

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

MEETING MINUTES

**City College of San Francisco
Multi-Use Building, Room 140
55 Phelan Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112
Monday, April 9, 2018**

6:00 PM

Regular Meeting

Please note: Meeting minutes are only intended to serve as a summary of the meeting. For a full transcript of the meeting, refer to the audio recording of the meeting [Available online at www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC].

Documents received during this meeting are in a document titled balboareservoir_CAC_Public_Documents_Received_and_Emails-040918 available via the following link: www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC

Committee Members Present:

Michael Ahrens; Robert Muehlbauer; Maurice Rivers; Lisa; Mark Tang; Jon Winston

Committee Members Absent:

Howard Chung; Brigitte Davila; Christine Godinez

Staff/Consultants Present:

Office of Economic and Workforce Development: Emily Lesk, Tom Shanahan
San Francisco Planning Department: Jeremy Shaw

1. Call to Order and Roll Call – [Recording: 00:00:00]

2. Opening of Meeting

a. February Minutes:

- i. Mark Tang absent in February
- ii. **Mike Ahrens:** “This fiscal feasibility *analysis* is premature...”
- iii. **Harry Bernstein, Merced Heights:** “Subside” to “subsidize”, “shamming” to “shaming”, “studying” to “study”, “the” to “they”, “feasibly” to “feasibility”
- iv. Motion to approve January meeting minutes
 1. Moved: Ahrens; Seconded: Winston

2. Ayes: Ahrens, Muehlbauer, Rivers, Winston, Noes: [none]; Abstain: Spinali, Tang

3. Recap of February CAC Meeting – [Recording: 00:05:53]

Lisa Spinelli: This will not be the only time to comment on the site design. Tonight should be about asking questions.

Brad Wiblin, Bridge Housing: The next phase will be more hands on. We hope you come to the upcoming open house. We will also be initiating the environmental review process in the coming months.

Kearstin Dischinger, Bridge Housing: This phase of outreach will focus more on interactive feedback and advancing a design. We will share some high level design pieces tonight.

Lisa Spinelli: We need to think about engaging MTA now. MTA needs to come to these meetings. Supervisor Yee agrees. I recommend that we also go on-site in the summer to experience what the weather will be like.

Robert Muehlbauer: I agree about MTA. We also need to get Bart here. I'd like to hear more about the architecture and massing.

Kearstin Dischinger, Bridge Housing: Our team will bring in examples of what the architecture could look like.

Rita Evans, Sunnyside: I find it shocking that transportation would not appear earlier in the meeting timeline.

Joe Kirchofer, AvalonBay: We are currently engaging with MTA. While this appears later in the schedule of topics, we have had a number of meetings with MTA.

Lisa Spinelli: Transportation should be at the forefront. MTA should be more proactive. This needs to be figured out.

Joe Kirchofer, AvalonBay: We have been collecting parking data and will be sharing the data at the upcoming open house and posting it online.

Note: Presentation slides (balboareservoir_CAC_presentation_040918) available via the following link: www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC

Community Engagement Schedule

1. CAC: Introductions (Oct 2)
2. CAC: Public Open Spaces (Nov 13)
3. Walking Tour (Dec 2)
4. CAC: Transportation, Circulation & Parking (Dec 11)
5. CAC: Housing Types and Distribution (January 22)
6. CAC: Preview of Fiscal Feasibility Legislative Package (Feb 12)
7. CAC: Master Plan Updates (April 9)
8. Open House: Community Planning (April 20/21)
9. Community Van Tour of Affordable Housing in San Francisco (May)
10. Community Walk from the Reservoir to BART (May)
11. Open House: Open Space Possibilities at the Reservoir (June)
12. CAC: Architecture, Building Locations, Massing & Design Precedents (July)
13. Community Park Day (September)
14. Open House: Sustainability (October)
15. CAC: On- an Off-Site Transportation: Walking, Biking, Transit, Autos & Parking (November)
16. Reservoir Community Holiday Celebration (December)

Community Feedback from February

- Fiscal analysis needs to consider impact on City College
- Public funds should not be used towards garage, should go towards housing instead
- City College students rely on existing parking
- City College needs a plan to help students and staff to get to campus without driving
- Clarify how parking garage impacts overall parking ratio for development
- New units will generate revenue to support transit improvements
- Impact fees should be target to support improvements in the neighborhood
- San Francisco needs more housing close to transit, consider building more units than currently proposed
- Current public transit is not adequate to accommodate the proposed number of new residents
- Need to hear more from MTA about how local transit service will be improved

4. Question and Answer: Recap and Schedule – [Recording: 00:24:55]

Harry Bernstein, Merced Heights: Joe said that the parking and traffic study data would be available in due course. However, could you elaborate on what is being studied and the methodology?

Joe Kirchofer, AvalonBay: The study includes hourly counts of cars and sensors at intersections.

Madeline Mueller, CCSF: Past parking studies looked at how students got to campus. They determined that the transit infrastructure alone wasn't sufficient to handle CCSF's need.

Joe Kirchofer, AvalonBay: We don't have studies planned for transit capacity. We will look into this though. We've heard from MTA that transit flows into CCSF are a reverse commute.

Robert Muehlbauer: Transit to this site worries me. I would like to see the data on transit use.

Joe Kirchofer, AvalonBay: We will try to get this.

Lisa Spinelli: The data should be made available publicly. I would like to see MTA at these meetings.

Jeremy Shaw, SF Planning: We meet often with MTA about this project. MTA is in the process of scoping a project on Ocean Avenue to see what can be done to improve mobility.

Brad Wiblin, Bridge Housing: CCSF has also engaged a transportation consultant.

Jon Winston: I agree with what was said about MTA. I would like MTA to come here and explain the plan for the area.

Mark Tang: I would like to hear more about the engagement with CCSF.

Lisa Spinelli: 1,100 units isn't the final number. Transportation is a constraint on size. This site alone will not solve San Francisco's housing crisis.

Mike Ahrens: This CAC never approved 1,100 units. The proposal was for up to 1,100 units. The project must fit in with the neighborhood and adhere to transit capacity limitations. We feel 1,100 is too many.

Joe Kirchofer, AvalonBay: We hear you. We are trying to be transparent and open. It is important to provide a lot of homes. We agree that there needs to be a balance.

5. Site Master Plan Update – [Recording: 00:35:30]

Note: Presentation slides (balboareservoir_CAC_presentation_021218) available via the following link: www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC

Plan from 2017 Proposal

- Approximately 1100 units
- 2.0 acre central park open towards the west
- Approximately 67 for-sale townhomes adjacent to Westwood Park

- Pedestrian oriented with streets and auto circulation at the perimeter

Concept Plan from 01/22/18 CAC Meeting

- Townhomes increased to approximately 100 for sale units
- SFPUC Parcel expanded to 80 feet in width
- Shape and location of open space and buildings still evolving

Base Plan

- This is an illustrative drawing of our new base plan
- This plan is intended as a starting point for further community input
- Streets, open space, and buildings have been adjusted based on community feedback
- This is not the final plan, but it does show one option of how all the pieces fit together
- Includes approximately 1100 units, the same number as our original proposal

Central Park

- 2.0 acre public park at the heart of this new community
- Park shifted towards Lee Avenue to create stronger connection to CCSF, and the Sunnyside and Ingleside neighborhoods
- Buildings shelter park from prevailing winds while preserving views to west
- Shape and location of park is still flexible

SFPUC Parcel

- Large underground water mains are located in this 80' wide zone, no buildings allowed in this area
- SFPUC land can be used as a park or street.
- In base plan SFPUC parcel is envisioned as 1.0 acre active park
- Provides continuous pedestrian connection from Unity Plaza to Ingleside Library Garden
- Design will developed in collaboration with SFPUC and with community

Pedestrian Greenways

- Larger open spaces are linked by greenways that promote walking
- Potential connection to Westwood Park
- Pathway adjacent to Riordan HS with views to Mount Davidson
- Over 4 acres of publicly accessible open space

Neighborhood Open Space Network

- Goal to connect to the network of pedestrian ways and recreation space
- Pedestrian way connecting to Science Circle at CCSF
- Four connection points to Ocean Avenue
- Views towards Mt Davidson
- Courtyard open space at each new residential block

Central Park: Preliminary Concept Sketch

- Concept sketch to help understand the scale of central park space.
- Park will include large green spaces, play areas, views, to west, and areas sheltered from the wind.
- Final plan will be developed with community

SFPUC Open Space: Preliminary Concept Sketch

- New open space takes advantage of connections to Ocean Avenue
- Active recreation next to Lee Ave and Whole Foods.
- Green areas on west end with connection to Library Garden

SFPUC Open Space: Potential Uses

- Wide range of creative uses that can be considered

- Active uses that take advantage of activity at Whole Foods and Ocean Avenue
- Design will done in collaboration with SFPUC and with community

Streets and Auto Access

- In this base plan, the public streets are moved closer to Central Park to improve access to park and to residential blocks
- Preserves pedestrian oriented character with raised crossings for pedestrians.
- Bike lanes at Lee Avenue, shared bike access at other streets.
- See additional road options in slides below.

Public Garage

- Provides public parking for the CCSF community, residents, and neighbors
- Public garage is located below Blocks G & F
- Will continue to study other options for location of public garage
- Total number of spaces will depend on outcome of parking studies

Townhomes

- Conceptual layout for approximately 100 for-sale townhomes
- Townhomes are 3 stories maximum in height
- 2 stories adjacent to Westwood neighbors
- Final arrangement of townhomes will be developed based on input from neighbors and community

Townhomes: Preliminary Concept Sketch

- Enlarged plan shows option with townhomes facing shared courts
- Side yards adjacent to rear yards at Plymouth with limited windows.

Building Heights

- Building heights similar to what was proposed in the original plan.
- Taller buildings adjacent to Lee Avenue and to Ocean Avenue.
- Within each block, buildings step down to create variety in scale and character

Site Overview

- New Residential buildings are similar in scale to buildings at City College
- Largest buildings at Reservoir are lower than Science Hall

Ground Floor Activation

- Buildings will have active ground floor uses at open spaces and pedestrian ways.
- Community-serving Childcare located near

Ocean Avenue

- Shared community room overlooking the Central Park
- Openings and visual connections to mid-block courtyards will increase activity and encourage walking

Base Plan

- The Base Plan is not a final plan
- The Base Plan represents one option of how all these pieces fit together, and an important starting point for further community input
- We will continue to develop options based on feedback from the community and stakeholders.
- The following slides provide examples of options under consideration

Base Plan Variations

- The master Plan will continue to evolve. We are considering variations for all of the elements below:
 - Open space

- Building heights
- Location of Public Garage
- Location of community amenities
- Street locations

Site Plan Variations: Option 1

- Public Street on SFPUC parcel adjacent to Whole Foods
- Potential for larger open Central Park
- Less open space adjacent to Ocean Avenue

Site Plan Variations: Option 2 Base Plan

- More direct street connection to Phelan
- Larger auto free zone at north end of site
- Loss of green way next to Riordan High School

6. Question and Answer: Site Master Plan Update – [Recording: 00:56:30]

Lisa Spinelli: Will the final design be informed by the traffic studies and counts?

Karen Murray, VMWP: Yes, we are also looking at a couple variations.

Rita Evans, Sunnyside: It is heartening to see the central park and to see the PUC green space connecting to Unity Plaza. I commend this. What is the rough size of the large lawn in the central open space?

Wendy Mok, GLS Landscape Architecture: The flat part of the lawn will be about 15,000 square feet, or 1/3 of an acre.

Bob Burns, Sunnyside: How will this development impact on-street parking and my daily commute? I think construction will begin before we know.

Marilyn Inez, Sunnyside: If the transit report shows that two entrances to the site are not enough, do you have an alternative? Would San Ramon be an alternative? I think we need to be open to an alternative entrance.

Peter Waller, PYATOK: San Ramon is not a great option in our mind because it is so narrow. We need to evaluate the two entrances first.

Jeremy Shaw, SF Planning: Part of the environmental analysis process will be to identify what alternatives need to be studied.

Lisa Spinelli: Can we keep a list of what we're studying?

Emily Lesk, OEWD: There is a formal process for identifying and studying alternatives.

Kate Favetti, Westwood Park: How large is the open space? There were some concerns about what the PUC open space can be used for.

Karen Murray, VMWP: There will be four acres of open space. The central open space is two acres.

Peter Waller, PYATOK: We need to work with PUC to see what can be built.

Liu Zhu, Sunnyside: I was surprised by the density of the proposed project. I'm concerned about the flow of traffic. Also, the open space is surrounded by tall buildings and a parking lot. I'm concerned about shadows.

Karen Murray, VMWP: We're proposing about 550 spaces for residents and about 500 in a shared garage. We will take into account wind and sun when designing the open space.

Peter Waller, PYATOK: The parking numbers are preliminary. Some people would like more; some would like less.

Monica Collins, Sunnyside: Phelan is already a mess. I try to walk, but not everyone has that luxury. In regards to the open space, shrubs take up a lot of space; I don't think there should be shrubs in the open space.

Amy O’Hair, Sunnyside: I would like to see a north south elevation cross-section. This project is going to feel like a cliff next to Riordan High School. This side should be stepped down as well.

Harry Bernstein, Merced Heights: Are you reaching out to Riordan? AvalonBay is considering converting offsite market rate units that it owns to affordable units instead of building the units on-site. I would like this addressed. Residents in the northwest corner of the site will be far from transit. Do you expect them to walk? Access will be difficult in the event of an emergency.

Joe Kirchofer, AvalonBay: We have had some preliminary conversations with Riordan. We are discussing, as a concept, converting market rate units in our neighboring building to affordable units. We do not know if this will work as a policy or financially. However, this could be a way to accelerate the delivery of the affordable housing.

Mark Tang: A concrete design of the site will be developed during the environmental review. We are just looking at options currently. How much parking is currently available on the site? Will the CCSF parking lot be accessible from Lee Avenue?

Peter Waller, PYATOK: There are about 970 spaces in the lower reservoir. Access to the lot from Lee Avenue has not been determined.

Jeremy Shaw, SF Planning: The general goal of the plan is to create connectivity, but the parking access is still being studied.

Robert Muehlbauer: PUC has strict requirements for building over pipelines. The construction of Unity Plaza was delayed by these requirements. How wide will the streets be?

Karen Murray, VMWP: Lee Avenue will have street parking and bike lanes. The total width will be about 71 feet. This is similar to a standard city street.

Jon Winston: A transportation study should look at all modes of transit. In the last few years, Ocean Avenue has development some street life. Unity Plaza has become a focal point of the neighborhood. I would like to see the PUC easement take some of the pedestrian traffic off of Ocean Avenue.

Mike Ahrens: I understand that there is a base plan and variants. In either the base or the variants, to what extent are the plan parameters on height being exceeded?

Karen Murray, VMWP: The current design that we are looking at would have some 7 story buildings. The parameters say up to 6 stories.

Peter Waller, PYATOK: Having some buildings above the height parameters allows greater stepping down towards the edges of the site.

Mike Ahrens: There are about 500 parking spaces for residents and 500 shared spaced. Correct? Both this project and the Performing Arts Center will take away parking. What are your alternatives if these numbers that you’ve stated aren’t enough? Have you considered a parking garage on the east side of the CCSF campus?

Joe Kirchofer, AvalonBay: We’re looking at a variety of options and numbers. We’re looking at a variety of locations for the garage. I believe a garage on the east side of the CCSF campus is in the CCSF master plan. The EIR will look at a lot of transportation impacts and alternatives.

Lisa Spinelli: If the park will be built on PUC land, it would be great to coordinate with the library. I’m concerned about how the townhomes will be developed. We want to see quality buildings. I like the idea of putting the child care facility next to the PUC open space. We are concerned with going above 6 stories. We have got to figure out Phelan Avenue. We need to publish the parking study data and methodology. The idea of moving units to the AvalonBay building on Ocean Avenue may create confusion. This needs greater clarity.

Brad Wiblin, Bridge Housing: Neither AvalonBay nor Bridge Housing are in the for-sale housing business. We are working with a broker to identify builders for the townhomes. You will meet them. There will be design guidelines for the project that will create a unified feel. We believe there will be significant interest in the townhome sites, and we want to choose a quality builder.

7. Environmental Evaluation Process – [Recording: 01:39:53]

Number of Units to be evaluated

- Environmental Evaluation Application will include three scenarios for the number of units on-site
- Our base scenario is 1100 units, the number we believe is feasible to build on-site
- The low scenario will include 900 units
- The high scenario will include 1300 units

Example Technical Diagrams

- Environmental Evaluation application includes technical diagrams that address specific issues.
- This is a draft of the Open Space diagram.
- It is not a final design, but it provides enough information about the size and location of the open space to begin evaluation process.
- Design can evolve as long as the amount of open space remains the same.
- EE may include variants on location of open space, similar to variants on location of streets.
- This is a preliminary diagram showing the size of the residential blocks.
- This is not a final design but it provides enough information to evaluate the general size of the building sites.
- The design can still evolve as the size of the residential blocks does not increase significantly.
- The EE application can also include design variants, such as the optional street layouts.

April 20-21 Open House: Project team on-site to discuss range of topics

- Open Space Options
- Pedestrian, Bike and Auto circulation
- Design of Townhome neighborhood
- Community Amenities
- Architectural Character
- Sustainability
- Options for Phasing

Lisa Spinelli: I would like you to look at a 800-1300 unit range. 900 seems too high as a lower bound. For the open house, I think it would be good to have name tags that identify what neighborhood people are from.

8. General Public Comment – [Recording: 01:49:20]

Rita Evans, Sunnyside: Why not study 700-1100 units? Why study a higher number?

Joe Kirchofer, AvalonBay: We want to be transparent. Studying a range is how environmental review has always been done. We're also looking at having CCSF housing on the site. If that is the design that people want, we want to maintain that option.

Chris Hansen, Excelsior: The Chancellor has been talking about 300-500 units for CCSF. I'm not seeing that in the site designs. I'm also not seeing the Performing Arts Center in the site design.

Brad Wiblin, Bridge Housing: We are in talks with CCSF about having housing on the lower site. We don't think that there will be a conflict with the Performing Arts Center construction.

Lisa Spinelli: We need a formal CCSF update.

Hedde Thieme, Westwood Park: Could a tunnel be built under Phelan? Can parking be put under the housing?

Karen Murray, VMWP: We did look at a tunnel. However, there are PUC water lines that make it challenging. We are planning to have parking under many of the buildings.

Yonathan Randolph, Ingleside: How will the TDM be incorporated into the EIR report? Malia Cohen asked that we go above 1,100 units to 2,000-3,000. Why don't we study this many?

Jeremy Shaw, SF Planning: TDM is a requirement of any development in the City. It is standard practice that there are multiple alternatives. The final alternatives have not been decided yet.

Laura Frye, Westwood Park: It took a long time for the Mission Rock project to reach a final agreement. The parameters for this site said it should have a gradual height change from 25 to 65 feet. This design doesn't appear to follow this. The lower bound number of units being studied should be lowered.

Jennifer Heggie, Sunnyside: I would like the EIR to study the impact of this project on the Performing Arts Center. The Performing Arts Center will have a large impact on parking.

James, CCSF student: Can we look at a higher number of units to study? CCSF students are struggling to rent in San Francisco.

Madeline Mueller, CCSF: The CCSF facilities master plan is a draft. It is highly flawed. There needs to be parking for events at the Performing Arts Center and at Riordan high school. We need to put the bicycle traffic on Lee.

Lizzy, Sunset: It would be nice to see a timeline for the project and a timeline for the affordable housing. I don't like the idea of identifying people by where they live. I would like to live here and don't think my voice should count less than others.

Greg: Could the EIR study reducing residential parking to reduce the environmental impact? This would reduce traffic on Phelan.

Harry Bernstein, Merced Heights: I would like to hear more about the Bart shuttle. Will the developer contribute to this? Will the developer contribute to the cost of replacing parking for City College? The loss of parking is perplexing. This seems like it is being hidden. Emily Lesk stated that the fiscal feasibility report did not need to look at the loss of parking or the impact on enrollment because these will be part of the environmental study. I don't support studying a higher number of units. Bay Area Renters' Federation brought in a handout with 6,000 units, and Lisa confiscated it.

Lisa Spinelli: 6,000 units is not being considered. I've never confiscated a document.

9. Adjournment – [Recording: 2:11:45]