

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

MEETING MINUTES

**City College of San Francisco
Multi-Use Building, Room 140
55 Frida Kahlo Way, San Francisco, CA 94112
Monday, December 9, 2019**

6:00 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 <https://sfplanning.org/project/balboa-reservoir#cac-and-community-meetings>

Documents received during this meeting are in a document titled balboareservoir_CAC_Public_Documents_Received_and_Emails-120919 available via the following link: <https://sfplanning.org/project/balboa-reservoir#cac-and-community-meetings>

Committee Members Present:

Michael Ahrens; Robert Muehlbauer; Amy O’Hair; Maurice Rivers; Mark Tang; Peter Tham; Jon Winston

Committee Members Absent:

Brigitte Davila; Christine Godinez

City Staff/Consultants Present:

Office of Economic and Workforce Development: Theodore Conrad

San Francisco Planning Department: Sue Exline, Seung Yen Hong, Vlad Vallejo

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

2. Opening of Meeting

Approval of September Minutes

Updates to Minutes:

- Michael Ahrens: On page 6 of the minutes, fix a name to read “Steve Martin Pinto” and other names as written in speaker cards

- Jennifer Heggie: There are no copies of the minutes for audience to review
- Motion: Continue approval of minutes to the next meeting
- Moved: Muehlbauer; Seconded: Ahrens
- Ayes: Ahrens; Muehlbauer, O’Hair; Tang; Tham, Winston; Noes: [none]; Abstain: [none]

3. Annual Report

Jon Winston suggested reviewing the edits proposed by Michael Ahrens paragraph by paragraph.

NOTE: **Unchanged text** is in plain font.
Additions to text is in single-underline font.
Deletions to text is in ~~strikethrough font~~.

The first proposed edits in the PROJECT’S RELATIONSHIP WITH CITY COLLEGE section:

“It is imperative that the Balboa Reservoir project not adversely impact San Francisco City College’s mission to provide a quality education at an affordable price for a large number of the City’s residents. CCSF has produced a transportation demand management plan (March, 2019) that, if implemented, intends to reduce the need for a large portion of its staff and student body to drive. ~~It will, therefore, have a smaller shortfall in parking needs than the one thousand parking spots that will be replaced by housing.~~ The developer team plans to accommodate the shortfall with public parking in the Reservoir. The amount of this public parking is undetermined at this time as the College finalizes decisions on their Master Plan and which version of their TDM they will settle on. The developers have promised that provided public parking will be scaled according to the need once these variables are resolved. As of this date, both CCSF and the City have informed the BRCAC that the problem caused by loss of needed parking on the reservoir has not been resolved. Hence, the Developer Team’s Proposal does not abide yet by the Principles and Parameters which stress that the Developer must address the new development’s transportation and parking impacts as well as alternative parking for CCSF students. The BRCAC intends to closely monitor any purported resolution of this matter.”

A. CAC Discussion

- Jon Winston: The City College’s parking study shows 242 spaces of unmet need, which the developer has said they will address as part of the project.
- Michael Ahrens: City College representative said a resolution has not been reached, and therefore it’s unresolved.
- Amy O’Hair: It would be more appropriate to use “appropriate” parking, instead of “alternative” parking.
- Mark Tang: I do not agree with the TDM sentence. “yet” solution has not happened at this state.
- Robert Muehlbauer: This edit is redundant, but the community wants to emphasize that it is an item of concern from the beginning and has not been resolved yet.

B. Public Comment

See following pages

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: 3 Meeting Date: December 9, 2019

Comment Summary*: Loss of parking is not the problem. Too many cars is the problem. The principles document says only "appropriate" parking, and in this era of climate change the appropriate amount might be 0.

Your Name: Theodore Randolph Organization: _____

Your Address: _____

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: addn Proj. Bal. City College Meeting Date: 12/9/19

Comment Summary*: Pls. Keep statement in, the parking supply for City College

in the current plan does not supply what graph states. And the graph is not the final say on parking issue.

Your Name: Laura Frey Organization: Westwood Park

Your Address: _____

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: 3 Meeting Date: 12/9/19

Comment Summary* Oppose amendments. We have a housing crisis + climate crisis. Amendments advocate harmful actions on both. Advocate reducing housing and perpetually perpetuating City College's dependence on automobile commuting.

Your Name: Christopher Pedersen Organization: _____

Your Address: 18 Divado Terrace #28, SF 94112

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: 43 ANNUAL MEETING Meeting Date: 12/9/19

Comment Summary*: PROJECT RELATIONSHIP W/ CEST
SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE PROPOSED TO ANNUAL
REPORT SHOULD BE INCLUDED

Your Name: FRANCINE LORRANS Organization: Homeowner
WP

Your Address: _____

**Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.*

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: 3 Meeting Date: December 9, 2019

Comment Summary*: Include Lisa Spinali
cover letter for Principles + Parameters
as an Addendum if necessary

Your Name: Jennifer Organization: SNR

Your Address: _____

**Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.*

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: ANNUAL REPORT Meeting Date: 12/9/19

Comment Summary*: INCLUDE ^{1ST} PARAGRAPH FOR
MORE RESEARCH AND PROPER PROCESS FOR
CCSF FACILITIES COMMITTEE REVIEW

Your Name: Melina Melles Organization: CCSF FACULTY

Your Address: 1163 Naples

**Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.*

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: 3 Meeting Date: _____

Comment Summary*: needed parking + EV charging

stations". Parking can be zero emissions

if EV charging is included.

Your Name: Jennifer Haggie Organization: _____

Your Address: Sunnyside

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: Poor City Planning Meeting Date: 12/9/19

Comment Summary*: The 17 acres should remain for the

use of CC use. If you plan 1,400 units that would

mean app. 3,000 people all of Treasure Island has only

has 1,800 people as of Dec 2019

Your Name: Hedda Thorne Organization: Westwood Park

Your Address: 1366 Plymouth Ave, SF

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

C. Motion

- Motion #1: Insert the 1st and 3rd sentences of the proposed edit, replace “needed” parking with “appropriate” parking and insert the word “yet” at the end of the first sentence.
 - Moved: Ahrens; Seconded: O’Hair
 - Ayes: Ahrens, Meuhlbauer, O’Hair, Tang, Tham, Winston; Noes: [none]; Abstain: [none]
- Motion #2: Keep the struck sentence, “The developer team plans to accommodate the shortfall with public parking in the Reservoir”
 - Moved: Winston; Seconded: O’Hair
 - Ayes: Ahrens, Meuhlbauer, O’Hair, Tang, Tham, Winston; Noes: [none]; Abstain: [none]

The second proposed edits in the URBAN DESIGN AND NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER section

In addition, the Developer Team’s Proposal further deviates from the Principles and Parameters. Such Parameters provide that buildings should be separated from Westwood Park rear yards by setbacks or open spaces. [See Principles and Parameters pages 22-23, Urban Design Principle, Principle 2(c)]. The Developer Team’s Proposal did not honor this Parameter.

Moreover, the Principles and Parameters provide that the buildings should integrate with respect to the local character, scale design of the neighborhood, including the designs of Westwood Park, Sunnyside and other nearby residences [Principles and Parameters page 22 of 30, Urban Design Principle, Principle 2(a)]. With a possible density exceeding 10 times that of such neighborhoods, and with the failure to abide by Parameter height limits, the Developer Team’s Proposal does not abide by this Principle and Parameter.

D. CAC Discussion

- Amy O’Hair: Where is the ten times density reference from?
- Peter Tham: Can we make a direct reference to the source?
- Mark Tang: This edit makes it seem like all the parameters aren’t being met.
- Jon Winston: The proposed project does have a setback against Westwood Park. The project would be denser but still respect the neighborhood character in harmony with the City College buildings.
- Amy O’Hair: The proposed setbacks do not violate the development parameters. The development parameters do not mention density.
- Michael Ahrens: Can we change the density reference to “a substantial increase of density?”
- Maurice Rivers: Need to abide by height limits. Should have buildings gradually step up toward Frida Kahlo.
- Jon Winston: The violation of height limits is already addressed in the draft Annual Report.

E. Public Comment

See following pages

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: 3 Meeting Date: December 9, 2019

Comment Summary*: The neighborhood character proposed amendments are factually and morally wrong. The proposal does comply with the parameters.

Look at the drawings and see. Integrate does not mean isolate. Density limits were created for segregation and should be

Your Name: Theodore Randolph Organization: _____

Your Address: anathema in 21st Century San Francisco.

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: Urban Design Meeting Date: 12/9/19

Comment Summary*: Like Michael Alvrens said, this is not an opinion of project, this is a REPORT on the BRCAC meetings/the parameters.

Your Name: Laura Trex Westwood Park Organization: parameters

Your Address: _____ have not been kept, creating high density.

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

The parameters said gradual. The heights increase is not gradual.

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: 3 Meeting Date: _____

Comment Summary*: Oppose accidents or setbacks, density

Your Name: Christopher Pederson Organization: _____

Your Address: (see other card)

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: #3 ANNUAL REPORT Meeting Date: 12/9/2019

Comment Summary*: PROPOSED CHANGES SHOULD BE INCLUDED
REPORT NEEDS TO ACCURATELY REFLECT FACTS

Your Name: FRANCOLO LOFARO Organization: Homeowners WIP

Your Address: _____

**Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.*

F. Motion

- Motion #1: Include Michael Ahrens' edits but does not include the reference to density
 - Moved: Ahrens; Seconded: Winston
 - Ayes: Ahrens; Noes: Meuhlbauer, O'Hair, Tang, Tham, Winston; Abstain: [none]

The third proposed edits: Adding "5. Comment on the City's Additional Housing Option" and "6. Comment on Reduced Density Alternatives"

5. Comment on the City's Additional Housing Option

Representatives of the City have presented at the BRCAC meetings information on another proposal urged by the City, commonly called the "Additional Housing Option". The Additional Housing Option propose a total of 1550 residential units with a maximum permitted height of 88 feet. Obviously, this proposal would exceed the height limit of the Principles and Parameters even more than the Developer Team's Proposal. It would exceed the height limit contained in the Principles and Parameters by 23 feet.

6. Comment on Reduced Density Alternatives

After parties in interest suggested at CAC meetings that a reduced density alternative be analyzed, such an alternative is being analyzed in the CEQA process ("Reduced Density Alternative"). The Reduced Density Alternative being analyzed consists of 800 units. In fact, another developer proposed in the Request for Proposal process to develop a total of 680 units, of which 50.2% were proposed to be affordable and work force units. This proposal, made by Related California, found that such a proposal was financially feasible. Either the Reduced Density Proposal or the Related California Proposal would clearly comply with all the Principles and Parameters.

G. CAC Discussion

- Robert Meuhlbauer: Disagree with the edits. The Annual Report does not address CEQA.
- Amy O'Hair: Understand that the Annual Report does not address CEQA, but this is our opportunity, as a body, to send public comments regarding the number of units to the Board of Supervisors.
- Jon Winston: Suggest committing to 1,100 units in the Annual Report.
- Michael Ahrens: These edits do not reference to the Draft EIR. This isn't about the DEIR and other proposals.
- Robert Meuhlbauer: We have only reviewed the 1100 unit proposal.
- Mark Tang: Let's not discuss CEQA. Let's keep our comments focused.

H. Public Comment

See following pages

I. Motion

- Motion #1: Add the proposed edits to Sections 5 and 6 of the Annual Report
 - Moved: Ahrens; Seconded: O’Hair
 - Ayes: Ahrens; Noes: Meuhlbauer, O’Hair, Tang, Winston; Abstain: Tham

The fourth proposed edits: Replacing two bullets in the 8. BRCAC Activities Moving Forward section

- The Committee will continue to serve as a forum for community feedback.
- The committee will continue to monitor the discussions between CCSF and the Developer relating to their collaboration, especially the requirement in the Parameters that CCSF and the Developer “address parking needs by identifying alternative parking and transportation solutions that do not compromise student’s ability to access their education.” [Parameters letter of September 9, 2016].
- The BRCAC will submit a further report or reports in advance of consideration of these matters by the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, the SFPUC, and possibly other City Agencies.
- ~~Continuing updates on CCSF and Reservoir developer team collaboration.~~
- ~~Once the environmental review is satisfactorily complete the project will return to the Board of Supervisors, then the Planning Commission, the SFPUC Commission, and possibly City agencies, for final approvals. The approvals package is likely to include a disposition agreement, a development agreement, design and development controls, and related revisions to the planning code.~~

J. CAC Discussion

- Amy O’Hair: Change “alternative” parking to “appropriate” parking.
- Robert Meuhlbauer: Change to read “The BRCAC may submit...”

K. Public Comment

See following pages

L. Motion

- Motion #1: Accept the proposed edits with recommended changes by O’Hair and Meuhlbauer.
 - Moved: Ahrens; Seconded: Winston
 - Ayes: Ahrens; Meuhlbauer, O’Hair, Tang, Tham, Winston; Noes: [none]; Abstain: [none]
- Motion #2: Ted Conrad suggests clarification change in description of affordable housing section:

The Developer Team’s Proposal includes 1100 units of housing of all types. As per the CAC *Principles and Parameters*, 50%~~33%~~ percent of the housing will be affordable to low and moderate-income households (18% for households with an income under 55% of AMI) ~~and an additional 18% will be made available for middle-income households making up to 120% of AMI.~~ By cross-subsidizing the affordable housing with the market-rate housing the project will need a minimum of public funding. The Developer Team proposal is in compliance with the housing parameters.

- Moved: Winston; Seconded: O'Hair,
- Ayes: Meuhlbauer, O'Hair, Tang, Tham, Winston; Noes: Ahrens; Abstain: [none]

M. Public Comment

See following pages

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: RE: DENSITY Meeting Date: 11/9/19

Comment Summary*: A NEW ^{GRAND JURY} REPORT INDICATES A ~~SEVERE~~ ^{SEVERE} PROBLEM IN S.F. INVOLVING BOTH DRINKING AND GREY WATER. S.F. IS ALREADY TOO DENSE.

Your Name: Madeline Muller Organization: ECSE FACULTY

Your Address: 1163 Naples

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: 3 Meeting Date: 12/9/19

Comment Summary*: Having sat in on years of BRCAC meetings, no numbers were agreed to for # units in the farmst parameters. There was no agreement

Your Name: Jennifer Heggie Organization: SNA

Your Address: _____

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: 3 Meeting Date: 12/9/19

Comment Summary*: Oppos including accidents re project alternatives

Your Name: Christina Pederson Organization: _____

Your Address: (See other slip)

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: 3 Meeting Date: December 9, 2019

Comment Summary*: The paragraphs about density should not be included. More density is interesting, but Avalon Bay says they won't do it. It's wrong that the Related proposal

Complies with the parameters because it does not maximize housing. 550 affordable units is more than 340, in accordance with housing parameters 16

Your Name: Theodore Randolph Organization: and 3a. Why are we even litigating the RFP? That was 2 years ago.

Your Address: _____

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: #3 Annual Report Meeting Date: 12/9/2019

Comment Summary*: Changes to Annual Report (Paragraph 5 & 6) should be included as they were discussed at BCAC meetings

Your Name: Francine Lorenzo Organization: Homeowner

Your Address: _____

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: comment on "body" of report Meeting Date: 12/9/19

Comment Summary*: _____

The proposed development also deviates from the parameters re: gradual increase in height w. to east. The parameter says

Your Name: Laura Frey Organization: gradual. The

Your Address: Westwood Park Highrise increase in height to 55'

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: 3 Meeting Date: December 9, 2019

Comment Summary*: Personally, I think a fully fledged out transportation plan is impossible, and Mr. Abrams knows this. If Related had been chosen, I'm sure he would be there saying 5x density is incompatible and transportation needs to be addressed.

Your Name: Theodore Randolph Organization: Detailed transportation plans are impossible because people are not machines.

Your Address: In the 20th Century we tried to replace people with machines and it was a disaster. The plan from Avalon Bay includes phases in accordance with the principles, with measurements and possible adjustments. I see this as complying with the principles and parameters.

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: ANNUAL REPORT Meeting Date: 12/9/2019

Comment Summary*: HOW LONG HAS BRCA BEEN IN EXISTENCE? 8/26/2015 - BYLAWS ADOPTED. THIS MEANS MANDATORY ANNUAL REPORT HAS NOT BEEN DONE

Your Name: FOR 4 YEARS HOW CAN WE BE ASSURED WE WILL HAVE ANNUAL REPORT MOVING FORWARD?? Organization: BRANVA CORP W/ ANNUAL

Your Address: _____

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: 3 Meeting Date: December 9, 2019

Comment Summary*: I disagree with Mr. Ahrens's proposed
amendments, and the only substantive shortcoming in the
developer's proposal is that they need to support non-single-occupancy
vehicle modes more.

Your Name: Theodore Randolph Organization: _____

Your Address: _____

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

4. Balboa Reservoir Timeline Winter/Spring 2020 (Presented by Seung Yen Hong, SF Planning)

PROJECT STATUS AND TIMELINE

- The draft EIR was released in July 2019. Currently the environmental planning team is working on responses to every comment, which is planned to be released in Spring 2020, before the EIR certification hearing in May 2020. We plan to have project approval hearings in Spring and Summer 2020.

ENTITLEMENT OVERVIEW

- Requires EIR Certification
- Anticipated Project Entitlements
- Purchase and Sale Agreement between SFPUC and Developer
- Developer will enter into a Development Agreement with the City
- Special Use District and Design Standards and Guidelines will control uses and design

ASSOCIATED PROJECT DOCUMENTS & REGULATIONS

- Development Agreement (DA)
 - Negotiated between project sponsor & City
 - Describes project sponsor and City commitments (e.g. housing affordability requirements, open space obligations, transportation demand management, childcare, and other community benefits, etc.)
- Special Use District (SUD)
 - New Planning Code section
 - Describes overarching land use and design controls as well as approval processes
 - Explicitly refers to DSG for detailed controls
- Design Standards and Guidelines (DSG)
 - Standards and guidelines related to physical design and land use
 - Supplements SUD
- Infrastructure Master Plan (IMP)
 - Describes large scale site infrastructure (e.g. water, sewer, electricity, streets, sidewalks, AWSS, etc.)
 - Drafted to ensure all infrastructure is coordinated and consistent with the overall design in the DSG

WHAT'S IN THE DSG?

- Project Vision and Goals
 - How can the project support the community's collective values and aspirations while maximizing housing production and achieving a goal of 50% affordable housing?
- Land Use
 - How much housing, community space or childcare? How will the ground floors of buildings be activated and enliven the streets?
- Streets
 - How wide will the sidewalks be, how will intersections be designed, where will bike facilities be located, where will pick up and drop off zones be located?

- Parks
 - Where are the main paths of travel and connections between places? How much green versus paving? What types of activities will be included?
- Buildings
 - How tall will buildings be?
- Sustainability
 - How to encourage sustainable modes of transportation? How to conserve water usage?

DSG EXAMPLES

- [Pier 70](#), Mission Rock, Treasure Island, Transbay District, Shipyards, Candlestick

NEXT STEPS

- Proposed 2020 CAC meeting topics:
 - **February**: Public Benefits
 - **March**: In depth review of Design Standards and Guidelines Document
 - **April**: EIR and CEQA update, Conclusion of Entitlement Phase, Discussion of Implementation Phase
 - Other suggested topics for discussion?
- Public hearings:
 - **Planning Commission** on EIR certification and project approval: May 2020
 - **SFPUC Commission**: TBD
 - **MTA Board**: TBD
 - **Board of Supervisors** ultimate approval of Developer Agreement and attached documents: Summer 2020

A. CAC Comment

- Michael Ahrens: DA is important. Does it go to the Planning Commission? Which public hearing happens first among the Planning Commission, the SFPUC, the SFMTA, and the BOS?
- Seung Yen Hong, SF Planning: The Planning Commission needs to certify the project EIR prior to any other project related approvals. The SFPUC and the SFMTA approvals can happen anytime between the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors hearings.
- Jon Winston: The BRCAC bylaw states that the CAC will automatically terminate on May 15, 2020, unless the Board of Supervisors extends the CAC's term by ordinance. Don't let the CAC sunset. We should continue it.
- Robert Muehlbauer: Don't let the committee disband. We need Balboa Park planning and transportation discussions to continue in the neighborhood, not at City Hall.
- Michael Ahrens: Can we pass a resolution outlining how we expand and continue the CAC?
- Mark Tang: Can the CAC review the draft DSG before the CAC meeting in March 2020?
- Seung Yen Hong, SF Planning: Yes, the public review draft DSG will be available at least 2 weeks prior to the CAC meeting.
- CAC: The continuation of the CAC will be agendized for the next week for a formal action.

B. Public Comment

See following pages

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: 4 Meeting Date: December 9, 2019

Comment Summary*: I'm concerned with this format of public meeting, that it is not representative of the community, and I think I heard that Seattle is looking into alternative forms of public outreach that could be more representative.

Your Name: Theodore Randolph Organization: _____

Your Address: Before extending the committee, we should find if we can have a better structure of public outreach.

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

5. General Public Comment
See following pages

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: PUBLIC COMMENT Meeting Date: 12/9/19

Comment Summary*: THE WESTERN HALF OF S.F. IS IN GRAVE
DANGER DUE TO LACK OF WATER AVAILABLE FOR
FIRE CONTROL AND ALSO FOR HUMAN USE.

Your Name: Madelina Huellas Organization: BCSF FACULTY

Your Address: 1163 NAPLES

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting Speaker Card

Agenda Item: General Comment Meeting Date: 12/9/19

Comment Summary*: (almost) the whole project
deviates by height, from the parameters;
the report should state this

Your Name: Jana Fry Organization: Westwood park

Your Address: _____

*Please submit this card to City staff for inclusion in the official meeting minutes.

6. Adjournment