

**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  
Monday, November 30, 2015  
6:15 PM  
Regular Meeting**

Please note that due to a technical malfunction supplemental audio recording of this meeting is not available.

Documents received during this meeting are included as attachments.

**Committee Members Present:**

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

**Committee Members Absent:**

Christine Godinez

**Staff Present:**

Jeremy Shaw, Sue Exline, Planning Department; Mike Martin, Phillip Wong, Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Peter Albert, Erin Miller, SFMTA; Supervisor Norman Yee, Jen Low, Office of District 7 Supervisor Norman Yee; Craig Freeman, SF Public Utilities Commission

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

a. Roll Call

**2. Opening of Meeting. (Action Item)**

**3. General Public Comment.**

- a. Craig Persiko. CCSF.
  - i. I want to support high-density development in this area. San Francisco needs more of it. More housing will bring more vibrancy. More housing would contribute to more amenities e.g. stores.
- b. Christine Hansen. Excelsior.
  - i. Balboa Reservoir is called surplus, but consider calling it change of use in this development plan. This space is already in use as a parking lot, it is not surplus. It was deemed surplus land during a bad period of CCSF's time.
- c. Monica Collins. Sunnyside.
  - i. Many students have kids; busses don't stop for them. Part-time teachers use this parking lot.
- d. Francine. Westwood Park.
  - i. Generally families with children don't stay in San Francisco. Affordable housing is a problem for the entire bay area; it's a regional issue and San Francisco should not be taking on the entire burden of solving the problem. I moved here for the lifestyle, detached single-family homes.
- e. Linda Judge. Westwood Park.
  - i. The 2008 TOD technical assistance panel document, I had not read this document before, and on page 4 CCSF has acknowledged they are supportive of the Balboa Park Station Area Plan. The proposal to increase density raised concerns regarding parking. Height increases were met with reservation. Point #1 decrease density.
- f. Hedda Thieme. Westwood Park.
  - i. Tech companies are disrupting the City. Shift the supply of housing towards Silicon Valley.
- g. Jennifer. Sunnyside.
  - i. The 12/14 CAC meeting is the first day of City College finals.
- h. Armand Domalewski. West Portal/Sunset Resident.
  - i. The City is a complicated place. As a City gets larger the demand for housing increases, every time you make a decision to not build means you are making San Francisco more expensive.
- i. Anita Theoharis. Westwood Park.
  - i. Continuing Linda Judge's comments. I was part of the community when the 2009 plan was developed. Please think about the livability for existing residents.
- j. Theodore Randolph. Excelsior.
  - i. Tech gets blamed for price increases. It's a problem that has been developing, even before the tech boom. SF, Silicon Valley, and the East Bay needs to build more housing.
- k. Laura Fry. Westwood Park.
  - i. Change "General Public Comments/Questions and Responses Matrix" to "Public Questions". The planner at the last meeting didn't address our

neighborhood at all. The presentation wasn't specific enough to this neighborhood. This presentation could have been given at meetings in any City in the world.

l. Aaron Goodman. District 11.

- i. Map from Affordable Housing Bonus Program [AHBP] shows 30,000 units could be provided throughout the City. Concerns with overall density being proposed. Where are we providing the proper balance?

m. Alvin Ja.

- i. Neighborhood character and urban design were just generalities. How will this project directly impact the neighborhood?

**4. Transportation: Background and Parameters. – see PDF presentation online (<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=4224>)**

a. CAC Discussion

- a. Chung. I like my car accessible from where I sleep, but I understand that conditions are changing.

- i. With new apartment buildings, what is the right ratio of units to parking spaces, and is that being done in the real world?

1. Peter Albert. With the right conditions (neighborhoods with transit and walking options) 1 carshare space can serve, on average, 12 households, under ideal conditions; the trend is however that 4 households will still buy personal vehicles. If the conditions are not ideal, the lowest is 4 households out of 12 will use carshare. These data are snapshots taken during in 2012 as the trends quickly progresses. The trend of carshare popularity could continue to grow.

- ii. What Current Muni busses currently serve CCSF, are there going to be more busses?

1. Albert. K Ingleside, J-Church, 43, 29-Sunset, 54-Felton, 8X; what programs are adding to make these lines more effective, increase transit times and frequency; TEP now MUNI Forward program, see map in presentation.

- iii. How many of those from CCSF park in the surrounding neighborhoods? Neighborhood preference for parking. How can neighborhood parking be managed with CCSF?

- b. Davila. I moved where I live in Mission Terrace because of the transportation and because I don't use my car. I feel unsafe on my bike on Ocean Ave.

- i. Walkability, explain presentation Slide 17 [principle 1, connect pedestrian routes]

1. Albert. Breaking down size of the block to create a grid that makes it easier and more appealing to walk ; San Francisco is fairly good at accomplishing this

- ii. Ocean Avenue Frontage for City College, how can that be solved as a barrier

1. Albert. Ocean Avenue presents many barriers to get from Balboa BART to Balboa Reservoir, e.g. the hill, sidewalk obstructions and limited right-of-way
- iii. There should be transit incentives for students; how realistic is this? SFSU has tried. There should be transit incentives for residents as well.
  1. Albert. USF has a Class Pass that is a part of student registration; it is a discount on transit. After implementation, more people started using public transit; it would be tricky for CCSF because they use primarily BART and a MUNI fast pass might not be as useful, Clipper changes this by possibly allowing transit discounts that can be applied to relevant transit services.
- c. Picar.
  - i. Real time information, where would this be posted?
    1. Albert. Place real time information at decision points; places where one would decide to travel to a transit line over another, based on which line departs soonest
- d. Winston.
  - i. Parking balance, not too much parking and not too little.
    1. Albert. If you know who you are building for, you can make an educated decision based on type: senior housing, students, or family
  - ii. What about CCSF pricing for parking? \$40.00 per semester, \$20.00 per semester receiving aid; SFSU \$560 per semester. How do you use pricing?
    1. Albert. TDM Study can help get at management solutions, including pricing; will help understand questions of parking supply and demand at different prices
    2. Martin. CCSF restricted by state law for what they can charge for parking.
  - iii. If you're charging for parking, does the money go back into parking management?
    1. It can. Revenue from SFSU Shuttle goes back into that program.
  - iv. Revenue from developer could be used to finance other transit initiatives (e.g. shuttles)
  - v. Transportation Sustainability Program – change in how environmental review is conducted.
    1. Albert. Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF), increases development impact fees by expanding fees to residential projects citywide.
- e. Favetti.
  - i. How will a TDM plan be updated? How will TDM be managed? Will there be a TDM manager?
    1. Albert. Mission Bay and Parkmerced have TDM plans and managers that direct transportation planning toward meeting

- targets (e.g. reducing vehicle miles traveled, reducing single occupant vehicles).
  - a. Favetti. Give example on how some TDM managers have succeeded.
  - 2. Martin. Responsibility of the developer, and a responsibility of the City to continue to monitor progress.
- ii. Access and egress. Extension of Lee and Brighton streets; add to parameters.
- iii. Will bike parking be aboveground, structure, or underground?
  - 1. Peter: Examples of all three; secure bike parking is the most important feature in case studies.
- iv. Good Signage for transit at e.g. Whole Foods, Next Bus
- v. When providing monthly transit passes is it every person in a household or just one per household? How is it funded?
  - 1. Albert. Design subsidy for transit based on how the project pencils
  - 2. Examples mentioned before include one per household
  - 3. Funding is penciled out by developer and up to the development agreement (DA) negotiation process
- vi. Bicycle repair facilities – is this an invitation of commercial development?
- vii. Flooding; example of a bulb-out which did not have sewer intake in front of it; any street design should think about permeability or where storm water will go. Plymouth Avenue floods frequently.
  - 1. Albert. Agreed, DPW is an important partner in street design
- viii. TDM – How will this impact areas outside of the development? Who will be managing impacts outside of the development?
  - 1. Albert. If TDM programs are too insular they can do more damage. Emeryville go around is a great example of how a private TDM requirement can benefit residents and workers beyond the development site
  - 2. Martin. In addition to TDM requirements for Balboa Reservoir, Planning will lead a TDM study to address needs for surrounding neighborhoods. CCSF and the reservoir site. Findings and recommendations can be incorporated into the reservoir DA
- ix. Underground the K-Ingleside
- f. Muehlbauer.
  - i. We need an idea of the main streets. It's difficult to understand the project beyond the abstract without a clear idea of what is proposed on the site.
- g. Lee.
  - i. Signage and bicycling lanes; I haven't missed one meeting and I biked to the first meeting. Once I left the BART station bike signage was confusing and I ended up having to walk my bike, and I took complicated routes with unnecessary crossings.

- ii. Pavement creates a storm water issue and there should be coordination with SFPUC.
  - 1. Shaw. SFPUC has rigorous standards for storm water management. There are many projects taking place in the neighborhood now to improve flooding (e.g. Hollaway). Further information can be found in the project links in the meeting memo packet.
- h. Spinali.
  - i. We have to think about the larger collective set of interconnected systems. We have to create a process to address all of the issues. There should be an overarching piece of the principles dealing with all the different pieces. Transportation has to be in conjunction with CCSF because parking is so important to the students. CCSF student is different than a student at SFSU or USF; figuring out childcare on site might be a very effective way to alleviate transit issues, more than bike lanes; target mitigations to users; need to more clearly understand demographic instead of proving faux-solutions that don't necessarily help the affected demographic
    - 1. Albert. When you talk about TDM you have users make choices they want rather than choices they have to.
  - ii. Ordering of the principles, we should be leading with number three about parking because of its impact. Stake in the ground in order to understand. # 4 is a "nice to have" but it could be eliminated (or should be 3, 2, and 1); there is a lot of City investment. I don't want to pass things over to developers if it's really the City's responsibility. Phelan Avenue needs to be fixed now, without this it will cause more community ill will; make Phelan Avenue work better.
  - iii. Principle 1a. "providing the right number of cut outs"
  - iv. Principle 1c. 5 schools in the immediate vicinity; how do we balance the two TDMs?
    - 1. Martin. We can expand the issues that the developers need to address; Venn diagram of issues specific to multiple groups
  - v. Principle 1d. More bike connections; SF Better Street Plans
  - vi. Principle 2a. In the 60% break down what is the breakdown of the mode share?
  - vii. Principle 2. Carshare. If you're a working person and you take your car to work, your spot becomes open; a formal carshare program could be useful at CCSF; when people are working and driving to their jobs, their spots could be available to students or other users who are there for the day and vacate the spot for those returning from work; we need the data to support usage habits in the neighborhoods.
  - viii. Consider a Shuttle program
    - ix. Principle 3. Ensure we have the appropriate supply of parking for our residents; we want the right amount of parking and we're going to be smart about it. We want to recommend 1 spot per unit. We need the one

spot per unit if we're really building for families. 0.5 spots/per unit: What housing stock will look like and the requisite parking for that. Right housing to meeting the right customer.

- x. Principle 3e. Parking should be at affordable rates; just like housing. It should be staggered and commensurate if you're owning your home or renting; appropriate for the level of income for that family.
- xi. MTA is looking at residential parking permit pilot programs. Sunnyside asked to be a part of it. I want to ensure we've elevated that: residential parking permit.

b. Public Comment.

a. Craig Persiko. CCSF.

- i. 3.v. I have two children and a husband and we went 10 years without a car in the Castro. Transit and city carshare nearby, but it eventually became necessary to get a car, but it is doable without. You're targeting middle-income people where parking is expensive. You're targeting a higher-income demographic when you have parking. If people want to be here but don't want a car you're targeting more moderate incomes.

b. CCSF.

- i. Transportation should have been given a more prominent role; parking should be listed second to emphasize priority. 1a – Streets adjacent to the property are at capacity. Neighbors in Sunnyside and Westwood Park have to deal with the overflow. Phelan and Ocean Avenue are the main arteries and are at capacity.

c. Bob Burn. Sunnyside.

- i. With proximity to CCSF, pedestrian bicyclists need more routes. There is a need for High-visibility sidewalks and traffic calming measures.

d. Ellen Wall. Sunnyside.

- i. Transportation is a vast problem in my neighborhood. [see attached submitted written comment]

e. Chris Hansen. CCSF.

- i. Principle 3. Performing arts center should have been built by now. Thank you for mentioning that the students need to be surveyed. 40,000 students have disappeared. I drive by SFSU, they park on Junipero Serra.

f. Hedda Thieme. Westwood Park.

- i. I walk everywhere. I am concerned for my safety constantly especially when crossing Geneva. We are discussing transportation at great length but the outcome is not guaranteed. Ocean Avenue is a through street, and there are banklets [parklets], which are very unsafe; example, parklet in front of library.

g. Bill Thompson. Westwood Highlands.

- i. Open site up for walking to Balboa Park Station. Connecting this area with area across of 280. No deck as suggested in Balboa Park Station plan. Safety on Ocean Avenue is paramount. LRV and cars share the street; cars don't respect the yield even with transit islands. More traffic flowing on

Ocean is a big concern. I want to see the transportation improvements start now.

- h. Geri Vahey. Sunnyside.
  - i. Two students were hit and killed recently; one by MUNI last year. It's hard to have faith that you all can fix this. When I hear you want to make it more congested, I can't believe it.
- i. Jennifer. Sunnyside.
  - i. Surveys – concerns of Balboa Reservoir development: congestion and parking. Principle 1, congestion and parking in Sunnyside streets and pedestrian paths, included in safety. Safe bicycle connections; replace existing bike lane. Electric chargers for vehicles; minimum of 220 volt outlets; facilitate adoption of 110 volt for two-wheeled.
- j. David. Westwood Park.
  - i. We are concerned about the congestion. Principle 3b. How we do this will determine a lot, who is attracted, and who is coming to the site?
- k. Theodore. Excelsior.
  - i. I bike on Ocean. Shared spaces would have adequate bike parking for activities there. When there is a softball game, there isn't adequate parking. Cars should be discouraged.
- l. Armand Domalewski. Sunset/West Portal.
  - i. More money used on parking there is less subsidy for middle income to support firefighters and those income-levels that need housing. More parking incentivizes more driving.
- m. Yonathan Randolph. Ingleside. (COMMENT AMENDED BY ATTACHMENT)
  - i. Did not grow up with access to a vehicle. Millennials tend to not drive.
- n. Aaron Goodman. D11.
  - i. Sent report that identifies all of the intersections that children use. Study doesn't deal with it in a larger context. SFSU needs more funding.
- o. Francine. Westwood Park.
  - i. Not enough time to make public comment. At least one parking space per unit. Not clear on bundling issue; I thought the City required unbundled parking. Why would I pay for a parking space/stall? You're not incentivizing people to stop driving by having to pay for parking if they can park on the street for free. Bad behavior with bikes. Public education needed for drivers and cyclists to improve safety.
- p. Alvin Ja.
  - i. I'm a senior citizen and I never owned a car until I was 27. I'm a minimalist. I park one car in my garage; not a car zealot. You're just concerned about the project folks. You're not concerned with impacts on folks outside of the project. Project folks need to adjust to the needs of the surrounding community.
- q. Burt Hill. Westwood Park.



- i. Primary mode of transportation is a bike. Dense community can have a variety of shapes and sizes. Multitude of options. Difficult to make a left turn on Ocean.
  - r. Laura Frye. Westwood Park.
    - i. No east west access across the new development. Westwood Park doesn't have east west connections and it is traffic calming. No connections for cars within the development itself. Curved street help with the wind and creates a nice feeling. 3a. Please clarify, is 60% automobile mode share of the 0.5 parking spaces? This would result in less than 0.25 spaces per unit. Moderate income families, one parking space per unit. People will still buy cars if they don't have a space.
  - s. Gene Loffrey.
    - i. Contacted Norman Yee and transferred to SFMTA re: traffic congestion. I lack confidence that the problem is going to be resolved by the developer. I want the project fixed now before the developer is involved; otherwise we're digging into the developer's profit margin. It's up to the City to fix the problems now. 280 is a scar. The 280 on-ramp is a bottle neck.
  - t. Harry Bernstein. CCSF. (COMMENT AMENDED BY ATTACHMENT)
    - i. Reverse priority of principles. Performing Arts Center needs to be constructed. What are you asking for and who are you talking to?
  - u. Frank Kalmar. Westwood Park.
    - i. I can remember when there were no cars parked on the streets. 4 grocery stores on Monterey Blvd., people walked everywhere. If you want to walk, the most basic thing hasn't been addressed, walking. We need to have these issues addressed before this project starts.
  - v. Clarita Natividad. Westwood Park.
    - i. Everything is imbalanced. I'm here to ask for everyone else. Traffic and safety. I live on Plymouth and I have a mentally-disabled dependent. Plymouth is the only block that is all-day parking, not 2-hour parking.
- c. CAC
  - a. Winston.
    - i. I don't want to force people out of their cars.
    - ii. The two things people are concerned about tonight work against each other: parking creates traffic. We have so much traffic coming in and out of the CCSF parking lot; there is too much traffic already. 1800 parking spots on the site and they're generating traffic. They all have to go down Phelan. I want to replace some of that parking with housing. I want to improve the walk to BART.
    - iii. 0.5 parking spaces per unit is right on the mark with me. 60% of Boston millennials want better transit and more walkable cities, 25% want easier parking.
    - iv. We can mitigate impacts with neighborhood parking rules, pricing and metered parking.

- b. Davila.
  - i. There could be more congestion. Look at different ways to resolve this.
  - ii. The average student I teach was born in 1995. People are open to a lot of different things.
  - iii. When it's easier to walk or bike, I do it. I moved to Mission Terrace so I didn't have to drive anymore.
  - iv. Performing Arts Center will be built. In regards to that, I want to see a green parking structure. Discussed with Chancellor. Possibly locating the police station there.
- c. Chung.
  - i. I see the parking issue both ways. We have resources with the City with best practices and projects that have already worked. We need to have the data. We're not ready to make a decision on what the ratio should be without the data.
  - ii. Encourage bicycling as much as possible.
- d. Lee.
  - i. Electric Bike Transportation and charging stations should be included throughout
- e. Muehlbauer.
  - i. I have two millennial children, neither drive. This area used to be called Interstate Ocean Avenue and it's improved since then.
  - ii. How will we improve transportation when all the neighborhoods are at capacity?
  - iii. Get to a point when the first thing we don't grab is not car keys.
- f. Spinali.
  - i. What do we do now? There are specific spots that can be addressed.
  - ii. What's the Ocean Avenue plan for safety?
  - iii. Public Transportation doesn't serve where I go.

**6. Partnership Updates.**

- a. None

**7. Close of Meeting.**

**8. Adjournment.**

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

Harry

November 30, 2015

p. 9

AS IS, MY COMMENTS DON'T MAKE SENSE

i. Reverse priority of principles. Performing Arts Center needs to be constructed. What are you asking for and who are you talking to?

[left out the specifics that two of the principal CCSF people in charge of facilities were Fred Sturner, a Director of Facilities Planning and Construction, who was fired earlier this month, and Mark Zacovic, an interim Vice-Chancellor of Finance and Administration who is expected the leave towards the end of the year.]

This is my full statement:

As Sunnyside resident aj has noted, your transportation Principles and Parameters should reverse the priority of trying to place the burden of traffic and parking inadequacies on the existing residential communities and on the College's students, faculty and staff.

I agree with a previous speaker that the CCSF Performing Arts Education Center, which is continuing to be planned, needs to have been considered in the 2014 draft plan of the SFPUC. The requirements for this facility, twice approved by the voters, needs to be accommodated in the immediate future, including access and its parking needs before a new housing project is added on an adjacent lot that has been termed surplus. This arts facility will be an asset to the College and to the surrounding Ocean Avenue district.

Peter and Jeremy have made references to working with City College in terms of how the College will be using its space and working out relations with the surrounding neighborhoods and with the proposed Balboa Reservoir projects. Who is the contact that anyone is expecting to make decisions or coordinate in lockstep with City College? Fred Sturner, the Director of Facilities Planning and Construction, who was working on the City College facilities master plan, was fired less than a month ago. Mark Zacovic, the

Vice-Chancellor of Finance and Administration, whose responsibilities include planning, is only an interim administrator who may be departing at the end of the year. The means for CCSF faculty, students and staff to get their ideas considered by administration is inadequate--which is why it's unclear who is responsible for the planning you have requested. The administration is seeking a 26% reduction of classes and hence faculty over the next few years.

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

=====

December 14, 2015

Page 5 of 31

comment from Harry Bernstein

k. Harry Bernstein. D11 Resident. Instructor.

-- changes I want to make:

Then during the war there was building on it for a WACs barrack.

This should have been WAVES barracks.

-----

i.

I have a comment about the legitimacy of these meetings. I understand that the land at the

(incorrect transcription) reservoir site had <sup>originally</sup> ~~recently~~ been owned by the Spring Valley water company. Then during

the war there was building on it for a <sup>WAVES Training Facility</sup> ~~WACs barrack~~. And then after the war that left

those buildings were temporary, they were given to the college as the college was really

exploded since it was established in 1940. There was even a thousand seat auditorium.

Until the mid-50s and by prior agreement those properties were torn down. At that time I

understand the PUC develop needs I'm not sure if it was water storage or some kind of

nuclear threat and they needed the land for something. Essential agreement was the PUC

no longer needed the land for any other purposes it claimed. Then the land would revert

would be returned to the college. Let me repeat that. The land the PUC didn't need would

be returned to the college. I've seen college planning documents showing 2015 projected

**Wong, Phillip (ECN)**

---

**From:** Yonathan <yonathan@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 10, 2016 9:35 AM  
**To:** BRCAC (ECN)  
**Subject:** Nov 30 minutes correction

Within the Nov 30, 2015 Transportation meeting minutes, I am disappointed at the summary of my comment, which to my memory misses the main thrust of my comment. The summary reads, "Did not grow up with access to a vehicle. Millennials tend to not drive." I would appreciate it if you change my summary in the minutes to the following:

More and more millennial households are happy to live in the City with no cars when they are allowed no parking. Since we are concerned about automobile congestion, the number of cars that new residents bring to the Balboa Reservoir absolutely should be limited. However, the number of car-free households should not be limited; car-free households put far less pressure on the transportation system. Therefore, I support principle 3.b (at most 0.5 parking spots per housing unit) and support adding more housing units as long as the number of cars is capped.

Yonathan Randolph

p.s. Is there an audio recording for this meeting?