

**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, December 14, 2015
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 included as attachments.

Committee Members Present:

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

Committee Members Absent:

Maria Picar

Staff Present:

Jeremy Shaw, Lisa Fisher, Planning Department; Emily Lesk, Mike Martin, Phillip Wong, Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Craig Freeman, SF Public Utilities Commission; Matthias Mormino, Office of District 7 Supervisor Norman Yee

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

- a. Roll Call

2. Opening of Meeting. (Action Item)

- a. Amendments to 11/5 minutes.
 - i. Kate Favetti. Correct spelling of Anita T-H-E-O-H-A-R-I-S on page 14.

- ii. In the absence of hardcopy of minutes for 11/5 and 11/30 this evening, they will be provided at 1/11/16 meeting and amendments and approvals will be continued to the 1/11/16 meeting.
- b. Review of Agenda
- c. Review of Ground Rules
- d. Emily Lesk. Overview of upcoming meetings.
- e. Visit www.sf-planning.org/brcac to view all documents.

3. General Public Comment.

- a. Madeleine Mueller. CCSF Faculty.
 - i. Mine is more of a question a research question. In the statistics we've had about needs for housing units, who does and do we have the statistics of units in the City. Anyway my question is do we have the statistics for how many units in the City are empty? Or perhaps part of speculation? Driving prices up and so forth. I hear this but I don't have a number so I don't know who would research that.
- b. Mario Damira. Filipino Community Center; District 11 Alliance - Communities United for Health and Justice (CUHJ)
 - i. I just want to touch briefly on an affordable housing survey we conducted this year. Around 300 people being surveyed. And my community partners will talk a little bit community about the survey. But we're really here to call upon the fact that we know the presentation that affordable housing is a major issue. Not just for particular neighborhoods but the entire city. And this land that's owned by the PUC, the 17 acres, should be seen as a vital resource for the greater San Francisco community at large and we're really pushing for the maximized amount of affordable housing we can provide for our community. As touched upon in the presentation, that class of people that are service workers, the construction workers, the low wage workers that are with families that are striving to survive in the city. Since this is a city asset, they should prioritize those types of needs. We all know there is way too much market development built right now. The 15 or 12 percent inclusionary rule that applies to these development is not enough and will not address the need. With development like this with this amount of land that's available we need to come together to push as much as we possibly can. Also with the basic principle that this is a public resource and not private land.
- c. Kevine Boggess. Director of Policy, Coleman Advocates. CUHJ.
 - i. We work with the parents of elementary school kids in the public schools here in San Francisco and high school students. We help them work to improve their schools and community and I'm here to also represent CUHJ. I'm going to ask that you prioritize affordability and try to find a way to make sure this project is a hundred percent affordable. And for us we're really looking at affordability meaning 33 percent for low income families; people who make under 56 thousand dollars. 33 percent for low income people; who make a hundred thousand dollars, and 33 percent for moderate income people who make

\$120,000. To make sure we're catching the heart of San Francisco that doesn't have access to housing there's a lot of emphasis now being put on people making a hundred thousand dollars and making sure their housing needs are met. Our constituency, a lot of hard working parents, couldn't afford that still. Really trying to make sure we're prioritizing the community in San Francisco of all the income levels so people who grew up here, and live here, and are part of this community can stay a part.

d. Lily Wong. Program Manager, CUHJ.

- i. Here to talk about affordable housing and making sure we have enough affordability for working class people in San Francisco. So I know Mario mentioned our survey. We did survey 310 people all over this immediate area. And these people represent everybody that could not make it out here. These are working class people. These are people that have families that they have to take care of in the evenings. People who are just trying to survive in San Francisco. And we know that in San Francisco it's very hard to survive. It's increasingly more expensive for people to live here. And we want to make sure that housing, if it's built here with such a huge opportunity site right next to us that you think about working class families and people that are low income. Because they are the back bones of the city. We wanted to make sure impacted community are at the table. I know the citizen's advisory committee and these head of committees are open for people to come in and talk. We want to make sure it's open for everyone and more people are involved and can even make selections of who the developers are. What does it look like? It's one thing to make affordable housing for the people. It's another thing to have the people tell you what they need.

e. Aaron Goodman. D11 Resident. Seat 8, Balboa Park Station CAC.

- i. I sent you an email on the CAC ground rule that says make time to listen. 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 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. You open the door. You make it an open competition. 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 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, additional public ideas. We submitted comments earlier tonight.

f. John Hayes. Student, CCSF (City College).

- i. There is a lot of discussion in our discussion board about a city CCSF administration consortium that's been talking about this issue. And I know nothing about this consortium except some of the names I see. And I don't think

it's appropriate that this sort of planning goes on not being in the limelight. And I know that some of the people on the planning department are there. I know some of our administrators are there. And I just I wanted it on the record that this is said to be going on and I don't think it's a proper strategy for handling these sorts of things. I think we need to be more open about the whole process and go to the fact to the Academic Senate and go to student government. And I think and I'm glad to see we have a member of our board here tonight. And we need to make sure that CCSF is fully represented as this process goes forward and I'm not sure it has been.

g. Abby. Student, City College.

- i. I wanted to reiterate the points for the need for affordable housing and this means 33 percent housing for very low income, low income, and moderate income. I don't think there should be housing for market rate. We've seen plenty of that and we don't need it for this space. Especially since this is our land, this is public land I don't think we should be planning for the people of San Francisco and not for profits. And I don't think that one of our main parameters should be offering a bid for the land at market value. I think this is our land and we should and we have a special opportunity here to have this type of planning for this land. And this is a control we don't have over a lot of land that San Francisco has because a lot of it has been already bought by developers.

h. Charlie. PODER. CUHJ.

- i. We were involved in alternative model for community planning. Basically we felt there was a real important need to really engage impacted community members in this district around development of public land so we went door to door. Literally in the Lakeview, the Ocean View, the Outer (edited per Harry Bernstein at 1/11/16 meeting) Mission, the Excelsior, we knocked on people's doors. We talked to grandmothers, we talked to Filipino black elders, and we talked to high school youth. And we engaged them around affordable housing (edited per Harry Bernstein at 1/11/16 meeting) community planning decision making and we learned so much from that process and we feel like that wisdom should be reflected in the thinking around development for the Balboa Reservoir. We felt that the threshold for affordability for this project has been set way too low. It's unconscionable for public land, a community resource that we should think about market rate development. 33 percent for public land it makes no sense. I don't know if anybody would agree 33 percent is a goal that we should be fighting for. We also feel that decision shouldn't be left up to a developer. We shouldn't issue an RFP and have a developer come up with their ideas for what they'd like to see. We as a community should make that our diverse needs are reflected in the set of values in the RFP that are also prescriptive for the kind of affordability that we need that can serve a range of diverse incomes from the very low, to low, to moderate income folks. And lastly I want to say we also are here in solidarity with our brothers and sisters of City College, the students, the faculty that also have tremendous stake in development of the site and have needs for community infrastructure and feel

like those aren't competing needs. Opportunity for community-based development that meets affordability and the needs of the college.

- i. Dana J. Labrecque. Faculty, CCSF. Vice President, Academic Senate.
 - i. I'd like to speak about the representation of voices of the college and what I also have seen and that you student John Hayes for bringing that up as that's what I'm going to speak about. I have seen some names of people who will be speaking or maybe have been speaking e-mails possibly some meetings that are not part of these types of forums and they don't represent the college voice. In fact, they're hired people that have come in since 2012, and most of them in 2013-14. We have been spoken for, the faculty, the students, and the staff have had people speaking supposedly on our behalf. They don't represent us, they don't have our voice, and they don't have the same concerns we do for decades (edited per Harry Bernstein at 1/11/16 meeting). What I'd like to urge you to do is contact the Associated Students, the Academic Senate, and the classified Senate. And make sure the Board of Trustees is all together on this so you understand what the true repercussions would be for the college because we are the voices of the college.
- j. Christine Hanson.
 - i. The land right now is held in Public trust and to sell it for a profit and try to create housing on that basis is to completely deny the fact that right now it belongs to the public. If any housing goes onto the reservoir it should be completely 100 percent affordable created by a nonprofit. It should not go to even if it's the middle income people that make a 180 thousand dollars a year are not, should not be in an affordable housing group. And I'd also like to point out that the special trustee that was first instituted at City College was a one that unilaterally canceled the performing arts center which was a shovel ready gold LEED building we had spent, the taxpayers have already spent 26 million dollars to bring to that status. The idea that a continuation of that group should be working with the mayor's office to advise you about what City College needs is ridiculous.
- k. Harry Bernstein. D11 Resident. Instructor.
 - i. I have a comment about the legitimacy of these meetings. I understand that the land at the reservoir site had recently been owned by the Spring Valley water company. Then during the war there was building on it for a WACs Waves (edited per Harry Bernstein at 1/11/16 meeting)-barrack. And then after the war that left those buildings were temporary, they were given to the college as the college it was really exploded-exploding (edited per Harry Bernstein at 1/11/16 meeting) 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 developed 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 build out covers the west campus. This whole area. So, when the PUC declared the land surplus in 2012 the understanding that the land should revert to the college, what happened to that and why isn't that on the table? We're only talking about how to sell this how to give for-profit housing. Let's have the full story.

l. Maximillian Walt. Ingleside Resident.

- i. I agree with everything I've heard tonight. If there is going to be building it should be affordable housing. My question about affordable housing, I do have a question about that. When these buildings were built over here on Ocean Avenue, I went to some of those meetings. And some of those were supposed to be affordable housing. And I went and looked at them a couple years ago and asked how much the rents were and they were very high. And I understood that they were considered affordable for maybe one year and then you raise the rates. So I just had never heard of that happening. I thought if it was affordable it stays affordable. It doesn't keep going up so I don't think what happened there. The other issue is green space. There was supposed to be green space over here. There isn't any. I understand what they call open space people think its green. It's not. An open space can be almost anything but it doesn't require. We need some trees. We need some greenery some, park areas.

m. Laura Frye.

- i. Recommend to the city to honor the 2009 Balboa Park Station area plan and the 2014-2015 housing element and not exceed the limits. The 2009 plan calls for a maximum of 40 feet height with 60 foot height on the eastern portion and 2014-2015 housing element, which is very recent, calls for 425 units if housing is built there. I have a copy of the housing element thing for you guys that shows that. All around the area again is 40 feet and east west, south north it's all 40 feet. The commercial core door which is 55 feet. Even the reservoir and that 40 foot limit would provide that and it would be a better thing for will whole area as well. Also other less like the traffic, open space, and stuff like that. I have contacted mayor's office regarding housing policies and they helped create the lack of housing and they have not responded to me yet. Again some of the housing policies are creating the problems and shortages. I also want to point out that the initial survey did not dress density or height at all. Just talked about housing and open spaces and stuff like that so people did not have a chance to really chime in what kind of density or height would really be too much. And I was a little confused beginning by Mr. Martin's comments about the 65 things on the parameters. That's a hard fact.

n. Donna Hayes. Counseling Faculty, CCSF.

- i. I'm not going to repeat some ideas and concerns that have been brought up. My concern is more about the fast tracking of this project. I've been at other meetings. There has been discussion about it but I think that this group it would be interesting to hear why this is being fast tracked. I have my suspicions and my concerns and I think they should be openly addressed.

- o. Geri Vahey. Sunnyside Resident.
 - i. I want to reiterate how crowded the neighborhood is now with respect to getting around. If you look at any road Phelan, Ocean any of the exits onto San Jose avenue it is incredibly hard to get around all the surrounding neighborhoods right now. So before we can even have a discussion about what number of families and units to add, I'm really hoping that a traffic survey is done first and of course the flood water all that thing and sustainability. K is a mess it's hard to get on at rush hour including downtown to go home. So big, big problems. You can't just plant thousands more people without looking at the state of things now. And I also wanted to reiterate about the low-income housing not being low-income in perpetuity. This is an outrage. You hear about low-income condos that are sold to the highest bidder as soon as the original tenant wants to move. This is our tax dollars. Clearly we need to do something to have more housing in the city but we need to protect it for people in perpetuity.
- p. Sidney Cass. Glen Park.
 - i. I would like to find out that we're really going overboard on housing. It is completely true no one can deny that there is a tremendous housing shortage. This has become the most expensive city in the country I believe it rivals New York and Manhattan. However, I would like to point out that education is really important and we are not talking about it here and we're not talking about City College. I would tell someone like the speaker on behalf of the Filipino community. Your kids are going to grow up. They're going to want to go to college. This should be the best college available. San Francisco is growing. It would be more people and more students. I believe you're going to have a speaker from... who has worked on the master plans. All the master plans of City College have always included the reservoir. It's really stuck in a bad place right now and very political because of the performing arts center, which was supposed to be built a long time ago. However, my bottom line is I hope everything you're doing I hate to say this but everything you are doing is a waste of time because if we do the right thing we're going to leave that land for City College and not come up with different plans for it.
- q. Resident.
 - i. (In Spanish, interpretation) I'd like to thank everyone for being here. And for the opportunity to share our opinion of what's happening here. And just take into account if everyone is given an opinion taking a positive view of things it would really help. Because all of us that are looking for some sort of housing that's comfortable for us is something. Because due to our current income that we have it makes it extremely difficult to find housing that could be comfortable to accommodate to our needs. My opinion on this is if there is housing that there should be housing for rent and there also should be housing for rent to buy. Because I feel that our effort should be for something, not spend our income or what we earn on something that you know is going to be thrown away. Because some of us have rents that are not just for one year but for 5, 10, 15 years.

Because in my opinion I think the project is a good thing. Reality we all need a place to live. Regardless. That's it.

r. Maria

- i. (In Spanish, interpretation) I've been living here for 15 years. And those 15 years I have a rent of about a thousand dollars a month. So we make numbers on how much I've been paying for all these years. I work for the community of San Antonio. I have applied for low-income housing. And up to this point I have made no headway whatsoever. As a person of 70 years old, there is not a lot we can do. We make the struggle but it's something we can't because when you are taking into consideration low income and putting that low income at 40 thousand that's approachable for us. For people like me that want to live with our kids because we want, we don't want to be a weight for anyone. It's sad we can't achieve some decent living for ourselves. I've been living in this area for ten years. And I wouldn't want to change because I like this place. And I will like to continue to be useful for the community that they serve.

4. Sustainability Parameters. – see PDF presentation online (www.sf-planning.org/brcac)

a. CAC Discussion

i. Rebecca Lee

1. With regards, on the aspect of water, the SFPUC CAC has in the past supported water metering which allowed each individual housing unit to have the capability of each knowing how much water they're using so that is a commonly sort of respective water conservation measure. I wanted to take that up as a potential aspect to consider.
2. My second comment was on the waste management aspect of, does the parameters contemplate the waste stream from the construction process? Or is it just for the operation?
 1. Lisa Fisher. The city has strict guidelines about construction waste and any projects have to put together you know very strict programs about what are they doing with their demolition? How are they avoiding dust so we really try to focus on the ways that we're trying to kind of answer to the current regulations in really interesting ways? This project of course would have to meet all city requirements in every category which would be quite a long presentation.

ii. Davila.

1. John Rizzo another on the Board of Trustees and I attended a campus sustainability conference at San Francisco State last summer so we're very interested as are other members of the Board of Trustees. And I had a question about this though. One of the things I see there is a lot of really great ideas in here. But as the parking lot is now, it is not very sustainable. That's my understanding for a parking lot to actually be sustainable and green it would have to be pebbles and not asphalt is

that correct? Regarding permeable paving, right now we do not have a sustainable facility, even if we did have that.

1. Lisa. Definitely in the memo we talk about in materials that you know any areas that we have the opportunity to repave and it's not the actual you can't really use permeable paving that easily on through driving areas. But definitely in open spaces and parking spaces in those areas it would be, we are encouraging that as an innovation point that people look or kind of show us to the maximum extent they can use those types of materials.
 2. And along the same linings I know that wind turbines have come a long way. This is a particularly windy areas as the residents of Sunnyside can probably attest to. Is there any way to harness that as part of anything that we end up doing here? What happened?
 1. Our idea from the beginning of the presentation about energy being this kind of 3 step process, first you know how efficient, maximize the efficiency of your building and second how much energy can you produce on site. It's not limited to solar. So I think if people you know and their proposals could show wind energy is the way to go or geothermal. City College is already doing in one of their buildings. Is it this building? We're definitely trying not to preclude any of the best, most efficient ideas.
 3. I know there is a problem here with the whining of the turbines. It's been a few years and every new generation provides better and better green types of implements for buildings. So I'm wondering if that's a possibility now. Because it hasn't work out to the -- it hasn't work out as much as we'd hoped in the past.
 1. Yeah I'm definitely not a wind engineer but I think just to kind of go back to the beginning the main thing we're focusing on is how can we create a framework for the RFP and RFQ that direct very high standards but are very open to greatest innovations? And so I feel like we're a few steps away from understanding what is the best renewable energy, but any sort of proposal would have to go through CEQA and there will be countless meetings about all of that I'm sure.
- iii. Muehlbauer.
1. My first comment, this is a really rigorous set of standards. Well analyzed, great presentation, too.
 2. When you look at innovative technologies I think we have to look to the long-term too. It's great when it new. Particularly when you look at living walls, green roofs. Looks great when it's new but what does it look like in 5 or ten years? We have examples in this neighborhood showing it can look terrible. So and can add to the long-term cost and up-keep. So that was my main comment.

3. But other than that when you talk about inter departmental collaboration I wonder if you can tell us whose representing this interdepartmental collaboration because I hear a lot about that. Sounds like a catch word but doesn't always come out in the wash so maybe you can elaborate about how these standards have come about.
 1. Lisa Fisher. To focus on the sustainability strategy. We've been working with the Department of the Environment on the Better Roofs policy along with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and also with the SFPUC. So I would say those are the main in terms of you know the whole idea with solar and living roofs the planning department actually drafted a living roofs manual. And definitely in terms of you know thinking about Balboa we've been working with the PUC and our colleagues on how we can best answer to the current regulations in a way that really benefits any future user of the site as well as the surrounding neighborhood. And I meant to mention earlier in a way that maintains the affordability. So I think that's a big -- we are really working hard at the city department and I can only speak for my own personal engagement. But we're working really hard that being green isn't something that's only on very expensive real estate. It's actually more critical in affordable house that you have lower utility bills. So we're really committed to figuring out that puzzle. And making sure that the same great indoor air quality is available for every type of development no matter if its market rate or
- iv. Kate Favetti.
 1. I'm agreeing with what Robert is saying regarding green walls and green roofs, it's important to look in the long-term but also for the general plan.
 2. I would like to add with regard to permeability, I think it's important we also take a look at our sidewalks. And put them in the permeable aspect as far as making sure that they can also absorb the water. I was looking at the flood or not the flood, the rain this weekend. And within a couple of minutes the streets were all pretty well flooded. And so since we are a DPW representative and we have a collaborative effort, Planning Department.
 1. Lisa Fisher. We are working with DPW.
 3. We should be having things like bulb-outs as far as the permeable sidewalks and to make sure we have our drains before the bulb out and not afterwards. Just as far as that and embedding solar I want to see what are the examples you had on the slides with the terracotta roof? The solar panels were in the squares. I was looking at the idea of

embedded solar in the tile itself. It becomes part of the tile. I think I've seen in some building actually they were recently affordable housing.

1. Lisa Fisher. Yeah there is that too. And I think definitely as these proposals evolve how can we get the most efficient in terms of renewable energy generation in a way that is also aesthetically pleasing? And provides the co-benefits like greening? And all of that.

v. Spinali.

1. One that I agree with the two previous comments it's got to be green for this neighborhood which has a special unique weather climate to it. And which is great and challenging.
2. The second is that I don't know if this belongs in the community benefits where to put this in the principles but given that so much of this particularly this parameter is so much about the future for workforce development, this is a growing field. I wonder how we think about partnering with City College as a part of the design for this for actual jobs and how do we build that in so we are training the next generation of green workers as a part of I don't know what the certificate program is at City College right now but that might be an interesting partnership to think about. And that's it.

b. Public Comment.

i. Ray Kutz. Sunnyside.

1. Principle number 1 energy. Wanted to make sure that we have power sources here. If there is a concern about using too much power I want to err on the side of using too much power for electric vehicles because that is very sustainable and it's only going to get cleaner especially when we have zero energy sources?
2. Number 2 Strong storm water I think you have that covered. I don't think you would design anything that would have standing water for mosquitos to breed in or attract other varmints. Water I have a question about district-scale what does that mean? That was used in your presentation and it was also in the principles. And that probably would help the CAC in their deliberations.
3. Principle 3. What is district scale?
4. Principle 4 ecology greening. Want to reiterate the challenge of green blooms in this neighborhood. If you are going to do anything a green roof is a solar roof.
5. And then principal number 5 air quality. Again I want to come back to zero emission vehicles. And making sure we have at least 110 voltage for all parking spaces so at least everybody has a place to charge.

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 gridded street pattern? That's a concern and something we can look at as an option. There's another issue here, we have the SFPUC where they had multiple water gains where SFSU as well as at Golden Gate park and during that 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 bring it down to 1 site 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 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 that is a key thing. Enforcements of speed as a transit issue and we also have to have enforcement of idling 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 realize that.

iii. Jennifer. Sunnyside.

1. We enthusiastically support the inclusion of energy efficient methods in particular parking outlets for EVs. EV parking on the site. There's still compelling reasons to drive cars and this location is well suited to supporting electric cars because of the short distance to the freeway.
2. 2.c. and 6.d. I asked like Ray we wanted to be very clear on what district scale means and how many units are required to make this designation.
3. For 4.c. we'd like to minimize landscaping on roofs and instead prioritize energy production and storm water management for roofs rather than green roof objectives. This windy locations is not ideal for purposes on roofs such as useable open space and growing trees.

iv. Edina Parnell

1. I was noticing that you are talking about the energy efficiency and the affordable housing and all of that. My question is this actually a proposal? Something you are talking about in theory or is this project actually going to go ahead and go through? Just because it looks like so

much planning went into it almost like it's already a done deal. That's just my question.

1. Spinali. We tended to not answer we tried to be fair and I think we'll move to the CCSF. 7 or 8 people nodding their heads and chuckling. The principles are being designed so that somebody who wants to develop the property which can be a nonprofit or for profit developers would have these as the parameters to put together the design of what they can offer up in response to the request for proposals. So they would put a proposal together. And it wouldn't be that they would utilize everything that you've seen but to give them as a framework and how many elements for example of what we just heard could be included in the design? So really is about giving a direction to go. And it's the developers to come back with the idea of how they might incorporate it with the purposes of the principles. That's why we're doing this work. It's not a done deal and people heard me say this before. We've laid out a lot of difference aspects of it. There is some pretty high expectations. I have a question about if anyone is going to touch it because we have so many things we're putting in as requirements that we want to see happen with it. We'll see happens and I'm sorry the Planning department if that makes you anxious but we're trying to have good expectations of what we want the principles to be that are really informed by the community. The question of height limit all of these pee are very important components but it's not a done deal by any stretch.

v. Lisa Fisher.

1. So just real quick I'm sorry I was using the word district scale and didn't explain that well enough. The idea is looking beyond an individual building having to deal with its systems within its own building. So for example it could be 2 or 3 buildings that are clustered around underground non-potable water system it would be much more efficient for those buildings to kind of all team up. And kind of have 1 system they're all plugging into rather than each of them trying to create their own individual systems. You probably have seen it also the idea of solar where maybe there is a larger building that can actually produce a lot of solar and then there are buildings maybe that are shadowed or something else that can actually hook into that energy. So that's kind of the basic concept if that helps. Okay. And the last thing I wanted to say is the majority of the things here if not all of them are already required of all new development in the city. So we anticipate by going through the RFQ process first we'll be identifying developers who have figured out how to meet these requirements and it won't be over burdening them to the extent that they won't apply.

5. CCSF Parameters. – see PDF presentation online(www.sf-planning.org/brcac)

a. Chancellor Lamb. Interim Chancellor, City College.

- i. We at City College have been part of this community for 80 years and we're proud to participate tonight. Since being notified of the city's interest in developing the PUC reservoir, I've asked my staff in government relations, in capital planning, facilities and finance to stay abreast of this project. They have had periodic meetings with the Mayor's staff and I've been briefed on a regular basis. I'm also happy that trustee Brigitte Davila is a member of the committee and also representing our interests here. We are all aware of the serious affordability crisis in the city much the impacts of the situation are very real for City College affecting our staff, our faculty, and our students. City College has a real stake in making sure that San Francisco remains affordable. For that reason, I would like to commend the Mayor and his staff for his efforts in this regard. At the same time, we must balance addressing affordability with our operational needs of the campus and our ability to fulfill our educational mission. We're very committed to continuing the progress we've made at the college and especially in rebuilding our enrollment. We need assurances that the Balboa Reservoir project not only addresses the needs of our current community but allows us to grow and flourish far into the future. We do have concerns, which would raise for the city about a number of transportation issues related to parking, circulation, and congestion. We understand that these are complex and difficult problems to solve. Our Ocean campus is the largest of our 9 campuses. And is our key to rebuilding our enrollment. The removal of the reservoir site used for many years as student parking is potentially a huge impact to the college. So while we have a very real stake in the affordability of San Francisco, we also have some site-specific needs that must be met in order to carry out our educational mission. I look forward to working with the community and the city to address and meet these needs.

b. CAC Discussion

i. Brigitte Davila

1. The things that are confusing are I keep hearing about the project but there is no project yet. Right? So, I don't want anybody else to get confused by that because this is either as I've heard an Aristotelian quest for truth on the one hand where all these ideas come forth and the best get chosen or some Machiavellian scheme to swindle taxpayers. So there's a broad area between those two. And I'd like to address some of the things that make people think the latter rather than the former. And one of them is the meetings between the city administrators and planning. Which I didn't know about. And that's fine from what I understand is that they're just meetings where one side says, "well we might do this," and the other side says "you can't really do that or you can do this." So I guess there is that dance going

on. But basically I think there's some key things here that I want you to know how I envision City College and from my discussions with the Board of Trustees how they envision this, also. That said we are going to be having a special study session just on this question so that will be a whole meeting on that.

2. One of the things that I would like to see is, I'm not opposed to housing here so I've said this before and I'll say it again. I'm not opposed to housing if it fits in with City College's mission and our operational needs. I'm talking about from City College's side I'm not talking about from Sunnyside or the neighborhoods or whatever. So I'm telling you, this is how I feel. I would particularly like to see focused housing for faculty and staff is what I said initially. I'm not opposed to certain types of student housing also for veterans, foster youth, anybody that's making use of the City College facilities. I think that would be the highest and best use here.
3. One of the other things that I want to mention is that the performing arts center is going to be built. I mentioned this before. The Board of Trustees is really interested in seeing the completion of the performing arts center. And so this is something that whatever project is envisioned here needs to contemplate. Because we already have the plans, part of it is already built underground. And all we need to do is finish what the taxpayers wanted us to do initially. So, that's something that's very important to understand because what it means is there may not be an opportunity for an easement road through the center of the property that City College owns. Right here adjacent to the MUB building, which by the way that stands for multi-use building so if any want to donate a lot of money we'll name it after you.
4. A green parking garage I forgot to mention this when we were discussing sustainable components to this project. And I see that as a possibility to resolve a lot of the issues. I under the neighborhoods around here. I live by here in Mission Terrace, so I also see the cars backed up around the parking lot there so I understand that. And I'm thinking there might be a better way than just having a whole bunch of asphalt on the ground and then have a parking garage. And I'm sure we'll throw police services building in there too, if you want. And to have some sustainable components to it like a bike garage also and to have electric space for electric cars to recharge. So there is a lot of things you can do with the green parking garage.
5. And then the transportation issue is something that we've all been working on and that we need to coordinate. I know some of you think it will never get better. But you know I have hope. I'm optimistic. I don't think it's going to solve our problems 100 percent but I think that we can coordinate better, that we can have a better BART walkway. That we can have better transportation. So that more people may be

using the public transportation. I know in my work I teach at San Francisco State University and I know that we have pretty close to free parking. And that means I take my car more than I should. I do use public transportation and I've timed it. It takes me about 9 minutes longer. But it's really easy to park when it's free. So that's something that we need to consider also. You know, where are the real needs here? So I know that transportation studies have come up as an issue and I do think we need more of those to ascertain exactly what it is that we're going to need here. So I think I've pretty much exhausted my list.

6. One other thing I wanted to mention about our master plan. For those of you who aren't aware our master plan basically was for ten years ending in 2014. We're a year behind getting a new master plan, but there's a lot of elements of the old master plan that have been completed. And there's some uncompleted elements that will probably be on the new master plan going forward and one of those is a different streetscape on Ocean Avenue. And the old master plan called for that to have a more direct relationship. That would also make it a little bit easier to get to BART. And probably solve some transportation issues there. So there's things we really need to work on. City College needs to work on and what I didn't understand maybe you can clarify this planning folks. I didn't understand what you meant by participate as a key stakeholder with our planning process.

1. Emily Lesk. To the extent there are public meetings like this one and members of the community, community stakeholders, are invited to participate, which I suspect they will be. We'd like to see the development partner be part of that so that they're not only having a chance to be out in the community talking to people and share their feedback but hear the feedback and the views of everyone who is part of that dialogue.

7. Sounded like the opposite of shaping City College

1. Emily Lesk. That was not the intent. The intent is we expect them to show up.

ii. Lee.

1. So as I sat through the entire public comments I had these thoughts sort of like swirling in my head. I'm getting over a cold so I'm trying to figure out how to, you know when we talk about, so we've heard a lot today about this is a public land and we don't want it to be, we don't want to swindle the taxpayer's money. And so I just so happen to have a background in utilities issues. My understanding and I'm not going to say, this is subject to verification. But my understanding, which is I think it's coming from almost a decade of water utilities issues is that when the piece of asset is purchased by a utilities district, either publically owned or privately owned that asset is purchased through a

surcharge on whatever utility service has provided. So, when a piece of asset is then sold off and say that today's circumstances it's sold off at a higher value than it was purchased years ago. That the difference in value is usually flowed back through your utilities bills as well. It's not a one-to-one. Because the people who live here pay utilities bills are not the same population that pay the utilities bill when the piece was purchased. But it generally flows through the same transaction that it's levied on utility bills and its flowed back, if there is a sale. That's a very sort of tried and true basic principles in either utilities companies or district operation. I don't know if it's exactly one to one, and actually there will be a meeting tomorrow with one of the PUC general manager Michael Carlin, where a lot of us from the SFPUC CAC will be asking these type of question. Saying how was this piece of property purchased? And how was it paid for? And so if it was sales or a real estate transaction then how does the money flow in and out? And we want to understand the mechanics of the contemplated transaction. I want to clarify that. I don't think any of the members of the PUC CAC would like to see that this just sort of I don't think anyone any of us would want to see a piece of asset purchased and now at how many years later that it will be sold off or what not at some kind of nonpublic interest purpose. So that's one.

2. So I think that's kind of getting into the sort of the value sort of how do we appropriate the value of the land versus the development? So that's sort of like a concept on to put that out there. Asset that we're talking about is the land and the proposed asset is the development. So there are 2 sort of different levels of project sort of revenue streams or sort of 2 pieces of asset that's been contemplated.
3. On the issue of transportation. I think that I just want to say I think from the last session I think this is something that the chair have teed up too. Even though this is a fairly significant development that's being contemplated there are existing transportation issues. And that it doesn't seem, while the developer, or the development, or the project partners can do as much they can to alleviate the problem it seems like there are existing problems that it seems more appropriate and incumbent upon administration, the Mayor's office are weighing in with SFMTA to address some of the existing problems. So. I just kind of having a hard time seeing how a proposed redevelopment would sort of address some of the existing problems. And I feel like coming to these meetings have given me a new insight on the existing transportation infrastructure here that will be exacerbated obviously by the construction process. Hopefully not exacerbated by the development, if done well and sustainably. I'm still trying to grapple with I think the same set of complexities everyone else here is grappling with.

1. Davila. I want to mention in regards to the number one. The board will be having a resolution on the agenda to ask you for the land. I'm just letting you know.
- iii. Godinez.
 1. Just curious looking at principle 1 with the housing for City College staff, is there a possibility to also look at a percentage also being for any educator that is in this area? Aptos middle school, Leadership, anybody in Unified? I know that in August we were facing a severe crisis with not having enough teachers and it's because of the cost of living.
 2. And then I was thinking about the performing art center. I'm in favor of that, and I would also like to see some nonprofits have access to that space. I think about youth art exchange currently using space at Lick Wilmerding high school, where I work, I'm Christy Godinez by the way, which is great, but I would love to see them have a real art space they can have access to.
- iv. Muehlbauer.
 1. South side of San Francisco here we have 2 great public assets. We have City College, San Francisco State. They are neighborhood identifiers. They have been. They are just such important part of this. And my vision here is that this continues to be the case well into the future. I also want to thank Susan Lamb for being here and also for Brigitte being part of this citizen advisory committee. It begins to address one of my big concerns as it applies to City College. They just haven't been at the table enough. These big decisions are being made and I have served on boards and questions go unanswered. So this is an encouraging signs that they are engaged with this process. Because any way you look at it, this development site and City College are joined at the hip. They will be forever. And I think almost we need to be looking at another principle here, maybe a principle 5. What's going to happen in the long-term? How are agreement made now going to be kept into the future? Issues are going to change over time, and how are they going to be addressed?
 2. Another point that I've heard, not only at this meeting but other meetings, I hear teachers, I hear students that are claiming that their thoughts and their sentiments aren't being represented. And I'd like to get better assurance that that is going to be because they're critical to these decisions.
 3. And then finally I just want to make sure that previous promises are kept. There's been promises made to the community about what's going to happen on some of these sites. So how can we meld this together so the community doesn't feel that they've been sold down the river? So I'll leave it at that.
- v. Favetti.

1. I don't have a lot to add. And I really think the presentation was thorough. I appreciate everybody's remarks. I think an especially Brigitte Davila. It's very helpful. I look at what I thought was a really important component, principle number one is the onsite child care facility, which I think is going to be of a great benefit. Not only to students at City College but the neighborhood. I think it's, to me this needs to be part of the process.
 2. I also agree with the nonprofits going into the area.
 3. I'm also particularly concerned about making sure that access to and from City College, through Unity Plaza, over through Lee and Brighton streets and into the Balboa Reservoir development are smooth and seamless. And whether it's pedestrian bicycle and then there is going to be some kind of car access and it needs to be smooth and seamless so that this is truly a part of the neighborhood.
- vi. Winston.
1. The interest of the whole city seems like the sixty-six percent of the people voted for proposition K they want housing. And of course the City College is one of the gems of the city. It's one of the most important things we have in this town, so we have to find a way to make them work together. And Robert also mentioned the difficulties we've been having about communicating with the college. And it would be really great if we could have at each meeting on the agenda a report of what's going on in the Board of Trustees meetings and whatever other meetings I don't even know of the shadowy meetings that go on. Also as well as in the Student Senate and the Academic Senate and the other parts of the student body. If somebody could put together a report every month on that, that would be great.
 2. City College. Another thing, parking, people bring up parking a lot. I think we need to wait until we hear from the transportation demand management survey that we're doing. I'm not sure when that will be over at this point. It could be a year or so to do. I'm hoping that the shared parking will solve the problem for the most part for the people that need to drive. For the other people that can be offered choices so that they maybe they won't drive so much in the future, City College can play a really strong part in that. I think that the parking spaces will be going down and with the reduction in supply, the demand will go up. And in a market system we usually see the prices of where things go up a little bit. If that were to happen I would like to see that it doesn't turn up as revenue for the city, but actually gets used at the point of impact right here in our neighborhood that it gets used for us in a way to provide choices for people to use other kinds of transportation. For instance, a shuttle bus was mentioned, I think a shuttle. Imagine arriving at the BART station, with your kid, and taking a shuttle bus coming every 5 minutes stops at every stop along the

way, maybe Cloud Hall, the Library, the childcare center. And I think that would be a really dignified way to get to school rather than fighting traffic, not for everyone but for a lot of people.

3. Bike share. Using the green bikes downtown. They don't leave the downtown area. It's said to expand next year. We could use 3 or 4 or 5 of those bike share stations in this area, in the reservoir, at BART and Glen Park as well.
4. Car share. Won be useful for City College, but for the reservoir it might be very useful for people who live there to be able to use a car. To go to Ikea to pick up something, or to go to a grocery store, or Trader Joes, or whatever. So on-site child care would be great,
5. Another thing I wanted to mention is the walkway. The walk to BART I mentioned this last month. It's just highly undignified to be able to walk from this area down to the BART station. You feel like a rat in the gutter. It's the worst trip to take on foot. There is a freeway entrance onto Ocean. Ocean is not a freeway. Why is there a ramp onto Ocean? That needs to be turned into a 90 degree turn with stop sign or traffic light. It's a city street.
6. City College I know there's been talk, I've talked to Tom Radulovich about this a while back. He said there's been talk with City College about handing over some small amount of land from the campus to widen the sidewalks and maybe provide some kind of pathway to what's now City College property. I'd love to see that in the short term.
7. In the long-term I don't understand why City College faces the parking lot. Why doesn't it face Ocean Avenue? And that is a long-term project. I walked along, above the retaining wall. It would be really hard to make that change, but over the years it would be really a good thing to look forward to especially you know the area where the big sign is at a Phelan and Ocean that could be turned into a plaza. A real beautiful entrance way into City College. Also by the swimming pool another way to get in.

vii. Chung.

1. I'm going to keep my comments very, very short. I especially like Brigitte's comments and thankful for her representation of City College. Glad to hear that the performing art center is definitely going to be built at some point.
2. Appreciate Roberts's comments that in the future that there are going to be continuing problems between the Balboa Park development and City College and some sort of mechanism to deal with those complaints and concerns so if it doesn't spill over into a lawsuit. Some sort of mechanism that takes into account that there are going to be future problems.
3. Kate's comment I especially like with regard to the seamless nature of whether it be pedestrian bicycling, to some extent automobile

transportation, between Ocean Avenue, Balboa Reservoir development, and City College. All those concerns have to be thought of.

4. Ocean Avenue benefits quite a bit from City College students. And faculty participating in their businesses. So we would like to encourage that continuing with this development. And transportation and pedestrian walk ways in order to contribute to that business, continuing business between the 2 areas; I'm all for that. We do have a meeting of the Ocean Avenue Association Wednesday this coming Wednesday 6:30 PM at the library, for those of you interested in Ocean Avenue business concerns, through the CBD, you are welcome to attend. It's 6:30 PM on Wednesday.

viii. Spinali.

1. The first is I have a question around and I don't think we're going to answer it tonight, to Rebecca's point about the fact that the land if sold has to be sold at market rate for ratepayers and how that works and how the only way to create housing for teachers is we have to find a pot of money for that and there are ways to do that I'd like for us to think about where we might be able to find the cash offsets that could help make that a reality and not just a dream to be able to talk about it. And I think it's complicated to do, I know from my conversations with the planning team, but I'd really like for us to think about that in earnest because I think the more that that's solidified for us, and I think for teachers both affiliated City College, Transitional Age Youth out of foster care there is a huge need for that and veterans, and pots of money that can be made available for them. I'm thinking we can put that piece in because that's a programming thing that's going to free up money or you're going to have to generate the money to do the offset because you have to deal with the market rate sale based upon what the requirements are when utility sales land, so that's one thing.
2. The second thing is I think the childcare piece is really important and when I think about the childcare piece and I think about the first floor of these buildings, I look at what was built on Ocean Avenue. The overpass lasted a hot second. And I'm almost willing to say I'd rather have my building be a little taller and offset the cost and generate the revenue there to be able to have first floor to have a really big childcare center to be able to use the first floor of your building so that it's going to be something that's vibrant that connects the community. I'm not about building high-rise buildings, I'm just saying I would be willing to really think about how do we use the first floor so that it is something that's vibrant. The larger question is right now City College sits kind of in the community but as kind of an island into itself and we are really not connected, and every neighborhood connects to it. And it's not a quilt that's connected. So I'm wondering as we think about

envisioning the future because Robert to your points it's been 80 years and another 80 to come. What do we do know that helps to create greater cohesion between the college, with the community? I know I've been on the side of the soccer field being built and all the problems with that. And I want to have a positive, good relationship as president of the Sunnyside with City College, and I think the way to do that is to envision a future that's something that's cohesive that we think about how we work together.

3. The last 2 comments I have are that the TDM study that's probably one of the most important things we need to do. I couldn't agree more with Rebecca's comment that we have got to fix some of these issues regardless of what happens with the site and that we need to prioritize that. The prioritization would help create good will that we're actually headed in the right direction with the city and not have the adverse relationship, which is historically where we've been.
4. The last thing is that principle number 3 is the most important of the principles. I said this before about how we put, in terms of the ordering of the principles, it sends a message. I think the envisioning of how to work with City College in a profoundly collaborative way is probably one of the most important things we can do. We set the process up right that allows for a much better outcome and so I think we need to think about that very proactively. So those are my comments.

c. Public Comment.

i. Sheila McFarlane. Instructor, CCSF.

1. I've been here since 1992. I'd like to talk, well, I have a lot of issues. I'll talk about my students. I feel like you don't have a strong understanding of who they are. I'll come to class and initially many years ago when I was a young teacher I'd get very upset that my students were nodding off and falling asleep in class. And I would say something to them afterwards and they'd say "I'm so sorry, I came straight from work," and these are not students who can hop on a bicycle and ride to here. I think you are imagining a university student, like somebody commented, U.C. Davis, nice, flat, they can maybe go to the job at the coffee shop, but really they're going to ride to work, and home, and study. These are not our students. They work, they have families, they work more than 1 job. And so I please take them into consideration, whatever happens there.
2. And I'm opposed to development, but if this is a done deal then I don't care how much you say it's not a done deal, it sounds to me very much like it is. Consider the parking for these students. I don't think it has to be free, maybe subsidized. But whatever developer takes over, they need to be compelled to supply in perpetuity a certain number of parking spaces to City College. Not that shared, that's very, very

concerning to me, shared parking. Sounds to me like paid parking, exorbitant prices. I think our faculty can afford to pay, I think we should have to pay. I feel guilty that I don't pay but the students need to be able to afford to come and go, maybe even more than one time during the day to get to class, go pick up a kid, come back again. Their lives are far more complicated than you're giving them credit for.

ii. Jennifer. Sunnyside.

1. Principle 1.b. We support having childcare facilities on the reservoir site that could be used by City College. However, the current state of this repair of the City College childcare buildings should not have any bearing on the timing of the construction of the Balboa Reservoir. I want to separate those.
2. Principle 1.c. Very happy that local services will be considered before adding those. Local community services. Before adding them to any residential site. We want to be sure that the burden of proof should be on the developer or the site manager that the comparable service are not available nearby.
3. Principle 2.a. We cannot adequately respond to parameter A until we've reviewed the TDM. Also, we need to understand what is meant by the project's mode split target. Both TDM should be completed review by the public before the CAC provides its recommendation for the RFP. Otherwise the purpose of the CAC has been seriously compromised and one of the key impacts to the neighborhoods is not being adequately considered.
4. Principle 2.b. There are multiple scenarios with the need for parking by students will overlap with the availability of Balboa Park resident parking and Bob is going to cover that after me.
5. Principle 2.c. We'd like to ensure local businesses such as Ocean Cyclery are considered when discussing bicycle repair and other services, doesn't make sense to reinvent the bicycle wheel.
6. Principle 2.d. We support most aspects of D, particularly the use of paratransit and shuttles. We cannot support the recommendations from the ongoing planning department led TDM study without reviewing them first.
7. Principle 3.a. The needs of City College should be number one and the development of Balboa Reservoir for other purposes secondary.

iii. Bob Burns. Resident, Sunnyside.

1. Principle 2.b. Any plan to consider a shared parking facility should take into consideration the following 3 scenarios which will impact parking availability. Some residents will park their cars in their housing unit all day, use public transportation to get to work, or walk to City College get to classes or work. The parking spots will not be available for incoming students. Residents who drive through typical 8 to 5 job will take up spaces students need for evening classes that run from 6 to

10. Residents and students will be looking for parking spaces at the same time. On Saturdays there's no guarantee the resident car parking spaces will be available for Saturday students as residents may not move their cars. Though there are fewer classes in the evenings and on Saturdays, public transportation runs less frequently on Saturdays.

iv. Ogden Willard. Mission District Resident. Student, CCSF.

1. I'm an older student. I'm now a continuing education student because of the repeatability clauses. I have been a voice mentor at City College for over 15 years. I am currently mentoring 5 of the 6 classes and I'm singing for the other voice teachers at her religious ceremony at St. Mary's. I think it's a shame that you are considering developing this reservoir on the backs of City College students. I have been coming to this college for 15 years and gladly have spent my money. Because you have a plannery [sic] meeting on the first night of finals I think is incredibly insensitive. Because no student can come here and talk to any of you about their issues they have about any of the things you discussed here because they're worried about what? Their classes. And why are they worried about their classes? Because their classes are being cut 25 percent over the next 6 years. Interim Chancellor Lamb if you are listening give us back our classes. Do not allow this to happen, this development to happen. And I can tell you that I've sat here for 3 hours and I've listened, and I've tried to think that you're plausible reasonable people but what I hear in your voices that this is a done deal and you are just going rubber stamp it because Edwin Lee wants it. And if you read the paper today he's not a real popular mayor. Unfortunately he ran pretty much unopposed in the last election.

v. Geri Vahey. Sunnyside.

1. It's interesting that you are talking about the hope of earmarking housing for teachers. I would love for you, if that is in fact legal, which is a big, I would really like you to open up that up to first responders. We have California Highway Patrol officers who can't afford to live here, they sleep in cars or vans. They share housing, they do crazy things in order to protect us and then the other piece of that is this all needs to be done in perpetuity. I have a good friends who's a Professor at NYU, he's in the NYU housing. Is he going to keep that forever and ever? No. When he's no longer teaching he will go and find his own place. If we're going to protect certain populations, we need protect future generations of those same populations.
2. I also want to add another tally for the parking lot for student. I live very, very close to City College. When I walk out the house people slam on their brakes and I know these are people who really seem very busy. I know students who work 2 jobs, go to school. It's not a typical university situation. So I would really hate to, well, see the impact on

the neighborhood of course, but really the impact on their lives. I think they should be protected.

3. And I'm just a little confused. I've got kids and there is a childcare facility. I would like to see if we need more childcare, presumably that's been surveyed. But I would like to see that be a part of City College. They have a professional program and we can kind of leverage the talent, and build experience, and keep it there. Actually Overland was very great for the community. I saw a lot of kids there. Friends of my kids Commodore Sloat, Aptos meeting there after school. I'd like to see more things like that and have the childcare as part of the school.
- vi. John Hayes. Student. CCSF.
 1. I wanted to address a couple of things. Mr. Muehlbauer you mentioned the lack of communication between the CCSF and the various departments in the city that are involved in this situation. You all need to be aware that up until the beginning of this year we did not have a Board of Trustees. We had a single super trustee who was running the entire show and not doing a very good job of it. Bad job. And there were a lot of things that were done back during that time I suspect this set the ground work for this entire project.
 2. On item 2.b. The shared parking. You're setting up a situation that's made for conflict. You don't know the depth of anger that arises over parking in this city. Well whoever wrote this doesn't understand the depth of anger over parking in the city.
 3. The last point I want to make is on principle 4 - ensuring the development of Balboa Reservoir site does not negatively impact City College's education mission and operational needs. I think that operational needs need to include the performing art center and I think its needs to be mentioned specifically in the principle 4 as an operational need.
- vii. Chris Hanson. Excelsior District.
 1. It is encouraging to hear the chancellor speak this evening and it is good to hear bridge Brigitte's background. Going forward I would like to see all discussions between SF Planning, the Mayor's office and City College to be made public. I'd also like to see the minutes from prior meetings to be published so that people can know exactly what's been talked about. On the principle 3 I still am confused as to who specifically is being referred to that is actively participating in City College's master plan as a key stakeholder. That is still confusing to me who specifically it is and I would really like to see that clarified better.
 2. In the context slide, you mentioned the performing arts center but the draft parameters do not address this issue in any of the principles. And I find that to be lacking.
 3. Also lacking is the... from what I understand the potential for access roads to be carved across City College land for access to the reservoir.

That's not mentioned in these draft parameters as well. And I would like to say as far as SFPUC goes we are the ratepayers. So if we decided as ratepayers that that land should be in public interest and should be developed by a nonprofit public interest that's something that we have the right to do as a group. Connectivity, the PAC, when it is built has boulevard. It also will have the Diego Rivera mural that will be visible. You can walk any time of day, it will be lit and you'll be able to see it from the outside and when the building is open you can see it from the inside.

viii. Ellen Wall. Retired Instructor. CCSF.

1. I taught at City College for 35 years in the English Department. I'm now retired and all those years and more I lived across the street. I just cross Judson to get to City College. So, as you can imagine this is very important to me. And I want to say this is clearly as I can. Do not build housing on the reservoir. Do not build housing on the reservoir. Every time I hear people speak, well we'll decide about this and we'll put this to this group and we'll take this to this meeting. No. No. Stop it. Do not build housing on the Balboa Reservoir. Say in your final report it was a bad idea and go away. I really appreciate your trying to do this. You are nice people. You're a part of the community. But don't build housing on the City College campus. We need it for our children and ourselves to get an education that otherwise will be denied to us.

ix. Madeleine Mueller. Faculty, CCSF.

1. I can't address any specific item because it's all deja vu all over. I brought papers from what were call the reservoir wars of 30 years ago. Where the same issues. Same issues. I brought a speech that I wrote for Westwood Park. It was an issue over 200 units of housing. I could put 500 units and everything is applicable. It 30 years ago. So, rather than to repeat history and I'm not saying we should stop history, not by any means, but I did bring some papers in back that you might want to read over. Before resolutions or propositions. But dealt with this issue. Lots of fact, lots of history. The con shots of sizing things. Lots of transportation data. All of this, we did in 1986, '87, '88, and '91. So, that you might want to put into your packets. And of course a picture of the parking that goes on in this quote empty reservoir and a letter that I found or an op-ed that Kevin Starr wrote; State librarian at the time. Elegant letter. And he really puts forth, and I won't try to repeat it, I'll just put it in the back. Because what I want to say about the PAC is that if you leave tonight you might touch the floor because it's underneath there. Our HVAC system. The PAC's HVAC system is underneath the MUB. And it keeps those nice cement floor toasty. And also one of the 2 architectural firms that design the PAC just won the absolutely years national award as the best architecture firm in the

nation. This they beat out twenty-one thousand architectural firms. So we have a design that's really iconic.

x. Monica Collins. Sunnyside.

1. I've lived in the Sunnyside since '82. I worked for City College for over 20 years now. I wanted to say what faculty have already said for me. I'm a staffer myself not a faculty member but they stole my thunder. They said it better than I can say it. Our student are very fragile, they're like little butterflies. These are working parents, they're commuting from all points. And their cars sometimes make it, cars are, darn him Trump, Trump would say, politically incorrect. I understand that. No one loves an ugly old parking lot but it's very useful to them and maybe they can pay a bit more. I don't really know. There is a fee for parking there. It's like 20 to 40 dollars a semester, which is quite low. I'd would also like to say I think members of the City College community can also serve. I understand that a lot of members of management are serving on the committee and I would like to see rank and file represented.

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 context in the site plan is something we really don't see enough of from 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? 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 actual new off-ramp 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 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 with S.F. State. I hope Chancellor Lamb and the committees there look seriously at the negative impacts that happened with SF State, with their master planning, transit wise, housing wise, parking wise, transportation wise. They ignored a lot of issues 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 way of looking at how you deal with the public and the public's needs.

xii. Otto. Journalism Student, CCSF.

1. 3 quick questions. Firstly the issue of potentially getting a little bit of revenue selling off a little bit of City College land for the road, all that. I realize I haven't seen any specific evaluation of the cost of the land that the SFPUC owns. And I'd be curious if one has been made available. An estimate. I'd like to know what we're working off.
2. Secondly I'm curious about the structure of how the parameters determined by this committee are applied. Who they go in front of. Are they legally binding? Are they interpreted by a third party who determines something is in violation or not? Or how would a violation of these be determined?
3. And thirdly just on the issue of the meetings. Apparently with members of the planning committee or administration. I'd just like to say publicly that in this very room on October 13 I specifically asked Fred Sturner, Mark Zacovic in conversation about this and they said there's been nothing done on this issue they were aware of. So I'm really curious to know what it is that's been brought up a couple of times.

xiii. Kay Kalmar. Westwood Park.

1. And I just wanted to comment on 2 things. One, a previous commenter stated that there was some things said many years ago for the SFPUC that if the land was declared excess that it would revert back to City College and I think that should be investigated and found whether that's still true or not.
2. And secondly the matter of Ocean Avenue. And that Ocean Avenue is sort of being regarded as a boulevard, a walking area, and it's that but it's also an east west access to the freeway. A major east west access as is Monterey boulevard and I think the other one is Brotherhood Way. And so I don't understand why we're impacting Ocean Avenue with bicycle lanes and bulb-outs. I think it's inappropriate for something that carries as much traffic on such a broad scale as Ocean Avenue.

xiv. Yonathan Randolph. Resident, Ingleside.

1. I would like to echo the comments by some of the previous commenters. Principle number 2.a. leaves a lot up to imagination about what we're going to do about the problem of parking of City College parking. It kind of punts the problem to the TDM study and

also leads people to assume the worst. The fact of the matter is that City College needs to get much better at managing a scarce resource of parking. Especially when that resource is going to become even more scarce. Right now City College, Monica Collins is right, City College charges three dollars a day for student parking, 20 dollars a semester if you are a financial aid student, and 40 dollars a semester if you don't have any financial aid being received. This is much less than public transportation costs. MUNI pass costs 70 dollars a month. MUNI costs \$4.50 a day. Students who don't need to drive will do so anyway just because it's cheaper if they already have a car. So, City College is going to have to work at encouraging the students who drive, who can take the bus to do so. So I was hoping that would be part of the principles but I guess it's going to be up to the TDM plan.

2. I was encouraged to see the principle 2.c. that they're going to ask for bicycle parking for students, class 1 and class 2. I was hoping also for more motorcycle parking or other modes parking that don't take as much space as cars to allow students to use less space when they park.

xv. Donna Hayes. Faculty, CCSF.

1. I just wanted to remind everybody here that our population, our student population is not just from city, from San Francisco. We have a draw throughout the Bay Area. We have unique programs that people come here specifically for such as diagnostic imaging, such as our architecture program, engineering program, culinary arts. We are outstanding in the area and people are drawn from other places and they drive great distances. So, we need to provide services for those people we need a lot of parking not only for these people but also we have veterans that call all the way from Sacramento to use our programs here so they can't get a bus or take a train easily. They take their cars and we need to provide services to them for our students. We're not just for San Francisco, we are a Bay Area resource.

xvi. Linda Judge. Westwood Park.

1. I have a comment first of all again thank you all for your, for being on the CAC. And I think a lot of us who have been involved in this process recently certainly understand and appreciate how much time it takes for all of you. So thank you.
2. On principle number 3 draft parameter a, I wanted to know if Brigitte can possibly speak to the audience who may not be familiar with the City College master planning process. What's the time frame for the master planning? When does it start? What's the end date and how is it implemented? If you can share that with us that would be great.
 1. Davila. We're a year behind right now. Last time I believe it took ultimately 3 years to finalize everything and maybe if my chancellor is still around you can confirm that. Usually that's what the process is so we're going to be hiring a consultant to

help us with it and get started on it this year and so it should be completely finalized in next year with everything signed off in the next 2 years.

2. So, 2 years out from now it will be signed off?
 1. Davila. I'd say that conservatively. I don't know, I haven't been through this process before, but I was just looking at what was done for the last master plan from 2004 to 2014. Do you need the mic?
 2. Interim Chancellor Lamb. Generally it's a 15 to 18 month process. And we anticipate finishing it and having it through the process completely within 2 years

xvii. Harry Bernstein. Resident, District 11. Instructor, CCSF.

1. So I second the request that another speaker made to make public consultation, agendas, minutes between representative of City agencies and City College administration. I had heard that there may have been 3 monthly meetings but also heard rumors that there had been meetings for far longer than that. Why don't we notice? Why isn't this known? It seemed some of you seemed to say "well, I understand why there would be consultation." Transparent body and this double layer of things going on that we don't know is unhelpful.
2. Another thing. Based on discussion with planning department there's into the upper reservoir, where the City College owns it, you have 3 access ways. One of them at least is 60 feet wide. And I've been told that the college is expected to build these at its own cost. I've only seen 1 document, which is not signed off on. There are lots of signature lines that are not filled. I have asked about this. I've been told yes that's definitely going ahead and we'll talk about it in this body sometime later on. Let's get that out there into the public discussion. Because you should show that one, 3 stripes across it. With this road if it's going to be built. If it's optional let's talk about that.
3. Another topic, I feel performing arts center must be built. It's a resource for educational purposes and you already said you don't want to interfere with educational purposes. It's for trainings in jobs, in the arts, in the entertainment industry as well as for the general public and it is also an important resource for the business district here.
4. And last thing principle 3 you have to prioritize the needs of City College. It's not making the college fit into the project. It's the other way around.

xviii.

1. Lee. Want to address Christine Hanson. I was asking about the mechanics; if there are profits made on a potential sale, as a publically-owned utility they need to be responsive to the ratepayers.
2. Muehlbauer.
 1. Want to see a second draft.

3. Winston.
 1. Thank you
- d. CAC Discussion.
 - i. Lee.
 1. I just want to address Christine Hanson. I think that the comment I made earlier was really just about sort of the mechanics of the transaction as I understand it from the perspective of someone who has dealt with utilities issues; to your comment, if there was a profit that is made on a potential sale of this asset, then yes as a publically-owned utility that where it is beholden to the public, that yes the public can/should, it's within their purview of its function to be responsive to ratepayers will on what to do with the asset or the gain on sale from this transaction. So I just want to clarify that. I didn't mean it as like I was advocating for one way or the other. I just meant to kind of explain the sort of mechanics as I understand it, which hopefully we'll get better clarification tomorrow at the meeting.
 1. Winston. Could you announce that?
 2. The meeting is at 5:30 PM at the Golden Gate room, 3rd floor, at the SFPUC headquarters. 525 Golden Gate.
 - ii. Davila.
 1. I just wanted to thank everyone for coming out and supporting City College. I know you're taking time out from your cooking dinner, being with your kids, or whatever. So, I wanted to thank everyone again.
 - iii. Muehlbauer
 1. This is a good first draft but I'd like to see a second draft. I've got notes all over the place in terms of what has been added to what I read previously and I think its staff should go back and rethink this a little bit more and flush it out a bit more and come back to us. And let's see if we're closer.
 - iv. Winston.
 1. I just want to say thanks for everybody coming by. Every month we have a huge crowd. And it's obvious that everybody really cares about their community, their college. And so do we. So does everybody here. We might not all agree but I think it's really great everyone that everyone is coming out a lot.
6. **Additional Public Benefits Parameters.**
 - a. [moved to January 11, 2016 meeting]
7. **Partnership Updates.**
8. **Close of meeting.**
 - a. No clapping to create equity with public comments.
 - b. January 11, 2016 meeting recap.

9. Adjournment.

xviii.

→ 1. So I second the request that another speaker made to make public consultation, agendas, minutes between representative of City agencies and City College administration. I had heard that there may have been 3 monthly meetings but also heard rumors that there had been meetings for far longer than that. Why don't we ^{Know this?} notice? Why isn't this known? It seemed some of you seemed to say "well, I understand why there would be consultation. ^{This CDC is supposed to be a} transparent body and this double layer of things going on that we don't know is unhelpful.

→ 1. Another thing. Based on discussion with planning department there's into the upper reservoir, where the City College owns it, you have ^{three} access ways. One of them at least is 60 feet wide. And I've been told that the college is expected to build these at its own cost. I've only seen 1 document, which is not signed off on. There are lots of signature lines that are not filled. I have asked about this. I've been told yes that's definitely going ahead and we'll talk about it in this body sometime later on. Let's get that out there into the public discussion. Because you should show that one, 3 stripes across it. With this road if it's going to be built. If it's optional let's talk about that.

2. Another topic, I feel performing arts center must be built. It's a resource for educational purposes and you already said you don't want to interfere with educational purposes. It's for trainings in jobs, ^{omit this common} in the arts, in the entertainment industry as well as for the general public and it is also an important resource for the business district here.

^{cut jobs in the future} 3. And last thing principle 3 you have to prioritize the needs of City College. It's not making the college fit into the project. It's the other way around.

build out covers the west campus. This whole area. So, when the PUC declared the land surplus in 2012 the understanding that the land should revert to the college, what happened to that and why isn't that on the table? We're only talking about how to sell this how to give for-profit housing. Let's have the full story.

=====

p. 30, Monday, December 14, 2015

xvii. Harry Bernstein. Resident, District 11. Instructor, CCSF.

1. Another thing. Based on discussion with planning department there's into the upper reservoir, where the City College owns it, you have 3 access ways. One of them at least is 60 feet wide. And I've been told that the college is expected to build these at its own cost. I've only seen 1 document, which is not signed off on. There are lots of signature lines that are not filled. I have asked about this. I've been told yes that's definitely going ahead and we'll talk about it in this body sometime later on. Let's get that out there into the public discussion. Because you should show that one, 3 stripes across it. With this road if it's going to be built. If it's optional let's talk about that.
2. Another topic, I feel performing arts center must be built. It's a resource for educational purposes and you already said you don't want to interfere with educational purposes. It's for trainings in jobs, in the arts, in the entertainment industry as well as for the general public and it is also an important resource for the business district here.
3. And last thing principle 3 you have to prioritize the needs of City College. It's not making the college fit into the project. It's the other way around.