

**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, August 8, 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:

Brigitte Davila, Kate Favetti, Christine Godinez, Robert Muehlbauer, Maria Picar, Jon Winston

Committee Members Absent:

Howard Chung, Rebecca Lee

Staff/Consultants Present:

Jeremy Shaw, Planning Department; Emily Lesk, Phillip Wong, Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Christopher J. Wong, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission; District 7 Supervisor Norman Yee

1. Call to Order and Roll Call.

- a. Roll Call

2. Opening of Meeting.

- a. Two (2) sets of meeting minutes at the next meeting.

3. Consistency and Clarity Review of Compiled Parameters.

a. CAC Questions and Clarifications.

i. Kate Favetti.

1. Concerned about the disabled community and whether we have adequately mentioned and have been consistent throughout this document with regard to some of the issues related to disabilities.
2. We specifically mention this population on page 4, 2.e.
3. We also specifically mention this population related to transportation including access for people with disabilities, on page 17.
4. Page 7, Public realm, principle 3. Are we adequately addressing the disabled community; are we adequately address wheelchair access as we are in transportation addressing bicycle and pedestrian access; is this implied or something we need to be more specific about; this is something I'm concerned with make sure is clear throughout the entire document
5. Page 5. 1.f. regarding privacy and scale of neighboring properties, City College should be mentioned as it is adjacent, that concept should be consistently throughout the entire document.
 1. Lisa Spinali. Good to do a search of the document to determine where it's necessary.
6. Page 22. 4.b. Related to the green roof issue. I thought we had specifically had serious concerns about prioritizing living green roofs? I thought we had removed it and put it more general or softer language.
7. Concerned 7/28 City College Board of Trustees Resolution was adequately represented in this document.

ii. Robert Muehlbauer.

1. Generally start to hang together.
2. When you think of this complex you think of neighborhood and you think of connections with public transit; if we're trying to achieve those reductions in parking it has to be all over the place.
3. Under public realm, I want to see something at the front end re: connections to public transit. Page 5. Somewhere linkage to transit should be mentioned up front; it's mentioned in the document, but the more you mention it then it will underscore the point for those that are building it.
4. Transportation. Page 13. Principle 2. This is a section that's extremely complicated. Talking about TDM and creative transportation centers that would meet this TDM. I think that we should have something that the TDM and the plan's effectiveness in meeting those strategies is evaluated in some way. Talking about hard data, surveys not hyperbole. We need real functional data that we can look at from year to year to show if these measures are indeed working.

iii. Brigitte Davila.

1. We passed a resolution that outlines what we would like to see from any Balboa Reservoir development.
2. There are many parts that are not included here, but they're not adding anything new, they're fleshing them out more.
 1. Emily Lesk. We talked at the staff level about attaching the resolution as an addendum to the RFP so it sits side by side with the parameters.
3. There are some things I've been hammering away at that are not included in here. One of the issues is the parking garage but I see it alluded to with what we're getting to about parking and reducing the number of parking spots but nothing specifically with what we're talking about calling a green parking garage, which could include these car-sharing spaces.
4. It would be nice if everyone's parking and TDM surveys coordinated. We might want to mention it here. Our facilities are conducting another survey and Supervisor Norman Yee will be conducting one as well. I'm not sure how many are out there but it would be good to coordinate them.
5. Extremely important to know who's parking, what they're parking and why are they parking. Knowing all of these things before we make a decision.
6. Urban design and neighborhood character, page 11. 4.c. The only place I see City College campus being talked about being designed with the site.
7. Science building is incredibly beautiful and the PAEC will be incredibly beautiful.
8. To the extent that we possibly can we should capitalize on what City College already has here.
9. Page 3. This is an overall comment. I don't see anything on focusing on faculty housing for the affordable housing. I would like to see this at least mentioned.
 1. Spinali. Already mentioned on page 4. Principle 2.d.
10. I would like to emphasize that more.
 1. Spinali. Agree that this should be stronger language.
11. I qualify for affordable housing.
12. We want to use sustainable energy as much as possible here. We have a lot of wind here. I want to see us be able to use that. If we can create student projects in the engineering program like we do at San Francisco State University that would contribute a lot to the community. We should investigate that.
 1. Spinali. We talked about wind more in terms of planting trees and doing things taking wind into consideration, not as using wind as a sustainable resource.

iv. Maria Picar.

1. Public Realm. Page 5, principle 1.c. regarding the child care facility, did we discuss it actually being built or will it be maybe built? That language probably needs to change. I think that's very important. It's important for working families to have decent child care facilities. You can improve the population of CCSF; a lot of people need child care.
 1. Davila. I was going to talk about this at the end when we talk about the resolution because we address this.
- v. Christine Godinez.
 1. In the whole background, it would be interesting to include what constituents we represent because there are a lot of groups that are not represented here. I think it's important to know.
 2. I was also thinking about the layout of housing as far as public realm, is that done intentionally? I think it influences what you think is most important.
 3. I did appreciate City College being mentioned, and I'm eager to see the other community schools being mentioned because there are a lot of other schools in this area.
- vi. Jon Winston.
 1. The whole thing connects really well.
 2. Looking at these documents in a siloed way was interesting because when you look at it all together you see how they balance out.
 3. The last meeting we talked about open space and how we wanted more open space, but when you look at it as a whole you might need more height as a result; maybe or maybe not but things have to balance.
 4. I want to echo what Robert said about connections to transit being really important in the housing and transportation sections.
 5. This whole thing hinges on transit.
 6. We haven't seen the TDM yet, but parts have been released such as the surveys. It turns out that 40% of commuters drive to CCSF, and half of them thought that if there was a better way they would take an alternative but they don't see an alternative. Like Robert said this is a linchpin.
 7. In spite of having a CCSF representative on our CAC, it's really opaque to find out what's going on with CCSF. We found out a lot in our meeting with CCSF, like an on-campus child care facility.
 1. Davila. It's a temporary facility right now.
 8. I didn't know there's going to be another administrative building next to MUB-140 and they seemed to put less emphasis on the PAEC; I want to see the PAEC personally.
 9. The whole things works really well and the order could be tweaked a little bit but it provides a good road map.
- vii. Lisa Spinali.

1. I have questions, then recommendations, and then detailed comments.
2. If I was a developer submitting a proposal the traffic data is really important. What traffic and parking data is going to be readily available to potential bidders?
3. What data will they have to work with?
4. How does the TDM fit into the planning and the RFP process and its future efforts? It would be good to have answers to these questions at the next meeting.
5. To Christine Godinez's point regarding the background piece, there needs to be a preamble as a context setting piece for the developer to explain what we're attempting to do in the neighborhood.
6. Think about it as a three-legged stool. It's about housing, City College, and the local community and neighborhood impact (e.g. transportation and parking).
7. If we think we're going to build something that will make it crippling for people to get to and from anywhere then we can't bring housing in; if it's going to create more congestion.
8. The number one concern is impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods.
9. I want to see that my cup in half full that there is something we can do and we can address the different constituent's needs.
10. Developer needs to understand that if their proposal is pie in the sky or is not really going to take into consideration what the true implications for the neighborhood then the neighborhoods will say there's absolutely no way that we can build something here.
11. Set that context up front in a preamble. Make it clear who is on the CAC and who we are. I think there's a graphic that goes with it.
12. On page 1, I think they proposed principles and parameters are out of order.
13. Transportation should be number two because housing is what this project's about but if we don't address the transportation issues, it's not what we've been working towards.
14. I think that the transportation piece is huge both in what we can do on the supply side to create more, and the demand side is currently and what it can be.
15. Page 3, principle 1. If values of property drop significantly would there be a need to change 1.a.? I don't know how that works or what the history/context is. Understanding what the percentages are and does that stay consistent. If we have an economic down turn, what would that mean?
16. 1.a.3. The last work should read, "enable the project to meet or succeed." Reach implies you don't have to attain it.
17. Page 4, 2.d. Partnering with City College, I like this language.

18. 1.c. consider the child care facility that may be built, this is a vague reference and could be stronger.; I think there is something wrong with the grammar.
19. Page 6, g. I have no idea what an open space network is and it would be great to know what that is.
20. 1.h. San Bruno Mountain
21. Page 8. 5.d. I thought we were moving away from green roof concept.
22. Page 10, 2.c. We have ranges we set for the height of buildings and the one thing to know is that the PAEC is going to be a two-story building.
23. Page 12. 1.a. Clarify residential parking may be made to be some car share; because it won't be all.
24. Page 12. 1.c. It should read cover all appropriate CCSF students; we want it to be more ample. Don't want transportation to be a hindrance to CCSF enrollment.
 1. Jeremy Shaw. At the top it says "meeting CCSF enrollment goals." What are appropriate students/employees? If you're not in this room you might not be represented. We'll work on this language.
25. I want to view this as a growing concern and not a declining concern.
26. Page 12. 1.d. What does best TDM practices mean in the context of being a commuter school? How does this TDM work given that many of our students are commuters?
27. Page 14. 2.d. Talked about removing the bike lanes on Phelan, it's not included; we discussed how congestion on Phelan is how we're down to one lane of traffic in each direction.
28. One consistency thing; page 14, 2.d. Provide a bike repair facility on site, and is not in conflict with the community benefits if we decide we're going to put ground floor commercial bike repair shops; make sure we're being consistent.
29. Page 15. Make sure each parking spot is wired and ready for electric vehicle charging; make sure infrastructure is in place.
30. Page 17. 1.b. Phase construction including current and future CCSF construction projects. Make this clearer.
31. Page 19. 4.b. Call out parking more than just part of the overall TDM strategy. We need to discuss the importance of parking for the PAEC. It's not fully understood across the board that parking is a big issue.
32. Page 25. Principle 1.e. We should identify additional opportunities and partners.
33. Thank you to everyone for feedback and all the hard work going into this.

viii. Kate Favetti.

1. Adding a preamble, we should include legal requirements; of particular interest is the RCD-1 for Westwood Park. It should be a part of the document, possibly right after the preamble.
 2. Westwood Park Association and its residents –315 responding to a survey–would have like to have seen a particular number of units, 500 units, in this document.
 3. Want to see stronger language regarding the amount of acreage for the park; it does not require a 2 acre park, strive is not strong enough language
 4. Specific that we have 28 feet on the Western section regarding the height requirement; desire to have maximum of 40 feet for the rest of the entire development.
 5. Higher percentage of the 33% allocated to middle-income between 120% and 150% AMI.
 6. More homeownership than rental.
 7. Residents are strongly supporting a 1:1 parking requirement.
 8. No development until the parking situation in regard to CCSF students and the loss of 1000 parking spaces is addressed and resolved before any development is designed.
 9. *Additional comments submitted in writing and attached to this document.*
- b. Public Comment
- i. David Tejada.
 1. Thank the committee.
 2. Thank you for the improvements.
 3. Transit problems facilitated by a shuttle that is permanently here all the time and is ADA compliant with a bike rack on the front. Everyone seemed to like that.
 4. The building we're in is totally geothermal powered and I don't see why we couldn't incorporate that into the new building.
 5. Include DPT before the semester starts to help the enforcement issue with the parking situation. Involve DPT with this process. Enforce all the parking laws at the beginning.
 - ii. Anita Theoharis. Westwood Park Association.
 1. We can't speak on the individual parameters but I respectfully have a correction with our representative Kate Favetti's testimony that our neighborhood wants 40', specifically what our neighborhood said that the City staff says 500 units on the BR site is a starting point not the maximum.
 2. Our recommendation is a maximum of 500 units that is part of larger Balboa Park Station Area Plan, which accounts for a 65% increase in population density for the plan area.
 3. Another correction is the height; you said 40'.

4. Current zoning is 40' across the site with a small portion on the eastern boundary at 65'. The City wants 25' on the western part and up to 85' on the eastern side, I believe we came down to 65'. WPA wants a maximum of 28' closest to Plymouth Avenue's resident's backyards, and 40' for the rest of the development.
 1. Favetti. I just want to clarify. I said not to exceed 28' on the western side and not more than 40' for the entire development.
 2. Spinali. We also have the document that you are reading off of entered into the record.
5. You can watch the TDM presentation given to the small business commission and the planning commission. It's so all over this document and I think it's time for you all to have this presentation.
- iii. Rita Evans. Sunnyside Neighborhood Association (SNA).
 1. Lack of any mention of a dedicated shuttle, the SNA has made that specific recommendation several times. I believe it was in a previous draft. I want to make sure where it went and how to get it back in there.
 2. In the transportation section there's a lot of comment given to bicycling and transit accessibility and very little is given to walking. I want to make sure that the issues of accessibility and pedestrian safety are addressed.
 3. I support Lisa Spinali's suggestion that the order of the topics in the document be changed so that housing is followed by CCSF and then transportation to signify the great importance that these topics have.
 4. Acknowledge that we, along with the WPA, think that the provision of a significant amount of public open space is very critical.
- iv. Ray Kutz. SNA.
 1. Reinforce the order of the parameters in the document. Housing shouldn't be number one. We've been talking about nothing but housing as far as this document is concerned. Why it's being made number one seems it should be lower in the stack following CCSF.
 2. Transportation being one, then public realm, followed by CCSF, then housing.
 3. Page 22. The Green Roof. Sustainability. Inconsistency with 1.c. We should be maximizing solar roofs. There's more to be gained by not creating CO2 than sequestration on a few roofs.
 4. Page 15. Transportation, 2.f. the fifth bullet seems a little awkward. It's going to get better than it is already? You might want to look at that.
- v. Muriel Parenteau. CCSF.
 1. Strongly object about this process where they mention CCSF, but doesn't show the impact of removing parking on CCSF and the surrounding neighborhoods.

2. Need to consider the PAEC parking. The PAEC was approved by the City voters twice and on the CCSF facilities master plan. The PAEC will be built, parking is not optional as a commuter school. Thousands of users are rushing out each day.
 3. I'm hearing some inference that people will use public transit if we limit parking. Where is the data on that? My experience is that people from special populations are going to go somewhere else. I want to see data that people are going to use other forms of transportation. We need parking in order to go to school.
 4. Bicycles work for a small segment of the population, but they do not work for students with disabilities, older students, and students traveling with kid - - they need parking. Yes we need BART shuttles, bike lanes and better pedestrian access.
 5. Shuttle is a great idea, we need a lot more than one.
 6. Students take their cars from one center to another.
 7. Shuttle system that goes between all the centers; we're not just talking about BART to Ocean.
 8. We need a thorough transit study.
 9. CCSF completely committed to building enrollment back up.
 10. Free CCSF is coming.
 11. Without parking CCSF enrollment will be killed by this committee.
- vi. Lisa Spinali.
1. These comments should be about whether this document is hanging together not reporting on the part that you care about.
- vii. Monica Collins. SNA.
1. I don't work for CCSF now but I am here to support CCSF.
 2. The elephant in the room is that we cannot ignore CCSF.
 3. CCSF and their needs are in peril.
 4. Construction here should be union made and union built and no two-gate system.
 5. You don't want a lot of labor strife here on the construction sites.
 6. I support the PAEC and parking at CCSF for all the reasons Muriel stated.
- viii. Theodore. Excelsior.
1. When we consider how all these things come together we should consider not just the entire neighborhood but the entire world.
 2. As a species we are using too much carbon and sprawling too much.
 3. Houses should be taller than their neighboring houses; a couple stories is not too much.
 4. Important to not have too many parking spaces. We cannot support too many cars on the roads and as a species.
 5. Don't like the green roof, it's nice to have sustainability type things but in terms of reducing carbon impact of our species we can get much better by increasing density of living spaces.

- ix. Madeleine Mueller. CCSF.
 - 1. Page 5. Add Lick Wilmerding and Riordan to this list.
 - 2. It all hinges on transit.
 - 3. The last time we did the data, 30 years ago, when we put the students all into transit it crashed the systems. There aren't enough MUNI or BART stops.
 - 4. It congested the streets terribly.
 - 5. We did the research and we have to do it again.
 - 6. Supervisor Yee said if we can't solve this problem it's a non-starter.
 - 7. We have to do the data.
 - 8. We made the Twitter shuttles go out from downtown because it created too much congestion.
 - 9. To move a college the size of the city of Hercules is the way it must be done, it makes a lot of road space and a lot of transit machinery.
 - 10. We have been talking about wind power forever. There are many reasons why it doesn't work out. It has to be really researched.
 - 11. Child care. We've always had child care facilities. Temporary facilities.
- x. Jennifer Heggie. Sunnyside.
 - 1. Support Lisa Spinali in the preamble.
 - 2. Transportation needs to be a higher priority.
 - 3. SNA supports more open space and a minimum of~~the~~ two consecutive acres of open space.
 - 4. Principle 1 on page 12, 1.d. are best TDM practices appropriately modified for a community college that continues to be a commuter school?
 - 5. Does SFMTA understand may work for one situation but not another?
 - 6. Is there an understanding of CCSF's tenuous position and the importance of increasing enrollment?
 - 7. Transportation Principle 2, page 15 top, does not provide a consistent way for electric cars to charge overnight, which is inconsistent with 2.e. second bullet, stating making electric vehicle parking safe and convenient as well as reducing barriers to installing future electric vehicle charging stations. 82% of charging of all-electric Nissan Leaf is done at home. If an electric outlet isn't provided with every parking space in the parking garage this development would not only block the future use of electric vehicles it will encourage residents to buy the most polluting automobiles.
 - 8. More expensive to retrofit a building after it has been built than to incorporate conduit from the beginning.
 - 9. Page 15, principle 2.f. Missing is impacts from proposed bicycle infrastructure improvements on auto, van, truck, and emergency vehicle access to and from freeway ramps and commercial interests along the Ocean Ave. corridor. Infrastructure changes should not conflict with CCSF parameter 2.d.

10. Additional comments submitted in writing and attached to this document.

xi. Bob Burn. SNA.

1. Page 3. Housing. 1.a. What if the land values do drop significantly? Have provisions been made for that? Does it make sense to have affordable housing for people that make 120% or 150% of AMI?
2. Page 10. Urban Design. 2.c. Does that mean 2 to 3 stories across from Riordan high school? What about 4 to 5 stories across from Avalon? 6 to 7 stories across from the science building? 3 to 5 stories across from the MUB?
3. PAEC at 2 stories should not be hidden behind taller buildings.
4. What are considered distracting views from above? Some people might like solar panels but they might not be attractive to others.
5. Do you want houses high up on a hill to minimize the use of solar panels because high-maintenance livings roofs are pretty?

xii. Yonathan Randolph. Ingleside.

1. 1:1 parking ratio is important it's directly in conflict with congestion management; the more people park here the more traffic there is.
2. We don't need a 500 unit max in our parameters.
3. Housing should not be the last principle, it should remain the first because it's what we're here for.
4. Under Urban Design, when the TDM presentation was made, there were interesting statement made, such that these principles should be about values instead about specific details.
5. The Urban Design parameters should be changed such that the maximum of heights is reflected in something we value such as no shadows on Westwood Park and not too much bulk relative to the other neighborhoods. 28 feet or 65 feet is too prescriptive.
6. Some people need parking, however, we don't have a needs-based system for parking; those that want to park here for \$3 a day can park for \$3 a day. If you raised the price and made it a needs-based system then fewer people will need to park here.

xiii. Laura Fry. Westwood Park

1. This CAC was originally put forward because the neighborhoods are getting railroaded.
2. This exists because of neighbors' concerns.
3. Appreciate what Lisa was saying about this having to fit with the neighbors; City policy also says this. Can't say there's an empty space so we have to put something in that empty space; it's not empty in that context.
4. People can walk to work in places like Mission Bay because there are many employers nearby.

5. Mission Bay has the open space of the bay, while District 7 has very low amounts of open space. So of course the residents want open space.
 6. The Planning department gets 90% of funding from developer fees; this RFP does not address the main concerns of the main stakeholder; CCSF parking. There is no guarantee about CCSF parking and there should be.
 7. There's no talk of density limit.
- xiv. Corey Smith. SFHAC.
1. Housing parameters, 120% AMI target is fantastic.
 2. Over the last 25-30 years the percentage of San Franciscans that fit between 80%-120% AMI has been cut in half. We're losing middle-class families.
 3. Goals of 50% or higher affordable housing are great; encourage City to find public financing strategies to make that happen; although writing on the wall from State and Federal government to get out of the subsidized housing game. Presently costs about \$600k per affordable housing unit.
 4. We're not seeing the financing presently. If public financing isn't available I really encourage the group to look at increased heights to get that 50% affordable on-site so we get socioeconomic diversity.
 5. Connecting this area with BART to make this feel like one community has to be a high goal.
 6. The 0.5:1 parking ratio is visionary and progressive. Future environmentalists will thank you.
- xv. Christopher Campbell. Westwood Park.
1. The document hangs well together.
 2. Transportation and the impact that it has on a community should proceed the housing although that is generally the purpose as to why we're here.
 3. Page 22. Ecology and greening; there's some documentation out there that the Department of the Environment with the SFPUC, RPD and other agencies are developing plants that are appropriate for different regions of the City—called SF Plant Finder. Often addresses specific needs for habitat and to develop connector properties that could be part of an entire network from San Bruno Mountain to Mt. Davidson to Twin Peaks and then continuing on for resident and migratory animals. I would appreciate the concerns for the ecology be forefront and that we don't plant succulents but we plant what was here previously.
 4. Thank you for all of the effort.

4. Overview of Developer Selection Process.

- a. Staff Presentation [see PDF available at: www.sf-planning.org/brcac]
- b. CAC Questions and Clarifications.
 - i. Kate Favetti.
 - 1. Go over the community input process once the parameters are forwarded to staff for the RFQ, where is the community process exactly going to be? Is there going to be a blackout in a sense because of the 2-3 month period for the RFQ? Is there space for community process there and going forward how is it going to work?
 - 1. Emily Lesk. Regarding frequency of CAC meetings during the selection process, we would work with the members and the chair to determine that.
 - 2. Is there a confidentiality piece to this? If the CAC for example had an update meeting, what would you be able to disclose?
 - 1. Emily Lesk. Regarding the RFQ process, because a lot of what is submitted is a developer's financial information that would certainly be confidential. Our updates there would be how the process is moving along.
 - 2. For the RFP, there will be confidential financial information there as well, but there will be a big proposal piece prepared in such a way that does not have proprietary information and that can be presented publically and that's where we have the discussion and get feedback.
 - ii. Robert Muehlbauer.
 - 1. After going through the RFQ process, how many would be invited back?
 - 1. Emily Lesk. Looking at past processes would work, e.g. the Port on Mission Rock and Pier 70, it was typically (3) proposers, so that is what we would target. Frankly it's a really tall order what we've set out and to have (3) really qualified proposers wanting to do it, that would be a fabulous outcome.
 - 2. I want to commend staff for having development vision at the front end as it applies to getting an RFQ and I wish we could write in here "proposal will knock your socks off". Would want a demonstrable record of award-winning projects. Has done similar in-fill, large-scale development. Show in the RFQ where the passion is? The last thing I want to see is a developer pull from the shelf something that looks like another completed project; that wouldn't work for us. I don't know how to convey that in the RFQ process but I encourage you to do that and I'm glad to see it this far.
 - 1. Emily Lesk. I'm being very careful not to say anything that would privilege a developer that could be sitting here today. We want to release everything all at once for people to see, but I will say that it is standard projects across the board in these RFQs to ask for example projects. And in the rubric to say

that example projects need to be comparable and the comparability is important.

3. Will you be visiting these example projects?
 1. Emily Lesk. If they were local sure. Projects of this scale are uncommon enough so staff that has been here for a while, if the projects are local, we many know them already.
- iii. Brigitte Davila.
 1. The Board of Trustees has gone through this RFQ process with other properties. What kind of committee is reviewing these proposals? We had a committee of all the stakeholders; many proposers drop out at the RFQ stage. Looking at it from the point of view that Robert stated. We need someone with the economic wherewithal and a proven track record of getting projects like this off the ground.
- iv. Jon Winston.
 1. Kate was asking about where the committee fits in. When the proposers come to us, will they come to us to present their qualifications?
 1. Emily Lesk. No. The selection panel is typically City staff with expertise in working with developers in this area following the parameters and the scoring rubric and the feedback that we hear as guidelines. Whether it's a CAC meeting or broader community meeting where the presentations and the feedback happen we'll have to think about.
 2. So closed-session meetings at City Hall?
 1. Emily Lesk. No. The presentations and feedback would take place and then the panel would convene and take all of that feedback into account in the convening.
- v. Brigitte Davila.
 1. Will we just see the top three after you've looked at all of them? Or will there be a panel for the RFQ?
 1. Emily Lesk. We envisioned just focusing on the top three really qualified proposers. We can think of ways to engage people in the RFQ process, but it would be honestly a very limited piece because much of it is the confidential piece.
 2. It did give the Board of Trustees confidence because there was a range of people looking at the submissions for RFQs. We felt very comfortable looking at the (3) and choosing.
 1. Emily Lesk. Yes, that makes sense, we will go back as staff and think about it more.
- vi. Kate Favetti.
 1. There would be some presentation to the community at large, with comment from the CAC and the community. Would there be another presentation to the Board of Trustees because this is such an entwined process?

- that not being recognized because the PAEC is a well-considered project. Don't want the building buried.
3. This project that's being proposed has to keep this all in mind because it all serves San Francisco; this is the southern entrance to San Francisco and we are a center for the arts.
- iii. Ellen Wall. CCSF.
 1. These meetings drive me a little crazy because about 90% of the people who got up before this said they didn't want housing--housing should be the last consideration.
 2. Now when these folks get up somehow everything is lost except the housing. We need to be education students not building housing. I don't know what happens? Where does it go?
 3. Why don't you respond to what people have been saying? I don't get it.
 4. You must educate not build housing for a few hundred people. You must educate thousands of people into the future.
 - iv. Theodore. Excelsior.
 1. I think there should be more housing.
 1. Lisa Spinali. This is not about housing. This is responses to the process. Please.
 2. We shouldn't prejudice against the plans just because they are somewhat cookie cutter. A lot of the neighborhoods here that we think of as nice now have started out as cookie cutter designs with minor variations. We probably shouldn't do Louisiana designs as they aren't earthquake safe, but we should we should consider nice, solid designs instead of something impressive and artistic but leaks in the winter.
 - v.
 1. It's the how in the RFQ, and in the RFP is the what?
- d. Staff Response.
 - i. Emily Lesk.
 1. Responding to Laura's questions.
 2. In terms of the contents of the rubric and making those public, we have provided an outline of what we're envisioning for the RFQ rubric on the slide print-out we gave you. [*available online at www.sf-planning.org/brcac*]. I don't know if we'll be ready to share something along those lines at the September CAC meeting but we will share it at a future CAC meeting.
 - e. Lisa Spinali.
 - i. I just want to underscore the difference between the criteria in the rubric in the RFQ and the RFP.
 - ii. The RFQ is about how to respond to the parameters. More of the how than the what. How they're thinking about it than the actual design.
 - iii. With the RFP when we get down to the 3 proposers, it's more about the what.

1. Emily Lesk. Yes.

5. CCSF Resolution.

- a. Brigitte Davila.
 - i. We passed a resolution at the last Board of Trustees meeting.
 - ii. I'm going to mention some of the important things we discussed.
 - iii. It should be up on the website soon, but I will give you the parts that relate to the parameters.
 - iv. CCSF cannot grant the City a roadway between the MUB and the planned PAEC. The BoT can exchange one or more roadway accesses/easements only if the City reimburses CCSF.
 - v. Housing in the project should be at least 50% permanently affordable, with a preference for dedicated faculty and staff housing; understand that there needs to be significant engagement on this.
 - vi. To avoid the loss of enrollment from students who need to drive and to provide parking for attendees/users of the PAEC, CCSF requires mitigation measures to offset the loss of existing parking.
 - vii. One of the mitigation efforts is a flexible parking structure, referring to a transition from parking alone to a range of other uses as parking ratios may decline as is the case with mixed-use development; if that's the case, we can use the parking for something else, and if it's not we will have plenty of parking.
 - viii. Other ideas for the parking structure include bicycle rentals, electric car chargers and having shared cars to provide access for those that need cars.
 - ix. A comprehensive transit study with input from CCSF. I mentioned that we seem to have a lot of transit studies and I'm not sure that we're always talking about the same one and I want to make sure that we are and we're putting all the data together.
 - x. Also, another transit alternative would include MUNI and BART passes for all students and residents; car and bike sharing options for residents, neighbors, and members of the CCSF community.
 - xi. City prioritizing open and accessible common space through the development. CCSF is actually a park; it was supposed to be an open campus, and people do walk their dogs. Keeping up with that and maintaining open spaces will enhance existing open space.
 - xii. Coordinate with the CCSF master plan. The master plan is a year behind, but we're up and running again.
 - xiii. New crosswalk on Ocean Avenue as you exit from Balboa Park Station would be used by thousands.
 - xiv. City should take additional measures to increase safety for bicyclists.
 - xv. CCSF capital projects planning committee is in best position to review the Balboa Reservoir development in concert with the master planning process and the Balboa Park BART station. This is the committee that will be looking at

plans, reviewing, and coordinating with everything else. We gave this to an existing committee.

- xvi. Chancellor is directed to communicate these priorities to the City, and instruct the administration to ensure that CCSF's interests are acknowledged and recognized with the primary started goals of CCSF's vision and mission state to provide an accessible, affordable, and high quality education to all its students.
 - xvii. The role of City College, for the past 80 years, providing education to those that would not otherwise have the opportunity.
 - xviii. I think we can do both. I'm particularly interested that we have housing for faculty, which would make us more competitive.
- b. CAC Questions
- i. Jon Winston.
 - 1. The flexible parking on CCSF property or our section of the reservoir?
 - 1. Brigitte Davila. Our section of the Balboa Reservoir. The PUC section.
 - 2. How many spots would be required and what would be the footprint?
 - 1. Brigitte Davila. Won't know until we do the TDM study. We want to mitigate any effects on our enrollment and we want plenty of parking for the PAEC.
 - 3. Transit passes, is that for students or for residents.
 - 1. Brigitte Davila. For students and residents.
 - 4. Paid for out of tuition fees?
 - 1. Brigitte Davila. Development would pay for them. This has been done before. We might already have passes for students. We want to make sure everyone has access to transportation.
 - 5. Any mention of the shuttle?
 - 1. Brigitte Davila. No we did not.
 - ii. Emily Lesk.
 - 1. Brigitte is going to provide me with the final resolution and we will put the resolution on our CAC website. I would encourage everyone to read the document. It strongly articulates a vision at a high level; it doesn't go into the level of detail our document has gotten to over the course of a year, but they are pretty complementary.
 - 2. If you have questions for Brigitte you can bring them up at our next meeting but actually reading the resolution should clarify some questions.
 - iii. Spinali.
 - 1. Do we need a webpage for shared documents within our existing website? We need a centralized place.

6. General Public Comment.

- a. Public Comment.
 - i. Laure Frye. Westwood Park.

1. Email that I got from Jeremy regarding faculty and student housing?
Can you clarify that you cannot have faculty or student housing for that group unless it is publically owned housing that it cannot be privately owned that it can only be based on affordability.
 1. Emily Lesk. Broadly speaking the institution whose people are living in that housing would need to own the housing. So it would need to be CCSF-owned housing in order for CCSF to prioritize its people. When Brigitte said there's going to be a lot of coordination; it's going to be a complicated structure.
 2. Lisa Spinali. Also SFUSD has been working on this for 4 or 5 years now. It's a hard nut to crack.
2. But it has been cracked.
- ii. Madeleine Mueller. CCSF.
 1. Can we lease the land; long-term lease?
 1. Lisa Spinali. We did talk about this at a previous meeting.
 2. Chris Hanson's email; I hope it makes it to the record.
 3. Quote the ordinance that set up this CAC. City received input from those directly affected by the development. CAC is central clearinghouse for public comments. I hope it makes it into the record somehow.
- iii. Public Comment.
 1. Outrageous City Planning.
 2. 65 foot height limit on the east side is about 50% higher than what's been recently built on Ocean Avenue.
 3. The typical height for residences in the adjacent areas is about 25 feet that fits into the community like oil mixes with water.
 4. The less than 1 parking place per unit, what kind of fairy land do you folks live in? This is outrageous.
 5. Incorporating all of these things here brings me to tell you that City College is being forced out of this.
 6. I have contempt for your organization from the way we have been treated in the past.
 7. 30 years ago when we had this matter before the electorate, I met with Barbara Smith and asked her if there was a way to come to a compromise.
 8. Barbara Smith said let us build the housing and give a list of what you want.
- iv. Theodore. Excelsior.
 1. SFCTA has a plan with the different departments to make this freeway off-ramp much safer, that's not on the reservoir.
 2. Personally I would prefer parking garage on the CCSF side near the freeway on-ramp. All the cars coming on Ocean and turning onto Phelan makes it very uncomfortable as a bicyclist. Have the cars closer to the freeway.

- v. Jennifer Heggie. Sunnyside.
 - 1. Brigitte, how has this nut been cracked? Can you give us an example?
 - 1. Brigitte Davila. Well our housing costs here are particularly outrageous. California has been hit across the board and teacher's salaries have not kept up. Examples are San Mateo, LAUSD, and UC Irvine
 - 2. There's a lot of different ways to do it. Some are rentals, some you take the equity out of it.
 - 3. I don't say it's easy to do it. It would be a lot easier for me to walk away from it. But we really need it.
 - 4. This property is uniquely situated to do this.
- vi. Yonathan Randolph. Ingleside.
 - 1. Encourage you to consider the needs of those that cannot make it here and those who aren't here yet in addition to those that are here.
 - 2. We should have the foresight to see when things cannot go on forever. Low-cost parking and private auto transit are things we have enjoyed in the past but will not go on forever.
 - 3. The City will become denser or we will force out those that cannot afford to stay here when we don't build.
 - 4. To the gentleman's point that 65 foot buildings will be inappropriate, in the parameters we should say what our values are. Our values aren't heights at 65 feet, 55 feet or 85 feet. Our values are how does it feel when you walk down the street? The livelihood of a street does not directly correspond to how high a building is. What matters is how bulky it is. Behind the immediate façade there can be higher floors. A strict height limit isn't necessarily what we want to put in our parameters.
- vii. Ellen Wall. CCSF.
 - 1. Brigitte, I have to see your cost analysis.
 - 2. I don't believe it's cheaper to build housing than it is to give the faculty a raise. Think of the cost of building and maintaining.
 - 3. I think what you're proposing to be built is more expensive than giving faculty raises; faculty need higher salaries.
 - 4. Faculty need the opportunity to live where they want to, not be stuck with some pre-fab houses that may or may not be suitable.
 - 5. I need to see your numbers before I would accept that.
- viii. Francine Lofrano. Westwood Park.
 - 1. I'm just trying to wrap my mind around this meeting, where we've been and where we're going.
 - 2. The 2009 Balboa Park Area Plan is being scrapped, that whole thing took years and years.
 - 3. How much did the EIR cost? That would be a valuable thing for us to know.
 - 4. We put this aside and are doing a new thing.

5. We're taking 5-6 months to do this qualification and RFP and this extended time frame.
 6. It seems like all the comments we are making over the past several meetings are going to be for naught.
 7. They said they are going to take our guidelines but they already took the guidelines from the 2009 Station Plan and threw them aside.
 8. I've been engaged with the process for years.
 9. It seems irritating to have to do them earlier over several meeting and we have to do it again.
 10. What are we looking at here?
 11. Where do we go from here? Do we have a 4-6 month hiatus while all this behind-the-scenes work is done and we all sit back and wait?
 12. Then we have another 2 years of meetings.
 13. What did the EIR for the Balboa Park Area Plan cost?
 1. Jeremy Shaw. I don't know how much it costs. I will give it a try.
 2. If there are specific policies you think we ignored please point them out.
- ix. Anita Theoharis. Westwood Park.
1. Francine's tone was just fine.
 2. We spent five years going to Lick Wilmerding week after week after week to assist and have community input in the 2009 Balboa Park Area Plan and this was heart wrenching because we didn't want 500 units.
 3. We all wanted to work with and not against.
 4. We have been asking about the 2009 plan. I don't know why it's not relevant and not timely? Let's find out why.
 1. Jeremy Shaw. I'm happy to help but I would like to know what particular policies are being ignored.
 5. Maximum of 500 units and the plan itself says worst case scenario. I'd be happy to provide some more next time.

7. Adjournment.