

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

MEETING MINUTES

**City College of San Francisco
Multi-Use Building, Room 140
55 Phelan Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112
Monday, December 12, 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-121216 available via the following link: www.sf-planning.org/brcac

Committee Members Present:

Michael Ahrens; Howard Chung; Christine Godinez; Robert Muehlbauer; Lisa Spinali; Jon Winston

Committee Members Absent:

Brigitte Davila; Rebecca Lee

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. Roll Call

2. Opening of Meeting.

- a. Amendments to 11/14/16 Meeting Minutes.

- i. No CAC Comment.
- ii. Public Comment.
 - 1. Harry Bernstein.
 - 1. On top of page three “one thing I did not”, I believe it is “one thing I did note”.
 - 2. I just want to endorse Rita Evans opinion that in the revised principles and parameters there's no explanation why those things were not changed in response to neighbor's request. I think that's outstanding and needs to be addressed.
- iii. Motion to approve amended 11/14/16 Meeting Minutes: Ahrens, Second: Chung
 - 1. Ayes: Ahrens, Chung, Godinez, Muehlbauer, Spinali, Winston
 - 2. Noes: [none]
 - 3. Abstain: [none]
- b. Spinali.
 - i. Review of CAC Ground Rules.
 - ii. Context: Addressing open questions and issues and respond to the plus delta feedback regarding community engagement. Connecting to the last meeting.
 - iii. There were a lot of edits to the BOS document and I was working through it very thoughtfully and I was rushing to get it done but that didn't seem fair to the process. I want to make sure the good feedback is included. It will provide context for what took place last year. It takes a lot longer to keep it concise – less than 5 pages. Apologize as a volunteer for not being able to bring it back to this meeting.
 - 1. Ahrens. See all the comments, keep it short, and are we subject to the Brown Act? We are a local legislative body?
 - 1. Emily Lesk. It is an advisory body, and you are legislated.
 - 2. Ahrens. With that, we have to meet in full session. Might we get in advance?
 - iv. Adding a section for points of contention. The document will cover what took place for each instance that we met, where there was agreement and where there was disagreement.

3. City Staff Response to Public Feedback.

- a. Emily Lesk, Jeremy Shaw, and Lisa Spinali. Presentation on responses to public feedback. **[Presentation available online at www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC]**
- b. CAC Comment.
 - i. Ahrens.
 - 1. I think I'm starting to understand the TDM, thanks to the four of you. Actually, first meeting with me before I was even on the board and then your explanations tonight. TDM is not a parking solution. It's an alternative solution to transportation.

2. So I have a very simple question, and that is: In this whole process, well, the first question in this whole process, who will address the City College alternative parking problem? I know TDM, you have explained to me, is an attempt to, in some manner, reduce the need for parking. But we all know that need will not evaporate. So as I understand it, it's during the RFQ process, it starts then, but I will let you explain.
 1. Jeremy Shaw. There are a couple things I want to make sure I respond to. One, is that TDM, again, it's generically: Any strategy that affects the choices we make, and part of that is parking. So parking management, how we design it and price it, how people access it, who can access it, that is all part of TDM. So the first thing you said, it does not quite cover, that was my error, not explicitly talking about parking. But it is included in TDM.
3. I have read in various places that, one, City College has to address it in its master study; two, the developer has to address this, as well as other problems. And so the matter will be addressed as I understand it in the RFQ as soon as -- in the RFQ process, as well as the RFP process. Is that where it's going to be addressed?
 1. Emily Lesk. I think it would happen more in RFP process when developers are really focusing on proposals, and then continue to be discussed and iterated and kind of zooming in on details from there on out.
4. So you expect the developers to try to solve the City -- or address the City College parking problem?
 1. Emily Lesk. I think the developers will have to do a lot of thinking and coordinating with City College and the City to make this work.
5. Going forward with the CAC process, given the staff recommendation, there will only be the Chair serving on the evaluation committee. That Chair is not able to talk to me or any other people except in session; is that correct? In other words, under the Brown Act, we can't have side meetings or seriata meetings as I now understand it.
 1. Emily Lesk. You can't have a quorum of CAC members get together outside of a scheduled meeting.
6. I also now understand there's a problem with seriata meetings; is that correct? So two people can meet and talk?
 1. Emily Lesk. Yeah.
7. And two other people meeting and talking, causing a quorum a problem for all of us?
 1. Emily Lesk. Yeah. You would have to be careful, but I'm not sure where this is going.
8. I'll tell you exactly where this is going. I don't see.

1. Michael Martin. So it's the existence of the conversations, it's a series of conversations that involve more than a quorum of the body that are intended to generate a consensus among that group. So the Chair can have a number of one-off conversations to describe what she's seeing or what she's hearing, but if she's not then trying to generate consensus among the quorum of the group, those conversations will not violate the Brown Act.
9. Well, and I don't know if this is the proper time, maybe it's later in the meeting, but I would repeat what I said last week, and I know Lisa said this is the staff's recommendation and we are still discussing later whether or not Westwood Park can have -- oh, no. We are not discussing that.
 1. Spinali. No. In our conversation with Supervisor Yee and with the planning team -- we had a meeting with the supervisor, I guess, about a week ago -- and went through and talked about where we were with the CAC, and also discuss your recommendation moving forward. The intention is that between having the Chair and -- at the last meeting I said I want to take it under advisement to really understand if it was going to be a situation where I needed a secondary perspective, and we went back and discussed it and came to an agreement it was best to have it be the Chair and have Linda DaSilva as the City College representative to be the two voices to represent the collective parameters of the principles we have agreed upon.
10. That was an agreement between you and the City.
 1. Spinali. Not between me -- I said I would come back. I wanted to find out exactly -- so let me break it down.
11. But you said it was an agreement.
 1. Spinali. I brought it back to them.
 2. Michael Martin. I would like to reframe it. It's not a recommendation. The City is forming a selection panel. And in our discussion with the CAC, we talked about how the CAC would be represented. There is not a vote for the CAC to endorse that recommendation. This is how we are setting up the panel.
12. Michael I recognize that, but I'm trying to find a way that we can be kept apprised of the RFQ and RFP process so that the CAC can have a true input and not have it be a fait accompli that here is the RFQ process completed. So we talked about meetings of the CAC; we talked about apprising us of what's happening. I want the CAC to have a true stake and a true voice in this process, not just a nominal voice. The CAC is not the Chair.

1. Michael Martin. The CAC has worked over a year to draft the meat of the RFQ in the principles and parameters, everything that comes through that process is based on the input of the CAC and the public. The CAC under the legislation passed by Board of Supervisors is not to take direct participation in the selection of a developer partner. We created a process that is frankly in my view unprecedented in terms of having visibility into the RFQ process and the specific proposals. So everyone in the public can comment on the proposals, so I don't agree at all with the notion there's only a nominal participation by the CAC or the public in this process. We view that as critical to getting to a developer that knows what's needed here, and therefore we feel the participation of the Chair and her ability to inform the CAC without trying to generate consensus is the way to do that and the way that we set it up.
13. Can you repeat that? You might have, hit a good topic in there, or a good solution or possible solution. What would the Chair do? Would she come back and talk to us about -- here are the problems we are seeing; here's the resolution I think is best for us. In other words, would we have a say in RFQ process or at least will she report to us or will she ask for consensus?
 1. Michael Martin. I think she's willing to inform you. I don't know that she's willing to seek your consensus on her input in the RFQ process and her role as a member of RFQ committee. The idea is she would represent the CAC with her knowledge of the history of getting to here and the issues that have been brought up at the meetings and give her input accordingly and can inform you on where and how she got there. That is how I think we envisioned the CAC's participation through this mechanism.
14. I will listen further as we go forward because my main comment is I think the entire CAC should be informed of the progress and at least be able to give their opinions on that. Is that the intention going forward?
 1. Spinali. I want to take it from defcon eight to defcon one and what I want to say is that the question you raised the last time - - which is a valid question -- I wanted to say: What's my responsibility in this role? And can I do this role as one versus two?
 2. And so through the process of really clarifying what's going to happen between the two stages are very different things. The first RFQ stage -- and being one of the two civilians, nongovernmental folks, selecting or narrowing the list of developers from however many we get to 2 to 3 -- my job is to

make sure, is this a developer -- so first off, we have the parameters of what we are looking for in terms of the criteria, and some are about financial ability, precedent of projects they have done before. I'm very comfortable being able to evaluate against that criteria.

3. The important piece is being able to understand: Do the developers that are applying, will they have the ability to work effectively with community? Have they worked well with communities in the past? Are they good at getting community feedback? Do they have experience doing open space projects within -- so my job is really to make sure, with the parameters and principles we have created collectively, to make sure the developer is one that has the ability to be able to deliver upon those parameters and principles. And I feel very confident be able to do that.
4. So for the second stage, which is the actual final selection for the developer, that's going to be a different process because that's the process which we will talk about for April meeting is about how are we going to get as much community input as possible? So developers will each come and make a presentation of what their ideas are, and then we will collectively hear feedback and everybody gets a chance to weigh in and give their feedback on the various options and that feedback is used to figure out which will be the best developer to select.
5. I feel comfortable being able to do that, because my job is being able to listen and hear everybody's feedback and that I will represent what the community has collectively said. Maybe it'll be after we hear from community collectively that we as a CAC have to then distill what we heard from the larger community to then feed into "Lisa, as you are looking at it these are top five things that we think matter". My job is to really be a filter that's collecting the key nuggets of what we are hearing and the way to have it bubble up. So I feel very comfortable in being able to do that.

15. Okay. Thank you.

ii. Muehlbauer.

1. Earlier in the agenda we talked about reports with the Board of Supervisors, and I have been serving on this committee now for a year, and here it says we are advisory to the PUC.
2. So this report should go to the PUC since the CAC is advisory to the PUC, secondarily to the Board of Supervisors.
 1. Emily Lesk. So the Board of Supervisors, in the legislation that they created to form this CAC, they put in this provision that, as

the Creator, they want to see an annual report. I think it would be a terrific idea to also send it to the PUC, as well.

3. Okay. Then we are looking at the transportation data that was collected to date in May of 2016. And I think that's at the lowest trough of enrollment here at CCSF.
4. So, you know, as we move through time, tuition will continue to go up. I happen to know a lot of student millennials going to school taking classes here, back fill classes, for State they are going back and forth. I can't see any scenario where enrollment will go anywhere but up from here, and when I hear about 35 percent reduction in enrollment since those numbers collected in 2016 maybe 35 percent below where we are in five years. So my question, is there any way to accommodate now anticipated demand? Maybe it won't reach it but up to a full 35 percent I expect it will be at some point. But what can we do to reconcile low enrollment figures today to where we expect we will be? And then I have one more comment after you respond.
 1. Jeremy Shaw. I think the consultants are very well-aware of City College enrollment and that supporting the enrollment goals of City College is part and parcel of the TDM plan, it's written in multiple places. So the guiding principles are there. The data I think you bring up really the most interesting and sort of the point of the whole thing is: Can we accommodate future demand? The premise -- and I apologize for this -- it's technical and -- so just takes a lot of words to explain -- but transportation demand, it's fungible and changes it can be -- it's like supply and demand of any economy, depending on the rules you set in place. So actually if you are talking about future demand growing, this is the perfect time to talk about TDM so we can manage it better before it's already here and we are in a whole heap of trouble even beyond today.
 2. So the numbers, the advantage of a TDM plan, because there's so many other facts going in, and there are more formal ways and implementing and -- this plan, now, it's not going to get into the level of precision and detail that would obligate or limit future options. It's really talking about types of recommendations, guiding principles, and the direction each of these three areas should go in. And then when we have better numbers, or at the appropriate time when ready to codify something, then we can make sure the strategies work. Sorry to -- it's hard to say -- it's hard to put a finer point on it, I guess, because we don't know the number, but the answer is: Yes. We will figure out how to accommodate future testimony in short.

5. That segues into my last comment or questions. So much hinges on TDM on this project here. And it's very theoretical discussing it here and rightfully so. Its state of the art, and we are trying to look at computer models where it will be and come up with strategies that kind of meet the whole development proposal. But one of the reasons I wanted to be on this committee -- I think we all need to be real familiar with the TDM strategy that comes at the tail end, and towards that end, as we get into the nuts and bolts of what we are doing to plug holes so we can have, you know, lower documentation on transportation and circulation. I think the community needs to really have a baseline understanding of how that works you know? Here's the hole; here's the proposed fix. Here's a hole; here's a proposed fix. We have to get it from the theoretical to really kind of nuts and bolts so that those of us in this room can feel that: Okay. There's been a real good effort and I understand it. I want to understand it. And I've suggested before maybe we can use some of the upcoming meetings where we have time while waiting for the proposes to come in to show some real nuts can bolts examples of how it works elsewhere in the City. I think it would be time well-spent. And last, with regard to the TDM, I'm glad you are meeting with the other committee. Same plan?

1. Jeremy Shaw. It's for the other committee to tell us.

6. Yeah. It has impacts. One of the strategies, maybe, and as -- and I don't want to use in too much if one of the strategies is to create a shuttle, well, doggone it, our friends need to know. There's an expectation that something goes in at the other end of station, so we have to make sure the two committees are really connected and we understand what's being recommended out of here is translated to the other committee so they can look at demands in Balboa Park station, you know, what maybe we need another loading ramp for something out here. We have a lot of work to do yet. And it's just very important, the fundamentals of this is understood by the community.

iii. Spinali.

1. Robert, do you think it would make sense for us to explore two committees coming together, you know, more formally? I wonder from the process perspective does -- Does that make sense? You are -- toggles before the two, so does the staff where we should think about are there points where we should have a shared meeting maybe with a preparation of data. Sometimes I think it makes sense for everybody to hear the same presentation at the same time so everyone has same understanding; otherwise, it's a little bit of: I heard that; I heard that. It's something for future consideration as we think about upcoming meetings.

2. Other feedback or questions to the presentation?
- iv. Winston.
 1. In addition to two CAC's meet, it would be great to have representatives from City College, especially master plan, so we can coordinate with them because there are big projects happening at City College. And we don't know all of them and they don't know all - - and the TDM plugs into a lot of that. I'm not sure how on the same page we all are, and it would be nice at least to have, as someone in the audience earlier said, we should have a regular report from City College and from the Balboa station CAC so that's all.
 1. Spinali. And you stole a little bit of the thunder for the meeting. Linda is making a short presentation. She's here. It's great and we talked about a standard item of the agenda is making reports back so we have ongoing good communication which will be so critical.
 - v. Chung.
 1. Howard Chung represented Ocean Avenue businesses. And, Emily, I appreciated your comments, kind of the macrolevel view of how we got here, what we have done for almost a year, if not more than a year. I mean, it's important to note that we have been sitting here through many, many meetings, hearing a lot of staff opinions and proposals on environmental, on design, on open space, so we have covered a lot of areas and all of that has been put into the set of parameters that we voted on and agreed upon.
 2. And I appreciate Mike's concerns. You were here for some meetings, but not all, so you were not here for all of that. From our perspective, it's kind of like -- being with Lisa, going into, being part of the evaluation committee, but we are not a part of that -- we trust Lisa and believe she'll do a great job. It's like being an alternate juror, sitting through the trial, but when deliberating, they can't because they are the alternate. We have to trust the process. I trust, personally, Lisa and her ability to make sure that the parameters that we worked so hard on are instilled both in the RFQ and RFP process. I guess my comment is to the extent that there are items that are -- they were not covered by the parameters and I can't imagine what those are, given the comprehensive process we all went through, but if there's something new or something that's not covered by the parameters, then perhaps that's an area that, Lisa, you would come back to the CAC and say: Look. This is the new issue not covered. Let's talk and have a meeting. I know there's not a lot of time on that, but at the same time, I don't want to relitigate things we have already covered. We have covered it and voted on it, and I think we have to move forward on this. So those are my thoughts.
 - vi. Ahrens.

1. I want to repeat: This is not because of a lack of trust in you at all, Lisa. I think I said last time it's because I would not want to be in your position to make a decision as to what's the best for the entire group. I know I have not been here, if a year, but I'm pretty well-informed as to what's going on, and I think you are too -- Lisa, you said you are getting the feeling, but I have a little bit better feeling now, that you told me, A, you can talk to people one-on-one without violation of the act because I don't understand. You know me, Howard, I'm not that type of lawyer. I don't know anything about the Brown Act. I couldn't remember the name last time, but I understand more about that, so, A, you can talk to us one-on-one, and I know you would; and, B, it seems like we will have a pretty big part in RFP and RFQ process. You will come back on monthly basis -- did I make the right decision? That's what I posited last time. I would not want to be in your position. I don't know how you make the decision. It's not that I don't trust you. I want to have -- you know the interests that we recited.
- vii. Muehlbauer.
1. When I hear comments saying "not all questions were answered," it bothers me, and I think we have a responsibility. If you have a question and you direct it to staff, sometimes staff doesn't understand your question, and sometimes we don't understand staff's response, so I think we have a responsibility just to be patient and stick with it. I mean, a lot of this is highly technical, and we are laypeople. We are just giving up Monday Night Football to be here, so I think it's important we really try to have genuine communication.
 2. And if you have a senior moment and glossed over the portion of the discussion, you know, backtrack because it is important. I would like to set as a goal: We don't have this in the future, where not all questions are answered. There are two parts of the staff to listen carefully and we as community listen carefully and make sure the connection happens. Because if not, it's a waste of time. That's it. I will get off my pulpit.
- c. Public Comment
- i. Theodore. Excelsior.
 1. I wonder what is meant transportation demand not covering circulation. When I think of that, I'm biking along Ocean and the intersection of Ocean and Geneva, that's not my favorite to bike. A lot of cars turn on Geneva, so I'm thinking that will discourage people from biking if they have to deal with that more often.
 - ii. David Tejada. Sunnyside.
 1. Did I -- there was a meeting tomorrow night; is that what I heard? What's the details on that?

1. Muehlbauer. Tomorrow night is the Balboa Park station Citizens Advisory Committee. The agenda for tomorrow will be to hear an update from mayor's Office of housing on affordable housing that's being proposed for upper yard, and also to hear a presentation from MTA with regard to traffic safety and Geneva and San Jose, as well as a requirement -- that part of the study of the Geneva and San Jose include the relocation of the M line terminus to another possible location in the area.
2. Those are the two major items on the agenda tomorrow. The comments are made earlier were more about the work here has to tie into the work there. They impact each other. So the agenda tomorrow is not necessarily talking about this; it's talking about business more immediate to the Balboa Park station. But in the future, the hope is that there's more linkage between the work between the two committees.
2. That's the committee meeting over its meeting here.
 1. Muehlbauer. Yes.
3. And it's open to the public.
 1. Oh, yes, same thing. Although staffed by MTA as opposed to this esteemed panel.
 2. They meet at 6 o'clock.
 3. Ordinarily the meeting is the fourth Tuesday of the month. Tomorrow's meeting is a special meeting, moving away from regularly scheduled meeting because of Christmas Holiday. It'll be towards the end of month.
4. But it's here.
 1. Yes, in here. And I will see you because I will be here too.
5. One thing, responding to what you said, Robert, about unanswered questions -- I think it's probably too late -- but going forward with CAC, the questions go to CAC and then are addressed to someone because sometimes they address questions -- not to the CAC, but to the City -- and I had to nag and still didn't get adequate answers. So it would have been great if I could have done the question to the CAC, directly, and then the CAC form the question, and CAC will know whether we get an answer or to -- or not.
 1. Muehlbauer. Great idea. That's what we are here for.
 2. Jeremy Shaw. Let me answer. Oh, excuse me. I'm happy to talk more about this. If this does not answer your question fully, but the short -- the question was: Why and how does TDM, Transportation Demand Management, include circulation, for example, how bikes get through the intersection here, which I admit is . . . harrowing.
 3. So I think it's a natural fit. Of course, like anything, I would encourage anything related to safety in that intersection would

affect your decision to ride through there. But I think the standard, like, technical way or policies that are used to quote manage demand are usually associated with development or land use, and that's the mechanism for implementing it, and that's why Transportation Demand Management is kind of limited.

4. So it could be something like bike parking or showers at your place of work, things like that, that are associated with a development or a land use.
5. Whereas, things in the middle of the road or in the streetscape -- well, there is a lot of overlap I admit -- are not typically part of TDM kind of strategy but that being said. Any time a new development or a campus or some kind of land use goes through TDM planning -- usually these things come up -- so in environmental review, for example, it might be required to mitigate some kind of impact, and that mitigation might be related to bike safety or circulation in the street, so it will come up. Just because the TDM doesn't focus on circulation doesn't mean circulation is ignored. I hope that clarifies the -- it's really confusing, especially when not looking at the meat of the thing, which I hope we can get to in February.
6. But does that sort of help? It's kind of a funky way, the way the planning process and kind of city staff work around things.

iii. Harry Bernstein.

1. I'm still not -- from what I understood about TDM, it's still a little vague about which . . . areas are covered.
2. I believe there was something in the original documentation saying: Should it deal with any trips not originating within the reservoir? Which means local traffic. And the direction I believe from the staff was: No, it should not.
3. I think it's those things the people living in this area and people at the college want to have accommodated, and I may be confused about that, but I think it needs to be in there somewhere.
4. Let's see. Other things. I don't know what it'll take to get City College engaged, but I mean, there were references to the various plans, the committees. There's a lot of stuff, talking about demolishing seven buildings, about not having parking lots. I know Jeremy told me how City College is going to manage when there's no parking over there in the lower lot.
5. I would like to know that too. There's a lot of issues. And AJ, a local resident, brought up the question:
6. How to deliver the Balboa Park station area plans objective, which I guess you know about, develop the West basin of the reservoir for a greatest benefit of the City as a whole, as well as surrounding

neighborhood, but there's been no discussion about what that means, and yet they are going ahead with this RFQ.

4. General Public Comment.

a. Public Comment.

i. Julia Raskin. San Francisco Bicycle Coalition.

1. Hello. I think this has to do with both, so I chose general. I'm Julia Raskin. I'm with San Francisco Bicycle Coalition. First of all, thank you to everyone at CAC for your service. I know, you know, these meetings can be really long, and I really appreciate you sitting and listening so well. Also thank you for passing the parameters that really encourage the, specifically the transportation parameters that encourage alternative modes of transportation aside from cars, specifically walking and biking. And with that, I think better access to the transits that existed, specifically Balboa Park, would be, you know, really important to making that possible. So as I think many people know, Ocean Avenue is not the most fun place to walk or bike. And it's actually a high-injury corridor. Many people get hit, injured, and killed on Ocean Avenue, so it's a huge concern for us. We hope the project can interface with other projects and also use ideas of the plan of Ocean Avenue corridor design study that was made by the Planning Department and use information that comes from TDM to create a safe east/west path between campus and the Balboa Park station so people feel safe walking and biking in between.
2. So I'm looking forward to exploring how that looks and leverage all these great opportunities that happen to be happening at the same time and improve access to BART and make Ocean Avenue safer for biking and walking. Thank you.

ii. Laura Fry. Westwood Park

1. I thought in the last meeting we were going to talk about changing the preamble for the parameters? Last meeting when talking about -- that was --
 1. LISA SPINALI: No. I think we talked about that. I'm changing that we are -- the preamble is also a part of the, with the report.
 2. And we had not talked about that.
 1. LISA SPINALI: I don't think we were talking about changing the preamble, just changing the report.
 3. I put this on the e-mail, but it's not up there, so I will give you guys a copy. It's two suggestions.
 1. LISA SPINALI: Sure.
 4. One is that in the creation of the BRCAC that my understanding -- this is from talking to different people -- is that:

5. N. Yee was pushed, quote/unquote, motivated to create the BRCAC because the neighbors were freaking out. It was going too fast and the direction it was going, that that was the motivation for the BRCAC. I feel that should be on record.
 6. And the other thing is that: There was that big online survey, and that should be on the record, the annual report too that was city wide. This is public land, so that online survey of the whole city, the results of the survey should be on the annual report because that was part of this whole thing.
 7. Okay.
 1. LISA SPINALI: Okay.
 2. JEREMY SHAW: What survey are you citing?
 8. The City-wide, city-sponsored by Survey Monkey.
 1. LISA SPINALI: Prior to CAC.
 9. I think it was right at the beginning. I mean, that's part of this thing.
 1. LISA SPINALI: You are suggesting there was a lead up that got up to CAC? I think we can certainly add it as part of preamble to the report because we are supposed to report on the progress of the CAC. Is the mandate -- this is stuff that happened before we were created, so that's -- we'll figure out a way to provide that context.
- iii. Harry Bernstein.
1. Thank you, again.
 2. Maybe this is ahead of us, since you have only an RFQ, not an RFP, it still seems to me that there is a, I think, was it Jeremy? Were you the one who spoke about the... that it's too costly if there were a 100 percent of so-called affordable housing, and that's one of the reasons that says there has to be a market rate component of that?
 3. So what you end up with is having a majority of unaffordable housing as a basis for privatizing publicly owned land, and that's still a concern.
 4. I'm not sure if there is going to be the minority -- reported minority views in this report to the supervisor. Will that -- I'm sorry -- is that what will be circulated for further discussion and comment?
 1. Spinali. Yes.
 5. Next month?
 1. Spinali. Yes. And it's not my intention to make a lot of changes. My goal is to have it be well-reflect of collective -- I will say, though, that based on what we heard tonight -- and I think I ask this with my meeting with Supervisor Yee -- I want us to get somebody from the city's attorney's office to give the advice directly back to say why this property needs to be 50 percent for how we are able to make sure we are true to the rate payers. By the way, the property is being divided up because

it's actually two things happening. One is to ensure 50 percent allows you to have the middle income housing that there's no money to pay for that. That's what the 50 percent of market rate allows us to have, and then we have the affordable housing, affordable component. So it's the combination of the two coming together that is allowing the land to be used in this way.

2. But I asked -- we get the legal ruling from the city attorney's office to once and for all be clear so everyone understands that the P -- satisfies the PUC requirement and satisfies whatever -- the PUC requirement is really where it's legislated, but I feel it'll continue to come up over and over. The challenge is we are brokering two things together to make it happen on the property is what's complicated. It does not follow solidly in one category. It's 50 percent of market rate housing is allowing the extra money, so to speak, will subsidize the cost of middle class housing because there's no funding. And low, low income housing, there are funds available to be able to afford that. The middle class housing is housing, which it's impossible to fund for.
 3. So the market rate housing is allowing us to fund the middle class housing. So the project is meeting two different needs: One, to make sure it's maintaining the requirement that we get market rate value for the land as rate payers, that they are obligated to do that with the land that -- they being the PUC -- and at the same time, being able to meet the housing needs. The only way to do any kind of middle class housing is to have market rate housing. That's how I understand it. It's two pieces coming together. It's not one or the other; it's both. That's where it's complex.
 4. And I think that's where the struggle is. It does not follow only one specific rule. It's fulfilling two different -- we are doing two things with the property. So we'll, you know, we'll get something that's the legal opinion back on it, so it's very, very clear. So there's question about it. But we talked about Supervisor Yee and staff last week to make sure what we are doing is legal to do and is the appropriate thing for us to be doing with the land. It's the basic premise the whole project is sitting on.
 6. And I would like to also to have the minority opinion that there's no housing built. That is still a wide community preference and option. I know that's not really covered anymore, but it should be stated and maybe explained why -- what the basis of that request is.
- iv. Kate Favetti. Westwood Park.

1. Westwood Park resident and also and also committee member street life and business committees Ocean Avenue association.
2. This question may be very premature. However, I thought, as you were describing, again, reminding the break down for housing, is whether or not, with the transition of the administration in the national level, how and will that affect us? And do we have contingency plans? I don't want, expect an answer, but I think it's something we need to be prepared for, especially as you were talking about that now. We can break that up.
 1. Spinali. Yeah. There would be no answer to that question.
- v. Corey Smith. San Francisco Housing Action Coalition.
 1. Cory Smith with San Francisco housing collaboration -- with the government being able to subsidize -- -- so the HUD determine as --
 2. The HUD sets caps and determines what they are willing to subsidize housing at. And once it crosses over to a certain limit 100 percent affordability, developers can't get tax subsidies from -- a little bit on Kate's comment -- I know we are talking with members of affordable housing community, and there's a lot of concern with basically seen the federal government is out of housing subsidizing the state is \$1.3 billion in 2010 to 0. So in terms of trying to produce the amount of subsidized housing we need is really, really on us to get creative and we are trying to figure out working where a coalition of housing organization to solve the problem it's a really big deal.
- b. Update from Linda da Silva, Associate Vice Chancellor of Facilities, City College of San Francisco
 - i. Muehlbauer.
 1. Prior to the Board of Trustees approving the draft plan, will there be an opportunity for that presentation to be heard in this body? So you have commentary from this group looking at the housing side of this development proposal, that's kind of joined at the hip?
 1. Linda da Silva. Yes. I am willing to come back and make any presentations to any group at any time.
 2. And our public sessions, where I have our architectural master planning consultant, they are open to the public, and we en -- and we have those sessions in both the afternoons and the evenings, so we do cover people with different schedules and we encourage you to come to those, as well.
 - ii. Spinali.
 1. Linda, would you, you know, you talked about in this, in the first phase, the assessment, you did work on the enrollment projections.
 1. Linda da Silva. Our enrollment projections are based on the enrollment projections given to us by State Chancellor's Office, so City College -- and their enrollment projection for us over the next ten-year period assuming that we are going to grow

- another 50 percent over where we are today, which is greater than the enrollment we experienced in the last 30 years.
2. So I'm just, want to make sure we note there's projection from that, that probably need to go into the -- to your point about numbers accurate.
 3. Earlier he talk about \$35 increase and she's talking about 50 percent increase. It's a big time increase, so we need to be.
 1. Linda da Silva. That projection is district-wide at all of our sites.
- iii. Ahrens.
1. First, thank you, because I think your facilities plan is very important to this group. The meeting on Thursday night, will it have anything to do with facilities plan?
 1. Linda da Silva. It's a presentation. The agenda is up, and surprisingly we are early on the agenda. Usually, I'm relegated to O-Dark-Thirty, but I think we are scheduling for 415 on Thursday.
 2. It's open to the public?
 1. Linda da Silva. Absolutely, open to the public. It is, again, a presentation intended to bring the Board of Trustees up to speed, but they receive public comment on items like that.
 3. Assuming things go without too much of a hitch, when do you think you will have a facilities plan we can look at that is meaningful? It's a broad question. Is there one now we can look at?
 1. Linda da Silva. Yeah. I don't know if someone is, could pull up the pretty picture, but the draft-preferred option right now, I want to say, is pretty landed. Now, it's not approved by the Board of Trustees yet. That will come in probably the April/May timeframe. If you were to click on the right, on the third link down: Facilities Master Plan development. And the presentation for Thursday night is right there. And it's a short one.
 2. It's slide seven, I think, is the -- the pretty picture.
 3. There you go.
 4. (On Screen). So again the blue buildings are existing repurposed. The yellow buildings are proposed new.
 5. And you also see in the space in tween, well, the peach colored buildings are existing and the space in between shows a lot of pathways, gateways, quads, external hot spots, because what we understand is that teaching and learning occurs as much outside of classroom as it does inside.
 6. And I would say, as I said earlier, this -- where the buildings are shown -- and again those are not actual buildings -- the Facilities Master Plan is 50,000 level plan. We are not

designing; we are suggesting an approximate location for a building or a quad or a walkway or a parking structure.

7. And what I think will be the difference between this image and what will be in about a month, a preferred option, which will then build upon with details, will be the interface along Ocean Avenue to get our gateways aligned with where the City's agencies can put the crosswalks, the MUNI, drop off stations the bicycle paths, the other transit-friendly elements and also on Phelan Avenue.
 8. That's a lot of, you know, Phelan over the years, as the West side of the campus has developed, we have created, well, both opportunity for growth and expansion but also pedestrian and vehicular conflicts, and we very much need to figure out where crosswalks want to be and how bicycles and pedestrians all live together nicely in the feeling of a sandbox.
4. Do you have an estimate as to how many new parking spaces will be in this plan?
 1. Linda da Silva. We are not there yet. That's part of the recommendations developments phase. What we know is that currently at the Ocean campus we have approximately 3000 parking spaces, about 1000 are in the lower Balboa Reservoir.
 2. So and we also, based on a parking demand study that we conducted in mid-August, we believe that the total number of parking spaces is adequate for our current enrollment. Our consultants are still projecting out what the, you know, if nothing else changed, if people continue to use their travel modes that they do right now, how many parking spaces do we anticipate we would need and where would we put them?
 3. So that's all the work that will happen next semester for us.

iv. Winston.

1. I really appreciate the way you are changing the focus, the direction of this, of the campus to face Ocean Avenue because, already, to move people from the lower reservoir down to the BART station requires an activation of the street to make it sociably acceptable to walk, which is not what it is right now. So it's really nice to have the buildings that actually face Ocean Avenue a little bit of green space, and I would hope the big retaining wall would-be part of that, as well.
2. Well, I have problems, but the garage in the back, the way the cars have to access it, they are obviously not coming there BARSTON avenue, but I guess the 280 can make an exit and make a U-turn behind the parking garage behind the football field. In one way, that's great because it keeps a lot of the traffic off of Phelan and on the grounds that we have right now. But I'm a little worried how might it affect the walkability on the North Side of Ocean Avenue side

sidewalk. So that's something -- and because it affects our connection between the lower reservoir and BART, it's really important that we keep that less like walking through a gutter and more like, you know, a dignified walk to transits.

3. Also, that's my statement, and as a question I was wondering:
4. You are still kind of fuzzy how much parking you are asking for. But I'm wondering, have you considered the TDM methods of reducing car use in the -- to do your part to try and lower the amount of traffic in the area?
 1. Linda da Silva. Yes. Actually, one of the -- oh. Thank you for your comments.
 2. We too believe that southeast corner where the majority of vehicles would enter to come to the Eastern parking structure will be the critical planning aspect, and that's one of our areas of focus in these upcoming two months of technical charrettes with BART and MTA and also with Cal Trans because they are actually rerouting their southbound off ramp to Ocean Avenue.
 3. And I hope that our campus is so beautiful and so park-like that residents from Sunnyside and from Westwood Park walk, not only on Ocean Avenue, but through our campus to get to the other areas around the campus and to BART.
 4. One of our focus meetings with the city team this coming, actually, next week is specifically to discuss the TDM.
 5. So City College has a sustainability plan, has had one in place for a while, and the TDM is part of that. It's time to update the plan and that falls under my facility's purview. It's definitely beyond just a bricks and mortar facility thing; it's a lot of policy and philosophy, et cetera.
 6. But TDM absolutely is a part of how we are going to make this happen and be a sustainable college and institution in the City of California? The City of San Francisco.
 7. In a traffic survey we did earlier in the spring -- part of our needs assessment phase -- we learned that about 40 percent of our students take our single occupant vehicle drivers, which is not bad for community college. That's not bad at all. We think we can do better. We are talking to our students right now about whether they would like to create -- model a discount transits pass after San Francisco State Gator Pass and we are -- we already have a staff transits discount program as well as staff, employee benefits; but we are looking at other ways to improve that and get people out of the cars.
5. 50 percent of those, 40 percent are willing to think about the, another method of getting to school if they thought there was another method?

6. Is it also since I'm re -- right now it's an onramp to Ocean Avenue -- there's going to be a right angle entrance from the freeway. Is it possible -- while doing construction, I guess -- exit right into the parking structure from the freeway without backing the freeway?
 1. Linda da Silva. This pretty -- it's in 2-D those are some of the questions we are going to be asking Caltrans this upcoming weekend.
- v. Spinali.
 1. So, Linda, thank you very much. We really -- it's great to have you, and I think you have -- giving us regular updates, as well as sharing data and working together, so we are excited to have you in your role.
 1. Linda da Silva. Thank you. And I bring back this to my committee, who then reports up to the City College.
 2. So just in terms of next steps, we are going to take January off. We are not having a meeting in January, and then our next meeting will be in February. And the focus of that meeting will be the draft report of the, the draft report of TDM, as well as the final board report. And ideally this gets into the question about packing and being with how much do we want to have at any one meeting? There's a request that we could hear from various constituents that we respect to be able to make sure we understood Westwood Park did a great job showing the map and historic character, and I think Sunnyside would like to do the same. We would love to hear, Christine, how do we think about galvanizing, about what's happening with our schools? And just again as a way for us to be able to educate.
 3. And, John, also your committee, we use the meetings as a way to educate ourselves about what's happening because there's so much overlap.
 4. So with that, happy holidays, take good care, and we'll see you in February of 2017.
 5. And look for things online. It's the second Tuesday -- sorry -- second Monday, which is the 13th, February 13th.
 1. Ahrens. Can I ask a question about January? The RFQ is due by January 18th, so will we get information before the February meeting about the RFQ?
 1. Spinali. No.
 2. Ahrens. So we are not being asked anything about RFQ?
 1. Spinali. I don't think so.
 3. Ahrens. Will the evaluation committee meet before February?
 1. Emily Lesk. Before February meeting? It may.
 2. Spinali. It may. So we have four dates on the books in terms of orientation and then session 1, 2, 3 -- we don't know how many sessions it'll take.

4. Ahrens. Is there a way that we can at least, being the members of this CAC, be at least told when the meetings are so if individually we want to call you and at least talk to you, we can do that?
 1. Spinali. Sure.
 2. Emily Lesk. You can share your schedule.
5. Ahrens. So I can call you individually with no meeting?
 1. Spinali. Yeah. Okay. Great. Thanks.

5. Adjournment.