

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

MEETING MINUTES

**Archbishop Riordan High School, Theatre
175 Phelan Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112**

Monday, November 14, 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-111416 available via the following link: www.sf-planning.org/brcac

Committee Members Present:

Michael Ahrens; Howard Chung; Brigitte Davila; Rebecca Lee; Robert Muehlbauer; Lisa Spinali; Jon Winston

Committee Members Absent:

Christine Godinez

Staff/Consultants Present:

Emily Lesk, Mike Martin, Phillip Wong, Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Jeremy Shaw, San Francisco Planning Department; Christopher J. Wong, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

1. Call to Order and Roll Call.

- a. Introduction of Michael Ahrens as Westwood Park Association Designee to the CAC.
 - i. Anita Theoharis. Westwood Park.
 1. President of the Westwood Park association. Myself or my designee holds the Westwood Park Association seat on the CAC.
 2. Thank you Kate Favetti for her service.

3. Introduce my designee Michael Ahrens. His biography will be posted tomorrow so you will be able to read his qualifications.
 4. We're very fortunate that he accepted the position.
 5. Mr. Ahrens is a native San Franciscan, lived in many parts of the City and is a graduate of Riordan High School.
- ii. Ahrens.
 1. Thank you Anita for introduction and Riordan for hosting meeting.
- a. Roll Call

2. Opening of Meeting.

- a. Amendments to 9/12/16 Meeting Minutes.
 - i. No CAC Comment.
 - ii. No public comment.
 - iii. Motion to approve 9/12/16 Meeting Minutes: Chung, Second: Winston
 1. Ayes: Chung, Davila, Muehlbauer, Spinali, Winston
 2. Noes: [none]
 3. Abstain: Ahrens

3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair.

- a. Election of BRCAC Chair.
 - i. Nomination of Lisa Spinali: Winston; Second: Davila
 1. Ayes: Ahrens, Chung, Davila, Muehlbauer, Spinali, Winston
 2. Noes: [none]
 3. Abstain: [none]
- b. Election of BRCAC Vice Chair.
 - i. Nomination of Robert Muehlbauer: Spinali; Second: Davila
 1. Ayes: Ahrens, Chung, Davila, Muehlbauer, Spinali, Winston
 2. Noes: [none]
 3. Abstain: [none]

4. Annual Progress Report to Board of Supervisors.

- a. Overview.
 - i. Lisa Spinali.
 1. Annually we have to send a report to the Board of Supervisors on our progress as a CAC.
 2. Planning staff prepared this document for my submission to the Board of Supervisors. So it will come from me with this report as well as with the development principles and parameters.
 3. First open it up to public comment for feedback. It's a historical report on how the CAC was created, what has the process has done to date, and what the next steps are.

b. Public Comment

i. Rita Evans. Sunnyside.

1. One thing I did note is that there is really no documenting or discussion that there are a number of things that neighbors and others asked for.
2. It's not reflected in the revised principles and parameters and there has been no explanation for why those things were not changed in response to neighbor's requests.
3. I'm thinking of some parking issues and the size of the contiguous open space.

ii. Hedda Thieme. Westwood Park.

1. Is there a way to inform people about meetings who are not on the internet?

c. CAC Comment.

i. Ahrens.

1. New member and tried my best in the last month to update myself on everything. Thank you to the City for meeting with me on (2) occasions and responding to emails.
2. Respond to Rita's comments because I agree with them 100 percent.
3. I did not know that this memo we're receiving was meant to be the progress report to the Board of Supervisors, but if it is we have to include a lot of discussion on parking and a lot of discussion on alternatives for City College. I met with the City and they said these things are being explored. That there are traffic studies being done.
4. Supervisor Yee recently in a newspaper said that the CAC is composed of individuals that will entertain neighborhood comment.
5. And you have received comment. You have received an almost unanimous survey of the Westwood Park area in which we voiced our comments and none of that is in this report.
6. The Board of Supervisors should know about the extensive and complete survey done by Westwood Park. In addition they should know about the substantial problems that have to be encountered.
7. We acknowledge that there will be a development. But it's got to go to terms with some real problems.
8. Two biggest problems I discussed with the City are parking and City College alternative parking.
9. I'm also very concerned about ingress and egress but we have been insured by the City that there will be no ingress or egress through Westwood Park. That is extremely important to us.
10. It's vague, the process going forward on evaluating the RFPs and RFQs. I might want to include that in this report too.
11. While I haven't been a part of the board for the past year I have familiarized myself with that went on and I did attend (1) meeting.

ii. Chung.

1. General question. I know this goes to the Board of Supervisors. What do they do with it? Vote on it, put it in their files?
 1. Emily Lesk. It's for their information. The process in the CAC bylaws is that the Chair forwards a progress report to Supervisor Yee and then he sends that to his colleagues on the Board so they have an opportunity to read.
 2. Lisa Spinali. It's like a status report.
- iii. Davila.
 1. I'm assuming we're turning this in with the principles and parameters, which would explain some of the many things that we heard over the 16 meetings and were included in there regarding parking and what not. There are quite a few areas there.
 2. I see on page 2 that City Staff attended meetings with community groups and that members these groups regularly attended BRCAC monthly meetings, but I wouldn't say that most of these groups were here very much. I would say definitely the neighborhoods have but it would be good to get other positions that represent younger people.
 1. Ahrens. Let me respond to that. That's a good point that the parameters will be sent. But if you're a Supervisor and you're busy and don't read that long report on that issue, if this is truly to be what Supervisor Yee said it would be and that is input from the neighborhoods, we would like some indications set forth earlier. I'm not talking about a long document with a lot of words because this is a short document and that's good. The Board of Supervisors should be given a short document. We would be willing, I would be willing, I don't think we should have a rush to judgment to look at this document that I only received two or three days ago. I didn't even know that this document was going to the Board of Supervisors unless you read the greyed line.
 2. Spinali. Where it is set out is in the original language of the policy that created the CAC.
 3. Ahrens. But my point is quite simple, I got this on Thursday I wasn't able to read it until over the weekend and I didn't know that this was the document that was going to be coming up today that would be going before the Board of Supervisors. I saw an agenda item that said annual progress report; I didn't connect the two. At any rate, all we ask for is a day and I'll have proposed language to you that will be very short and brief. It will include, as is only fair, to give some notion to the Board of Supervisors as to comments made by the neighborhoods.
 4. Spinali. I don't think you'll find an issue with that, what we're hearing right now is feedback as this is a draft. If there are things that are missing we want to make sure to include them.

One is being able to articulate the areas that were the most challenging. Everyone needs to know what those are. But I also think, building off of what Rita said, I think we should include some background on the number of surveys and information was galvanized through the individual communities to be a part of that process.

5. Ahrens. We're in full agreement then.
 3. I have a question. When I was reviewing the document I thought it was fairly pro forma and that we were basically being constituted as a committee once again going forward that the Board of Supervisors would do that. And that it wouldn't be going into too much greater detail besides describing the committee and what it does. Are we getting into the principles and parameters here? Because if it is that's a bigger issue. If we're going to get into parking again and transportation again.
 1. Spinali. The principles will be included because this is where we landed at the end. And this is what's in the RFP; that's done. I think it's fair to be able to say that if we want to be transparent these were the areas, such as 0.5 to 1 parking ratio and how we landed on that was this way. Let's include the areas that had the most energy around them.
 4. Davila. Transportation then.
- iv. Spinali.
1. What I'd like to do now is since we're going to do this by edits and we need to take another review of it.
 2. I have parking 0.5 to 1 ratio, contiguous open space, and transportation.
 1. Davila. I would like to add affordable housing for faculty.
 2. Ahrens. I included others in my statement. Also included the survey from Westwood Park and the severe problem for City College parking.
 3. Spinali. Do you want to list them as parking as two parts or two separate issues?
 4. Ahrens. Two separate issues for parking because they are two distinct problems. The City will attempt to solve for them through the RFQ and RFP process. The Board of Supervisors should know the site parking issues in addition to alternatives for City College parking, and a third parking issue, which is parking in the neighborhoods of Sunnyside and Westwood Park. This commission went a long way in addressing Westwood Parks problems, which is appreciated and we just want to make sure that they are addressed. I don't know what kind of comments I'll have on this document until after the meeting is completed since this meeting has on its agenda

further work and how often it's going to meet and participation in the RFQ and RFP process. After that I will have further comments on the memo.

5. Emily Lesk. I just want to remind everyone that the parameters document that the CAC approved last time has a detailed memo from the chair that describes all of the issues that have been brought up. That would be the next piece of paper after the staff memo. I think we should take a look at that side-by-side with the minutes from this meeting. And then if there are things that are not covered in Lisa's memo that's already attached to the parameters, either staff can revise their staff memo to include those or since the Chair is going to write a cover letter that could include those. But I think that we'll find that some of the comments are already written up in an approved document.
6. Ahrens. I disagree. I read that letter this evening and people are coming here and it does not address these issues.

v. Muehlbauer.

1. When looking over this document it looks like a decent historical record of what we've been doing here for the last year.
2. But in collapsing all of the comments we've heard it's missing some meat in terms of an analysis of issues.
3. If I was on the Board of Supervisors I would look to see from this community something other than we met, we had this process, and this is how the CAC was created. What really happened? I think it's weak in that respect.
4. I think this discussion is the start of a new section called analysis of issues.
5. The elephant in the room with this process is the disconnect with the City College master plan. I think the Board of Supervisors needs to have a sense of how this is disconnected and how the two processes with meet.
6. We have the Balboa Park Station Area CAC, it's formed to look at the same plan. How does the work they are both doing relate to each other? It might have been useful to bring these development parameters before another committee. Listened to comments. Also going back to City College maybe that should be another piece that they respond to the work we've done.
7. We have a start here, but it needs some fleshing out. We may need another meeting or a joint meeting with City College's Board of Trustees, Balboa Park Station Area CAC to put some meat on it and have the Board of Supervisors fully understand what's going on. They can accept it or reject it. That is what I've always viewed is the work of this committee.

vi. Spinali.

1. Let's go back and look at this as a table with the topic and the various viewpoints and where we landed on the parameter. We can see where the issue points are.
2. To the Planning team, we're due an annual report so if it's a little over a year does it matter?
 1. Emily Lesk. They are probably interested in seeing it sooner rather than later but we're not getting people asking for it.

vii. Ahrens.

1. Robert, I for one would be willing to meet in a couple of weeks or a week to hash this out and send it to the Board of Supervisors. We all have email and we can redline each other.
 1. Spinali. We can't.?
2. Is there some act in the State of California that prohibits that?
 1. Spinali. It makes for a less inefficient process.
3. At least we would all be prepared to address our suggestions at the next meeting.

viii. Spinali.

1. Can we do it by specific comments coming back?
 1. Emily Lesk. Sending them one way? I believe so. You can't be in conversation with each other.
2. We can get a copy of this document in word. We could receive comments one way and then consolidate the edits.
 1. Emily Lesk. If the whole CAC is participating in a conversation it should be a public meeting.
3. I want to jump start for the next meeting. Each CAC member has a copy of the document, then redlines and returns them individually to you and created into one document.
4. Instead of coming back to the next meeting, where we redline we can have another draft.
 1. Ahrens. Whatever is legal is fine with me, as long as we get our comments in.

ix. Anita Theoharis. Westwood Park.

1. I would like to make a point of order. I served as President of the Planning Commission. That was not an advisory body, that was a decision-making body, and I was told by the City Attorney, and had to attend an ethics meeting every year, I was permitted to talk to other members of the Planning Commission as long as it wasn't a quorum and we couldn't have seriatim meetings.
 1. Spinali. Anita, what we're trying to figure out is whether there is a way for us to provide preliminary feedback on the document, but it's a one way communication that can be collected and then a few people, less than a quorum, could review and then create the next round of drafts.

2. Well, so the public understands am I correct that these people can talk to one another if they choose so?
 1. Emily Lesk. If it's four people in conversation and not a quorum.
- x. Kate Favetti. Westwood Park.
 1. As a sitting commissioner and someone who trains others on the Brown Act I just want to caution all committee members that although you do not have a quorum it's important to not create an inadvertent ad seriatim meeting; that is two people talk to others who talk to others and that does happen. The advice I received over and over again from the City Attorney's office is to provide extreme caution in doing this. You don't want any of your hard work undone.
 1. Ahrens. So just to ask a question. Are you a lawyer? Here's a lawyer asking a non-lawyer a legal question. If two people are appointed as a subcommittee to come up with this idea and they only talked to each other, then they could return to the full committee?
 2. The subcommittee would be appointed by the whole body there may be some Brown Act provisions that apply to that subcommittee.
 3. There are many changes that have occurred since the '90s and that includes the Sunshine Ordinance and the Brown Act. I would like to caution you that everything you do is transparent and everyone knows that you are doing.
 1. Ahrens. This is getting ridiculous, I have a suggestion.
 2. Spinali. You have to be called on. I think what we take from Kate is that we have to be careful and that if there is going to be a subcommittee it has to be a small group and we don't play a telephone chain.
 4. And if you're establishing a subcommittee by vote you may have Brown Act provisions that may apply.
 1. Spinali. And if we make a subcommittee they can't telephone chain to everyone else. I'm speaking obviously so that we all can understand.
 2. Ahrens. I disagree. I think the simplest way, since we all have ideas on what should be in this, is getting a word like you said and give it to the chair and we can discuss it at the next meeting. Let's not talk to each other.
 3. Spinali. I agrees.
 - xi. Davila.
 1. I don't know what the protocol is here. I think we need to go over this again. Are we raising hands or are we talking whenever we feel like talking? What's going on here? Because this doesn't seem very fair. We have had a pretty reasonably running meeting before and I think we need to go over the ground rules. Are we raising hands?

1. Spinali. Yes, we should be. And usually we are holding one microphone and passing it to each other when they are going to speak. Thank you for the reminder.
 2. Ahrens. I apologize. I didn't know that was the rule but I can follow that now.
 3. Spinali. Maybe what we should do is, let's look at the second page in the agenda we have our ground rules of how we work with one another. The clapping comment is about ensuring everyone has equal voice. If you clap for someone's comment it can be intimidating for others and it's about creating equity in participating. Mike probably you and I should have met before this meeting so I apologize for that.
- xii. Muehlbauer.
1. I like the notion of all the committee members putting in their comments to the Chair and I don't want to put too much on your plate but maybe you could put it all together and work with staff to put together a redraft.
 2. Draft should come from the Chair since we've had a facilitated discussion over a year, I would like to get all the public comments in a facilitated discussion and come out with a document from there and make the work that we've done more useful.
- xiii. Spinali.
1. So if you were to have a week to get your comments back to me in a week's time and then I had a couple of days to then to take everyone's comments and input them in track changes built upon more feedback and we post it and people can provide public comment and we could combine that in the next document it could be a part of the next meeting.
- xiv. Muehlbauer.
1. Maybe the Chair and the Vice Chair could sit together with staff at their office to get all the materials together.
- xv. Spinali.
1. I want to make this as transparent as possible.
- xvi. Ahrens.
1. My only comment is that sounds great, but I would like to see the unedited comments of everyone on the commission. But you mentioned we would see the comments.
 1. Spinali. Yes, everyone will have their own color in track changes so everyone can understand it. Brigitte I could see red being your color and when looking through it you can see who has made specific comments.
- xvii. Davila.
1. I just wanted to make one more comment about the Brown Act. I was a big devotee of the Brown Act before I was elected to the Board of

Trustees. It is very difficult to follow, but we must follow the Brown Act, that we don't engage with more than three people that would include the person talking. It's not something we can really gloss over because it's a problem right now. We really need to stick to the Brown Act.

xviii. Spinali.

1. I'm going to lay out the next steps.
2. Everyone will take a copy of the document in Word, which will be provided.
3. You will have one week to provide your comments back to me.
4. I will then consolidate everyone's comments by section with a master color code to attribute to your comments to your color.
5. Robert and I will work on creating the next version and then the Public can weigh in and then we will come to the next meeting with the revised version and the additional public comment.
 1. Emily Lesk. I would like to run it by the City Attorney to make sure the Brown Act considerations are definitely met.
6. We'll come back with an email that says what we can do and also post that on the website if we need to have a revised process that meets the Brown Act.

5. Debrief of First Phase of CAC Process, Lessons for Future Meetings.

- a. Spinali. Explanation of activity to build upon what works and address what doesn't work as it relates to the CAC process.
 - i. Ahrens.
 1. Discussions questions come later?
 - ii. Spinali.
 1. Yes, on that back side of the sheet are specific areas that we would love to get your feedback on. These are just ticklers to get you to think about what we should be doing differently, or change, or keep the same.
- b. Public Comment.
 - i. Rita Evans. Sunnyside.
 1. Comment about the information that was provided to the public in advance of the CAC meetings when we were to discuss the draft principles and parameters.
 2. Extremely short review time as they were not made available until one week before and sometimes less than 7 days, which is an extremely short window.
 3. Disservice to the participating members of the public and in the neighborhood associations.

4. It was a real scramble to try and schedule our meetings and get our members together to discuss the points and prepare written comments.
 5. In the future, I hope there would be the provision of a more reasonable amount of time. 2 weeks would certainly be an improvement.
- ii. Kate Favetti. Westwood Park.
1. The Q&As were very helpful to not only synthesize what the questions were at the time from the community but also what the City's responses were.
 2. Concerned about providing feedback on the RFQ and RFP and how the community structure is going to be organized.
 3. We do not have representatives from Avalon and Mercy; those are two developments that are directly adjacent to the new development and there are no representatives. I have not heard community input from them at all. This could be something we should improve.
 4. A short Sunshine and Brown Act review may be of interest.
- iii. Francine Lofrano. Westwood Park.
1. Also speaking on behalf of Ann Chin and Anita Theoharis.
 2. First off the questions of what worked well. This assumes that this worked well. Many people don't think this.
 3. In the very brief time I had to jot down thoughts, I think the CAC should have less mayoral appointees.
 4. The comment made by the previous speaker, Rita, in regards more time to review the materials was one of my comments. Often times there isn't adequate time to review documents posted so late.
 5. Many of the meetings were allowed to go over the allotted time rather than be rescheduled. It felt like the meetings were rushed and forced to stay over time. It's already a cumbersome process for us to attend then be forced to stay.
 6. The questions raised go unanswered from the previous minutes of the meeting. I have an ongoing question and I'm still waiting for an answer; this isn't the first time this has happened to me.
 7. This is open public input but because of the impact on the neighborhoods they should have a louder voice in the process.
- iv. Laura Fry. Westwood Park.
1. I agree with a lot of stuff that other people have said.
 2. It's good when people identify themselves when they come up.
 3. When people are here as a staff member from another organization they should identify themselves as such.
 4. City should have be more transparent about the size of the development.
 5. I still can't believe no one is talking numbers at all. The still refuse to talk numbers or size.

6. In the parameters there should be more detail about what's possible and what may not be possible.
 7. CCSF is still not being seriously considered a sole recipient of the property; it's not legally possible, it cannot be privately owned and legally turned into student housing.
- v. Theodore. Excelsior.
1. I really like the even temper and tolerance exhibited by the chair.
 2. I like the very detailed minutes, they have been pretty useful for reviewing what people have said in these meetings.
 3. I prefer the amplification and the stenographer to try and make these meetings more accessible.
 4. One think I would like to change is I want this process to go faster.
 5. We have thousands of people that are homeless and tens of thousands that are under-housed and crammed together. Houses that are not designed for their current uses. We should build faster and we can start here.
 6. I would like to see the TDM reports from the consultants because they looked interesting and I wasn't able to attend the meetings and based on the PDFs put online they looked like good resources.
- vi. Jenny Perez. Plymouth Avenue.
1. Thank you for documenting the information; it's been very helpful whenever I come in.
 2. After 16 meetings, it's been a year, we did see research done after 2016, it's going to be 2017, we'd like to see more research done on our neighborhoods to date.
 3. There are over 3000 units that are either rental or property to buy that are available and people aren't taking them up. It's not about not having space in San Francisco, it's that the price is too high.
 4. Thank you City. I called the City to inform myself as to what their model is to facilitate these units. It's to saturate the City landscape to bring prices down. More spaces means trying to lower prices; that's where the bubble happens.
 5. We need more research on our neighborhood and our needs. Available rental lease properties are currently available and how many are currently being built is a huge problem.
- vii. Jennifer Heggie. Sunnyside.
1. I like the early responses to our requests, in particular the ones handed out once or twice in response.
 2. Access to housing and planning right here in the meeting to be responsive to questions was really helpful; also the slides.
 3. I am concerned that we don't even have a TDM report. We're already at the RFQ; cart before the horse.
 4. Timing is off; there are huge issues that affect people and institutions in this area.

5. Riordan was not included in these discussions.
- viii. Christopher Campbell. Westwood Park.
1. Thank you to the committee.
 2. Those of you that are paid I appreciate you investing your energy and time. It bodes well for both sides and the City.
 3. The overall process and engagement with the public has gone well.
 4. I feel that I've had questions that have not been answered.
 5. Is there a way to succinctly categorize questions with the responses from the City?
 6. As someone that uses mass transit I really like the discussion about concerns about public transit, traffic related concerns and parking. I really think at this point there might be more feedback from the City and how those concerns might be met and how we might be moving forward on them.
- ix. Joe Coleman. Westwood Park.
1. The City seems to have done traffic surveys during the summer and that doesn't really fit in this neighborhood. You have Riordan, City College and Lick-Wilmerding and this is a disservice to what really goes on here
 2. The early images with the empty parking lots for City College were deceptive. Traffic survey in the summer is misleading. It should be brought out especially with the issue of the parking.
- x. Harry Bernstein. City College.
1. Will there be a parking study that includes the surrounding neighborhoods or is it just the study trying to mitigate and reduce the demand for parking on site? It needs to be more widespread.
 2. It's a discussion that needs to happen.
 3. There was a community friendly preamble added to the parameters. You were asked to approve them separately. The preamble was ignored in the report that the City team has putting together. Maybe the preamble can return and be discussed. What is the difference between that and the principles and parameters?
 4. Two news items. 50% low-cost housing in the Examiner, but not true because only 18% speculatively will be available to those make less than \$55,000. Treasure Island housing came up and fewer housing units will be built as costs have escalated. Adds to the discussion of what low-cost housing will be at this site.
- xi. Chris Coghlan. Sunnyside.
1. I read the same article about what's going on at Treasure Island.
 2. I'd hate to see us get halfway done and see the project not working.
 3. I'm not happy with the communication from the get go to the neighborhood; I never received in the mail surveys or anything.
 4. The Sunnyside requested open space as their number one desire. Somehow I heard you agreed to 1.5 of contiguous open space which

is insanely small. I don't care if you put a 50-story building there; we need park space. I know Westwood Park wouldn't like that but I'm not going to see it. I'm a NIMBY on that, I have to admit.

5. The way you have all the traffic come out onto Phelan, Sunnyside is going to bear the brunt of all the traffic.
 1. Spinali. What is your exact recommendation of what we should change or do differently? I appreciated your comment about mailings during important times, especially for those nearby.
6. A survey, such as do you want housing in the reservoir? Instead we're getting, what kind of housing do you want? Not all of us want housing. We like having open land.
7. I have a place to live so I'm okay. We can build along the BART corridor. There are plenty of places to build in the Bay Area near public transportation. The thing we don't have is open space. I am steadfast on trying to protect that.
8. Why are we meeting without that TDM; that is appalling.
9. Speaking as vice president of the SNA please send me reports as according to our bylaws as our community chair.
 1. Spinali. Happy to do it and happy to have you join our meetings.
10. I know but sometimes I can't, but as the vice-president I expect to get reports.

xii. Alvin Ja. Sunnyside.

1. I've written a lot of stuff and have sent it to the CAC. I've had input.
2. The problem is how the City responds to the input.
3. It's been an exercise in futility.
4. I've done a whole lot of research including doing Sunshine requests. Investigating into the AECOM reports. Looking into the Balboa Park Station Area Plan.
5. I wrote a thing summarizing the flaws regarding the Balboa park reservoir project. Those issues I've brought up have not been answered. What you answer is just within what you want to see.
6. I saw this at the first SNA I said this as a done deal. Lisa, you slapped me down for being disrespectful, but I hate to say that perspective has been vindicated. It was a done deal. The whole thing has been pre-ordained. And all the community gets to do is tinker.
7. I just sent you something now, but I'll read it. Fundamentally the public and community participation was just coping. The reality is public engagement process was merely a way to manage and direct public input to conform with the City team's pre-determined outcome. The public engagement process was in reality was a process of manipulation towards the City team's desired outcome.

xiii. Hedda Thieme. Westwood Park.

1. I'd gladly give my time to the gentleman so that he can finish, is that possible?
 1. Spinali. No.
 2. Our meetings have stifled rules that we cannot express ourselves.
 3. I've asked many questions and never got answers to them. That needs to change. We are here to inform and interact with each other and that does not exist. We speak in statements that are put on paper and filed away. Something is not working out right.
- xiv. Monica Collins. Sunnyside.
1. I used to work at City College.
 2. I have something strange to say that nobody has said, but Mr. Coghlan put it in my head.
 3. I do think open space is precious. This is a little tiny city and it is defined by geography, 7 by 7, like Manhattan.
 1. Spinali. Monica, do you have feedback around what we should change about the process? I didn't meant to shut you down.
 4. And yet it happened.
 1. Spinali. Because the rule is around this part of the meeting we're asking specifically for feedback on what to change or do differently, and the purpose of that is to ensure it's consistent for everyone to have an equal experience. I'm sorry I didn't mean to shut you down.
 5. I forgot what I was going to say.
 1. Chris Coghlan. Point of order, it just says public comment.
 2. Spinali. Chris if you look at the agenda at number 5 it says debrief of first phase of CAC process, and after we went into that I shared the hand out specifically.
 3. Chris Coghlan. I'm fine, I just made my point.
 4. Spinali. Sure, okay. And Monica, I'm sorry, I did not mean to shut you down, if you think of your public comment just come to the front of the line.
- xv. David Tejada. Sunnyside.
1. Thank you, the meeting is run well. The records are well kept. I would appreciate that we continue to have the print out and the microphones working. That really helps because we all need to hear it. I will continue to come to these because I'm coming for most of the people on my block, who listen to me and I give them feedback from what's happening at the meetings, and I think that it's running well.
- c. CAC Discussion.
- i. Chung.
 1. I represent the Ocean Avenue business corridor.
 2. A lot of the comments are great comments and I don't want to repeat them. My one comment is we live in a diverse state and a lot of

people don't even speak English. And a lot of people work and we don't get to see a lot of them at our meetings.

3. They are busy, they are working, and they have families. Something we need to try and implement is how to get those people to participate in our process?
4. I can talk to Avalon, Mercy, and Riordan, but those people are represented well, but how do you get the disenfranchised into this process? That's something I'm trying to think about and work it.
5. A lot of my other comments have been said.

ii. Davila.

1. I want to say that I agree with you on that, there are people that have not been heard.
2. Comments heavily weighed on the older side, but we don't have a lot of younger voices; we have two and I appreciate them for coming to every meeting. They are the ones that are most going to be impacted. I appreciate everyone coming to meetings; it's been 16 meetings, quite a long haul.
3. We need more diversity among those that will inherit this City, we need to do better about the disenfranchised people regarding this.
4. I think the board has had great decorum and respect for each other and we pretty much followed our process and I think we have done that very well. It has moved things along.
5. I feel like we have listened to one another, and I've heard things that I wasn't prepared to agree with but when I hear the reasons I understand.
6. I want to make sure that we continue with the process and limit any mansplaining or going on without raising our hands; keep that to a minimum. Those are my main two comments.

iii. Ahrens.

1. Having not been on the board until today, I have no comments on what happened prior to today.
2. But I just have one observation. I'm absolutely amazed that we are proceeding as quickly as this RFQ says we are proceeding, especially when some of the members of the residences locally say we don't have a TDM or a study on parking. And that's a process I'm told by the City but I don't understand why we are going forward so fast without having that before us, it might all just be a waste of time.
3. But I'll reserve the rest of my comments for the discussion questions.

iv. Muehlbauer.

1. I want to commend the staff. They put a lot of work into this and there has been a lot of paper generated. Having served on other committees that isn't always the case. I've served on a committee where I don't even get a staff report. There's a lot of pre-work that happens behind the curtain.

2. Sure it can be improved, but from what I've seen it's been good work and I have a 30-year history of public service.
3. These meetings are all about airing out the issues, so if you have to hear it 50 times at every meeting that's really the benefit of these meetings. We take notes, and I put check marks next to comments I hear over and over again; it has an impact on what I think in the long run.
4. Written staff reports have to continue and I like the quality of the work.
5. A constant chronic issue has been you have people who have been at meetings since the beginning who know the history and know what's going on. Then you have others who come in mid-process and they don't know what's going on so you can end up duplicating stuff. The initiative to have a pre-meeting reviewing a little bit of the history, 15 minutes before the meeting so the new people have an inkling of what has taken place beforehand I thought was very well done and a good move towards trying to main stream everyone as we move through this process.
6. These meetings have been well-attended so someone is doing their homework.
7. Be it Westwood Park, Sunnyside, the OMI, the email blasts, having 50 to 100 people at these meetings shows there's a lot of interest.
8. On what would I change, I want to see joint meetings with the City College Board of Trustees, the Balboa Park Station CAC and maybe even Riordan. I would like to see an attempt to do that going forward.
9. Secondly I've never been entirely satisfied from what I've heard about the public purpose of the SFPUC selling affordable housing that's only halfway affordable housing. Is that satisfying a public purpose? I know that I've heard from staff but I'd also like to hear a legal opinion from the City that says what they think about it and we can put it to rest once and for all, at least in my mind.
10. The work that we're doing hasn't even started in my mind. We have a long list of wants in terms of what we want to see but it's a very abstract notion of what that's going to look like when we actually have a proposal in front of us.
11. We have no idea what the units are going to be, or the streets or the heights. How do all these development parameters fit in a real deal that's being put before us?
12. We have to get to a point where we can look at this as an actual development proposal.
13. Every time I come away from these meetings thinking what does this all mean? It's kind of abstract.
14. The TDM is a little of putting the cart before the horse.

15. How is the TDM going to mirror what the needs are of this development and be harmonious with City College's TDM?
 16. This is important, it's parking and traffic circulation. This is where the rubber meets the road in terms of this development. It is opaque to say the least. Going forward everyone in this room should be keeping staff's feet to flame to explain to us very clearly how this TDM is going to mitigate some of these issues.
 17. Otherwise it's all smoke and mirrors.
- v. Jon Winston.
1. We are patting ourselves on the back for surviving 16 meetings, but we really haven't started yet. We haven't mentioned any numbers because we don't know them.
 2. The TDM is one part of it. It's coming out in December but before we can make decisions we need all of these parts to come together at one time.
 3. All we have now, although being a big achievement, are vague parameters that are telling us what we'd like to see. We haven't figured everything out, that's what happens after the RFP. That's when we'll need the TDM, that's when we'll need all this other planning.
 4. All of that is coming in the next year.
 5. Representation from other people; most people in here are my age with a few small exceptions.
 6. I talk regularly to people who are interested in the subject and need housing; some live in the neighborhood. 35- to 40-year-old people don't really have the time to come to meetings. They need to be accommodated somehow. You see them on Twitter but they don't show up at the meetings. It's not to their credit but I sympathize. Maybe we need to think of Saturday meetings.
 7. Part of what we are charged to be is a clearinghouse for all the information and opinions and I think we've done a pretty good job. I understand the people complaining that they haven't been heard, and if you look online you'll find matrices staff put together actually answering questions. People stand at the microphone, ask a question and no one answers, but if you look back a month later on the website you'll see a matrix that has most of the answers.
 8. If somebody gets swept under the rug, I'm sorry. We need to work on that.
 9. With City College there are multiple processes going on, there's the Board of Trustees and a master plan occurring in parallel with us. There's almost no communication. I know folks from the Facilities Master Plan attend meetings, is there anyone here now?
 1. Spinali. Linda da Silva wasn't able to attend tonight, but will in the future.

10. We need a Regular report from someone from that staff at every meeting; what's happening at the Board of Trustees and we need to report back to them.
11. I've been going to several master planning meetings they don't know that we're planning on building a childcare center or it slipped their mind. They don't know that we have 0.5 to 1 parking. They don't know any of this stuff because they haven't been looking and we haven't been broadcasting this stuff. There's a lot their doing that we need to know.
12. What's going right? We have been collecting a lot of information. What thing we're not doing is spreading information
13. Jeff Tumlin's presentation was one of our better meetings where we talked about the TDM. We need more meetings like that with guest speakers. We can have people talk about playground design. We can have someone talk about bike share or car share. Someone from MUNI can come talk to us about why the 43 isn't great.

vi. Lee.

1. I think a lot of great comments have been said, especially Howard and Brigitte.
2. Since you brought it up, Robert, I am more familiar with the SFPUC Commission. I'm also a member of the SFPUC CAC and the committee has had numerous discussions on the activities of the BRCAC. We often seek answers from SFPUC staff. We check legality of conditions such as a 100% affordable development.
3. The repeated answer is on because we have a financial obligation to the ratepayers across San Francisco whose money was used to finance the purchase of this property. Of course everyone here is an SFPUC ratepayer; we're not talking about two separate bodies of taxpayers and ratepayers, although there are some differences.
4. If you think about the financial responsibility owed to everyone across San Francisco it's for those reasons that obligation is in conflict with the desire to make this as affordable as possible. This has been a point of discussion repeatedly and disagreements on the SFPUC CAC. We have members on the SFPUC CAC that don't believe housing should be a topic of discussion and there are some who think there ought to be 100% affordable housing developed.
5. After much debate, the consensus there is to support 50% to 100% range depending on what's achievable, which is what the housing parameters ended up being.
6. It's not going to please everyone, but that is a place that I'm comfortable with.
7. If we need further legal verification I will send a request to SFPUC staff to ask them for such a response. They have given it to us and I don't think it should be a confusion.

vii. Spinali.

1. After listening to everyone, one of the most important things we have to do is around coordination because this is very complex. And we're going to need to figure out a better way of calendaring and creating the overall process which we're going to talk about around the next steps to make sure we give it these two weeks before any time we want community input so there's enough turnaround. When we talk about the big events that are going to happen in the next phase we've already begun to talk about how important it is to go two or three months in advance to let people know there's going to be an opportunity to provide feedback or that an event is going to take place.
2. We learned over time that we have slowed things down even though it seems that it was rushed. We did slow down what people thought was going to be a six-month process before we were even elected to this.
3. I think that the pacing and timing and really looking at what the outlook is going to look like is important.
4. The TDM question, people have heard me say it over and over again, if we don't figure out the transportation piece to this we're dead in the water before we even start. It's the traffic, it's the parking, it's all the components to figure that out with the developer.
5. I'm wondering if anyone is going to bid on this based upon the parameters we put on this.
6. It hasn't been a perfect process and I don't want to over commit but I'm concerned that we balance the voices of everyone that's hear tonight. But the notion that we haven't answered questions, Jon talked about this a little bit, and I would like to take a look at the matrices. If people feel they haven't had a specific question answered that is really preventing you from participating to send the question to us again and we'll answer it the best we can.
7. Harry, when you asked if 50% affordable housing will be legally acceptable, we need to be able to address those things. Otherwise it's not a transparent process.
8. I agree completely with the representation of who comes to the meetings, younger families not being able to. We need to think of a different set of meetings, which may mean a heavier lift from the CAC because we may need to do multiple meetings on the same topic. I don't know how that would work but we have to think about how we do a better job of building that network to make sure we are connected here and make sure we do a better job for those communities that are most going to be impacted by this. Make sure they have a voice.

9. Mike I'm going to turn to you because as the newest member you want to respond to the discussion questions. I don't necessarily think anyone else is going to have questions, why don't you take a couple minutes on that.

viii. Ahrens.

1. Yes, I've heard a lot of good comments from the public tonight. I share a lot of concerns with the public.
2. I am resigned to the fact, as I said earlier, that I don't think we should be going forward with this process because of the parking and transportation problems and with City College considering putting a Performing Arts Center on their share of the parking lot out there. I just don't see how we can go forward without a solution to the parking problem.
3. That being said, the City has said what Robert basically said, that we have to go forward because if we don't go forward we'll never get this done. I'm resigned, even though I disagree, we were in the middle of a vote.
4. Going forward I want to make sure all these people and the public have input into the process of what's called the evaluation committee.
5. I requested that Westwood Park, who was the biggest impact in my mind than anybody, be put on the evaluation committee, even as an ex-officio member.
6. I think a lot of things can go wrong in the rush to judgment on the evaluation process and that is the evaluation of the RFQ and RFP.
7. Basically I was told this morning that we have a representative, and that is you [Lisa Spinali] as the Chair, and you're well qualified to be the Chair, but to represent the voice of all of us, I'd just like to understand how that can happen if you're going to go forward and have the meeting but you can't report back to us.
8. How are we going to know when the RFQ process, let's start when I learned from this big document I got offline just before coming here tonight that RFQ responses are due by January 18, 2017.
9. How can we as Westwood Park, how as we as a commission here have input into the RFQ or RFP process?
10. A lot of the things we have said and have objected to in the parameters basically were thrown off to the developer.
11. You tell me what the parking is going to be, you tell me how many units. Tell me what is economically feasible and tell me how the units are low-cost housing.
12. And so I think it is crucial that we, the CAC, have a say in the evaluation committee.
13. The evaluation committee is made up of mostly City representatives. You are the only voice we will have Lisa. So I'd like to know how we

- get input to you with this thing I've heard about of which I don't remember the name.
14. I want input every step of the way. I thought the best resolution was for me, as a very important neighborhood.
 15. Plymouth Avenue is going to be looking at this building behind here; that's my neighbors. So I want to know how I can give input. And I thought the best way is if I'm there and Sunnyside is there you've got both neighborhoods there. Put me on the committee as a non-voting member, an Ex-Officio member and I can give you my views. I can't vote, I just want to give you my views, everyone's views.
 16. You know me Howard, I'm a deal maker. I want to do a deal here. But I want to get my neighborhood properly represented, and I think that's the best way. Put me on that committee.
 17. So far the staff has said no. I'm sitting on the evaluation committee. I'll give you my views, and I'll try to see that everything proceeds forward.
 18. Because, if as you say Lisa, there is no parking solution none of us want to go forward. If there's no traffic solution, no of us want to go forward. I've accepted the fact that we do have to proceed otherwise this won't get done. If there's a solution, fine. That's my comments, discussion points, and how often do we meet? As many times as you want.
 19. We've already solved the questions being put earlier today and I think we can continue to do that.
- ix. Spinali.
1. I'd like to have Emily Lesk discuss next steps in the process and come back to this conversation after we've seen the next steps.
 2. The next phase has different forms of community participation.
 3. I'd like to respond to you after this next piece.
- x. Ahrens.
1. And I did say to Michael Martin, Emily, and everyone sitting at the table has been very helpful in educating and bringing me up to date.
- xi. Spinali.
1. Yes, and it's a lot.
- xii. Emily Lesk.
1. Running through the milestones in the RFQ process and how they can overlay with the CAC process.
 2. We the City issued the RFQ last week, that's the first of the competitive steps in the developer selection process, to bring on a developer partner, a development team.
 1. Spinali. Generally we would have had a PowerPoint, but we only have one screen, which we are using for the transcription. We are going to make the calendar of next steps available online for everyone to have access to.

3. The RFQ has been issued and a link was sent out to the whole CAC email list. It consists of the RFQ document to developers explaining what they should submit and outlining the process and the criteria for evaluating the request for the qualifications responses that come in.
4. The criteria is focused on finding a short list of prospective development teams that have the experience both in building projects of this scale and building projects in San Francisco neighborhoods with sensitivity, and also have the financial capacity to actually bring the resources to bear. That is the bulk of what will be evaluated by the evaluation panel.
5. The third piece is a very high level vision for what the site can be and that's where we test whether developers understand and are respecting the parameters, which are an attachment to the RFQ.
6. Now that we are in this competitive process we have to be really systematic and really fair about the communication that happens.
7. As questions come in from development teams, we collect them and we answer them all in writing online so that everyone including the public can see the conversation so that no prospective developer has an advantage over another one. So that is how we will respond to questions that come up.
8. We intend to post those answers to those questions before Christmas and will give teams another month to complete their proposals, asking them to turn them in in January and then the evaluation panel will meet and make a recommendation to the General Manager of the SFPUC around the top 3 top scoring teams to invite to participate in an RFP, which is really where the rubber will meet the road of the proposal.
 1. Spinali. Why do we do the qualifications before the proposal?
9. We do the qualifications because entering this kind of process is really a lot of work, time and money for development teams. This lowers the barriers to entry to allow people to come to the table. It gives teams who are going to spend a lot of time and resources on coming up with proposals some assurances that they are a serious contender. It lowers barriers to entry and hopefully gives us as big a pool as possible.
10. As far as how the CAC and your meetings coming up interact with that, it's up to you all. We have a couple of months which may be an opportunity for some of the informational and coordination items that people raised. The CAC will really get engaged with the proposals once we have them through the RFP process. We don't have a schedule for that but the main way to engage in addition to having the CAC representative on the evaluation panel and having the parameters as a criteria for the evaluation is that we'll be asking the three main proposers to come present their proposals and invite the

public to give comment. This can be in person at a huge meeting, hopefully hosted by the CAC, and on-going over a period of time. Then the evaluation panel will be asked to take those comments into account in their evaluation.

11. We're going to have quite a few months before that happens.

xiii. Spinali.

1. One thing that we've had preliminary discussion about is that once the 2 or 3 developers get the green light to go ahead and do the full proposal the intention would be that we as a CAC would design a process that's going to maximize community input to refine the developers proposed design. So imagine having a large charrette, where people can give their feedback.
2. Our goal is because we're going to have an opportunity to have really robust community input into the developer's ideas on how to manifest the 17 acre parcel that best meets the principles and parameters that we've laid out.
3. Our work is going to be how do we get enough people coming out to see that? How do we make sure it's people impacted by it? How do we make sure it's done in language that everyone can understand?
4. The intention is that the process is going to have a lot of community input. Over the next few months design a process that maximizes community input as well as we don't have a repeat of the dot exercise.
5. The RFQ process is about finding the right people that have the capacity to do this kind of project.
6. My job as the chair is to represent the parameters not just Sunnyside, which we worked on over the past 16 meetings to put together to make sure whoever comes forward best reflects what we've talked about the process. An important thing we'll look for is their ability to work effectively with diverse communities. We need someone who is creative when putting these together. It's going to require a creative firm not someone who is just doing a cookie cutter model because of the different aspects of the principles. The thing that's complicated is we push to have community representation on this selection committee, which has not happened before with the Planning department. We thought it would be cleanest to have the Chair of the CAC and the right representative from City College because City College is going to be a huge piece of this as well. So I'm not prepared to say right now, Mike. I don't even know what it would take to have you as a shadow or Ex-Officio member because I think this is uncharted territory in itself that we have community participation at all and my job is to represent the collective CAC.

xiv. Ahrens.

1. A big burden would be taken off your back if you had the neighborhood that sits right in front of this development right there with you, Westwood Park.
2. Non-voting member but at least you would get the input, otherwise we would want to have some input into you such as regular CAC meetings before you make decisions on behalf of this entire committee. I think having two neighborhoods and City College, that basically surround this thing, on the evaluation committee would solve the problem of wondering if, “geez, am I making the right decision for Westwood Park, are they going to second guess me a year or in two years” without any input from the CAC.
3. The other alternative I mentioned is meeting after meeting where the evaluation committee with you as a representative come out to us and ask us should I do it this way or that way? That is inferior I think to having another, the major neighborhood, Westwood Park, represented on a non-voting, ex-officio. I will not say anything until I’m told to talk. I think that’s the best way to solve this problem. We want to build a consensus, we don’t want to have fights between Westwood Park and the rest of this group.

xv. Winston.

1. With all due respect I’m one of the at-large members, so my constituency is tens of thousands of people who need housing in the City. To say that one neighborhood or the group I represent, that one is more important than the other, I think we are all equal. Each of us on the committee has a constituency and each one is important and while I would like to be on the committee and be a fly on the wall that is why I nominated Lisa to be a representative on the committee. I would like to keep it that way.
2. I would like to have regular reports on what happens in the meetings and have a chance to respond to what happens in the meetings but that’s my opinion.

xvi. Ahrens.

1. Can I respond to that?
2. If that could be worked out that might solve the problem.
3. I gave two solutions.
4. One solution is Lisa to come back to us on a regular basis. Look at this timeline. Written questions by December, responses to questions by December, and responses due in January. I mean, if she can come back to us and say hey we have questions about the RFQ what do you think about it that might solve the problem.
5. With respect to the neighborhoods, your interests are well represented by the City, and other interests are well represented on the selection committee, with 7 or 9 mostly from the City. And I think that City for trying to build a consensus among the neighborhoods,

and I know Lisa would do a good job in trying to represent all of our interests, but it's a tough task. It's a tough task when you get an RFQ, is this right or not? You don't want to wait, the City has told us that the RFP process is going to be open to public comment, but then you only have three and maybe you should have taken this one or that one during the RFQ process. So I'm making a suggestion and I think there are one of two ways. Lisa, I don't know how you can keep coming back to us saying, well, what about this, what about that?

6. You need a sounding board but you can't talk about it because of the Brown Act, and I gave a solution made in good faith to resolve this whole thing.

xvii. Davila.

1. I already said this, but I feel like there are other constituencies that are not represented at all here and I thank Jon for standing up for them.
2. I would like to think that my work with younger people informs my understanding that they are left out. One thing we might want to consider is childcare, if we have childcare and a meeting on a Saturday might mean we get more families attending.
3. I'm old and I have my house and I'm set and it's going way up in value, but I still care about young people and that they can get housing in the City.

xviii. Lee.

1. I think Lisa has done an incredible job in managing the oftentimes seemingly impossible, conflicting, opposing views that have been discussed and brought before the group and re-discussed.
2. I trust she would do a good job, and I also am someone who rents in the City and I probably won't own my first home in San Francisco so when I come across that bridge it will be dual decision on whether I stay in the City that I love and have been a resident of for 10 years, or do I purchase my own home and leave San Francisco?
3. I'm drawn to what Jon Winston has said.

xix. Spinali.

1. I'm going to answer with I don't know.
2. The reason I am saying I don't know is I want to know more about exactly the evaluation process for the next phase as we've only talked about it at the highest level.
3. I need to understand exactly the requirements.
4. I want to respect the decision that this group came to when we put this forward and laid it out, and I want to respect what you've all heard especially to Mike as a new member.
5. I appreciate you trying to take the burden off and Westwood Park being the number one most affected neighborhood by the project. I take that seriously.

6. I weigh that also with my colleagues to the left who say this is also for their community and our collective community.
 7. What I would like to do is come back to it in our meeting in December and be able to come back to it then.
 8. I can't register my opinion at the moment; it will be cut and dry because it is qualifications of the developer and who is coming back.
 9. In my mind the harder part is the longer term process, and that's the part that's going to have a lot of community engagement.
 1. Ahrens. That's constructive.
- xx. Muehlbauer.
1. I appreciate the fact that Westwood Park and Sunnyside are directly impacted, but the most impacted part to me is City College.
 2. And if the Westwood Park door is open to sit on the committee.
 1. Ahrens. They aren't. SFPUC is on the committee, City College is on the committee, and the Chair of the CAC is on the committee.
 3. I stand corrected.
- xxi. Spinali.
1. I want to table this for now.
 2. I want to look at the Westwood Park people, and I'm looking you all in the eye. I am completely open to figuring this out and doing it in a way that makes sense. I'm also looking at you Mike.
 1. Ahrens. I said that's very constructive.
 3. Yes, I just want to make sure to say that because there has been some concern that I may not be listening but I am very much listening.
 4. We're going to general public comment now.
 5. Actually I'm going to move ahead on the agenda quickly first. One of the things that we've done with the neighborhoods involved in this is, Linda da Silva who is running the master plan process for City College, we asked her to come to our meetings on a regular basis to report on what's happening with the master plan. I hear she's a rock star and really knows her stuff. This is great because she is also the City College representative on the evaluation committee for this project.
 6. One other thing I want us to think about is how do we do a better job of reaching out to make sure each of us are doing a good job of our web and who we are connected to. I would ask Christine who couldn't be here tonight because she is ill, I would ask her if she can be the representative for the other schools in the area because a lot of the transportation issues deal with transporting kids to and from school so being able to up the ante around the school voice. How do we do our best to make sure our webs are as intricate and vast as they can be and to make sure we are getting good representation.

7. Does staff have any additional comments before we move on to general public comment?
 1. Emily Lesk. I just want to add to the communication with City College and the Facilities Master Plan.
 2. Linda wanted us to mention that there will be an update item on the City College Facilities Master Plan at their Board of Trustees hearing this Thursday evening.
 3. Spinali. Can you post that on the website?
 4. Emily Lesk. Yes.
 5. Spinali. Okay, great.

6. General Public Comment.

a. Public Comment.

i. Harry Bernstein. City College.

1. Mr. Ahrens said the college is thinking of potentially building a performing arts and education center. Yes, they promised that to the voters in 2001 and 2005 and it was one of the most popular parts of that bond measure. So yes, we are obligated as far as I can tell.
2. At least 3 people mentioned unanswered questions.
3. Maybe we can have a spotlight area that these questions are answered by the City team.
4. My department chair has asked many times how many properties are in San Francisco that are being taxed and are owned but not occupied; this has gone unanswered and you probably have access to the resources to answer this.
5. Mr. Muehlbauer asked how much low-cost housing does there have to be to justify privatizing publically-owned land? This is a good question.
6. Including something AJ talked about, but not in the draft report. The PUC's land use framework is ignored in that draft report.
7. Linda da Silva that will probably change if she is involved but Brigitte being here is not necessarily representative of the institution.

ii. Rita Evans. Sunnyside.

1. My comment has to do with Lisa's comment a few minutes ago that Westwood Park will be the most heavily impacted by this development. I respectfully disagree.
2. Sunnyside will bear the brunt of the of the traffic and parking impacts generated by this development.
3. Please note for the record, Westwood Park is not the neighborhood most heavily impacted, although it may be the one in closest proximity.

iii. Alvin Ja. Sunnyside.

1. The RFQ document does not talk about the land use framework policy. It needs to be included in the RFQ.
 2. At the previous meeting, I asked that the CAC preamble and the parameters be voted on separately. The preamble was initially needed because the parameters didn't reflect what the community wanted, or City College, or address the parking and transportation issues.
 3. What the RFQ does is point strictly to development parameters.
 4. The preamble is what the community wants but more of a nice if you can do it.
 5. I want to address something Robert and Rebecca brought up and that's the idea of the public purpose. Is this use of the land for the Public Land for Housing Program really the best use? That has not really been examined, it's been put out by fiat that housing needs to be done. No real discussion.
- iv. Chris Coghlan. Sunnyside.
1. When you brought up the history of the reservoir. I'm shocked none of you contacted me.
 2. In this room, the only person that has more knowledge of the history of that reservoir is Rita Evans.
 3. The walkway that goes along Riordan out to the PUC land, that walkway is there because of the SNA and me. We got them to tear up the curb and the street and put in the walkway.
 4. As far as Westwood Park being the most impacted. If you guys will agree to letting that traffic into your neighborhood instead of having a dead end street I'll be right on board with you. You're welcome to say you're heavily impacted, but you're not, you're just going to be looking at it. All the ingress and egress is coming towards Sunnyside.
 5. Sunnyside is by far the most heavily impacted neighborhood.
 6. I appreciate everyone's work, but trust me Sunnyside will be bearing the brunt.
 7. Linda da Silva is great.
 8. Keep up the good work.
- v. Yonathan Randolph. Ingleside.
1. Thank you. Especially to those of you listening to those outside of your constituency. We're all here to communicate with one another.
 2. I have one concern about the RFQ process, which is I was reading the law and it said the CAC shall have no authority to execute the sovereign power of the City including the power to select a developer and I'm wondering whether having a CAC member on the RFQ process would be in violation of that law.
 3. In regards to Michael Ahrens comment, if he can be on RFQ process as a fly on the wall, I'm wondering if you can open it up to other

members to or those of the public who would provide excellent feedback to the RFQ process.

4. Finally I'd like to ask about this process, what is the scope of the program. When I look at the Public Land for Housing Program, it doesn't really explain the goals of the program. How are the impacts and benefits to the immediate surroundings balanced against the citywide needs? We need to give attention to the immediate surroundings and the entire City.

vi. Chris Hanson.

1. Although you all are advisory and would not have any real say in the RFQ process, what you would have is the ability to see what was turned away. Otherwise the rest of us are just going to see three things. We are going to see the finished product, but I'd like to compare it to the Gough street development of City College, we didn't see any of it, there were no presentations from a larger group of applicants. We just saw the finished group that was presenting.
2. Try to get as much information as you can. There may be something that was missed and not being in the room you won't even know if something was missed.
 1. Davila. Thank you for your comments, Chris. I agree with you that we should be looking at this, but I want to mention that 33 Gough there was a panel of stakeholders and they decided on the final 3. There was input from stakeholders of City College. It was the academic senate, the classified senate, the faculty. It was before I was on the board. I don't want to argue on that point, I just want to explain there was a process.
 2. Spinali. I also take from Chris' comment the importance of transparency is the bigger point.

7. Adjournment.