

**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, June 13, 2016**

**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](http://www.sf-planning.org/brcac)

Documents received during this meeting are in a document titled balboareservoir\_CAC\_Public\_Documents\_Received\_and\_Emails-061316 available via the following link: [www.sf-planning.org/brcac](http://www.sf-planning.org/brcac)

Committee Members Present:

Kate Favetti, Rebecca Lee, Robert Muehlbauer, Maria Picar, Lisa Spinali, Jon Winston

Committee Members Absent:

Howard Chung, Brigitte Davila, Christine Godinez

Staff/Consultants Present:

Jeremy Shaw, Planning Department; Emily Lesk, Mike Martin, Phillip Wong, Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Martin Gran, Christopher J. Wong, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission; Jen Low, Supervisor Norman Yee, Office of D7 Supervisor Norman Yee; Beth Rubenstein, Office of D11 Supervisor John Avalos

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

- a. Roll Call

**2. Opening of Meeting.**

- a. Amendments to 05/09/16 Minutes.

- i. No CAC Comment.
- ii. Public Comment.
  - 1. Harry Bernstein. CCSF.
    - 1. Page 9. Comment 15. Donna Hayes. Change “death nail” to “death hammer”
- iii. Motion to approve 5/09/16 minutes with amendments: Favetti, Second: Winston
  - 1. Ayes: Favetti, Lee, Muehlbauer, Picar, Spinali, Winston
  - 2. Noes: [none]
- b. Amendments to 05/23/16 Minutes.
  - i. CAC Comment.
    - 1. Favetti.
      - 1. Thank you for including Robert Muehlbauer’s letter.
  - ii. No public comment.
  - iii. Motion to approve 5/23/16 minutes: Favetti, Second: Winston
    - 1. Ayes: Favetti, Lee, Muehlbauer, Picar, Spinali, Winston
    - 2. Noes: [none]

**3. Transportation Parameters.**

- a. Spinali.
  - i. There were three main changes; this is our third round of revisions.
  - ii. Review of three major changes.
    - 1. Page 1. Description of TDM plan gives a much better definition of a TDM plan and how it’s going to work.
    - 2. Explaining exactly what automobile mode share means; definition on bottom of page 3.
    - 3. Page 6. Figure out the best way to do the parking ratio. Goal is to be able to say that the ratio varies by unit type, not exactly a 1:1 parking ratio project wide. Studio might have a 0:1 parking ratio, maybe a three-bedroom unit would have a 2:1 parking ratio, and maybe with one-bedroom unit half would have a parking space and half would not. The intention was to create language that would allow the developer to be creative to figure out the right parking ratio so that we’re accommodating everyone that needs to have a car while also encouraging those that do not need to have a car to use public transportation or alternate modes but also have the ability to drive; to have the wording be such that it accommodates all.
      - 1. 0.5 is the wording for the citywide standard that’s being used currently for all projects.
      - 2. The intention isn’t that it be 0.5 but that it’s tied to the units so that the housing stock and parking availability, or non-parking availability, is going to accommodate the different types of people residing in the units.

b. Public Comment.

i. Julia Raskin. San Francisco Bicycle Coalition.

1. While the parameters are being developed specifically for this site, there's an important opportunity to improve transit for all that pass through here.
2. The current draft parameters take advantage of that opportunity and we urge the BRCAC to approve them as they stand.
3. This includes maintaining the 0.5:1 parking ratio, which would minimize congestion and allow more space on the street for pedestrians and cyclists; keeps choice available for what type of transit they want to use.
4. Goal of the site is to provide affordable housing for San Franciscans the transportation options must also be affordable.
5. It's important that the draft parameters give benefits to those who take public transit, bike, or walk around, reflected in principle 2.
6. The streets surrounding the site are some of the most dangerous, both Ocean and Geneva are both on the high injury network for biking and walking, which represents a small percentage of streets where the overwhelming majority of crashes occur resulting in serious injuries or even fatalities. Critical need to ensure development along these corridors are bike friendly and walkable and connect to the major transit hub at the Balboa Park Station; the four draft principles do just that.
7. We're encouraged by the bike language in 2.d.
8. In addition to a north-south bike route through the site, we think there's ample opportunity to provide an east-west bike route parallel to Ocean Avenue.
9. 1.d. creates an alternative to crossing Ocean at Phelan by the Lee avenue connection; this project had been funded and was in the works but had been stalled indefinitely.
10. Hopes BRCAC approves these parameters and upholds the City's transit first policy and Vision Zero goal.

ii. David Tejada. Sunnyside.

1. We need to rethink the whole process. We're in this century not the last one. We need to get rid of our private, polluting vehicles.
2. We have modern technologies, we have shared cars.
3. People can live here and not have to own a car.
4. All the spaces should be secure shared spaces and plugged in with outlets at every single space; lots of different types of bike parking, infrastructure for electric bikes.
5. We need to educate the locals; make it so that people that live in the neighborhood have shared cars on their block. On my block alone I think that would eliminate 5 cars.
6. Make less cars; get rid of the cars.

- iii. Chris Peterson. Dorado Terrace, Westwood Park.
  1. Agree with the past two speakers.
  2. I think it's important given how much transit there is in the area and is adjacent to a pedestrian friendly commercial really try to reduce dependence on the automobile.
  3. I was concerned with the Chair's summary of the changes to page 6; the comments downplayed the importance of a 0.5:1 parking ratio being a cap. I think that it's very important to try to minimize the amount of parking because there is a correlation with the amount people are driving.
  4. I understand that there will be greater need for parking for larger units than smaller units.
  5. Add goal to be a maximum of 0.5:1 parking ratio per unit on average.
- iv. Madeleine Mueller. CCSF.
  1. Referring to page 6, City of Hercules has the same population as enrollment in CCSF so I think we have to have a sense of perspective that we have the City of Hercules in this neighborhood ~~and our students don't bike or walk to school.~~ (Amended at July 11, 2016 CAC Meeting)
  2. On page 6, when it talks about sharing residents and night and students during the day, it doesn't take into consideration the Performing Arts and Education Center (PAEC); it's a completion project and our campus would not be complete without it.
    1. Spinali. It says include the future PAEC.
    2. Madeleine Mueller. Yes it says that, but mostly those will be open to the public at night, and I don't see night school and PAEC will be accommodated; it's a double-dip. This paragraph doesn't seem to cover the logistics of having night school and community attendance at the PAEC.
- v. Laura Fry. Westwood Park.
  1. Supervisor Yee said that this project would be a non-starter if CCSF parking was not replaced, and the language in here does not reflect that.
  2. It's a guarantee that CCSF students will be taken care of.
  3. 3.c. page 6, re: shared parking, this is an experiment, you have someone or people deciding that this will work, but it's still going to be an experiment and it's not guarantee it's going to work for CCSF students.
- vi. Carol Ito. Westwood Park.
  1. 3.b. Reinforce what Laura said regarding the speculative plan for the students and for evening parking.
  2. 23% or more of our population is the baby boomers going into the senior age. There's talk about students and families needing parking but we also need parking for seniors.

3. Department of the Environment's transit study this week. Is that coordinated with what we're doing here?
  1. Jeremy Shaw. Yes, the Department of the Environment's survey is done in conjunction with this project.
- vii. Christine Hanson.
  1. 3.c. regarding expert analysis demonstrating shared parking is a viable approach, this does not actually say very much; it's a broad statement on who is an expert. I know that some of the surveys that have happened seem to be of a wider population. I'm not hearing of any surveys that are being done specifically of the students that park in the parking lot of the reservoir.
    1. Spinali. Are we not doing surveys specifically for students, were they in the parking lot?
    2. Jeremy Shaw. Yes we are surveying students and we are surveying in the parking lot.
  2. Expert analysis does not clarify what you're going to be relying on for data.
- viii. Maureen. Plymouth Avenue.
  1. San Francisco currently has 65,000 housing units in the pipeline and has one community college that at its peak had 100,000 students. And hopefully will again if Supervisor Kim's proposal for free community college is passed.
  2. Refusing to address the traffic impacts of 50% reduction in CCSF parking and the addition of 1000 new residents to the reservoir is a failure of planning that asks planners to look at the long-term consequences of present actions and a special attention to the interrelatedness of decisions.
  3. This is a transit-rich site.
  4. If you live on Geary and 25<sup>th</sup> it will take you one-hour to get to CCSF on MUNI. From Hunter's Point it is one-hour and two transfers. From the Western Addition it's 40 to 60 minutes and two transfers.
  5. Imagine if you're a student who works 8 hours and comes to a night class for 3 hours and spends 2 hours on MUNI. How much time do you have for sleep, eating, and homework?
  6. Have you ever taken a night class or come home from work and been so afraid to leave your bus stop in the middle of a deserted street that you pick up a rock and walk in the middle of the street acting crazy.
  7. This area is not accessible to many people unless they are on a BART route.
  8. This is a major transit destination because it's a school. If you are sending students here, who come from Tracy to take nursing or robotics classes... this area is a draw for people far outside of the MUNI or BART system. They are coming here and if they can't find a

- space they will circle the neighborhoods looking for a space or they will drop out.
9. Refusing to address the impacts on CCSF would be the equivalent to the ACCJC decision.
- ix. Anita Theoharis. Westwood Park.
1. I'm echoing Maureen, Laura, and Carol Ito.
  2. The Westwood Park Association just very simply is advocating for a reasonable 1:1 parking ratio and retention of parking for CCSF students.
  3. Housing on the Balboa Reservoir has been an issue for decades. The Balboa Station Area Plan, completed in 2009, determined 500 units is the worst case scenario and there would be a major deficit in parking. And that was before the McDonald's development, the 1490 Ocean development, and the 1100 Ocean Avenue development.
  4. This plan is from 2009 and is being ignored in my respectful opinion.
  5. I respectfully implore our Westwood Park representative, Ms. Favetti, to vote no on these parameters because they do not reflect the decision of the Westwood Park Association Board supported by 315 residents.
- x. Monica Collins. CCSF.
1. I would like to reiterate what the lady said a few minutes ago.
  2. I work in the financial aid office and many of my students are single parents, with jobs, trying to get through school, and that live outside of the City because they can't afford to live in town.
  3. I would love to ride my bike again.
  4. There's a time when seniors and bicycles do not necessarily mix; this is not the time of year for people like us to go out on bikes.
- xi. Laura Clark. GrowSF.
1. As a young person I might be better able to say what would be best for students, and I think it is housing.
  2. Students needs housing more than they need parking.
  3. This is a great location close to public transportation, and I've heard a lot of great arguments for beefing up our public transportation, and I can't wait to see some of these public transportation activists come out to support improving BART and improving our bike lanes and generally coming out to continue the fight for public transportation because I'm sure that's what they meant to say.
- xii. Ellen Wall. ~~Westwood Park.~~Sunnyside. (Amended at July 11, 2016 CAC Meeting)
1. After reading this I couldn't believe it.
  2. People have after several meetings said, "Please do not build housing here for all of the obvious reasons."
  3. I remember that 40 years ago this supervisorial district has the least park space of all the supervisorial districts in San Francisco. So I went over to the district that has the most, Richmond.

4. You should build your housing at 10<sup>th</sup> and the park, Fulton; there's parking, there's a parking garage, there's open space for entertainment; it's a gorgeous place to build housing if you must have housing. But our poor little neighborhood with our inadequate everything. We are grossly lacking in everything including places to park.
  5. The things you have written here are so wrong, it's just as if you're not listening to people who are getting up week after week, month after month saying don't do this.
- xiii. Corey Smith. San Francisco Housing Action Coalition.
1. On behalf of our 300 business members and individuals I did pass around our official statement on the proposal itself. *Attached to this document.*
  2. We do not take an official stance on what we would recommend in terms of the parking ratio, but 1:1 is not consistent with what we're seeing around the City and what we strive to be as a transit-oriented City.
  3. I understand there are circumstances in the extreme where people travel a long way to CCSF in order to attend and enjoy the great school that we have here.
  4. Every spot we put down is a unit of housing that's not there. Prioritize creating housing for students here first so their commute is across the street.
  5. It's all trade-offs and we have to decide what is more important in terms of our total priorities. We're in a transit-rich area, less parking means less cars on the road and less pollution and congestion and is where we want to be moving.
- xiv. John Hayes. CCSF.
1. You should prioritize student housing here that in no way is going to make up for the student population of CCSF.
  2. You need to balance the needs of CCSF with the need for housing and the needs of the City.
  3. I've been hearing that some members of this committee are ginning up support from SF BARF to come in to testify for as much housing as possible, forgetting CCSF.
  4. I ride a bike. I've been here since 1987. In between bicycling and transit it's a wonderful way to get around if you have time to do it.
  5. Our students don't have that kind of time.
  6. If you take away their parking it'll be a real blow to CCSF.
- xv. Harry Bernstein. Merced Heights. CCSF.
1. Are the TDM results going to be completed before any RFP is issued?
    1. Spinali. No, it's part of the development process.
  2. I saw comment after comment about it was pointless to not have that information first. I guess maybe it's pointless.

1. Spinali. We can clarify that again after you finish your comment.
  3. I still don't understand how the TDM is supposed to address the loss of parking to CCSF. Was it in the original charge of the firm doing the study to consider that? Or is it just being tossed aside?
  4. Disturbed by comments from the neighbors that in 2009 the Balboa Park Station plan a deficit of over 900 parking places and possibly 1500 under some other circumstances.
  5. More in-fill development will aggravate this situation further. Are we going in the right direction?
  6. I am still concerned about the needs of the students, and I don't see sharing cars, or no cars, being routine
    1. Spinali. We will wait until the last comment to respond.
- xvi. Bill Maguire. SFMTA.
1. 100 students randomly polled, 62% said they work while going to school.
  2. We have an amazing workforce, I love my kids because they work and go to school.
  3. 38% said it takes 30 minutes or less in a car to get here.
  4. 53% said it takes 45 minutes or less from the job to school to be on time. Public transit has a long way to go.
- xvii. Supervisor Norman Yee.
1. Two points on transportation.
  2. Many people have already testified that we have to cure the parking that the students will need. I will add to the anecdote. I've was a student here and I would get here at 7 in the morning to take my lab classes and other classes and from here go straight to work and get home around 10 or 11 PM, sleep, then get up again.
  3. When I was here I would say that 99% of students were also working, without even knowing I bet that 75% of students that come here, currently, go to work. It's something we need to consider, some of the places don't get them to their jobs by MUNI.
  4. Second point. I live here so I get it with the parking. It's really important. I mentioned before there are certain family configurations that need parking, seniors need parking. Whatever this project becomes we need to make sure we don't make parking worse outside of this project.
  5. If you're thinking we might save some parking spaces here, we need to be 100% sure they aren't going to park outside of this area in their neighborhoods.
  6. I want to reinforce what my fellow neighbors have said and I will talk about housing later.
- c. CAC Comment.
- i. Muehlbauer.

1. This has been thorny all the way through and I want to commend staff for going back three times now and trying to take all this testimony and try to wrap it into something. I think they're doing a good job. It may not ultimately be what we're looking for but they're making a good effort.
  2. I made a memo for April 13<sup>th</sup>. My comments and my sentiments still remain there.
  3. The transportation parameters are like polishing a rock. At some point we have to just put a wrap on it.
  4. As it applies to providing soft services at this development such as discounts on Clipper Cards or Fast Passes, it could work really good particularly if it's a TDM package and the soft services are developed as a mirror to them, or it could be the biggest flim-flam package if it's not monitored. I think it would be wise to have an evaluation component to any of the soft services meant to defray the need for a car, otherwise it's going to get out of control.
  5. Regarding the ratio of 0.5:1 parking to units, we saw successful examples of that in the City. Parts of the City were developed before the car, and maybe geographically that is still the same, but out here it was largely developed with cars. We have a suburban frontier here and I think we need to be cognizant of that fact. That's not to say that 0.5:1 parking ratio as a whole won't work but it might be good to see some examples.
  6. Principle 2. Consistent with my memo, when we talk create incentives for improving the experience of utilizing transportation choices between the Balboa Reservoir site and transit, I would feel much better if we mentioned our regional transit station, Balboa Park Station because that's really where we need people going to from this site to that transit station. Until we address how we get over to the transit station outside of our cars we're going to be missing an opportunity.
- ii. Favetti.
1. We should also include the CCSF bus station.
- iii. Winston.
1. 22 Franklin, 14 two-bedroom units, 14 one-bedroom units, and 7 studios, and 1800 sq. ft. of ground floor commercial, no on-street parking.
  2. 5 story Mercy Housing around the corner half of that is foster kids aging out and the other half is family housing with zero parking; that's here and that's 74 units not producing traffic. They have cars but I haven't seen them parking in the neighborhood.
  3. If we have a low parking ratio in the reservoir, how are we going to police parking in the neighborhoods? That's done all throughout the City as well. We have residential parking permits all over the City and it

can easily be made illegal to park outside of the reservoir or within the reservoir; you'll have to have a sticker.

4. We had this issue with Sunnyside with CCSF people parking in the neighborhood especially this site of Monterey Blvd.
5. We could implement, overnight, residential parking permits.
6. There has been some revamping of the residential parking permit program. Some of the problems can be fixed if people spoke up about it.
7. Just because someone parks in front of your house, I don't think we should be worrying about our constituency in the reservoir because if everyone who moves into the reservoir and brings their cars we're going to have carmageddon on the streets.
8. Those of us who think that this TDM policy is meant to get you out of your car, actually the TDM is to provide choice for those that want to use something other than a car can and the people who must drive will be able to because the streets will still have a little bit of space to accommodate them.
9. If we keep 1000 parking spots here on the reservoir and offer a 1:1 parking ratio for a hypothetical 500 units, that's 1500 cars coming in and out of this parking lot up and down Phelan every day. We can't support that.
10. We need to think about ways of reducing the number of cars in the reservoir. Parking is the best way to do it.
11. If you need parking it can be purchased as it is unbundled and you'll pay a little extra.
12. Those that don't want to drive won't have to pay extra, which is why I'm in favor of a 0.5:1 parking ratio overall.

iv. Lee.

1. After hearing public comment it seems like the issue is not so much parking for the residents (addressed in 3.b.) but also what happens to those that are traveling here from outside of the City to go to class or a show at a future Performing Arts and Education Center (PAEC).
2. There seems to be quite a bit of doubt about having shared parking. There seems like there is a lot of skepticism.
3. I'm open to see if it will work because I actually live in a neighborhood that has a similar arrangement and was probably developed before there were cars or when they were not readily available with very narrow streets. There are particular lanes where parking in parking spaces is illegal during certain times so MUNI can travel through and after a certain time cars are allowed. That was one very unique arrangement in my neighborhood and I want to impose that on other neighborhoods. But I see that people are engaged, there is a shared parking arrangement that could work.

4. I'm comfortable with exploring that as a viable approach, and maybe it's not but at that point through the TDM analysis and the development process there is an input process to determine that shared parking can or cannot work.
  5. I think this language allows us to move forward and if folks are interested we can work it out.
- v. Spinali.
1. Rebecca that was going to be my point. We're supposed to only be talking about the things in green, so it's really about the 0.5:1 parking ratio.
  2. But, I want to reiterate something about 3.c. Once the parameters are done and the RFP is created and a developer is selected there's going to be a lot of on-going community participation in figuring out how things are going to move forward. Understand the two new sentences - making sure CCSF students, faculty and employees are being taken care of as well as those that would frequent the new PAEC, and regarding shared parking you have to figure out how it will accommodate CCSF students and employees and that's the mandate.
  3. Regarding Supervisor Yee, we can't build this if CCSF parking isn't accommodated. There is nothing that says we're doing shared parking as an option for CCSF. It's to be explored. When proposals come forward we're going to see different approaches to this.
  4. I was a very big proponent of 1:1 parking ratio, but my perspective has changed. And it has changed because I think we need to give the developers latitude to figure out creatively what the right ratios will be based upon what they are going to plan to build.
  5. I think none of this can be taken care of though if we don't fix the transportation issue. The 43 is a nightmare.
  6. It's a little disingenuous to call us a transit-rich community, transit laden might be a better way to describe it. It doesn't work it can take 90 minutes, or like a sardine on a bus.
  7. We're all very aware the CCSF students are from special populations (e.g. work, have families, juggling important demands) and they are going to school to improve their economic vitality. We have to make sure to take care of that. I feel like I need to say that for the record because every time someone gets up to say it we're not thinking about it.
  8. I think that CCSF is at the core of this community and we are surrounding CCSF and we are a collective community with CCSF at the hub.
  9. Whatever happens has to happen in tight conjunction with CCSF.
  10. I'm comfortable with the language of the new 3.c.
- d. Levels of Consensus. [Levels of Consensus Graphic attached]
- i. Lee – 4

- ii. Winston – 5
- iii. Spinali – 4
- iv. Favetti – 0
  - 1. I need to say that I appreciate the fact that City staff has responded with many changes and we appreciate my request to clarify the auto mode share and that you have removed quite a bit regarding the overall parking ratio. I also want to say as a senior, seniors go to CCSF, and I take the 43 to Fort Mason. I am a daily MUNI rider and I have a car. I realize we have a neighborhood that is a strong supporter of CCSF. We are the strongest advocates we could possibly be. It's a very strong feeling that replacement parking for CCSF students is an absolute must. The neighborhood has spoken 1:1 parking ratio is the position of Westwood Park. To that end, I don't like the reference to a visit so I will vote zero.
  - 2. Anything we can do to safely walk around the neighborhood would be greatly appreciated. Particularly to the Balboa BART station and underground K.
- v. Muehlbauer – 3
  - 1. I can live with the decision.
- vi. Picar – 3
  - 1. I live in the neighborhood and I have a car, and I do walk a lot, and I went to CCSF. I know that when I've gone to performing arts venues and shows I sometimes bring my car because it's too windy and it's too cold and there's no parking. So I know the feeling of running around for parking but I also know what it's like to walk and get there on your own.
- vii. Chung\* – 4
- viii. Davila\* – 4.5
  - \* CAC Member was not present at meeting. CAC Member submitted a level of consensus based on reviewing written material and previously submitted written public comment to BRCAC@sfgov.org, available online at [www.sf-planning.org/brcac](http://www.sf-planning.org/brcac).**
- ix. Spinali.
  - 1. We do not have consensus because Westwood Park will only take a 1:1 ratio. Is it possible if we remove the percentage and just have it be 0.5 and leave it open for the developers to come back, would that be acceptable? Instead of mandating it has to be a 1:1 parking ratio.
    - 1. Favetti. The strong message from the neighborhood is no.
  - 2. With that we've recorded the vote, we have the parameter as it is laid out and I guess we're going to move forward. We have 5 out of 9 that have given it a 3 or above so it's going to move forward as articulated.

**4. Housing Proposal by Supervisor Norman Yee.**

a. Presentation by Supervisor Norman Yee – **PDF Presentation available online at [www.sf-planning.org/brcac](http://www.sf-planning.org/brcac)**

b. CAC Questions and Clarifications.

i. Winston.

1. I just thought I'd clarify because I didn't understand I actually don't understand the original parameters too well. It was sufficiently vague that it was okay with me because they are parameters not plans; all aspirational. We haven't started planning the actual building yet.

2. 1.b. Propose financial mechanisms to achieve at least 50% low to moderate and middle income, original. You changed it to propose additional public financing mechanisms to achieve 50% or higher. What is your thinking on changing this?

1. Supervisor Norman Yee. The intent is to say that – when you say this goal that may not be reached – we have to reach at least 50%. And if it takes looking into public financing then we should look into it. We may or may not have it but she should consider it.

ii. Favetti.

1. I appreciated the fact that the housing would be permanently affordable for the 17% above – the 120% to 150% AMI – which was not on the original parameters so that it gives it additional security with regard to keeping it permanently affordable for a larger number of housing. 120% to 150% responds to a lot of comments from Westwood Park.

2. What I was not clear on and would like clarification is in the original parameters our poll was that proposals should strive to exceed this 50% target and that was under the 120% to 150%, but I don't see that being addressed. Is that intentional or are we still striving to go beyond 50%?

1. Supervisor Norman Yee. What I'm saying is you have got to do it.

3. What you're saying is at least 50%, what we said previously was to strive to have more than 50%.

1. Supervisor Norman Yee. And you can make it more than 50% here because you have to make it at least 50%.'

4. At least and strive to do more should be added.

iii. Spinali.

1. I think the language is stronger and when you start to do the calculations around what market-rate is going to mean this helps to clarify what it means. It's housing for those that really need the housing. We're addressing the collective community need. I want to remind everyone of the very skinny hourglass that the least amount of

housing is built for middle income. This is a rare opportunity given the size of the parcel that will allow us to subsidize middle income housing. I'm fine with it.

iv. Favetti.

1. I would be fine with it, with my additions.

c. Public Comment

i. Christine Hanson.

1. When you are considering a proportion of affordable units, bear in mind that if the AMI is \$72,947 and a portion of your units are in the category of middle-income (150% AM) you're talking about a one-person household with an income of \$109,420.
2. For a perspective, a full-time, tenured teacher at CCSF makes \$81,134 and they will not be able to afford this middle-income...
3. When I see middle-income I see middle-class but when I look at the numbers that's not what I'm really looking at. Firemen, teachers, a lot of other people are not middle-income in this description.

ii. Jesse Fernandez. District 7 Resident. PODER. CUHJ.

1. While we're encouraged by the proposal to increase the proportion and level of affordability at the reservoir we believe the housing parameters are far and away from true affordability and accessibility to San Francisco's most vulnerable residents.
2. These are people that have come before you to tell you stories of displacement, inequitable investment, and a general disregard, by several of the offices that are stewarding this process forward, to no avail.
3. Aside from the Warriors game, people are not here because of a lack of transparency behind this particular meeting.
4. As a massive, publicly owned site the reservoir can have a wonderfully meaningful impact on a lot of the people faced with housing insecurity, talking about cooks, laborers, teachers, and professionals all working under the burden of unaffordable housing. A housing crisis created by a legacy of inequitable investment, exclusivity, and a narrow vision of development.
5. A short-term gap in municipal funding shouldn't preclude truly affordable development or a dialogue to end.
6. The CAC must mold this project and its parameters such that they reflect the needs, not just of a singular district but of the surrounding neighborhoods, CCSF, those that would benefit, and the San Francisco community at large.

iii. Yonathan Randolph. Ingleside.

1. I disagree with revision to 2.a. that the rents or purchase price should be at least 15% below local market-rate prices. It's unclear why that should be there. If someone who's making 120% AMI doesn't need any subsidy why should they get a subsidy? Probably at the time of project

approval I don't expect prices to go down that much but even if they did I don't see why that that 15% below market rate is there.

iv. Fernando Martí. CUHJ.

1. Thank Supervisor Yee for moving the needle getting us closer to what we've been advocating for in terms of greater affordability.
2. Something that is critical to how we have done these types of projects before is regarding public financing strategies. For example Octavia Boulevard, we have dedicated specific sites for low-income housing, whether it is one or more sites. That is a different way of approaching this than saying 18 percent or some other percent that we come up with.
3. When you talk to the Mayor's Office of Housing it costs about \$250,000 a unit, which they leverage state and federal dollars to build this. If you imagine a parcel on this site, 100 units would be about \$25 million. That's a lot of money. The housing trust fund will be putting \$50 million into affordable housing. Within the recent bond we passed \$50 million is dedicated specifically to the Mission district. We'll probably be doing another affordable housing bond in another 5 years, 50 million could go into this and we could build two sites of exclusively affordable housing.
4. Part B talks about the range of housing serving 80% - 120% AMI. How do the respondents to the RFP respond? They will probably all be at 120% because they can make a lot more money that way. Make it an average of 100% AMI between 80% - 120%.
5. Regarding the person before me who asked about why 15% below local market rate. If you go online right now and look at what's being marketed at Avalon and Brighton it's 150% of AMI.

v. Chris Pederson. Dorado Terrace.

1. This City is facing a housing crisis, the world is facing a climate change crisis.
2. This plan needs to maximize housing at all income levels given it's in a location with a tremendous amount of transit service. I'm fully supportive of pushing aggressively to get as much of that housing as possible as being for affordable housing.
3. I do have a bit of a concern of expressing that in percentage terms because a development with a low number of units could have a very impressive percentage of affordable units but may really make an insignificant contribution to addressing the City's affordable housing crisis.
4. A proposal with a significantly larger number of units may not have as impressive a percentage figure but still be producing a larger number of units.
5. It should be done in a way that you're not just looking at the percentages but the number of units.

6. If one is proposing more units but with a lower percentage they shouldn't be penalized, if anything they should be rewarded for providing more affordable housing.
  7. One detail of Supervisor Yee's proposal that I'm concerned about relates to the fair market value being set at 33% affordability. The additional 17% of that being provided by public subsidy. This is publically owned land that provides really an unusual opportunity where we can put in rules now before the property is sold establishing affordable housing requirements without scavenging very limited pots of subsidy for affordable housing.
- vi. Mike Eggie. SF Resident. SF BARF.
1. I don't want to sound glib, but it's one thing to drop the needle to the floor and it's another to try to nail it through the floor; you end up breaking the needle.
  2. Supervisor Yee's recommendations in terms of the overall mix seem really good but are made moot by mandating 50% affordable.
  3. I want to echo the sentiments of the previous speaker about making goals based on percentage of units.
  4. We should be looking at a total number of affordable units within a spectrum like this that this neighborhood needs, in my opinion it would be what the entire southeast corner of the City needs, and can be fulfilled by this site. Then you figure out how many market-rate units you need to pay for it because right now it's all you've got to pay for the affordable units. We need housing of all kind. We can't guarantee in a post-redevelopment era public financing, and when you start talking about 50% affordable it looks to developers like a poison pill. There is also the needs of the PUC ratepayers and their fiduciary duties. Then we will endure a few more decades of no housing built here.
- vii. Madeleine Mueller. CCSF.
1. I'm going to do the ultimate heresy, market-rate is where I have a real problem. This is moving the needle way over, there's speculation going on in the peninsula and San Francisco.
  2. An article that talks about a glut of empty, high-end units downtown.
  3. High-rises of 500 units is less than 50% leased.
  4. So we have to have some city-wide cap on where we have empty units where we are being victimized by speculators coming to this town and raising everything up. It's a game. We have to get that data out there.
  5. We now have 5,000 units of high-end housing and if that 50% empty rate continues, that's something.
  6. I think there are empty rates throughout the City and we have to get that data.
- viii. Shanell Williams. CCSF.
1. Submitting comments for Tomasita Medal.

2. I definitely appreciate the comments earlier by Ms. Spinali around CCSF as the hub and that we need to look at that, appreciate that, and focus on that and build from there.
  3. Tomasita's comments rally speak to having affordable housing to address the affordability crisis that we're in.
  4. We don't need additional market-rate housing.
  5. We want to see student and employee housing. We want to allow faculty to continue their work supporting over 75,000 students.
  6. She also wants to say there needs to be respect paid towards the need for the PAEC, which was voted on by San Francisco residents.
- ix. Christy Wong. SPUR.
1. Reinforce the idea that this is a major opportunity to create a lot of housing in places near transit.
  2. I think both the consensus already adopted and the Supervisor's proposal are pushing the envelope on affordable housing, which is absolutely the right thing to do especially on a public parcel of land.
  3. But 50% is probably pushing it. Given that you're doing an RFP people are opting in to do it. You should be careful on that.
  4. I think some flexibility is important to inspire creativity.
  5. This is a really special site in terms of its size and location. It's an opportunity to allow market-rate housing to cross subsidize affordable housing.
  6. Doing 100% affordable housing on this site would be an amazing opportunity but would suck up the City's resources for many years and take it away from other neighborhoods or it would take a really long time.
  7. We're in an affordable housing crisis and we need to maximize the number of affordable and market-rate housing units.
- x. Laura Fry. Westwood Park.
1. 3.c. Seems to talk about the fiscal responsibility the City has, why is that whole thing crossed out?
- xi. Anita Theoharis. Westwood Park.
1. In a previous hearing, our board member Linda Judge gave very good testimony. She's a controller for a developer on how the WPA's position on the housing and affordability component would pencil out for a developer. WPA considered that, too.
  2. WPA board as confirmed by the residents agrees with the City that 33% of the units be affordable with 18% for middle-income and 15% for low-income but urges everything over 33% be middle-income. We are also urging that a significant amount of ownership opportunities be provided.
- xii. Bill Maguire
1. We live in a City where a great majority rent.

2. If the Victory Gardens are going to be built, I really think some affordable rentals for students would make the project attractive. Also for teachers. A lot of people I work with rent.
- xiii. Corey Smith. SFHAC.
1. I want to repeat some previous comments and commend Supervisor Yee for employing the definition of a progressive policy to maximize the amount of affordable housing we can have on this site.
  2. There's a bit of a question mark as to whether 25% is going to ultimately be feasible and doubling that to 50% is concerning especially if it's going to not result in actual units being built.
  3. The opportunities for public financing; Governor Brown's recent legislation, they are trying to release \$400 million for the entire state, that is such a small amount of money for what we need. The opportunity to publically finance large amounts of housing is few and far between. Given our current tax structure and the ability to gain revenue for the City.
  4. Discussion of salaries and AMI levels; SFPD's starting salary is \$81,000 and after 7 years it is \$113,000 which knocks right at that 150% AMI. SFFD firefighters move up from the \$70,000s up to \$112,000. The average Registered Nurse makes around \$108,000. So I know a lot of these numbers can be mind-blowing for a lot of people especially for, no disrespect intended, some of the older residents but given our insane housing prices our employers are overpaying their employees. It's sort of adding on to itself.
  5. In today's reality people are getting paid a lot of money to live here because they have to be able to afford it.
- xiv. Spinali.
1. I think the comment is important that each person is allowed to present their perspective but that it shouldn't come at the expense of anyone else in this community because our intention is to try and build a collective community of support of this.
  2. I am not going to speak for you but the key kernel is there's a huge range of what people are paid and to remain competitive some are paid more money to stay.
  3. SF CASA I know there are social workers that are working large cases making \$45,000 a year. So I think there's a really broad range of what people are making. One of the very early slides that Mike Martin shared with the income levels and what jobs they represented. It showed we are very underrepresented in terms of supporting our public servants and allowing them to live in the City. There's a broad range of incomes and those from CCSF here probably are dealing with it the most and they certainly aren't paid a wage commensurate with SFFD and SFPD.
- xv. Laura Clark. GrowSF.

1. I think what would be fair to say that while salaries are slightly higher in the bay area, most of that increase in salary is eaten up by the cost of housing and also eaten up by the cost of transportation inherent in that.
  2. The only way we're going to fix that and be able to see our middle and low-income people is to have more housing and more affordable housing.
  3. In order to try to say we need more affordable housing according to Supervisor Yee, I deeply respect that. I think what is often lost when we talk about percentages is total units. If we don't build enough total units and we focus too much on percentages everyone is going to lose out. If we put in that our values are surrounded by percentage we're focusing on the type of community we want to have rather than focusing on the maximum number of people we can help.
  4. We have slashed affordable housing funding across the state, and until we do radical things like reforming prop 13 and other things outside the scope of the CAC we need to focus on how do we maximize the money going towards affordable housing. And we need to be realistic in understanding it's not always about percentages, it's about doing economic feasibility studies, looking at a bunch of different options and picking one that maximizes the total number of affordable units.
- xvi. Theodore Randolph. Excelsior.
1. I agree we need to maximize the number of units. I prefer the consensus language, maximize the number of affordable units and not have an additional thing to not exceed the minimum number of market-rate units.
  2. I think the number of market-rate units will be adequately limited by the height limits and the other parameters.
- xvii. Roger Ritter. West of Twin Peaks Central Council.
1. The council has not taken an official position on this yet, but it has generally always supported homeownership. So I would like to commend Supervisor Yee for his last point regarding a mix of rentals and homeownership.
  2. The reservoir will become one of the City's western neighborhoods, characterized by a preponderance of single-family units that are owned by their occupants. That is something we should not lose sight of.
  3. While we are concerned about affordability, we also need to be concerned about the sustainability of the community, and we need to consider how his new neighborhood will fit in with the characteristics of the western neighborhoods.
- xviii. Bob Herman. Westwood Park.
1. I grew up in a low-income household, and I worked my tail off to make the income I do today.

2. I understand the affordability aspect; I go to a church and our minister makes \$65,000 a year. I know the pains of what it's like to live in the City. I see it with my peers at UCSF Medical Center. I see the struggle with many people in the City to afford a house.
  3. I'm thrilled we are doing something with this pavement, but I also know we have to balance it out. It's about balancing it out and being kind and fair to each other because we all come from different perspectives. Affordability is important to low and middle-income people, but I also know the developers need to make sure that what they're doing makes sense and that they make some sort of profit or they're not going to do it.
  4. Infrastructure, how are we going to get healthcare and fire and all the safety aspects when we add this new influx of housing?
  5. I liked what Supervisor Yee said, we just need to balance it out.
- d. CAC Comment.
- i. Muehlbauer.
    1. We're talking about 55% AMI, 120% AMI and 115% AMI. We begin to lose track of what those are. What are they and where do they come from? Are these numbers provided by Housing and Urban Development? Are these Housing and Community Development, from the state, or are we looking at the census tract? Could you provide what that income level is for a family of two or a family of three, or those three range?
      1. Emily Lesk. A family of two at 55% of median income, a low-income household, they are earning a maximum of \$47,400. If it's a four-person household they are earning a maximum of \$59,250. At 120% of median income, which we are defining as the top end of the moderate income range a family of two is earning \$103,400 and a family of four is earning \$129,250. At 150% of median income a family of two is earning \$129,250 and a family of four is earning \$161,550.
      2. Emily Lesk. Every year based on HUD's data the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development puts together this table. This is from the 2016 table and it's also available at [www.sfmohcd.org](http://www.sfmohcd.org). These numbers are used citywide.
  - ii. Picar.
    1. I agree with a lot of Supervisor Yee's proposal.
    2. I definitely like the mix of the rental and ownership units.
    3. I'm also concerned with the professions that you mentioned, teachers seem to be the last to get any provisions, and I'm a teacher myself. I want teachers to be able to have some affordable housing.
  - iii. Muehlbauer.
    1. When I look at this 17 acre site and I've said this before we can't lose sight of our main priority which is building a neighborhood here.

2. This isn't just about housing and affordability, we're building a neighborhood and it's going to be here forever if we're lucky and we want to make sure it integrates well into the surrounding community. This is foremost on my mind.
  3. The process of using market-rate units to help subsidize the below market rate units seems consistent with what we're trying to accomplish it seems like this 50-50 range with the affordable units broken into three ranges and you have market rate units, the market rates are going to effectively subsidize the affordable units. I think it's clever and I think it's something we should try to do. The \$25 million that we need in public financing could be used elsewhere like our Balboa Park Station where we have 100 units that are going to be built there and we need a large amount of public subsidy.
  4. Here's a way of spreading that public subsidy around and getting housing built all over the City, and it's also consistent with building a good, solid neighborhood here.
- iv. Winston.
1. As a family person who is a working class person. My kids go to Mission High School. We struggled to stay in the City. I'm on two CACs. I contribute to my neighborhood and work hard for my neighborhood and for my family.
  2. I'm hanging on by my fingertips to stay in this town. I'm not alone, most of my friends are like that as well.
  3. I think for the City as a whole to be able to retain families, to support the school system with kids that can actually go to the schools. You really need to have printers like me in the city, you need teachers, you need dry cleaners, and you can't have all the rich people in the City.
  4. It's not a successful City if you don't have a wide array of incomes. This will go some distance in helping that. It's not a complete fix but it will help and I'm in favor of that.
- v. Lee.
1. For 3, the developer should assume they will receive a fair, market rate land value based on the 33% scenario. What does that mean? How does 33% accommodate SFPUC's fair market value?
    1. Emily Lesk. This is something that City staff ask Supervisor Yee to include when he went about his changes on behalf of SFPUC. Based on SFPUC's legal counsel, when we look at how much this developer will pay SFPUC for this land, they have to receive fair market value. The calculation of the value of the land changes with my how many public benefits and how much affordability goes into the project. It will legally be considered fair market value if the land price is calculated assuming 33% affordability because with Prop K, the voters set up that expectation.

2. We can require the developer go above 33% affordability but the funds on the balance sheet for the extra affordability cannot come by decreasing SFPUC's land price.
  3. There are a couple of sources we've talked about to get that incremental extra affordability above 33%. One is cross subsidy from market-rate units and the other is the potential creation of an infrastructure financing district, which is a public financing mechanism that if we end up using we'll talk about it more. But basically it looks at the future tax revenues, the future property tax that's going to be collected from the market-rate units, and investing that in increasing the amount of affordability. This increases affordability without borrowing or taking away subsidy dollars from other projects in the City.
  2. 33% is the most legally defensible assumption for how much SFPUC ratepayer will received for the land.
- vi. Spinali.
1. I want to remind everyone that there's a reason why we're going with percentages, which is not a specific number because this is the first stage of the process and it's about creating parameters to allow the developers to be creative. We're looking at the parameter by itself and when we see the parameter collectively with all of them together, it's about building relationships with CCSF, which could mean housing. When a complete picture comes together I would be surprised if we didn't see student housing become a critical element of it if they were not an astute developer.
  2. When we get to see all the parameters together, the story will be more robust.
- e. Levels of Consensus. [Levels of Consensus Graphic attached]
- i. Picar – 4
  - ii. Muehlbauer – 4
  - iii. Favetti – 4
    1. With the permanence in the 120% to 150% AMI, in response to the comments from Westwood Park in previous meetings, with the thoroughness of this response I am voting a 4.
  - iv. Spinali – 4
  - v. Winston – 4
  - vi. Lee – 4
  - vii. Chung\* – 5
  - viii. Davila\* – 4; if you add student and faculty housing it would be a 5
- \* CAC Member was not present at meeting. CAC Member submitted a level of consensus based on reviewing written material and previously submitted written public comment to BRCAC@sfgov.org, available online at [www.sf-planning.org/brcac](http://www.sf-planning.org/brcac).**

**5. General Public Comment.**

a. Public Comment.

i. Laura Clark. GrowSF

1. Disappointed that we spend a lot of time on work that was done previously only to have a lot of it changed radically toward the end of the process.
2. You should acknowledge we've been here awhile and we have a while to go and if these kinds of big changes are going to be happening maybe they should be happening earlier in the process.

ii. Laura Fry. Westwood Park.

1. Underground parking, I think the developer could use the hole for that.
2. Is it legally true that the City cannot designate the housing for special populations and only based on income?
3. RFP is a blueprint for the basic size, et cetera. The height, the amount of open space, I've only received one example of a deviation on height or maximums on open space.
4. Developers don't give you more open space nor do they build lower than you allow. Clearly delineate those points because they are not going to give us more.

iii. Fernando Martí. CUHJ.

1. I believe developers can build housing for college teachers if it is on college land.
2. So if a portion of the site, similar to College of San Mateo, is dedicated in perpetuity to CCSF you can do it. There's a move from the state to allow this for our school district.
3. Principle 2. You have to have a certain number of two bedroom units otherwise the developer will decide they make more money with more studios. You won't get a minimum otherwise.
4. City of Emeryville requires 50% of all developments be two bedrooms or larger and within that 10% be three bedrooms and no more than 10% studios. On our Shipyard redevelopment site we have to have an average of two bedrooms achieved.
5. Staff did not say what one-person households make.
6. A one-person household at 150% AMI is \$107,000 or 108,000, that's a studio or one-bedroom.
7. If you're requiring two or three bedroom you're talking about \$150,000 or two people each earning \$75,000, that's a different demographic.

iv. Madeleine Mueller. CCSF.

1. There is a law that says under the state of California master plan every county in the state needs a comprehensive community college. San Francisco has this requirement. There's very little land and what's here is pretty land locked.
  2. We are three times more dense re: student per acreage than other community colleges because other counties can put their colleges on the perimeters of their cities.
  3. We have to be careful to not abridge or negate state laws regarding community colleges.
  4. The college has used the entire site for 70 years. There's 70 years of some sort of ownership.
  5. Thank you for pointing out transit mode. Transit curse at the hub. Not only do you have the City of Hercules here CCSF is also the size of ~~Modesto~~ Millbrae. (Amended at July 11, 2016 CAC Meeting)
- v. Bob Herman. Westwood Park.
1. We need to acknowledge that no one has voted against housing. It's a win for this room. It's a matter of balancing out the low and middle-income folks that get to participate.
  2. I want to highlight the infrastructure, that's the thing people forget.
  3. What's it going to take to do the sustaining model?
  4. What are we going to need from a public service perspective to support any new development? MUNI bus lines.
  5. Our City services our stretched and stressed and how do we ramp up those social services like medicine, SFFD and SFPD?
  6. We've had an influx of crime and SFPD can barely keep up.
  7. Do we know how many units?
  8. Is there any public statement on how many units?
    1. Spinali. Not yet.
    2. Emily Lesk. It's going to come from the RFP process. One of the sets of parameters that the CAC has iterated through is a set up urban design parameters that look at physically what the maximum envelope could look like on the site and based on that the RFP is asking developers what the whole program is? How many housing units, how much sq. ft. of housing, as well as all the other requirements. That's when all the numbers will come back and we'll take a critical look at them.
- vi. Maureen. Plymouth Avenue.
1. In terms of number of units there is no need to honor the Balboa Station Area Plan?
    1. Spinali. We'll answer at the end.
  2. Regarding the TDM, I think on the whole the City takes alternate forms of transit whenever possible, and only drives when the situation meets the needs.

3. There's not a lot of low hanging fruit, we need to keep that in mind when you're talking about deleting 1000 parking spaces and adding 1000+ residents.
  4. People will take public transit when they can, but oftentimes that is not possible.
  5. Regarding SFPUC fair market value, from the beginning we were told this was for sale to benefit the ratepayers, and the SFPUC real estate person in 2012 said the 25 acre fair market value was \$36 million.
  6. This fee varies based on different parameters and changes?
  7. Thank Robert Muehlbauer for mentioning that the desire of everyone to create a wonderful, viable neighborhood that reflects the diversity of the City and reflects the scale of the neighborhoods (81% single family homes).
- vii. Yonathan Randolph. Ingleside.
1. I would like to draw attention to the population of people who show up to the meetings.
  2. Thank them but also recognize that it's easy to get the impression there is a consensus among the audience in one direction when actually there are other opinions out there.
  3. There's a very strong Westwood park showing because they are very organized and opinionated, but you should also recognize south of Ocean, in my neighborhood, we don't have any neighborhood association and we don't have the organization to bring everyone out at the same time and participate and have very strong opinions.
  4. We have a lot of people here who are homeowners but if you look at the general population of San Francisco, most people are not homeowners, and if we want to benefit all of San Francisco we should think about those that are not represented here as well as everyone who is heavily represented here.
  5. We should also recognize that we try to remake this site in the image of Westwood Park, there's no way to bring back the same kind of population we have in Westwood Park. It will basically be all rich people. It won't be the middle class feel of Westwood Park because the population has changes so we need to create a built environment that differs from the single family housing because that is not physically feasible to help all the people we need with higher housing.
- viii. Anita Theoharis. Westwood Park.
1. We are organized that we are the only neighborhood that directly abuts the proposed development.
  2. If you go on Twitter people are not as nice.
  3. So far the 2009 EIR is really being ignored, I respectfully submit that.
  4. A lot of get the feeling that the City has largely ignored us. Special invitations have been sent to organizations like SF BARF, a group financed by developers and others seeking to label us as NIMBYs.

5. Speaking as a Westwood Park resident how can we be NIMBYs when we are agreeable to a number of units that represent the maximum number of units determined by the City just a few years ago?
  6. Does advocating for CCSF students make us NIMBYs?
  7. Does urging the City to address the real world we all face in terms of traffic, parking, and the limitations of mass transit make us NIMBYs?
  8. Does urging open space make us NIMBYs?
  9. Is advocating for a project whose qualities of life through open space, adequate parking, and addressing their traffic issues make us NIMBYs?
  10. We have coalesced behind an approach that would be a win-win for all stakeholders. To be clear it's not one that we would normally want but recognizes the realities of the housing shortage, affordability issues, the needs to CCSF students and faculty. It's one that needs to be seriously considered by the Mayor, Planning, and most important the CAC.
  11. Submitting a document. *Attached to this document.*
  12. I would only ask in the future that we do not have any teleconferencing.
    1. Spinali. Just to let you know. We coordinated to have Brigitte Davila on the phone. She is en-route somewhere.
  13. I don't think someone should be able to vote unless they participate via Skype or teleconference. But if they are not here, they should not be solicited or called for a vote if they haven't been able to attend.
    1. Spinali. If you heard, I put his vote into the record stating "Howard is not in". It will not count towards consensus.
  14. I often participate in my meetings by teleconference because we have busy lives and it is very acceptable.
- ix. Chris Hanson.
1. When someone is hired in the San Mateo College District, which is CCSF's closet neighboring district they can sign up for College Vista – below market-rate housing apartment located on campus. Ironically built on one of their parking lots.
  2. Usually a short wait and then they are able to live in an expensive area and walk to work for about \$1,000 a month. This lets them save money to buy a home in the future.
  3. Barbara Christensen, Director of Community and Government Relations, said providing housing for employees gives them a competitive edge in hiring talented faculty and staff. CCSF is paying below what they were making in 2007. We can offer recruited employees first class housing at a bargain price plus a college teaching or support job. Several recruited faculty with multiple offers of employment chose to work for them because of the terrific housing option.

4. The land is now publically owned. Maybe an exploration of how to keep this land publically held could be a topic for principles and parameters. There might be a lot of interest in this room for a presentation on that.
- x. Corey Smith.
  1. Speaking on behalf of myself.
  2. I want to apologize for a poor choice of words.
  3. I think everyone knows that teachers are woefully underpaid in the City, region, state, and across the country.
- xi. Mike Eggie. SF BARF.
  1. Beg your indulgence. Friend of mine is a survivor of cervical cancer and underwent chemotherapy when she was 9 years old. She did not understand that. Parents had to fight with the sisters to get her to go to chemo. The doctors administering the chemo were sometimes callous. Yet, she is still alive.
  2. Everyone in this room is here for the right reasons no matter what they think the right this is. We all care about this community, and I like to think everyone here remembers that. Certainly Corey does.
  3. All we ask is we understand the reality of how things work and not kill the good with the preconceptions of the perfect that may not be available to us.
  4. We're very dedicated to making sure that everyone of all income levels can have a foothold in the City. That's why we're willing to look at give and take.
  5. Consensus with SF BARF members that 0.5:1 parking ratio is fine and even if you move the needle somewhere between that it's okay because we recognize the need of CCSF needs to park.
  6. If the parking need is reduced we can also convert the parking to housing.
- xii. Resident.
  1. In my opinion this is one of the best residential areas in the City.
  2. We have a good City College and two private schools.
  3. We have to save the best for what we have here.
  4. City needs to give them parking.
  5. We need housing for the teachers and students.

**6. Close of Meeting.**

**7. Adjournment.**