

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

AMENDED MEETING MINUTES

**City College of San Francisco
Multi-Use Building, Room 140
55 Phelan Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112
Thursday, November 5, 2015
6:45 PM
Special Meeting**

Please note that a supplemental audio recording of this meeting is included on the Planning website via the following link:

<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=4224>

Documents received during this meeting are included as attachments.

Committee Members Present:

Howard Chung, Kate Favetti, Christine Godinez, Rebecca Lee, Robert Muehlbauer, Lisa Spinali, Jon Winston

Committee Members Absent:

Brigitte Davila, Maria Picar

Staff Present:

Jeremy Shaw, Neil Hrushowy, Planning Department; Mike Martin, Phillip Wong, Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Craig Freeman, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

- a. Roll Call

2. Opening of Meeting. (Action Item)

- a. Motion to Approve Second Revision of Meeting Minutes 08/26/15: Chung, Second: Winston

- i. Ayes: Chung, Favetti, Godinez, Lee, Muehlbauer, Spinali, Winston
- ii. Noes: [none]
- b. Motion to Approve 10/19/15 Minutes.
 - a. Public comment:
 - i. Aaron Goodman *(comment amended by attachment)*
 - 1. Page 2 of 12. Under item 4.b, regarding energy creation, I was talking about “more or expanded energy creation related to electrical, water, and sewer, concept as related to CleanpowerSF or other agencies in regards to amenity creation”; housing being built equitably in the western edge of the City, some neighborhoods are seeing a lot of density while others are not; where do we place density along existing transit corridors: West Portal, St. Francis Woods, Pacific Heights, outlining one area while not looking equitably at other areas; edit: include the term “equitable development”
 - 2. Page 6 of 12. Item X. Design streets for emergency services; concern for adequate space for the density we’re placing in urban areas; edit: include “issue of evacuation areas” for item x; don’t use it all for building material, consider landscape, support vertical gardens, horticulture, greenspace for neighborhoods
 - 3. Page 10 of 12. Item 6.1.3. concerned with the use of “consider” regarding co-ops, this use quickly eliminates other options, and it’s important to keep all options on the table in regards to how to build in all parts of the City
 - 4. Housing Matrix. Page 2. Housing Production Goals, 33%; units are permanently affordable; this is a legal quandary, other legislation restricts affordable housing production goals under Prop K.
 - ii. Natalie Mueller. CCSF.
 - 1. Page 5: We have the worst possible facilities; edit: change “facilities” to “faculty”
 - iii. Francine. Westwood Park. *(comment amended by attachment)*
 - 1. Page 10 of 12. Clarification on city handout regarding legal residency, is that tax-payer subsidized? Her answer was “yes”; Brigitte Davila’s comment is missing, please add: “I hope you’re not checking green cards. I think that would be a violation of City policy, and I’m kind of appalled that someone would say that besides Donald Trump.” Wants CAC to play by the same rules of respect as expected of the attendees.
 - iv. Chris Hansen. Excelsior.
 - 1. Page 3 of 12. Change “Phil Ting” to “Supervisor Yee”.
 - v. Laura Frye. Westwood Park.
 - 1. Page 6 of 12. Item VII. Open space was a top priority of the City and did not mention Westwood Park.

- b. Motion to approve 10/19/15 Meeting Minutes as amended: Winston, Second: Chung
 - i. Ayes: Chung, Favetti, Godinez, Lee, Muehlbauer, Spinali, Winston
 - ii. Noes: [none]
- c. Spinali. Thanks to Brigitte and Christine for securing our meeting spaces.
- d. Reminder of Ground Rules
 - a. Located at end of agenda and posted on wall
 - b. Respect diversity of perspectives
- e. Discussion of Agenda
 - a. How are we doing in getting input from the community members that cannot attend?

3. Communications with the Community.

- a. Spinali. Check-in on members abilities to reach out to the communities they represent, especially those that cannot attend meetings.
In Sunnyside, trying to get better alignment with regular meetings of Sunnyside Neighborhood Association (SNA); Kate Favetti is trying to do the same. SNA did another mailing, detailing the purpose of the CAC and future meeting dates with their respective topics; SNA mailed this to everyone in the neighborhood. As a neighborhood association, we don't have a ton of money and it costs a couple hundred dollars to do these mailings. Member's feedback on how their outreach is going.
 - a. Winston. As the at-large member it's difficult to reach out; I don't have the neighborhood associations or the ability to use neighborhood mailings. A few meetings back I suggested starting a Facebook page and to better publish our email addresses; I see the emails that are sent to BRCAC@sfgov.org. I would like to find better electronic means to communicate with the city at-large. I would like to move that someone gets the authority to start a Facebook page.
 - b. Lee. I occupy the seat that is designated for a member of the SFPUC CAC. I have briefed and spoken at a high-level with other members of the SFPUC CAC. There will be a City staff presentation to the SFPUC CAC on November 17, 2015, which is open to the public, and will be at SFPUC headquarters; there is a commitment that it will be cross-noticed.
There are a variety of interests represented by the SFPUC CAC, for example, customers, and they are from every district of the City; the caliber of the SFPUC CAC is high. We will be discussing the real-estate surplus land aspect of this project.
 - i. Spinali. There is still the question of whether the reservoir is still needed by the SFPUC. I know it's not, but I would encourage people to attend the SFPUC CAC meeting because they will get all of the background information there.
 - c. Godinez. How are we getting students from local students (e.g. Lick, City College, and Riordan) to give their input? In talking with my own students, they get really excited but don't really feel like they have a say as to what comes into the neighborhood. Concern for outreach to families where English is not their first language, and having them contribute to the discussion. I grew up in the Excelsior

and my father could have benefitted from being a part of these types of meetings, but wouldn't have attended because he doesn't speak English well.

- d. Muehlbauer. The web is a wonderful thing, but for those of us that don't work or aren't in front of our computer for large stretches of the day, it might be useful to take more reliance of our local print media/publications; maybe we can get a fact sheet or a data update in print media; this is not a substitute for using the web. If we can get some of the casual users, or those with a peripheral interest, and take advantage of existing publications and resources, this could augment what we are trying to accomplish.
 - e. Spinali. I would like to take these recommendations back and we can work offline to put together a plan to figure out how to take advantage of everything from leveraging the student voices and creating print material as not everyone has access to the web. Please mark November 17 in your calendars for the SFPUC CAC meeting. To Jon Winston: Let's develop a plan for the Facebook page.
- b. Public comment
- a. Kishan Balgobin. Westwood Park Resident.
 - i. As we go through this process I want to understand that there are three ways of providing input: In the meeting in person, through representatives, and online. 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?
 - 1. Spinali. One of the things we did for the SNA is we added a Google phone number to our mailings and printed material, so that if you're someone from the neighborhood who doesn't have a computer, but have a comment, you could leave a voicemail with us and we would make sure it's incorporated.

4. General Public Comment.

- a. Kishan Balgobin. Westwood Park Resident. WPA Balboa Reservoir Subcommittee.
 - i. Reading comments and recommendations of the WPA. We appreciate the proposed parameters, and support the voter-approved Prop K mandate. We further appreciate the Public Lands for Housing program's focus on our neighborhood site as well as three other study sites including, Upper Yard at Geneva and San Jose, 4th and Folsom, and 1950 Mission. At this early juncture the community wishes to remind the City and reconfirm and restate results and input from the greater San Francisco community of the Citywide, City-sponsored online survey. The top 5 choices as listed in public workshop number 2 from May 5, 2015 are (1) large open spaces for multiple uses at 24%, (2) affordable housing for all incomes at 13%, (3) neighborhood character and integrity at 12%, (4) large open spaces for programmed uses at 6%, (5) pathways/walkways to go on walks at 6%. Further Westwood Park residents would like to restate and reconfirm the top 5 choices of the neighborhood-specific survey, which asks the same questions as the City-sponsored survey. The top 5 choices of the WPA of

the 130 residents who responded are (1) retaining neighborhood character and integrity at 30%, (2) large open spaces for multiple uses at 25%, (3) large open space for programmed use at 14%, (4) affordable housing for all incomes at 13%, (5) housing for low or workforce, and pathways/walkways at 11%.

1. Winston. We have a copy of this and it is in the records.
- b. Frederick. Westwood Park.
 - i. WPA comment as submitted to the CAC. The Westwood Park community respectfully requests that the CAC and City provide more than one CAC meeting in order to address Housing. Given that this discussion point of the RFP forms a significant portion of the Westwood Park community concerns and will significantly impact the other components of the CAC guidelines for the RFP, that is Urban Design/Neighborhood Character, Parks and Open Space, Transportation, Relationship with CCSF, Sustainability, and other desired community benefits.
 - c. Francine. Westwood Park.
 - i. WPA comment as submitted to the CAC. We respectfully request more detail around the RFP process, in particular number one, before the RFP is put in final form we ask that a draft be made available to both interested proposers as well as the community defined. All of us have an interest in understanding the level of detail requested in the bid proposals. For example we'd be strongly opposed to an RFP that did not ask the developer to include specifics as to how it intends to address the housing goal, which is number of units, as well as the community interest in maintaining neighborhood character, open space, et cetera. Number two does the City have any existing studies surrounding the economic viability of the project. For example does the City have or intend to do any studies that analyze the total number of units that would be required to support the development that would also include low affordable housing?
 - d. Christine Hanson. CCSF Student. Excelsior District Resident.
 - i. In this City the development machine is an ever-changing organism that is learning as it goes. These meetings are a prequel to the CEQA process, where the final environmental report will be approved. Once that is approved and appeals are exhausted the project, whatever it is, goes ahead if approved by the Board of Supervisors. This neighborhood, its residents, City College (CCSF), Riordan High School and its students are included in the CEQA process as being stakeholders as part of the environment of the Balboa Reservoir. I urge you to learn as much as you can right now about the CEQA process so that your comments can be considered under CEQA as being made from the very beginning. Thank you committee members for volunteering to serve on this committee. I greatly appreciate your willingness to sacrifice your time to do this, however, having watched the drama that has taken place at CCSF over the last three years, it is my cynical belief that these meetings are quite

possibly a way for the Planning Department and the Mayor's Office to thwart or spin any opposition when they prepare their EIR. In a nutshell, maybe we are training them to have their arguments ready before the permitting process under law begins. That sound pretty nefarious, but consider that in San Francisco the CEQA process has been changed so that parking is not considered an environmental concern. So what can we do? Perhaps it's even too late now for a local coalition that meets without the overview of the Planning Department and studying what rights we have under CEQA, but it might help if we did something else in addition to these meetings or perhaps find some legal help as a group.

- e. Frank Kalmar. Westwood Park Resident.
 - i. As a long-time resident in this community, in fact, I was born and raised in Westwood Park, I went to Riordan High School, I went to Sunnyside, I went to CCSF, and I went to SFSU, walked to all of them. And one of the things I would like to recommend, I know that this is down the road, but at least get on the boards on this, and that is there are a lot of students here and a lot of faculty that commute into this area. And their renting places someplace else, and they probably would fit into the matrix. And I would like to see a certain amount of housing devoted towards them. They are in the neighborhood already, why shouldn't they be able to stay in the neighborhood. That would address part of the transportation and the flow of traffic in and out of this neighborhood, which is absolutely grid-locked already. And the other comment I would like to make, we're going to talk about transportation down the road, but part of what I'm concerned about is they're all are saying, "we want to get people out of their cars." We don't have sidewalks to walk on. You cannot walk on Ocean Avenue unless you walk single-file in both directions. There are so many trees and all kinds of other things on the sidewalks. The sidewalks are too narrow. There are wider sidewalks in Sunnyside than there are on Ocean Avenue, and we're going to be dumping a lot more people out there. The other thing I would like addressed, at some point, is whether this is going to be ownership or rentals because I think with ownership is more important, when you're looking at the character of the neighborhood and having a vested interest.
- f. Aaron Goodman. D11 Resident. San Francisco Tomorrow Board Member. Balboa Park Station CAC. *(comment amended by attachment)*
 - i. I want to just point out that in all the changes of the election stuff there was something on the SocketSite today about the accessory housing bonus program. I'm very interested in how much of that is actually going to be included in this discussion on the overall building heights of what can be done with this site and I think that it's critical to know something more about how that relates to this site and what kind of heights we're going to see. At the SocketSite.com there was a website that shows some images of how density can be increased. The Affordable Housing Density

Program (AHBP) and how it affects this, and the second thing would be there was before the Board of Supervisors, the Transportation Impact Development Fee (TIDF), transit taxes. How much of that money for this development actually is going towards local transit policy improvements especially for the Balboa Park Station and for getting some of the students out of their cars. So what are the exact number and figures so we can hopefully begin to learn about how this housing development can actually help affect transit policy and transit development of this station?

1. Spinali. Height will be discussed during this meeting.

g. Jenny Perez.

i. I live around the corner and have the monstrosity covering my sunlight in the morning. Just a heads up. I'm also reading comments that were presented to the CAC for everybody here. While the roots of the Sunnyside neighborhood go back to the 1900s, Westwood Park homes were primarily built in the 1920s the architecture of those neighborhoods reflect a shift from Victorian and Edwardian homes, which predominated before and immediately after the turn of the century. In the case of Westwood Park it was developed as a residence park of bungalow-style homes, primarily to offer middle-class residents the opportunity to escape the noise and pollution, and the crowd conditions of downtown San Francisco. Any development on the Balboa Reservoir site should be respectful of the original intent of the development of the area west of Twin Peaks. Complementing and highlighting the characteristics of the historic architectural style of the surrounding neighborhoods. Buildings that have recently predominated the new developments within the Mission District, boxy glass fronts, loft styles are starkly out of character with the surrounding structures, just as six story glass and steel buildings would be out of character in Cow [Hollow], Steiner Street, Nob Hill, and in the Richmond District. Any project that follows the current architectural design trend in downtown and some of the adjacent neighborhoods would evoke a specifically negative response from existing residents in Westwood Park. Site and design buildings to enhance public spaces while maintaining residential privacy and access to light.

1. Spinali. This comment should be a part of Urban Design and Neighborhood Character.

h. Harry Bernstein. Merced Heights.

i. I saw that in the future meetings, December 14, I believe it concerns the relationship with CCSF, and I'm trying to see if there's any clue of how you're planning to organize that meeting. The college is normally chaotic in how it's treating or being treated by the community, by City Hall. Do you know if there will be any representatives from the college besides Ms. Davila, who's one of your members? It's not just a question of having official voices, but there's planning going on, there's a facilities committee, they have ideas of what to do and what not to do. Ms. Davila

last time asked that the site be given to City College. And I don't know if that will be discussed at that time. My other comment is about the CAC Ground Rules. I was not clear about how those came to be, it's on the second page of the agenda. One that I noticed besides the "no clapping and no cheering" is "keep non-verbal vocalizations of disgust to a minimum." I realize there is limited time, you don't want all the pros and cons, and all the clapping and shouting and jeering, but very condescending. Take advantage of every opportunity to respond.

1. Spinali. Ground rules were brainstormed with CAC and offered by members of the public. There were many people who were not respectful in a non-verbal way, and that's why this rule came to be.

5. Urban Design & Neighborhood Character: Background and Parameters.

- a. Spinali. Clarifying Questions with Neil Hrushowy. We'll go principle by principle and provide our feedback.
 - a. Lee. We get educated on rate infrastructure re: permeability, in terms of storm water capture and also run-off pollution management; good way to incorporate aspects of sustainability, also creates a more welcoming open space. Japantown Peace Plaza is a great landmark because it has a distinct design, but it is completely paved over, which affects its welcoming aspect. SFPUC CAC members are sustainability issues focused and would raise issues of permeability and run-off management.
- b. Principle #1
 - a. Favetti. Ocean Avenue has become a freeway entrance. Would like to see that small-level streets, Westwood Park for example and other areas, are maintained. Nice seamless approach for gateway to CCSF/Unity Plaza. Consistent streetway/walkway being able to go from Unity Plaza to the new neighborhood, but that the neighborhood would have the streets that are reflective of surrounding neighborhoods. Agree with Rebecca, permeability is a big topic, discussed with Robert and Jon. Eyes should be on the open space, i.e. the different buildings in other neighborhoods are facing open space, but also thinking in terms of a 360 degree view. New buildings going up on Ocean Avenue, front-view looks great, but back-view is not so hot. It's important that we're going to have a 360-kind of neighborhood the views with regard to the architectural design of the building also have a 360 view. Looking forward to Public Comment.
 - b. Winston. I really like the idea of small blocks and alleyways and a fine-grained approach to the layout of the neighborhood. Want to see connections to other neighborhoods. We did drop neighborhoods down from the sky. Sunnyside was built in the 1900s, it's Victorian, and it's got its own grid (e.g. Joost, Hearst, and Gennessee). The roundabout streets in Westwood Park don't connect at all; some connections to Monterey and to Ocean. The neighborhoods look inward. The neighborhoods across Ocean Avenue have a different grid and feel when you walk down the street. This neighborhood will be probably be different, Ocean and

Phelan unify these neighborhoods. Neighborhoods still don't connect very well. Challenge is connecting neighborhoods without encroaching on them. There is one road from Westwood Park that dead ends at the reservoir; we don't want to open that up and see more traffic there, but more walkways or bikeways. More connections would be beneficial to the new and old neighborhoods. Last meeting we talked about putting up a buffer, and this new neighborhood will have new architecture and we can buffer between this new architecture and the surrounding neighborhoods with park lands. We can make it transition nicely that will make everyone happy.

- i. People are concerned about tall buildings. They have their disadvantages; they cast shadows. Their advantage is if you place it properly, on a corner. Kate mentioned the Avalon building, that it looks nice from Ocean Avenue, but not from the backside. I don't want to see row after row of Avalon-type buildings on the reservoir; they aren't human-scaled. I want to see a wide variety of heights and scales, different amounts of bulk in certain spots, lots of open space to break it up and a wide variety of architecture and materials. Don't want to see loft-style housing; I think we can do better than that.
 - ii. Smaller housing/buildings, I want to face towards open spaces/social areas. During the Nixon administration, people parked in their homes and homes faced towards their backyards and sealed out the front, blocking out the community. I would like to see some forward facing housing, possibly with room for a porch. A transition from public to private space.
 - 1. Lee. Second on the porch; Favetti. There's a third.
- c. Chung
- i. How much say do we in terms of putting these principals down and making sure that the developers follows them? Are these principles that we just give them or can we really get down to the granular level of what we want?
 - ii. Cover more detail on the commercial aspects. What type of commercial establishments can be expected? This is a way to get people out.
- d. Muehlbauer
- i. The photographs are helpful. Other area plans are all narrative. Although, how does that really get translated into a site-plan?
 - ii. Struck by a comment, maybe there should be a pre-site plan that happens before so we get an idea of what the developers are reacting to, rather than narratives with pictures which leaves a lot open for personal discretion and individual judgment on the part of the developer; I'm coming around to this idea.
 - iii. Get to a point where we encourage people to get out and walk in their neighborhoods. This is missing inviting paths of travel to our modes of transit; Balboa Park Station is a connection to the entire City but access ways are undesirable and discouraging for use. We need more lighting and way-finding on pathways towards transit.

- iv. Pay attention to our view corridors. CCSF is attractive, can we align are streets so they point to our predominant view corridor?
 - 1. Favetti. Good point that Balboa Park Station is a dark place; reminder that there is coordination with the Ocean Avenue Corridor design, and wants to make sure this is happening.
- e. Godinez.
 - i. University that are designed such that you happen to walk by their buildings within neighborhoods (e.g. Carnegie Mellon, USF). How CCSF can be integrated into this whole project?
- c. Principal #2
 - a. Spinali.
 - i. Visual component important
 - ii. Trees and wind; consider having trees as we're in a wind tunnel. The taller the building the greater the wind problem becomes; we need to have a wind study done, so we can make impact determinations about sunlight and wind and what the footprint will do
 - iii. Think not just about permeability but solar power options, in regards to making it a green building, and have the building generate its own power
 - iv. Principle 4. Safe garden paths, not just a place for people to walk. Thinking about what does it really mean to connect to CCSF. How do we think about horticulture, education, artists, landscape designers, teachers, small businesses, gardeners, community members, i.e. the members of our community and leveraging CCSF's horticulture expertise in figuring out what works?
 - v. Design principle 4.c. Role of Ocean Avenue as a gateway. What is the impact going to be bigger than the current role? We have a lot of schools in a very small place. Schools as a customer. How can we create ways to connect students in these spaces?
 - vi. Principle 2: 25-65 feet is the current allowance. We want to keep it as much to code as possible. If it's 85 feet it would need to be a profound package of community benefits. It would also not need to cast too much shadow, blight (i.e. not keeping up with neighborhood character), and the wind impact.
 - d. Public Comment.
 - a. Robert Giletta. Westwood Park. According the charts I qualify as a low-income senior. On the surrounding areas, several pointed out that Westwood Park is insular. I live on the freeway which is in the center going through. I happen to know my neighbors and a lot are sitting here.
 - i. Walking blocks are good, but having it be a thoroughfare as a primary purpose is not good. If Westwood Park is insular and a new neighborhood in insular and they have a nice space to be in and they have good parties, I'm going to go visit them. Having a thoroughfare is not good.
 - ii. Mid-block alleys are a bad idea, it is where the junk and unsavory activities happen.

- iii. I would like more humanity and texture in the design, more to with people not industrial design.
- b. Steve Martin Pinto. Sunnyside.
 - i. I want to see emphasis in transition from bungalow-style homes in Westwood Park to higher apartments/homes on the eastern side.
 - ii. Not adverse to detached homes on the western side. Light airy feel and 360 degrees would be a good thing and make a more seamless transition from Westwood homes to the new neighborhood.
 - iii. Connections to Plymouth are important for emergency vehicles, otherwise you have to go all the way around Ocean and Phelan; maybe make it so emergency vehicles at the very least can enter at that point
 - iv. I don't want to see a repeat of the Dorado Terrace development; it was built against the neighborhood not with it. It's horrible. I don't want to see a repeat of that here.
- c. Hedda Thieme. Westwood Park.
 - i. The higher you build the cooler it will be. We have a lot of fog. This is not a neighborhood where people sit outside and sunbathe.
 - ii. The higher you build the fiercer the wind will be. E.g. Polk Street at Market.
 - iii. Be mindful to have sidewalks at least 65 inches wide; no trees on sidewalks less than 65 inches; I have fallen because lights could not penetrate through the tree canopy. 65 inch sidewalks are not wide enough to accommodate trees.
 - iv. Commercial space in the area is something I would not appreciate because we have stores on Ocean Avenue.
- d. Alvin Ja. Sunnyside.
 - i. I'm kind of disappointed that staff did not incorporate my written comments.
 - ii. Principle 4.a: design amenities in public realm to align with neighborhood activities, desires and needs including current uses of the site for family, dogs, dog walking, and exercise. I pointed out that you guys pointedly excluded parking, which is a current activity/use at the site and is important to students and staff.
 - iii. Principle 4.C: "design site and public realm to respect and reflect community heritage, the City College Campus" I made a written comment that we need to emphasize the fact that CCSF is an economic, cultural, and education focus of the community; it is a benefit to the entire community, even people across the bay. This campus is particularly important because this campus is where people want to go to transfer to a 4-year universities. Keep in mind keeping CCSF as a top priority in whatever design is made.
- e. Francine. Westwood Park.
 - i. Provide examples of permeability.

- ii. A positive aspect of Westwood Park is that there are a very few through streets from Westwood Park into other neighborhoods; this provides a sense of a close-knit neighborhood setting. Westwood Park residents retain high homeownership because of this characteristic. The new neighborhood would benefit from the same concept, reasonable but limited traffic into and out of the neighborhoods, family-friendly, bike-friendly, and safe. This would help with traffic calming.
- iii. Rentals have a transient population. Homeownerships have upkeep their properties. Alleys and similar public spaces in a highly urbanized area, this attracts illicit, unsavory uses (e.g. crime, drug use, graffiti, encampments)
- iv. Agree with previous comment; parking is a current use
- v. Photos are pretty but not representative of reality. Encampments are a reality and I would encourage ownership over rentals.
- vi. Submitting a photo of a development next to Forest Hill Station; you can look all around the building and its height appropriate.
- f. Frederick. Westwood Park.
 - i. At the January 21, 2015 community meeting, City indicated 4 pilot sites. These sites were studied in conjunction with the Public Lands for Housing program. Can the City provide an overview of the status of the other three pilot sites? For example, are these sites moving forward, how many units will be development, how many will be affordable, and the cost of the land?
- g. Westwood Park Resident.
 - i. I thought this was an effort to coordinate the interest of building with the needs of the community.
 - ii. The building is going forward in some degree, and the question is the impact. I want to offer my concerns about the building.
 - iii. I've watched the population the students diminish (75,000 to 55,000 students). I recognize the need for housing is of paramount concern for educators and for the City due to difficulty in obtaining and cost, but on the other hand we have a neighborhood that has issues with traffic. It's impossible to move around as it is. Prospect of adding more traffic or cars is not viable in terms of the impact. Services are going to be impacted. It becomes a safety issue. It's a wonderful neighborhood with a lot of children. Input on how many more thousands of people and cars are coming into the neighborhood; it's going to have an incredible impact.
- h. Christine Hanson
 - i. I hope this slide will be available online. [Timeline slide from PDF presentation]
 - ii. I'm looking at the 2016-2017 CAC meetings on development design and community design workshops with developer partner; this is making an assumption that this is space is available for development.
 - iii. For people that don't want to do community design workshops with the developer partner, what I'm seeing in the environmental review before

- project approvals I'm seeing a tiny blip of space for ongoing community engagement.
- iv. What kind of ongoing public engagement will be a part of this project?
- i. Madeleine Mueller
 - i. Community College. When I came here I valued terribly much that you can walk to a community college. It's open to everyone. I teach adult beginning piano students and it's a whole community. It's a good place to be. In the design, keep valuing CCSF as a component of the project.
 - ii. Performing Arts Center will be going kind of ahead. We have poor facilities. We have reengaged our architect and dialogue should continue. Project has one national prizes in sustainability. Our architect is on top of that.
 - iii. We have geothermal wells underneath the MUB.
 - j. Steve Rausch. Westwood Park.
 - i. Student parking and is terrible in the evening in Westwood park and it's terrible in the mornings.
 - ii. There are going to be hundreds of parking spaces that are going way. My concern is the additional parking and traffic we're going to have. Other residents have said the same thing.
 - iii. We were promised there would be parking underneath this building (MUB), which never happened. Many of the students now park in Westwood Park. We have problems with parking and it's only going to get worse.
 - k. Carol. Westwood Park.
 - i. Neighborhood character and integrity of the surrounding neighborhoods is the number one concern for all of us; over 600 homeowners.
 - ii. Sunnyside should weigh in; it has a lot of character.
 - iii. The presentation of 30-85 feet is not in context with the neighborhood
 - iv. The texture of the college and the flow is important; that synergy is important
 - v. These buildings are not presented in context; it will be a problem if not presented in context
 - l. Frank Kalmar. Westwood Park.
 - i. Westwood Park was designed with curved streets so no wind tunnels and increase sun exposure.
 - ii. No heights over 2 stories, which is part of the building code; no powerlines in front yards; we have front yards
 - iii. Scares me to think about a 5 story building; if the City is committed, are they going to give the land to the builder? They should so the builder can lower their costs and lower their building to three stories with a lot of open space.
 - iv. Long-term maintenance needs to be addressed. We have a little bit of green next to the sidewalk and there is garbage all over it. Is it the City or CCSF's responsibility? They need to not only be attractive but long-term

they will be easy to maintain and there is money in the budget to do that, not just through the initial first year.

m. Anita Theoharis. Westwood Park.

- i. Westwood Park is a 1917 planned development of 669 California bungalows. In 1995, the City determined that the unique architectural and neighborhood character as a whole was worthy of protection and enacted legislation designating Westwood park the first and still only residential character district in San Francisco; it also incorporated Westwood Design Guidelines.
- ii. Page 38 of design guidelines; chart of foot print and story height
- iii. One story over garage comprises 91.6 % or 613 homes in Westwood Park. Low height and placement of homes is part of the unique character of this neighborhood. Because of this the City lowered the Park's back height limit from 40 feet to 28 feet.
- iv. Any proposed project on the reservoir is immediately adjacent to Westwood Park
- v. I would have viewed Westwood Park's unique neighborhood character as a significant factor in evaluating any project proposed in the reservoir.
- vi. Fundamental to good planning that an innovative project with design with a view towards compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods and structures.
- vii. If you're designing a project next to the only residential character district in San Francisco compatibility with that neighborhood is essential if not mandated by City law and Planning policies.
- viii. First used Sanborn maps, which gives footprint of the homes, yellow dots show vertical additions in the late 80's and early 90's, which is why we embarked on this legislation.

n. Laura Frye. Westwood Park.

- i. Online Balboa Reservoir Study. Urban Design element of the San Francisco General Plan is "concerned mainly with development preservation" and 2.a. "respecting and reflecting" "Preserving" when talking about scale, character design, and use. Parking is a current use and needs to be addressed. Although there is no developed park, it still functions as a place where people walk, dog walk, and bike. It's a buffer from the intensity of other places.
- ii. The development needs a lot of open space
- iii. In terms of scale, Avalon is not a part of the neighborhood, it's on the commercial corridor and is a part of the allowed higher height on the commercial corridor.
- iv. I agree about the permeability. I live on Plymouth and it's crazy. On a lot of other streets no one drive there except if you live there or park there. There should only be access on Phelan and Ocean to the new neighborhood. Otherwise people are going to be cutting from City College to avoid Ocean.

- o. Aaron Goodman. District 11. *(comment amended by attachment)*
 - i. Submitting documents.
 - ii. Precedence setting.
 - iii. There are other solutions besides gridded street plans when developing a large-scale site; Westwood Park was trying to get away from that.
 - iv. We don't have to work with just grids and alleyways we can come up with a lot of other designs; sometimes the City ignores that, primarily on Parkmerced, with a lot of layering of landscape systems, and public to private space
 - v. Look at precedence of how the City has developed over the years and why have people moved away from urban street grid planning into more suburb areas of San Francisco in the past; these areas are now facing issues of density.
 - vi. How do we redensify these neighborhoods without ruining the neighborhood character?
 - vii. We should be more open to new design concepts. How we look at open space, energy creation, structural technology, and height.
- p. Jenny Perez. Westwood Park.
 - i. Locate taller buildings where adjacent buildings are tallest, with heights tapering down on approach to single-family neighborhoods.
 - ii. Building on the west side height should be lower than on the east and should respect the scale, privacy, and light of homes to west.
 - iii. Building heights should wall within the range of 25 to 40 feet allowing for heights of up to 65 feet in the eastern portion, where due to economic efficiencies allows for additional community benefits.
 - iv. Current zoning of Westwood Park is 28 feet; current zoning of the Balboa Reservoir is 40 feet on the west and small slice on the east at 65 feet as agreed to in the Balboa Park Station Area Plan including the accompanying FEIR.
 - v. Please describe for the community how an 85 feet maximum was derived given the significant community input that resulted in the 40 foot height restriction within the 2009 plan. The community concern is that desired open space will be negotiated for increased height and density. Please address this concern.
 - vi. Please inform the public how the new density bonus/affordable housing bonus plan would impact the Balboa Reservoir Development site.
 - vii. Indicate and provide examples of current density guidelines compared to proportional density guidelines under the new bonus plan. Site and design bonus plan to enhance public spaces while maintaining existing residential privacy and access to light.
 - viii. Air tunnels/wind between library and Westwood Park
- q. Kay Kalmar. Westwood Park.

- i. Some of the buildings shown remind me of the Mission Bay Development and the towers built there have no character; I hope you're not going to do that on this site.
 - ii. Very concerned about density being brought into the neighborhood, the traffic in this area is almost impossible; you can't get to the freeway and you can't get off of the freeway, which damages the character of the neighborhood
- e. CAC
 - a. Spinali.
 - i. Status of the other three sites.
 - ii. Parking and transportation is its own principle, which we're dedicating an entire session that will be the November 30 meeting, will make the agenda available on November 16. I've been stuck for 35 minutes on Phelan.
 - 1. Mike Martin.
 - a. 1950 Mission Street, currently homeless navigation center, that operation is transitioning elsewhere, and the site will be developed in the next two years as two buildings comprised of 120 units that will be 100% affordable to low incomes
 - b. The Upper Yard site is near Balboa Park Station. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development has an MOU with the SFMTA to purchase that site, and they are in negotiation with BART to get an easement to get a little more space due to proximity to freeway. 90 units 100% affordable to low incomes.
 - c. 4th and Folsom Central Subway Station; not as close because the station is under construction; not official yet but my strong expectation will be 100% to low incomes; guess is that it will be confirmed as 100% affordable early next year; 85 units

6. Partnership Updates.

- a. Spinali,
 - i. City College is an important anchor and they have their own planning process; the performing arts center and several variables are connected to it; the reality of the CCSF student is not of an 18-year-old who could take public transportation but chooses to drive, our student is older with more obligations than just being a student full-time.
 - ii. Brigitte Davila is working with our team to meet with the senior people at CCSF, so that the meeting in December will be ample and lay out as much as possible; hard to think about this project without considering CCSF and their parallel process

7. Close of Meeting.

- a. Winston. Clarification, November 30th meeting will be about parking and transportation
 - i. Spinali. You'll get the principle in advance, read it, digest it, get a red pen and edit it, talk with others, and decide if you want a member of the committee articulate your thoughts or do you want to stand at the podium and reinforce them. We want to get as much feedback as possible.

8. Adjournment.

- a. Motion to adjourn: Favetti, Second: Winston
 - i. Ayes: Chung, Favetti, Godinez, Lee, Muehlbauer, Spinali, Winston
- b. Noes: [none]

My name is _____, resident
of Westwood Park.

LOAC GROUP RULES

In regards to having a respectful meeting, at the last meeting, I asked for clarification on the City's Comment & Response Matrix handout, under principle 2 which stated "legal residency should not be required for affordable housing placement". I also asked if this is taxpayer subsidized. Following my questions, CAC member, ^{OPINION} ~~Bridgette Davis~~ commented QUOTE: "I hope you're not checking green cards, I think that would be a violation of city policy and I'm kind of appalled that anybody would say that besides Donald Trump" UNQUOTE. I respectfully ask that the CAC play by the same rules of respect they expect of us to as this sort of censure & personal attack, intentional or not, seeks to shame and silence important inquires and opinions.

Further, if housing is the "crisis" it's purported to be, then it begs the question: should persons with legal residency (and special populations such as CCSF faculty/staff) be considered first for such an important taxpayer subsidized benefit as affordable housing?

POST-QUEST

THIS COMMENT BY CAC MEMBER IS ON THE
~~THE~~ AUDIOBLUE TRANSCRIPT BUT
NOT ON THE WRITTEN ONE

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2016 1:13 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Cc: Keith Tanner
Subject: Re: Draft Sustainability Principals and Parameters - Minutes Corrections December 14th 2015

Thank you due to the lack of comment time on each issue its hard to stay coherent and clear on comments which is why I went back over it all for my sanity

Agoodman

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 11, 2016, at 11:31 AM, BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Aaron,

Good morning.

Thank you for your email.

I listened again to the audio recording of your public comment, and the minutes almost exactly transcribe what you said during the meeting, with a few exceptions for minor parts of speech.

I will attach your email as an addendum to the amended minutes to show you would like to clarify the comments you made on December 14, 2016.

Best regards,

Phillip C. Wong

--

Project Assistant
Office of Economic and Workforce Development
City Hall, Room 448
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4653
Office: 415-554-6512
Email: phillip.c.wong@sfgov.org

From: Aaron Goodman [<mailto:amgodman@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Saturday, January 09, 2016 11:59 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Cc: Keith Tanner
Subject: Draft Sustainability Principals and Parameters - Minutes Corrections December 14th 2015

Draft Sustainability Principals and Parameters - Minutes Corrections Thursday Nov 5th 2015
Please note the following corrections I noted on the minutes published for the December 14th meeting on Sustainability

These corrections in **BOLD RED** are to the best of my recollection, as some comments did not appear properly transcribed.

e. Aaron Goodman. D11 Resident. Seat 8, Balboa Park Station CAC. i. I sent you an email summary **of my comments for this meeting, I would like to point out to the BRCAC on their CAC ground rule that says "make time to listen, process and reflect."** . As the key issue, I don't think we have time enough for all the topics. **We have a lot of information we got pushed on us for this single meeting and we had stated prior the need to look at sustainability in more than just the materials used in the buildings built, and on the communities needs for power/sewer/water needs, and one of the planner's said, "we want to wrap things up."** That's not the way to do things. We don't wrap things up when we try to address all the issues and we want to gear this design towards solutions **as noted in your ground rules.** You open the door **to other ideas.** You make it an open **design competition selected by the community.** You make it open in terms of ideas and policy. You don't close your doors towards anything. That's the key concern about all of this is how are we going to address this? Is it just housing we're putting on this site or energy needs **and services like sewer and water systems per the SFPUC mandate for the future population proposed,** are we looking at more things than just one program that might be shoved down our throats as a committee. That's what I'm hoping all of you are paying attention to when you hear all these comments tonight especially in regards to these 3 different items which carry a lot of weight in terms of the sustainability, CCSF **possible cumulative impacts, and** additional public ideas some of which **we diagrammed again and submitted comments earlier tonight via email.**

ii. Aaron Goodman. 1. Wanted to just point out the sustainability parameters the issues of district scale especially since this was called the Balboa Reservoir the key issue is are we just talking about chopping up blocks and creating gridded-space and not looking at the concept of a whole block? A whole block concept that includes a reservoir. Whether this reservoir is for water, whether the reservoir is for energy creation or storage. What other ways can we look at this site besides chopping it up into **a typical san Francisco** gridded street pattern? That's a concern and something we can look at as an option **or possible solution.** There's another issue here, we have the SFPUC where they had multiple **water games held at SFSU as well as another at Golden Gate park** and during **those** session most people put large storage facilities of water on the site and included in that was the issue of sewage treatment. We have 2 low lying plants on the east and west side of the city. We do not have a secondary system to deal with waste treatment. So part of the issue of including later on in the principle 6 site organic waste dealing with waste in general should be a serious consideration for any higher level elevation **development bringing** it down to 1 site **above where we may have a rising sea water concern** and processing it. Look at downhill theory for waste. Another item would be on item 4.a. conference or network of public parks. I think a lot of people **at initial Balboa Reservoir meetings** spoke in favor of Public Park and open space on the site. Something to keep consideration under principle 5 was to ensure that fuel trucks, construction vehicle, worker vehicles are energy efficient and they look at commuting to the site not just driving and parking in the area. The other concern is that enforcement of **speeding near transit platforms by people trying to cross the city via ocean ave, is a key impact.** Enforcements of speed as a transit issue for **pedestrian safety** and **especially children's safety near schools along ocean ave,** we also have to have enforcement of the **impacts of cars idling in traffic jams at ocean ave,** and lastly micro climate. This is a micro

climate here. So when we build up and build big we have to look into and consider what happens with mold and fog. It's something considered on the west side of the city a lot, and most people that **live here** realize that.

xi. Aaron Goodman. 1. I wanted to speak on behalf of the issue of project context. If you could put the slide back up Phillip on the project **site context map** in the site plan is something we really don't see enough of from the **Planning Department, BRCAC or City College**. And I think it's what Mr. Muehlbauer was addressing is that we're designing things in a vacuum. We don't have enough information from City College currently on their plans and project and what they're proposing and that slide alone is cut off because it's not showing the eastern edge of the campus. It's not showing, really, the southern edge correctly. You're getting cut off at both sides and the focus is only on SFPUC and CCSF land shown on the western edge. There's a concern they should look at the whole master planning issues of their existing facilities. A lot of the existing facilities are old and falling apart. They need to be looked at seriously. You have to look at the overall master plan, how much money needs to be spent in rehabilitation of existing facilities? **I disagree with handing City College more land**, The most sustainable way to approach a campus master plan is to work within your existing boundaries and don't look at expanding and handing over more land to a college that needs to already address a lot of issues on their existing campus. The east side could actually look at **actually a new off-ramp prior to ocean ave, directly to a parking garage structure, or onto Phelan** to help prevent some of the traffic coming onto Ocean Avenue and it might even funnel directly into an eastern edge parking garage and having it closer to the freeway, rather than bringing all that traffic straight up Ocean Avenue and into the area. There could be a lot of other solutions that come of it. I think the discussion on a better Southside presentation of the college **along Ocean Ave** is key. I think that was mentioned earlier. Lastly I just want to mention the issues of campus master planning. I've dealt with this prior by **submitting comments** with **S.F. State's Masterplanning impacts**. I hope Chancellor Lamb and the committees there look seriously at the negative impacts that happened with SF State's **acquisition of land**, with their master planning, transit wise, housing wise, parking wise, transportation wise. They ignored a lot of issues that **impacted Parkmerced working families**, and they're still just building away and taking over what was formerly open space that belonged to tenants out in Parkmerced. And I think that's a sad **and improper** way of looking at how you deal with the public and the public's needs.

Last item in hindsight was that I wanted to re-emphasize in the email image submitted (diagram sketch) was the need for a more diagrammatic initial design looking at the prior shape of the CCSF 1/2 horse-shoe design, and the race-track oval shape of the terraces as a possible idea for integrating a better scaled solution using a reservoir as a "uniting" feature. A map was brought into the meeting, but not discussed in terms of street neighborhood context and integration. A key solution should look at precedent in the integration of new denser buildings into the existing community. A parklike setting around a reservoir or designed landscape site might make a lot more sense similar to the precedent images we sent initially to the BRCAC.

Thank you for the corrections submitted to be included as a formal correction to the minutes.

Aaron Goodman (BPSCAC) Seat 8 - Families + Children

cc: BPSCAC