



*Responses to Questions Raised by General Public Comment
To the Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
November 6 through December 1, 2015*

The following matrix contains City staff's responses to (1) questions raised during the General Public Comment period of the 11/5/2015 CAC meeting and (2) those questions raised in writing between 10/1/2015 and 11/5/2015 that pertain to topics not covered on the 11/5/2015 CAC meeting agenda. Responses pertaining to 11/5/2015 meeting agenda topics can be found at <http://sf-planning.org/brcac>.

	Question	Response
1	How do we define community? As we go through this process, how can we guarantee that people commenting online are from the neighborhood, San Francisco, or even the US?	The community participation process is open to all members of the public, regardless of where they live. It is unlikely, however, that many individuals living outside of San Francisco will be interested in participating actively in this project.
2	What is the anticipated RFP process? Will the RFP be available to the public before it is issued?	The RFP's proposed development parameters are being made public through the CAC process. Drafts of the parameters can be found online at www.sf-planning.org/brcac . Before the RFP is issued, these draft parameters will be revised to incorporate community feedback. City staff is preparing other portions of the RFP document and will share them with the public, including prospective developers, in final form.
3	Does the City have any existing studies surrounding the economic viability of the project? Will the City analyze the total number of units that would be required to support the development that would also include low affordable housing?	The City's understanding of the project's economic viability is based upon City staff's technical expertise and experience with other projects of similar scale and scope. The project's economic viability will be analyzed extensively once a developer partner has been selected and the proposed development has become detailed enough to prepare a reliable cost estimates.

Responses to Questions Raised by General Public Comment,
November 6 through December 1, 2015

		<p>A number of factors, including the total number of housing units, will impact how much low-income housing the project can provide. City staff expects to analyze these relationships extensively after a developer partner is selected and the development vision has become more detailed.</p>
4	<p>What will be the project's overall building heights?</p>	<p>The draft Urban Design & Neighborhood Character Parameters emphasize the need to respect the adjacent urban context and vary the building heights accordingly, including the following provision:</p> <p><i>Locate taller buildings where adjacent buildings are tallest, with heights tapering down on approach to single-family neighborhoods. Buildings on the west side of site should generally be of lower height than the east, and respect the scale, privacy and light of adjacent homes to the west.</i></p> <p>In order to allow for building designs that respect the adjacent neighbors and create a new neighborhood with variation and visual interest, a range of building heights from 25 to 65 feet would be permitted. Taller building heights would be located in the eastern portion of the site. The revised parameters consider a maximum building height of 85 feet in the eastern portion only if the additional height enables a “substantial package of additional community benefits.” This provision’s text is as follows:</p> <p><i>Building heights should fall within a range of 25’ to 65’ feet, allowing for heights of up to 85’ in the eastern portion of the site where, due to economic efficiencies, the additional height allows for a substantial package of additional community benefits.</i></p> <p>The complete current draft of the Urban Design & Neighborhood Character parameters, which reflects the first round of community and CAC feedback received by City staff, can be downloaded here and found online at www.sf-planning.org/brcac.</p>

*Responses to Questions Raised by General Public Comment,
November 6 through December 1, 2015*

5	<p>How will Citywide conversations and legislation about accessory dwelling units, the affordable housing density bonus program, and transportation impact fees be incorporated into the discussion about Balboa Reservoir?</p>	<p>The City’s accessory dwelling unit policy allows the owners of certain existing residential buildings to add additional housing units within the existing buildings or elsewhere on the same property. Because the Balboa Reservoir does not have any existing residential buildings, it is not possible to create accessory dwelling units on that site. Furthermore, the current accessory dwelling unit policy is limited in geographic scope and does not apply to the Balboa Reservoir site.</p> <p>The Board of Supervisors has not yet approved the draft affordable housing density bonus legislation. If approved, the legislation would not apply to the Balboa Reservoir site because the affordable housing bonus program would not apply to areas with adopted neighborhood plans. In this case, the Balboa Reservoir site is part of the Balboa Park Station Area Plan. See more information at http://www.sf-planning.org/ahbp.</p> <p>The City expects that the Balboa Reservoir project will be subject to all applicable impact fees, including all transportation fees.</p>
6	<p>How much transit fee revenue will this project raise?</p>	<p>A project’s transportation impact fees are determined by the size of its buildings and the impact fee rates that are in place at the time at the time when each building is built. After the project’s approximate building sizes have been determined, City staff can estimate the project’s projected impact fee amounts.</p>
7	<p>Will representatives of City College be present at the 12/14/2015 CAC meeting?</p>	<p>Members of the City College administration attended the December 14, 2015 CAC meeting. Furthermore, the City College Board of Trustees is represented by CAC member Brigitte Davila.</p>
8	<p>What are the status, unit counts, affordability levels, and land costs of the other three pilot sites in the Public Land for Housing program?</p>	<p>All three of these sites are in planning stages. They are all slated to contain 100% affordable housing for low income households, which is why it is appropriate for the Balboa Reservoir project to contain mixed-income housing, and why the Balboa Reservoir can do so without compromising the</p>

*Responses to Questions Raised by General Public Comment,
November 6 through December 1, 2015*

	<p>Public Lands for Housing program's program-wide average of 50% affordable housing.</p> <p>The 4th & Folsom site has capacity for approximately 85 units and is expected to be 100% affordable to low income households. The property will be appraised to ensure that SFMTA is paid fair market value, as required by the City Charter. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) can proceed with a non-profit developer selection process after transferring the inter-jurisdictional fee to the SFMTA and acquiring the site.</p> <p>The Upper Yard site has capacity for approximately 80 units and is expected to be 100% affordable to low income households. MOHCD has paid SFMTA an interjurisdictional transfer fee based on an appraisal of the property's fair market value. MOHCD is expected to issue an RFP to select a non-profit developer for the site in early 2016.</p> <p>The 1950 Mission site has capacity for approximately 165 units and will be 100% affordable to low income households. MOHCD obtained the property through a land swap with the San Francisco Unified School District. MOHCD has selected a nonprofit developer team to develop the affordable housing.</p>
--	--