RFPs Sheppard ran a conflicts search. Sheppard does not represent any of the parties in connection with this project. Sheppard has represented in some matters Avalon Bay Communities and Bridge Housing. It does not appear that we represent any of the other participants.*

*I am not serving on the CAC as a lawyer, but as a resident. And, I am not acting as a lawyer at all in connection with these matters, but as a resident of Westwood Park.*

*I believe that it would be appropriate to put this email in the record of tonight's meeting. If anyone feels that it is necessary, it could be read into the record if there is time to do so.*

b. December Minutes

- i. Motion to approve December meeting minutes: Winston, Second: Chung
  - 1. Ayes: Chung, Davila, Godinez, Muehlbauer, Rivers, Spinali, Winston
  - 2. Noes: [none]
  - 3. Abstain: [none]

c. February minutes:

- i. Edits:
  - 1. Page 7, row 10:
    - 1. The SFSU and Parkmerced infrastructure project did not connect to Daly City Bart, which was the key component. There was the possibility of shared costs with BART in doing an eastside parking structure. It could be positive for BART and City College.
  - 2. Page 10, 4a2: Bikes and cars go too fast down Phelan. Additionally, there was no EIR report for the changes made to Phelan. LWHS construction in the area will only make things more difficult and hazardous.
  - 3. Page 6: The City's presentation is based on problem data. The Planning Department collected data on May 10th and 11th of 2016. Finals started on May 20, 2016. Data collected in the evening omits evening classes. Data taken at the end of the semester doesn't reflect average parking. There is more demand earlier in the semester.
  - 4. Page 6: number 7: Change collusion to collision.

- ii. Motion to approve February meeting minutes with edits: Muehlbauer, Second: Winston
  - 1. Ayes: Chung, Davila, Godinez, Muehlbauer, Rivers, Spinali, Winston
  - 2. Noes: [none]
  - 3. Abstain: [none]

d. Welcome to new CAC member Maurice Rivers.

**3. Transportation Demand Management:**

[Presentation available online at [www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC](http://www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC)]

Staff presented responses to recent questions about the Balboa Area Transportation Demand Management Framework (more project info available at [sf-planning.org/balboaTDM](http://sf-planning.org/balboaTDM)). The Transportation Demand Management framework is a way to start and coordinate the TDM conversation

between the Balboa Reservoir, City College, and adjacent neighborhoods. No final decisions have been made. Developers and City College can incorporate these recommendations in their TDM plans as they further refine their development proposals.

There were several answers to questions from the previous CAC meeting. Concerns were expressed that the Residential Permit Parking (RPP) process does not guarantee parking in front of individuals' homes and that it requires neighbors to collect signatures and pay a fee. RPP and parking pricing have been shown to be one tool among many that can help make it easier for residents to parking in their neighborhood. At the same time, SFMTA initiated an RPP reform process, including pilot projects which may help reform the program.

At the previous meeting, removing parking on Phelan was mentioned during public comment as a means of improving safety and traffic flow. Safety is MTA's number one priority and street parking provides protection for pedestrians from vehicular traffic. Parking management and supply in the area can continue to be considered in light of the many other community priorities.

Shuttles for the neighborhood and to BART have been mentioned as a means to improve access to Balboa Park station. The TDM Framework suggests a number of first/last mile measures and ways to improve connections to the BP Station. SFMTA currently runs a number of bus services between the Balboa Park station and surrounding neighborhoods, however SFMTA does not operate shuttles. Shuttle service can be proposed by a future Reservoir developer as part of its compliance with the TDM ordinance. If so, SFMTA would consider the feasibility of the service and its potential impacts. City College can also propose a shuttle to serve their needs. Any sponsor of a shuttle would need to determine how to financially sustain the shuttle service. To further a case for a shuttle, or similar service offered by a future developer or by CCSF, it would helpful for community members to identify specific areas and routes or groups that are underserved by existing service.

Public comment included concern over the collection of data during May 2016, in one of the final weeks of regular classes. To address this concern, the City and consultant collected more parking data in September 2016 and included City College's parking data collection from registration period in August. Additional data can also be collected in the future. If future conditions are significantly different, any future analysis would likely need additional data. Also, the night data was not intended to capture night classes; it was meant to identify the baseline of parking demand.

Next steps: A forthcoming report will explain in the further detail each recommendation.

**CAC Comment**

- The shuttle is a good solution to the first mile and last mile problem.
- A shuttle would not duplicate Muni routes if it circulates through the campus, reservoir, and other areas that the 43 does not go to. The developer can fund the shuttle, and it would be separate from MTA's priorities list.
- We have to think outside the box. We cannot build on the site if we cannot figure out the transportation and congestion piece.

**Public Comment**

- A shuttle may be difficult to implement in this location. The area is congested. A shuttle may move slowly and may add to congestion. MTA, BART, and all the parties involved need to work together to come up with a more solid solution.

- The shuttle is not replacing a Muni line; it is adding to Muni's coverage. A jitney program could also be effective.
- The shuttle should receive greater consideration. The shuttle can be developer funded.
- The RPP program requires residents to collect signatures and to pay for the permits. Neighbors who already live here are being asked to bear the burden of this development.
- PUC promised City College shuttles for the Evan's campus, but it was never implemented.
- The data for the TDM framework is not representative. The data includes dead week, the week between the end of instruction and finals.

#### **4. Developer Selection Process:**

The first phase was the process of coming up with the development parameters. The CAC completed this over the course of sixteen meetings. Next, developers responded to the Request for Qualification put for by the City. The selection committee scored the submittals, and PUC selected the top three scoring proposals to move forward. The three selected development teams will be submitting proposals for the site as part of the RFP process. The proposals will be presented at the June meeting. The selection panel will review and score these proposals, and PUC will select a developer. The proposals from the three selected teams, as well as the nine total submissions, will be available on the project website.

Each of the three teams is a partnership between multiple development organizations and include a combination of market rate and affordable housing developers. The teams are:

1. AvalonBay Communities, Bridge Housing, Mission Housing, Pacific Union Development Company, Habitat for Humanity
2. Emerald Fund, Mercy Housing California
3. Related Companies, Sares Regis Northern California, Curtis Development, Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation, BAR Architects

#### **5. June Meeting:**

The aim of the June meeting will be to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to provide feedback on the various proposals. A video of the meeting will be posted online, and written public comments will also be accepted for a period after the meeting. All public comment will be provided to the evaluation panel and the developer teams. The developer teams will prepare written responses to the public comment. During the review process, the review panel will read the developer proposals, public comment, and developer responses to the public comment.

It is important that expectations are properly set for this meeting. The meeting will focus on the proposals and selecting a developer. The meeting will not get into specific details of site design. There will be an opportunity to explore more specific transportation, open space, and design issues in the future.

#### **Outreach:**

The aim of the June meeting is to include as broad an audience as possible. This includes people who regularly attend CAC meeting, and those who may not have heard about the project yet. An example of some groups that outreach will include are:

- City College students and faculty
- Avalon Bay and 1100 Ocean Avenue residents
- Non-English speakers
- People who cannot attend evening meetings

- Younger people
- OMI residents
- People without internet

Some forms of outreach will include:

- Contacting neighborhood groups
- Paper mail
- Email
- Neighborhood papers (e.g. Ingleside-Excelsior Light)
- Neighborhood groups
- Multilingual communications
- Flyers at Main and Ingleside libraries
- Distributing flyers to local merchants

Ways neighbors can help publicize the meeting:

- Parenting newsletters
- Flyers on community bulletin boards
- Nextdoor (neighborhood social network)
- Reaching out to neighbors

**CAC Comment:**

- The outreach for the June meeting and the developer selection process needs to be expanded beyond the constituency that regularly attends CAC meetings. The larger community needs to be engaged.
- Future faculty and students at City College need to be represented at the meeting. Many faculty are nearing retirement age. City College has difficulty recruiting new faculty due to the high cost of housing in the area. It is difficult for this constituency to be represented because they do not exist yet; however, it is important that their needs are understood. College of San Mateo has housing programs for their faculty.
- We need to build more a crescendo of community input and rather than trying to put all our marbles in one day. Having all three developers present in a single day could lead to a very long meeting.
- A pre-meeting or an informational packet that can be distributed before the meeting could be helpful.
- Having all three developers present in one day is probably preferable to having three separate meetings.
- Refreshments should be provided at the June meeting.
- It is important to have good representation from the PUC so that they hear what the community says.
- Some important means of outreach include: local newspapers, contacting neighborhood associations, distributing flyers to local merchants, contacting the Ocean Avenue Association and City College Trustees, and engaging City College students.

**Public Comment:**

The following means of outreach could be effective:

- Multilingual mailings.
- Flyers distributed to merchants.

- Flyers placed on cars in the parking lot and surrounding areas.
- Local newspapers, including the Chronicle.
- Other localities and government agencies, including Daly City, the Association of Bay Area Governments, the Army Corps of Engineers, and Caltrain.
- Local schools and daycare centers.
- Nextdoor (neighborhood social network).
- Social media ads using geographic targeting.
- Multilingual talk shows.
- Press briefings.
- Motorcycle school that uses the parking lot.
- Teachers union.
- CCSF student newspaper and magazine.

Outreach Discussion:

- There should be multiple meetings.
- The PUC Commissioners should be formally invited.
- It is important to include OMI residents. The OMI Neighbors in Action group would be a good means to contact people. There is also a Balboa Terrace neighborhood group.
- Saturday can be a difficult day for merchants to make.
- A video of the meeting should be posted online.
- Poles should be used to show the height of the new buildings.
- The fire station on Ocean Avenue should be notified of the project.

**6. General Public Comment:**

- Santa Monica Community College was used as an example of an effective TDM program. However, their student population skews younger than City College's student population. More of their students may be living with their parents and not working part-time, or full-time, jobs.
- Parks and recreation are one of the backbones of our communities. Park resources are limited in this part of the City. The new project will only include 1.5 acres of continuously open space. New housing is important, but livability should be the biggest concern.
- Students in vocational and music programs need to carry things and need access to parking.
- The development teams that have been chosen are experienced and community-focused. The neighborhood is in fantastic hands.
- Parking is a concern. City College's enrollment will increase as a result of regaining its accreditation and the free tuition program. Additionally, the new performing arts center will remove hundreds of parking spots.
- There should be outreach concerning bikes as a means of reducing traffic.
- The TDM data is a concern. There seems to be a discrepancy between City College and the Planning Department. There should be additional data collection.
- The site should include housing for City College students or faculty on the site. City College should buy the property and use it for housing.
- Housing on this site is necessary. Young people struggle to afford to live in the City and rent control is of limited benefit to this group.
- The developer will have to be involved in upgrading the transportation infrastructure near the project, specifically the K line. The M line improvements are being subsidized by Parkmerced.
- The loss of parking may hurt City College.
- The transportation problem needs to be solved before design and construction move forward.
- Co-ops should be explored as an alternative to the current development.

- The current amount of parking relative to the size of City College's student body seems reasonable.

**7. Adjournment.**