

**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, February 13, 2017**

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-021317 available via the following link: www.sf-planning.org/brcac

Committee Members Present:

Michael Ahrens; Howard Chung; Christine Godinez; Rebecca Lee; Robert Muehlbauer; Jon Winston

Committee Members Absent:

Brigitte Davila*; Lisa Spinali*

*Participated by telecommunication only in an observational role without the rights and powers provided to members of the CAC participating in person.

Staff/Consultants Present:

Emily Lesk, Mike Martin, Phillip Wong, Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Jeremy Shaw, San Francisco Planning Department; Christopher J. Wong, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission; Carli Paine, SFMTA; Jeff Tumlin, Nelson/Nygaard

1. Call to Order and Roll Call.

- a. Roll Call
- b. Emily Process on RFQ.

2. Opening of Meeting.

- a. Amendments to 12/12/16 Meeting Minutes.
 - i. No CAC Comment.
 - ii. Public Comment.
 - 1. Chris Coughlan
 - 1. I don't see my comments in the minutes.
 - iii. Motion to table 12/12/16 Meeting Minutes: Ahrens, Second: Chung
 - 1. Ayes: Ahrens, Chung, Godinez, Muehlbauer, Spinali, Winston
 - 2. Noes: [none]
 - 3. Abstain: [none]
- b. Emily Lesk. Update to RFQ process.
 - i. I'm going to give an update on where the developer selection process is. We issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) in November to create a short list of qualified developers to later submit a detailed proposal of how they would develop the site. The criteria used to evaluate the RFQ responses were: (1) technical capability, (2) financial capacity, and (3) a vision aligned with the development parameters. The RFQ went out to non-profit developers, for-profit developers, local public agencies, and members of the public who have been participating in the CAC. Responses were received in January, and they have been reviewed by the evaluation panel, which includes representatives of PUC, OEWD, the Planning Department, SFMTA, MOHCD, the CAC chair, and City College. The panel reviewed the qualifications of the responding developers and scored them against the criteria. These scores were turned over to the PUC, who will decide which three developers to invite to submit proposals. By the next CAC meeting, the results will have been released and we can talk about next steps.
- c. Lisa Spinali.
 - i. The process was very thorough. The team from the City was really smart, and all the proposals were given serious consideration. The criteria were very robust, and I'm really delighted that the CAC was represented on the panel. It was a strong and detailed process. I think people will be very happy to see the types of organizations that submit RFPs. It's important that we have very robust outreach prior to the developer presentation meeting. We should have outreach in multiple languages and by mail.
- d. Robert Muehlbauer
 - i. I understand that there are a variety of conflicts for the next meeting, but staff will work to find a time that works.
- e. Mike Ahrens.
 - i. The outreach for the next meeting is going to be very important. Lisa is constrained by her confidentiality agreement. The next step of the process is going to be very important for the CAC. I would like to be a part of that next meeting. I have a lot of meetings in March and I will be traveling. I've given 4 meetings dates.

- f. Staff to find alternate date.

3. Update on Balboa Area Transportation Demand Management (“TDM”) Framework.

- a. Jeremy Shaw, Presentation. [Presentation available online at www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC]
- b. CAC Comment.
 - 1. Howard Chung (Question).
 - 1. Were there any TDM strategies specifically targeted to the Ocean Avenue corridor? Do you have any data on the impact of offering students transit passes? How does that affect ridership?
 - 2. Jeff Tumlin (Response).
 - 1. It would be difficult to predict the precise effect of offering students transit passes. We can look at examples like Santa Monica City College and Long Beach State, which are much less transit assessable but saw large increases in students taking transit. The bike programs at Santa Monica City College also saw large increases. These programs definitely have a measurable impact on parking demand and reduce the need to build new supply. There’s a number of colleges around the country that built parking structures. The resulting increase in parking prices to fund the structures reduced demand and put the college in difficult financial positions.
 - 2. The Ocean Avenue businesses also warrant a parking strategy. We would recommend parking demand management, where the price of metered parking would vary slightly throughout the day. Also, an employee transit pass program could reduce parking demand by employees. Oakland is exploring a program where the City sells a number of permits to businesses to park in the neighborhood and residents can use the proceeds for neighborhood infrastructure improvements.
 - 3. Michael Ahrens (Question).
 - 1. Is there a further version of your report coming out in the future? Will the report be used by the developer to solve the transportation issues?
 - 4. Jeremy Shaw (Response).
 - 1. We would like to finalize the draft this month and produce a final report by March. The report is a tool to identify transportation issues.
 - 5. Michael Ahrens (Question).
 - 1. Your report says that if you have a ten percent reduction in transit volume, traffic will flow much faster. Can you explain this?

6. Jeff Tumlin (Response).
 1. This is common traffic operations math. We've all experienced this in the real world. When you're on the freeway and traffic slows, this can be due to a relatively modest increase in the number of vehicles.
7. Rebecca Lee (Question).
 1. Did you look at the points of origin and destinations of people travel to and from the neighborhood?
8. Jeff Tumlin (Response).
 1. We have some data for City College students. For residents travel patterns, we can look at the American Communities Survey, which shows there is an increasing attraction of residents in this neighborhood to commute to the South Bay rather than Downtown San Francisco.
9. Rebecca Lee (Question).
 1. Can you include this data in the updated report?
10. Jeff Tumlin (Response).
 1. We're not updating the existing conditions report. We're developing the recommendations for the report.
11. Rebecca Lee (Question).
 1. Have you considered formalizing the informal paths used by City College Students?
12. Jeff Tumlin (Response).
 1. The City College Facilities Master Plan will address this. The topography of City College has a big impact on commuting and accessibility.
13. Robert Muehlbauer (Question)
 1. As we move from a framework to actual plan have does TDM get embodied in the development plan? Is there monitoring and enforcement?
14. Jeremy Shaw (Response).
 1. It's hard to put a finer point on many of these recommendations without a concrete development proposal. Mitigation measures for the issues identified will be codified in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) agreement and the Development Agreement with the City.
15. Carly Paine (Response).
 1. The Treasure Island development, which is a much larger project, is required to actively monitor the traffic on the island and if it exceeds certain levels the developers are required to pay a financial penalty. Other penalties might include delays in approving further phases of the project until compliance is achieved.
16. Jeff Tumlin (Response).

1. If TDM requirements are in the CEQA agreement, citizen groups can sue to ensure compliance.
17. Jon Winston (Question).
 1. What will the enforcement mechanisms be toward City College to implement traffic mitigation?
18. Jeff Tumlin (Response).
 1. City College's Facilities Master Plan is working to address traffic and accessibility. A lot of the recommendations for City College in the TDM report are more operations focused. However, the City has limited enforcement ability in regards to City College. It must be a collaborative relationship between the City and City College. The coordination between San Francisco State and the City provides a good model of how this could work.
19. Brigitte Davila (Question).
 1. Regarding City College's Facilities Master Plan, the informal paths are being reviewed. Does the ten percent traffic rule apply to other modes of transportation, e.g. bikes?
20. Jeff Tumlin (Response).
 1. Cars take up significantly more space than bikes or pedestrians. Transportation planners work to provide the most space efficient transportation, while ensuring that a variety of transportation modes are available for those that need them.
21. Robert Muehlbauer.
 1. A point to note, committee members participating by phone will be noted as such and will not be considered as present.
- c. Public Comment
 1. Hedda Thieme. Westwood Park.
 1. I'm very concerned about planning for the future. I appreciated Jeff Tumlin's presentation. We should be concerned about additional students that will come from rising enrollment rates now that City College is free. This has not been addressed. Ocean Avenue is very challenging. The streetcar stop at Miramar and Ocean doesn't feel safe. I feel putting more people into this area is irresponsible. In 1974, the voters passed Prop L, which gave City College the Balboa Reservoir parking lot.
 2. Rita Evans. Sunnyside.
 1. I strongly recommend that the next CAC meeting be held in March to allow for sufficient time for review and outreach. I worked at the Institute for Transportation at U.C. Berkeley, and the 10% rule discussed earlier is valid. If we can manage to do that, we will be successful. A developer funded shuttle between Balboa Reservoir and Balboa Park Station would be

very beneficial. It would serve the residents and CCSF students. This should be in the RFP.

3. Bob Byrne. Sunnyside Neighborhood Association.

1. The first goal should be to make it easier to find on-street parking. What are the strategies being suggested? Residential Parking Permits (RPP) are a nice panacea, but there is no evidence that this provides parking relief. According to a 2015 survey by the City, 60% of RPP areas still took more than 5 minutes to find parking and only 40% found parking within one block of their home. The permits cost \$111 per year, and there's no guarantee that you'll find parking near your home. RPPs require that neighbors solicit signatures to create a new permit area. The City needs to identify real solutions.

4. Christine Hanson. Excelsior District.

1. 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.

5. Kate Favetti.

1. There are commuters who use the City College parking lot and neighborhood parking to go downtown. This could be a potential revenue source. Permit parking fees act as a penalty for neighbors. The TDM should say that these fees are waived for neighbors. The K and M Lines should be upgraded and put underground.

6. Monica Collins.

1. The goals of TDM, including optimizing parking resources and ensuring right size parking facilities, are laudable goals. Sunnyside is pleased this critical matter is recognized in these goals. However, we see very little that gives us confidence that these goals will be achieved. Demand pricing has two serious flaws in the context of City College. Students may not seek alternatives. Alternative options may not work for those that work multiple jobs, have kids, or come from varied locations. They'll look for free parking. This is asking students to subsidize the TDM program.

7. Theodore. Excelsior.

1. It seems like we need to reduce more than 10% of vehicle traffic. Any reduction in traffic will induce more people to drive in the area. I don't want to go onto Ocean for driving, it is too busy. There were many collisions in the area last year. The City's Vision Zero goals include more traffic calming and

- reducing the amount of cars driving. In my neighborhood, the Excelsior, I haven't seen any TDM measures. There are more cars than the streets can hold; people park on sidewalks.
8. Steven Martin-Pinto. Sunnyside Neighborhood Associate President.
 1. We need to expand the capacity of the K and J lines. This includes putting the K line underground.
 9. Francine Lofrano. Westwood Park.
 1. I think unbundling parking from the new housing units will de-incentivize people from paying for parking. They will try to park for free in the neighborhood. The developer should subsidize parking. Unused parking in the development should go to the students. Parking permits aren't a perfect solution, but they should be free to residents. People drive because they feel unsafe. I went to night school at City College and did not walk because I did not feel safe. The bus takes much longer than driving. If I were to drive to my workplace I can be there in 10 minutes, on the bus it is an hour. Uber and Lyft have not helped traffic. They are adding to congestion.
 10. Yonathan Randolph. Ingleside.
 1. The presentation had a lot of ideas. This site is an ideal location for those that want to live car free. We should be encouraging as many people as possible that want that lifestyle. If we are worried about traffic, we should be encouraging everyone that doesn't want a car to live here. This area is well served by transit. I believe the RPP program does work. During the day, not many students park here. It doesn't apply at night, which is the caveat. The RPP program should be extended to prevent reservoir residents from parking in the neighborhoods.
 11. Laura Fry. Westwood Park.
 1. Jeff Tumlin's presentation said that the lower reservoir was completely empty at peak times. I would like to know what times those were. At the next meeting, are you going to make a recommendation on how much of the City College parking is going to be replaced? I, like many people attending these meetings, would like to see more open space.
 12. Aaron Goodman. District 11. Balboa Park Station CAC.
 1. In regards to the TDM section, it is one thing to prepare conceptual infrastructure. I haven't seen a plan that provides greater connectivity or fixes the transportation issues. I would like to hear more about the east side parking structure. There have been many new developments on in the area, and there needs to be a program and plan to address the impact.
 13. Linda da Silva. Associate Vice Chancellor of Facilities at City College.

1. City College often feels like the 800 lbs. gorilla in the neighborhood. We want to have a positive impact on the neighborhood. Parking and the traffic has a big impact. My team and I have worked closely with the City. City College is facing a variety of issues in the coming years. The loss of the Balboa Reservoir parking is a major threat. The other threat is that a large percentage of our employees are at retirement age. The high cost of living makes recruiting employees challenge. I would like to see SFPUC and the City require the developer to provide housing for some City College employees on the site. It will reduce traffic in the neighborhood because employees can walk to work.
14. Frank Calmar. Westwood Park.
 1. I commend your efforts to identify traffic flow problems in the neighborhood. My observations over the years are that you need to improve the capacity and flow of public transportation. If a bus sits in traffic it doesn't do anything. Parking should be taken off of Phelan Avenue and the buses will be able to move much freer. Walking on Ocean Avenue and walking from Bart to City College do not feel safe. Students and City College employees should be given preferential access to these units.
15. Chris Coughlan. Sunnyside.
 1. One of my chief concerns with Nelson\Nygaard is that they want to blend bikes and pedestrians. Bikes are vehicles with different needs and wants. Everyone is a pedestrian even if you drive. City College is going to lose a lot of parking with their new art center. In addition to the new housing, a lot of parking is going to be taken out and demand is going to increase. I agree with earlier comments that Uber and Lyft increase congestion. When I was living in the Haight and attending City College, I took the bus, but I had to give up it up because it was too slow.
16. Vicky Legion. Teacher at City College.
 1. I would like to see a response to Chris's question about surveying parking from 10:30 PM to 12:30 AM and during dead week (period when students are studying and not going to the college). This is not transparent data collection.
17. Robert Muehlbauer.
 1. The meeting is running a bit long. Let's have answers as an addendum for the next meeting.
- ii. CAC Comment.
 1. Michael Ahrens.

1. We all recognize that this is not the final report. Once the RFP comes out we will be able to work more to finding solutions to the identified questions.
2. Rebecca Lee.
 1. There's some cynicism and skepticism around data collection. The audience needs to have confidence that the data is solid.
3. Jon Winston.
 1. The Ocean Avenue corridor plan has been completed from Phelan to Miramar. The pedestrian traffic is better than it used to be. The last mile between here and BART is horrific. There are two plans to address this, but the construction has not been funded. These improvements are integral to what we're doing here. We need to fix the last mile between here and the BART station.
 2. As far as parking prices go, people are induced to drive because it's cheaper. But there are some people that really need to drive. The low price of parking has really incentivized the desire to drive. Higher priced parking could increase its availability and the funds could be used to fund a transit shuttle.
 3. The bike share program is going to be expanded in the next year or two. You will need to walk no more than 5 minutes to get to a bike share station. The expansion is being done in phases, but City College is split between phases three and four. If we can provide bike share immediately, that is low hanging fruit. That is something we can use immediately to improve traffic.
4. Christine Godinez.
 1. Thank you for mentioning the BART shuttle. I would love to take BART, but I drive because I don't want to have to walk in the dark.
5. Brigitte Davila.
 1. I also appreciate the shuttle comment.
 2. Uber and Lyft carpooling may reduce traffic.
6. Robert Muehlbauer.
 1. The Balboa Reservoir Project, City College, and TDM all need to be linked. There needs to be a way to enhance the connection to the Balboa Park BART station. It would be great to see City College students and employees live in this new housing.
7. Jeremy Shaw.
 1. The data was collected in May and August. The August data captured the beginning of the semester and should show peak demand. Also, this is not the end of data collection. If future conditions change, we may need to collect more data.

4. General Public Comment.

a. Public Comment.

i. Chris Coughlan. Sunnyside.

1. I am beyond upset. 1.5 acres of contiguous open space is not enough. This has to change.

ii. Aaron Goodman.

1. I don't think we should underground the street car. I like being aboveground. Bike lanes sometimes work great about around Lick-Wilmerding bikes go too fast down Phelan.

iii. Yonathan Randolph.

1. To Chris's point, there is more diversity of opinion at these meetings. The CAC has had a hard time of balancing all the needs. We are in a housing crisis, and the City needs additional housing. Supervisor Yee recently commissioned a report that showed that 70% of family housing is not used by families because it is not affordable.
2. As for demand pricing parking, the City College parking lot is set at \$3.00 as required by state law.
3. Perhaps City College can sell its parking lot and use the proceeds to fund the Balboa Reservoir project as housing for students and employees.

iv. Harry Bernstein. Merced Heights.

1. Over a year ago at a CAC meeting, I asked if the Balboa Reservoir site had been declared surplus and was told it had not. I looked at some ballot arguments from 1986 and 1987, which declared the land surplus. There is a state surplus land statute that says that any local agency disposing of surplus land must first send a written offer to local school districts to purchase the land. It's premature to do the RFQ without considering the possibility of City College having access to the land.

v. Steve Martin-Pinto. Sunnyside Neighborhood Associate President.

1. What can City College do to divert students to satellite campus to alleviate traffic concerns here?

vi. Theodore. Excelsior.

1. I have biked everywhere in the City, and I think we need to be more aggressive to get people out of cars.

5. Adjournment.

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

EMAILED PUBLIC COMMENT

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

6:15 PM

Regular Meeting

Christine Hanson, Excelsior District

The City's presentation might seem complete and reasonable, however it's based on problem data. The TDM framework presented this evening is based on insufficient data regarding current CCSF parking.

Planning collected parking data on May 10 and 11, in 2016 representing average parking usage. But finals started on May 20th so the data was collected at the end of the semester. Last May when the pending survey was mentioned at the CAC meeting we had a laugh about it thinking wouldn't it be funny if they actually used data when semester is almost over. But it isn't funny now because they ARE using that data.

Data collected in the evening completely omits evening classes at City College because parking was surveyed from 10:00PM to 12:30AM--after all classes at the school are over—Remember, the CAC Principles and Parameters leaves the idea of shared parking up to the “experts” even after multiple comments about a possible conflict with the needs of students attending evening classes. Will an expert rely on parking data for CCSF evening classes that is taken after 10PM?

Everyone who lives in this area knows that there is an ebb and flow to the parking during a semester. You KNOW that data taken the last week in the semester does not in any way reflect PEAK usage, and doesn't reflect even AVERAGE usage.

Please demand that the parking data in this current framework be removed and new surveys taken that truly reflect parking at CCSF BEFORE they finalize this draft.

Kate Favetti, Westwood Park, via email dated 2/23/17

My comments on the TDM presentation last night:

1) I would like to expand upon the comments made by Rebecca Lee - As we heard in public comment last year, in addition to commuters attending City College, it is also important to address commuters going downtown. Many park their cars during the daytime impacting both the City College parking lot and the neighborhoods. Addressing this need in reviewing the TDM and overall parking issues may alleviate neighborhood parking issues and create a potential revenue opportunity for CCSF or others.

2) Residential parking permits while not perfect do help to alleviate neighborhood parking issues and support businesses. The fees however act as a penalty and the TDM should address a possible waiver of fees to encourage more neighbors to participate.

3) Request more information on M line improvements and how those could also support the K line. And, although I am sounding like a "dripping faucet" undergrounding the K will alleviate many issues. Although the TDM does not specifically address this, perhaps there could be a recommendation or, at least, some support included.