

**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, May 9, 2016**

6:15 PM

Regular Meeting

Please note that a supplemental audio recording of this meeting is included on the Planning website via the following link: www.sf-planning.org/brcac

Documents received during this meeting are in a document titled balboareservoir_CAC_Public_Documents_Received_and_Emails-050916 available via the following link: www.sf-planning.org/brcac

Committee Members Present:

Howard Chung, Brigitte Davila, Kate Favetti, Rebecca Lee, Robert Muehlbauer, Maria Picar, Lisa Spinali, Jon Winston, Maria Picar

Committee Members Absent:

None.

Staff/Consultants Present:

Jeremy Shaw, Sue Exline, Planning Department; Emily Lesk, Mike Martin, Phillip Wong, Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Martin Gran, Christopher J. Wong, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission; Jen Low, Office of D7 Supervisor Norman Yee; Beth Rubenstein, Office of D11 Supervisor John Avalos

1. Call to Order and Roll Call.

- a. Roll Call

2. Opening of Meeting.

- a. Amendments to 4/13/16 Minutes.
 - i. CAC Comment.
 - 1. None.
 - ii. Public Comment.
 - 1. Harry Bernstein. Merced Heights.
 - 1. Page 13. Number 3. Bob Burn. Change “new” to “now”
 - 2. Christine Hanson. Excelsior.
 - 1. Page 12. Number 5. “Record new car sales in 2015”
 - 2. Number 6. Add, “how the data is collected is super important”
 - iii. Motion to approve 4/13/16 minutes with amendments: Winston, Second: Muehlbauer
 - 1. Ayes: Chung, Davila, Favetti, Muehlbauer, Picar, Winston
 - 2. Noes: [none]
- b. Agenda review.

3. Project’s Relationship to City College Parameters.

- a. Remarks by Mike Martin, Office of Economic and Workforce Development
- b. Favetti. Review of revisions to parameters.
- c. CAC Comment.
 - i. Davila.
 - 1. 2.a. Suggest we take out the word “some” and put in the word “significant”; this describes what CCSF wants. There is considerable interest in CCSF taking on this role, in discussion with various stakeholders; I think that this is something we can definitely do we can create affordable housing for faculty and staff, and if possible targeted student groups.
 - 2. 3.d. If the bicycle facilities should indeed happen, non-profits should be included with businesses; there are several non-profit bike repair shops that work with CCSF classes.
 - 3. 4.b. I really think that we need to add something about parking here. I know that we have parking elsewhere and I appreciate the on-site parking for added flexibility, but I want to attach parking to the PAEC, so there will be parking adjacent to the PAEC.
 - 1. Spinali. Within the master plan for the PAEC was there a strategy around parking?
 - 1. Davila. We expected the Balboa Reservoir to serve as parking.
 - 2. Spinali. Can we go back to the PAEC designers to get a number and see how much parking is necessary, especially for evening events?
 - ii. Muehlbauer.

1. The Balboa Park Station needs to be included. We need to think of it as a triangle, if we're going to get people out of their cars we need to make it convenient to get to public transit – make the linkages among housing, balboa, and transit; make these changes either in principle 3 or principle 2.
 2. Regarding students using cars; is there actual data to show the number of students that are using cars? If it doesn't exist, is there a way to put out a survey? We are poking in the dark since we don't have data on what the situation is.
 3. If our enrollment is back up a third (down a third from historical levels), we should assume that we will have full enrollment again regarding our data-driven assumptions. I want to see that built in some ways.
 4. Principle 2. Balboa Reservoir Public benefits, are these things the developers will be providing for the benefit of the project?
 1. Spinali. This is the list of parks and all the amenities that have come out of some of the other principles.
 2. Muehlbauer. Will there be a dollar amount?
 3. Spinali. Yes. The equation is a park will be this much space and this fewer units.
 4. Mike Martin. Everything we're talking about is public benefits. Public benefits is a general blanket term to encompass items that are not just for the benefit of the project but for those outside of those four walls. The idea behind the language referring to "identifying opportunities" is meant to say that what we're talking about here is keeping our eyes open to opportunities to maximize these benefits.
 5. When you're talking about public benefits is that only at the project site or can that extend outside of the project area because it's contributing to the quality of the project as a whole.
 1. Mike Martin. The latter. Funding benefits that are outside of the project area, like a shuttle, end up being a project public benefit.
- iii. Favetti.
1. The Westwood Park Association and the residents are concerned that there is a plan for parking that is done and implemented prior to any development on the Balboa Reservoir. I didn't see it was that clear in the parameters.
 2. There is a concern that CCSF survives, does well and goes back to full enrollment.
- iv. Winston.
1. Development is coming and the parking spots are going away. A lot of people are nervous about it. We should think about the positive

benefits that are happening as a result. The advantages CCSF is going to reap from the development.

2. CCSF will gain a number of local amenities; they will gain a park, possibly campus-related retail, faculty and student housing, possible locate a child-care center in the Balboa Reservoir. All of this has to happen with the cooperation of CCSF.
 3. Glad to see that CCSF is represented in the audience, along with Brigitte Davila.
 4. Regarding parking, we've heard a lot of anecdotal comments from people that say they need to drive to CCSF, and I don't deny a lot of people have to do that. There are a lot of circumstances.
 5. All I've ever heard is anecdotal evidence; we need, as Robert said is actual data, which will come from the TDM. We need to know who's coming to school, where they are coming from, how they are getting here, what are their choices, why are they making the choices they are making; only then can we determine how much parking we need, for the PAEC and the students, faculty, and staff; this needs to be a data-driven project.
 6. As stated at our last meeting, we're designing for the future, beyond the staff and students here now. We have to think ahead in terms of time.
 7. Question about maintaining routes to drive between CCSF and the Reservoir, bicycling, walking, and driving. I'm not sure who will be driving between the two.
- v. Davila.
1. CCSF is going forward with the TDM study.
 2. None of us want to move forward without more data; there is a lot of anecdotal stories.
 3. To Mike Martin. You mentioned the role of the CCSF and San Francisco. I don't know if it's just because I'm a San Franciscan that I think our college really does occupy a unique place in the hearts of people here. Everyone is very concerned about CCSF. We are planning for the future. I'm not opposed to housing, I want to see 50% to 100% affordable housing, housing targeted towards faculty, staff and students. I appreciate that we are all trying to work together; I'm glad parameters include working together with our master plan as it develops.
- vi. Spinali.
1. CCSF is the epicenter of this neighborhood. We are all connected to CCSF, whether we are formally a part of CCSF or not.
 2. If we don't keep that in mind we won't make the best decisions.
 3. Because CCSF has more to do regarding its robust survival that may be why they cannot be a full partner in this process today.

4. 4.c. How do we think about this project in partnership with CCSF such that it can be mutually beneficial; that the processes can be on a parallel track sooner rather than later. I'd like to see us have a more proactive approach with CCSF.
 5. Principle 1. The notion of being able to impact CCSF's education mission for current and future operational needs, that's important; it's about today and tomorrow.
 6. 3.b. It's not explore opportunities to provide parking, the language needs to be much stronger. It's how much parking is needed, how much parking makes sense for the types of units, and what's the equation there – we need stronger language there.
 7. How do we create greater transparency? We want to make sure that this isn't seen as a back door deal that Mayor Lee did with the Housing Department. Let's move beyond that and ask, what's the right thing to happen that unifies the area and leverages the resources of CCSF?
 8. Urge colleagues at the table, if agree to think about that strategically we would see movement around fixing Phelan avenue and getting back to two lanes in each direction that we can do right away. We have to fix the transportation infrastructure first before we can do anything new. We have to find a way to get our colleagues in various City agencies to make this happen, and it would show a good faith effort on behalf of the City towards the project.
- vii. Lee.
1. 1.d. The intent of this paragraph is great. Have folks discussed what this process looks like? The devil is in the details. How the process is conducted is very important to folks here.
 2. Access and creating a safe environment is important and might help people get out of cars.
 3. What would this process look like? How would it be productive when constructed?
- d. Jeremy Shaw. Planning.
- i. Regarding Robert Muehlbauer and data, we started a student intercept survey; included anyone affiliated with CCSF. We had about 15 city staff on campus all week, which was done in parallel with CCSF's facilities survey; the transportation part of the CCSF survey is consistent with our survey. We can also collect data in the fall if we feel like the data is insufficient.
 - ii. To Davila, you mentioned parking for the PAEC, is that something we can we wrap parking into 3.b, which discusses parking already.
 1. Davila. I'm not opposed to it being in 3.b., but I put it in 4 because I wanted them to be part and parcel with each other that it needs to support the PAEC.
- e. Public Comment.
- i. Harry Bernstein. CCSF.
 1. 1.d. and 2.d. Following up on Rebecca Lee.

2. 1.d. Work with CCSF to establish a communication there; goes back to a question that goes back a few months. Mike Martin mentioned that staff has been to PGC and the Board of Trustees. Who represents CCSF, we have administration, faculty, students, and trustees. If something is going on for planning, who is talking?
 3. I remember that Brigitte Davila, who is a CAC member and Trustee, wasn't informed of on-going conversations regarding land-use with the City.
 4. 2.d. It might be beyond the Balboa Reservoir proper, but safe travel to the college from Balboa Reservoir. Access for the overall community; I don't know if it's a shuttle or a safe path for crossing over Ocean Avenue. All those things have to happen as a starting point.
- ii. Hedda Thieme. Westwood Park, Plymouth Avenue.
 1. The swimming pool built on Ocean Avenue was a parking lot. They eliminated parking there.
 2. This put more cars into the water reservoir. If you want to know why parking is needed in the water reservoir I'm only referring to the history.
 3. There are some neighbors who use the water reservoir at night, and when I look out during the evening it is like a funeral procession, cars turning onto Plymouth and Phelan.
 - iii. Rita Evans. Sunnyside
 1. Strongly urge that the Planning Department and other City entities not proceed with the RFP until the TDM is completed and results from the TDM are used to modify the RFP.
 2. TDM study should be a semester long effort. To gather relevant traffic and parking data, data collection should include all forms of transit, cycling, public transit, pedestrians and motor vehicles and take place during appropriate times during the day and days of the week.
 3. Two CAC members asked if we have hard data on how many students are driving we don't; this is the data TDM would collect, and needs to be completed before the RFP.
 4. Fix Phelan Avenue, not just the lanes but also the traffic signals.
 - iv. David Tejada. Sunnyside.
 1. The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association Balboa Reservoir Subcommittee wants the City to delay RFP until TDM study is completed.
 2. We feel that the data compiled from the TDM can effectively address parking and transportation issues in the RFP; issuing the RFP before the TDM is completed is putting the cart before the horse.
 3. Issues with BART, usability and accessibility – specifically ADA issues. Not many can walk the distance and it's rather challenging to do it.
 - v. Chris Hanson. Excelsior. CCSF Student.

1. Principle 1 heading---rephrase to read: Ensure that development at the Balboa Reservoir, which is planned for the site of existing City College parking.
 2. Principle 3. Add to the heading at the end: and recognizes that an existing parking lot in use by City College students, faculty and staff is being affected.
 3. 3--b. Does not take into account parking for evening classes. Add after not a viable solution: especially if negatively impacting students taking evening classes, explore alternative approaches.
 4. 3--e. if referring to other nearby educational institutions name each educational institution here, Riordan for example...at the end: while recognizing that this development is being proposed on the site of an existing City College resource.
 5. Principle 4. Heading. Where it says work with City College, please omit the line about
 6. "its master planning consultants" and replace with: Its Board of Trustees, Academic Senate and Associated Students, Add at the end: if working with CCSF master planning consultants all meetings must be public and transparent
 7. 4--b. omit: unless informed otherwise by City College... and end the parameter with will be built period.
 8. This proposed development has come at a time when City College is still vulnerable. Recognize that what you know about the history of the school may be more knowledge than what most of the people who are running the school today possess. Please be as explicit as you can be in your language and if the language does not protect the school, please do not approve it.
- vi. Jacqueline Roberts. Westwood Park.
1. I came from NYC to live in a low-density City.
 2. The height of parking structures is a possible solution.
 3. Westwood Park has low height limits; I do think that there should be a taller parking structure; you can't get it all in, it has to be prioritized; PAEC and childcare center; putting parking somewhere else when there isn't anywhere else.
 4. When I try to park two blocks away at a friend's house it takes me 20-25 minutes to find a parking place.
 5. As it is now parking is already terrible. Parking is an extremely high priority. Does the housing have to be here? Why do we need to compromise CCSF for this broader goal? I agree with the goal that there should be affordable housing, why don't we just sell this whole parcel to CCSF. Make it for housing for students and parking.
- vii. Leslie Simon. CCSF.
1. When the accreditation crisis hit CCSF we saw three threats.
 2. Teachers are a strong visible force in the union movement.

3. Education Deform
 4. Land Grabs
 5. Keep the PAEC with sufficient parking; parking for restored full enrollment at CCSF
 6. If housing is built it should be affordable.
- viii. Madeleine Mueller. CCSF.
1. 1.d. Seems like there's an emphasis on process and error correction after the development.
 2. 2.e. We agreed to have an open campus and be a park.
 3. 3.d. Basement of MUB is the PAEC; we put in showers for bicyclists, we had a repair business on campus.
 4. We should note we have a lot of BART parkers. Survey should include and acknowledge BART parkers.
- ix. Jennifer Heggie. Sunnyside.
1. Jeff Tumlin's presentation – we need good empirical data on student transit and parking use when creating the RFP. Numbers will change but we need a good faith effort to understand the demographics.
 2. Coordinating with CCSF will provide a better RFP once the TDM is completed.
 3. We will reduce the amount of inaccurate assumptions incorporated into the RFP by waiting for the TDM to be completed.
 4. Millennials may need to drive depending on future life decisions
 5. Assumption regarding residential parking permit program. RPPs were suggested in Sunnyside and many have been adamantly opposed. What works in one neighborhood may not work in another.
- x. Theodore. Excelsior.
1. If parking is really important to CCSF, why do we keep taking away parking to build these buildings, shouldn't we try to build parking for CCSF?
 2. Friends of mine in the Sunset and lower density areas drive to CCSF because the area they live in is low-density and poorly served by transit that it's easier to drive.
 3. To make transit better, we need to make density next to transit higher.
 4. Safety is really important; I was hit on Phelan.
- xi. Monica Collins. Sunnyside.
1. Parking removed next to library which was converted to childcare.
 2. Has City Hall done any outreach beyond certain faculty and administrative groups? For instance staff and students.
 3. Traffic on Phelan should be coordinated, the lights.
 4. Parking here is used by part-time faculty. They are currently in a labor dispute.
- xii. Bob Burn. Sunnyside.
1. 3.e. Missing is non-polluting vehicles. Encouraging shared cars that pollute will not take care of pollution increases with more density.

Electrical vehicles are easier to maintain. Please add electric vehicles while discussing reducing the number of single-occupancy vehicles.

- xiii. Yonathan Randolph. Ingleside.
 - 1. Amount of parking demand is not constant, which is the reasons we are conducting TDM to manage this resource and reduce it where it is reducible.
 - 2. The cost of parking at CCSF is cheaper than a fast pass or maintaining a bike. How much parking demand is induced by the cost of parking at the reservoir? Study how much of this demand is because the prices are so low and how much is generated by single mothers and other special populations; accommodate them and not subsidize those that don't need to drive.
- xiv. Carol Ito. Westwood Park.
 - 1. 3.b. We can't even imagine what kind of development can come in until we have answers to the replacement of lost student parking.
 - 2. Fix Phelan – bicycle lanes and lane traffic; would go a long way in good faith.
 - 3. Principle 4. This is just a lot of words. I think that the master plan with CCSF has integrity but we need more detail. What are their timelines? Is there master plan focusing on Balboa? Those are issues. Master plan representatives meet with the CAC in public and in parallel. What is their first point of discussion?
 - 4. Where do the CAC and CCSF master planning process meet? We need markers and accountability.
 - 5. Brigitte Davila, I know you represent the CCSF Board of Trustees; are your comments approved by the trustees as a whole or do you bring feedback back?
- xv. Donna Hayes. CCSF.
 - 1. I was at the first CAC meeting. There was a discussion on several potential sites within San Francisco for potential housing development. Then Balboa Reservoir became the focus. I want to see the process and notes that led to Balboa Reservoir became the focus.
 - 2. CCSF is under dire peril and we feel like the City has conspired with the death nail for CCSF by destroying our facilities. This has increased our stress and worry.
- xvi. Corey Smith. SFHAC.
 - 1. There is a number of different priorities for the City and this is a piece of it.
 - 2. Regarding the several requests for data, we absolutely need a data-driven approach. An RFP and an RFQ are not a finalized development plan. If you're going to put anything in writing here make sure there is flexibility that if the RFQ/ RFP is issued before we get quality data we can incorporate it into the plan.
- xvii. Bob. Westwood Park.

1. The general tone seems to be doing a lot for CCSF not with CCSF.
 2. 1.a. Put a period at the end of do not develop on CCSF property and strike the rest of the sentence. If CCSF wants something else that would be wonderful.
 3. The other three items are good neighbor items; separate project.
 4. 2.a. Why housing, why not units for parking? Let's consider all the possible uses.
 5. 2.b. As far as expansion, build an infrastructure for multiple uses – that would be a more appropriate objective.
 6. The purpose of this project is to build space, not businesses. It's not this projects objective to build services; it's to build spaces.
 7. Work with CCSF not for CCSF.
- xviii. Francine Lofrano. Westwood Park.
1. I don't think RFP should be issued until the TDM is completed. It would be an extensive TDM that would take a long time to figure out who is driving here not a quick study.
 2. 4.b. I don't understand the comment "unless informed otherwise by CCSF" in reference to the PAEC. Financing the PAEC was an assessment on our property taxes. If it doesn't get built, what is going to happen with our money? Do I get it back? It should be a forgone conclusion that the PAEC will be built.
 3. If CCSF returns to previous enrollment levels, parking is going to be increasingly more critical as enrollment levels increase; parking is not something that we can rid of.
- f. CAC Responses.
- i. Davila.
 1. Excellent question. How are we going to do this? In principle 1.d. I mentioned earlier on that I volunteered for the CAC because I have a great interest in what's going on at CCSF. I live nearby and I went to other CAC meetings.
 2. The master planning process has been problematic.
 3. I've talked with individual trustees; also discussed publically at our meetings.
 4. I put forward a resolution to have SFPUC transfer the land back to CCSF, which did not pass; this generated more discussion, which is good.
 5. To Carol, yes, we have discussed it, but not to the extent I would like. I've had to revisit what has been done with the site. We do need to have much more.
 1. Spinali. What is the right ongoing addressing of 1.b. Formalize the right representation of CCSF groups: student groups, trustees, master planning representatives.
 6. Re: Rebecca Lee. The devil is in the details. We need to make our idea more clear, coherent and formalized.

- ii. Spinali. Make changes to CCSF parameters to allow for consensus making at special meeting on 5/23.
- iii. Lee. Re: public comment – always have a need for parking; we already discussed having spots electric-vehicle ready with infrastructure support.
 - 1. Jeremy Shaw. In the sustainability parameters.
- iv. Spinali. We will look at the document as a whole to make sure that it's cohesive and that things are cross-referenced well.
- v. Jeremy Shaw. We can review results of the survey for data collected before tonight's meeting and afterwards.

4. General Public Comment.

- a. Public Comment.
 - i. Madeleine Mueller. CCSF.
 - 1. We have a master plan that is still in effect until it is updated and it is currently being updated.
 - 2. CCSF has never been completed, we are the only school without an auditorium and the state has told us to complete the campus.
 - 3. We're talking about completion; we need to complete the campus.
 - 4. Documents submitted and available online – www.sf-planning.org/brcac
 - ii. Ken. Westwood Park.
 - 1. Surprised we have people from the Mayor's office and staff on the board who when we see these guidelines being put together there's nothing about ADA compliance.
 - 2. 13.5% elderly, 9% are mentally challenged.
 - 3. Parking will not disappear.
 - 4. Driverless cars will double the number of cars.
 - 5. We put together a park plan for this area; submitted and available online – www.sf-planning.org/brcac
 - 6. Make this a transit hub. Don't lose this space.
 - iii. Donna Hayes.
 - 1. I want to see the notes on the other sites wherein Balboa Reservoir was chosen.
 - iv. Laura Fry.
 - 1. Can we look at the survey?
 - 1. Jeremy Shaw. Yes, just don't click submit.
 - 2. I want it to be better than that survey monkey survey.
 - v. Francine Lofrano.
 - 1. Who created the survey?
 - 1. Jeremy Shaw. Nelson Nygaard Consulting Associates, they are working on the TDM Plan.
 - vi. Chris Hanson.
 - 1. Are you going to survey the neighbors?

1. Spinali. Yes.
- vii. Jacqueline Roberts. Westwood Park.
 1. One person asked for the notes on how this particular neighborhood was chosen. There are many of us who agree with that. Who's responsible with following through with that request?
 1. Mike Martin. The earlier meetings mentioned four sites that were being considered for the Public Lands for Housing Program. All four sites are being developed for housing because there is a housing affordability crisis in the City. The Balboa Park Station Area Plan EIR looked at this site as a possible site for housing and open space. That's where we got the idea that these 17 acres could be used so long as we address all of the other things we've been talking about. We have been straight about this and want to have a community dialogue about this.
- viii. Corey Smith. SFHAC.
 1. We're big fans of this site because it's right next to Balboa BART and MUNI. You have access to two different transit infrastructures.
- ix. Spinali. This 17 acre plot is unique in the City and it allows for more interesting things to be done with the combination of housing types so that we can build middle-income housing that is the type of housing that is most difficult to build with very little public subsidy available. This is done with market-rate cross-subsidy.
- x. Christine Hanson.
 1. When this process began, were you not concerned that CCSF was taken over by the state?

5. Close of Meeting.

- a. Comment from Jeff Hamilton, Director of Government Relations and oversees communication for CCSF. We do not have secret meetings. The Chancellor is only seeking to create a process where decisions can be made; no decisions have been made and the process is ongoing.
- b. Spinali. Helpful to have CCSF in the room.

6. Adjournment.