

**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, July 11, 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

Documents received during this meeting are in a document titled balboareservoir_CAC_Public_Documents_Received_and_Emails-071116 available via the following link: www.sf-planning.org/brcac

Committee Members Present:

Howard Chung, Brigitte Davila, Kate Favetti, Christine Godinez, Rebecca Lee, Robert Muehlbauer, Maria Picar, Jon Winston

Committee Members Absent:

Lisa Spinali

Staff/Consultants Present:

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

1. Call to Order and Roll Call.

a. Roll Call

- i. Present: Winston, Muehlbauer, Godinez, Picar, Favetti, Davila, Lee

2. Opening of Meeting.

- a. Amendments to 06/13/16 Minutes.
 - i. CAC Comment.
 - 1. Comments from Favetti
 - ii. No public comment.
 - 1. Madeline Mueller. P4 – remove “and our students...”
 - 1. P24 – CCSF size of Millbrae
 - 2. Ray Kutz.
 - 1. Ellen Wahl (Sunnyside)
 - iii. Motion to approve 7/11/16 minutes with amendments: Winston, Second: Muehlbauer
 - 1. Ayes: all
 - 2. Noes: [none]
 - iv. Staff Note: timeline graphic will be fixed

3. Sustainability Parameters.

- a. CAC Questions and Clarifications.
 - i. No questions from CAC members
- b. Public Comment.
 - i. Jennifer Heggie. Sunnyside.
 - 1. 2c – what does district-scale refer to?
 - 2. 3c,d,e – Pleased to see stormwater management c and d, and addition of e
 - 3. 4d – Call out honeybees
 - 4. 4e – What effect would living facades have on building facades and deterioration of materials. Can we assume proper maintenance? Have concerns based on Orfalia Childcare Center’s deterioration
 - ii. Monica Collins. Sunnyside. CCSF
 - 1. Principle 5 – Alter first sentence: Support a healthy environment by reducing indoor and outdoor air quality impacts...
 - iii. Ray Kutz.
 - 1. 5d – add “including an electrical outlet at every garage parking space”
 - 2. 6d – ensure a backup is added for pneumatic vacuum waste system
 - iv. Responses – by Jeremy Shaw
 - 1. District scale is to reap benefits that you wouldn’t get from one building alone. Shared resources or facilities between buildings, among multiple buildings. Shared energy, shared water.
 - 2. Jennifer – regarding living roofs, there have been issues historically. Understand that legislative for better roofs is effective in January.
 - 3. Jeremy – Any new policy will apply. The parameters, Principle 1c, were written by the person who wrote the better roofs legislation
 - 4. With regard to technology, we’d have to talk to sustainability staff. We were trying to set aspirations, so not everything under the sun is

mentioned. We can add some of the things that are just mentioned, would have to check with sustainability people about an outlet at every parking space.

- v. CAC discussion
 - 1. Brigitte – Questions about wind generation. If the site is suitable for wind generation, include that. Want to make clear that Ocean campus is already a park, an open campus. I'm sure many local residents use it. So this should be coordinated with CCSF.
 - 1. It should be okay to have solar on the roof instead of landscaping.
 - 2. Clearly state that the developer is not allowed to count rooftop landscaping as open space.
- vi. Consensus exercise
 - 1. Brigitte – 4
 - 2. Robert – 4 – but he has concerns about living roofs, too
 - 3. Howard – 4
 - 4. Maria – 4
 - 5. Kate – 3 – have some concerns about green roofs
 - 6. Christy – 3
 - 7. Rebecca – 4
 - 8. Jon - 4

4. Additional Public Benefits Parameters.

- a. CAC Questions and Clarifications.
 - i.
- b. Public Comment.
 - i. Laura Frye – retail on Phelan, not internal
 - 1. City College parking is biggest public benefit, should be retained
 - ii. Madeline Mueller
 - 1. 1c – add on surrounding “education uses”
 - 2. 1e – coordinate with Lick and Riordan
 - 3. 3a – acknowledge educational hub
 - iii. Jennifer Heggie
 - 1. 1b – delete “...and seek out tenants/buyers who are interested in running in-home childcare”
 - 2. “Principle 3” not “parameter”
 - 3. 3c – change parameter order: large meeting first, Public pool (not water features)
 - iv. Corey Smith
 - 1. Prioritization of benefits could be useful to developer
- c. CAC discussion
 - i. Muehlbauer

1. We've been discussing transportation impacts all along. We need more about getting people to walk outside of Ocean Ave
2. Including encouraging walking outside of project area.
3. Developer should be providing these benefits
- ii. Davila
 1. 3a – integrate the contributions of city college students wherever possible
 1. Arts
 2. Construction program students
 2. Question: don't want to see redundancy (e.g. swimming pool at city college). To the extent we can, coordinate with City College resources
- iii. Favetti
 1. Also nearby many Ocean Ave area community organizations, ensure they're coordinated with when creating, delivering benefits. Would add to the vibrancy of our community
 2. Ingleside Library over used , great need for open space
- iv. Lee
 1. Specific uses will have to be proposed later in the process. Do we need to address the prioritization of these features now?
 2. Lesk: there will be more opportunities to address, assess order of priorities later in design process.
- v. Winston
 1. Ground floor uses: well said.
 2. Figure out a way to populate the streetscape, get more people and more community in the street
- vi. Godinez
 1. Just having open space for child care is important
- vii. Favetti
 1. Important for the project to be "seamless".
- d. Public Comment on CAC discussion
 - i. Ja
 1. Additional public benefit should include existing student parking
 2. The City is taking away public benefit of parking and access to education
 3. City is throwing us crumbs, like the child care center
 4. What City is doing is comparable to getting mugged on Ocean Avenue. City staff is taking our wallets and money, and throwing back the crumbs, like my ID card
 - ii. Anita Theoharis.
 1. Are the sidewalks including public space?
 2. Winston: sidewalks should be designed as part of commons, public realm, not the open space count
 3. Parking is public benefit , don't take it away
 - iii. Consensus exercise

1. Jon – 4,
2. Rebecca – 4
3. Christy 4,
4. Favetti - 3
5. Maria - 4
6. Brigitte – 4
7. Howard - 4
8. Robert – 3

5. Public Realm Parameters.

a. CAC Questions and Clarifications.

i. Kate: Survey results showed a strong desire for open space

1. 1(f) – “Transition” What does it mean?
2. Jeremy – comments saying that development shouldn’t be walled off. Wanted to acknowledge that. And it’s in the public realm section, and there’s a landscaped area within the RFP – it should be usable and accessible to both sites. Previously “buffer” was in there, and people were concerned that buffer meant “wall,” but that was not the intent. We acknowledged privacy, access to light, noise, those kinds of concerns more specifically to get at the meaning of buffer that people seemed to really be striving for.

b. Public Comment.

i. Madeline Mueller.

1. No comparison to Schlage. They’re not next door to a college. Not a way to make comparisons. Incorporate language saying public education is a public good. We’re under pressure to privatize. We are the most impacted community college in the state, space is a real issue, always have been. Add an “education” set of parameters.
2. Parameter 7(d) – Do cooperative work with community partners. Add “community and educational partners.”

ii. Anita Theoharis. Westwood Park.

1. If you’re going to refer to Schlage or any other development. Put these examples in context. This is apples and oranges.
2. Many Westwood park residents, I can speak for Westwood park association. 1(f) – Westwood Park was taken out. We’re not adjacent, we about it. That should be noted.
3. Kate: On 12th of March, the change was to name all of the adjacent neighborhoods.

iii. Laura Fry. Westwood Park.

1. Open space changed from “buffer” to “transition” to “path.” Path is not sufficient.
2. 1(b) – change to “shall be no less than two acres”
3. The sites given as examples were private land.

4. The surveys had open space as the preferred use.
 5. The Sunnyside and Minnie and Lovey Ward are not next to 65' heights.
 6. Whatever is codified here is not going to change that much. I asked the city for examples, they didn't provide many
 7. Submitted email printout as public comment
- iv. Francine Lofrano.
 1. In full agreement with others' comments.
 2. 1(f) – Make sure that Westwood Park language is restored. All neighborhoods are impacted, but Westwood Park is probably most impacted.
 - v. Yonathan Randolph. Ingleside.
 1. Laura said that open space was number 1 request from Westwood part. Note that that's a survey of homeowners, so they would naturally view additional housing as less important. If you surveyed their children or other neighbors, they might prefer housing
 - vi. Carol Ito. Westwood Park.
 1. There has been dialog here, and there's been dialog with Jeremy about the language, changing Westwood Park reference.
 2. Inappropriate to compare this to Schlage. Examples of possible buildings have nothing to do with our neighborhoods.
 3. Pay attention to what people are saying at the meetings.
 - vii. Laura Clark. Grow SF.
 1. IN addition to the voices that can be here, listen to the voices who can't be here.
 2. Housing is dire need. The people who can't come every month are vital voices to be heard. They should be part of the people who you are listening to as well.
- c. CAC Member Discussion
 - i. Muehlbauer.
 1. This is a good job. Principle 1 is a good general statement, but connectivity to public transit should be highlighted. Appreciate that that's in transportation, but it's such a big issue that it needs to be included everywhere.
 - ii. Davila.
 1. Robert's suggestion might be helpful because this is a key issue and a sticking point. Can't say it enough.
 2. Put coordination of parking and transportation in everything, it could help guide the developer.
 - iii. Winston.
 1. Agree with Robert. Walking is a form of transportation, we should promote it. I recently came across the phrase "desire lines" to figure out where roads should go. Unity Plaza is going to have a path of people going through all the time, it's a desire line that already exists. It's hard to predict where the desire lines will be in the Reservoir.

2. With regard to the park, I understand why staff brought up Schlage. It's the same size. But the park will be really different in this neighborhood. We need to respect Westwood Park's character. Open space between this neighborhood and Westwood Park makes sense. You won't see 60' buildings by the park.
3. I think it's a pretty good document and agree with Robert.
- iv. Chung.
 1. I agree and disagree with Robert. I see elements of transportation in the public realm, like 1(d), walking routes. Overview of principle 1 talks about a network of streets and open spaces. But in our RFP, how do we emphasize that the transportation component is a big priority. I don't think we should name transportation everywhere, but how we let the future developer know that transportation is key.
 2. Mike – suggest sprinkling connectivity and transportation throughout rather than getting a prioritization exercise, the developer should take the first step based on the parameters and then they'll be refined based on community.
- v. Kate. Can Robert's language be added?
- vi. Jeremy – made suggestions for where to add: Principle 1, Parameter 1d
- vii. Kate. Also talk about connectivity to commerce. Add in general principle and 1(d). That supports the concept of it being seamless.
- viii. Kate. For some people, the Reservoir is 17 acres of open space. This is a significant reduction in the amount of open space. Our neighborhood needs a requirement of 2 acres. Density is increasing.
- ix. Jeremy:
 1. We'll add the list of all neighborhoods, transit connections, tie into the Ocean Ave. commercial district.
 2. 7(d) we will amend to include community and educational partners
- x. Brigitte
 1. More inclusion of the uses of City College. WE have a parking lot there that a lot of students use. We need to do more to make sure that enrollment is not affected.
 2. Want to include more references to City College's needs for the public realm to be a safe, useful, and welcoming part of the daily experience.
 3. Also mention City College in principle 3 and principle 4.
- xi. Consensus Exercise:
 1. Brigitte – 4
 2. Robert – 4
 3. Howard – 4
 4. Maria – 4
 5. Kate – 0 if there isn't a requirement for 2 acres of open space
 6. Christy – 4
 7. Jon – 4

6. General Public Comment.

a. Public Comment.

i. Jennifer – we did 2 surveys in Sunnyside. Transportation was #1 issue, Parking was #2

ii. Anita

1. Schlage, Mission Rock – previously an industrial use; Comparisons have been made to projects where they can increase height and density because there are no existing residential homeowner units. Parkmerced always had higher heights. The comparisons made are just not relevant.

2. Planning and the Mayor’s Office made a presentation to the small business association on May 27th about TDM. They were explaining about points, where fewer parking spots earns more points. What am I doing here asking for more parking if there’s already a point system for TDM Small Business association was concerned? Encourage everyone to listen to that hearing.

iii. Madeline Mueller.

1. Has traffic studies for the performing arts center designs, done by LMN architects.

2. 2006 and 2012 reports and data on transportation done by the best architectural firm in the nation. Provides historical perspective.

1. CCSF students take public transportation at approximately 60% level. They park at about a 30% level. 10% walk/bike. Our students are really transit focused. Studied parking and flow pattern for 2,000 parking spots on campus was 10,000 students/day.

iv. Yonathan Randolph, Ingleside.

1. Comments about last month are meeting. Read through the comments that were emailed in. A form email from Westwood Park, largely identical throughout public emails. It had a couple of main points. Respect Westwood Park Residential Character District. But this development is not part of Westwood Park, so it does not apply. The emails also say 500 unit limit from the EIR, but there will be another EIR to study the actual unit count. It’s weird to restrict ourselves to an old EIR. It also said 28’ height limit and 1:1 parking ratio, which would be appropriate if it were in Westwood Park, but it’s not in Westwood Park. It’s a different neighborhood; SF is full of diverse neighborhoods that are next to each other.

v. Laura Fry. Westwood Park.

1. Want to stress that this is public land, not private land. Private developers should have more leeway.

2. Last week someone mentioned that District 7 had the least amount of open space, but I think that was in the past. Could not find the data.

3. RFP. Urban design. Initially 65' height was going to just be on the Phelan side. It technically could be anywhere. Put back that the highest buildings are just on the east.
 4. The RFP is the blueprint. The basic structure of the site.
 5. The surrounding neighborhoods don't have 65' buildings. IN defending Westwood Park, we're defending the whole area.
- vi. Laura Clark. GrowSF.
1. Neighborhoods come up a lot. Infill development is one of the greenest things we can do. It will always take place next to existing neighborhoods.

7. Close of Meeting.

- a. Robert. Announcement from the Balboa Park Station Area Plan CAC. There will be two design charrettes around balboa park station. One will be about safety at Geneva and San Jose, staffed by [San Jose SFMTA \(amended at 9/12/16 CAC meeting\)](#). Also the terminus of the M line on San Jose—staff will be looking at another alternative to the M line ending there. The second charrette will be about the 100%-affordable development planned for the upper yard. Also reimagining of the plaza. How to make it somewhere that people want to go to. It will be co-managed by BART and MOHCD. Both expected to take place in the fall.
- b. Brigitte.
 - i. One of the issues is looking at all of these areas, need to coordinate this with BART station planning, the CCSF facilities masterplan.
 - ii. CCSF BOT guidelines for the city for Balboa Reservoir. Will be heard on the 28th. These have been commented on already but we can always use more comments.
 - iii. Believe in public transportation but also use car. Recognize that we need to use cars. We keep coming back to parking. I don't want to waste this opportunity just focusing on cars, but I recognize the need. Need to find the sweet spot. CCSF Trustees proposal is for a green parking garage. Need to also weigh the need for affordable housing for faculty and students.
- c. Rebecca
 - i. Lots of things we need to fit into this finite parcel. I would be comfortable seeing what ideas developer proposals bring back, what the tradeoffs are for the extra park acreage.
- d. Maria
 - i. For CCSF enrollment, childcare is very important
- e. Kate
 - i. Next step will be looking at all parameters in total. We have gone a long way and have a long way to go.

8. Adjournment.