

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

**DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC DURING
1/22/18 REGULAR MEETING**

AND

**EMAILS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC VIA BRCAC@SFGOV.ORG**

Period: 12/12/17 – 1/22/18

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

**DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC DURING
1/22/18 REGULAR MEETING**

Period: 12/12/17 – 1/22/18

[NO DOCUMENTS RECEIVED]

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

**EMAILS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC VIA BRCAC@SFGOV.ORG**

Period: 12/12/17 – 1/22/18

From: Milo Trauss
To: [BRCAC \(ECN\)](#)
Subject: Balboa Park Reservoir
Date: Monday, January 22, 2018 8:28:38 PM

Please build as much housing on this site as possible.

The city needs the housing, This will allow more diversity and provide more people access to opportunity.

San Francisco is a city, and the purpose of a city is for people to be close to each other and take advantage of the synergies that come with density. We used to be good at fostering this. In the past years we have lost our way and it has become increasingly difficult for us as a society to capitalize on the good that exists here. The main reason for this is because we have stopped our housing production.

Lets get ahead of this beast and get much much much more housing on the market! 1200 units with 50% BMR is a huge win!

Do not listen to neighbors who want to close the door of opportunity to others. When they bought their houses, they bought their houses - the did not buy the neighborhood. It is unjust to cater the the whims of those who already enjoy so much privilege at the expense of everyone else.

Thank you,
Milo

Milo Trauss



From: Aaron Goodman
To: [BRCAC \(ECN\)](#); [Tim Chan](#); [Brigitte Davila](#); [Joel Roos](#); [CAC](#)
Cc: [Mark Rocha](#); tselby@ccsf.edu; rmandelman@ccsf.edu; alexrandolph@ccsf.edu; [John Rizzo](#); ttemprano@ccsf.edu; swilliams@ccsf.edu; studenttrustee@mail.ccsf.edu; rsmith@ccsf.edu
Subject: Fw: RE: Discussion BRCAC - in regards to big picture moves....
Date: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 10:04:13 AM

BRCAC (Transportation Infrastructure Development Ideas)

As I missed the Dec. 11th meeting and ability to provide feedback and comment, I want to help re-emphasize and refocus the BRCAC and CCSF planners on the concept of the PUBLIC infrastructure component, and how to best solve for the transition of land, and needed CCSF input on their design for the CCSF campus masterplanning. I sent an email (2) actually in Feb. 10-14, 2017 prior on the need to address concepts and alternatives that include a "BIG-PICTURE" infrastructure solution to the CCSF, Balboa Reservoir, and Balboa Park Station changes. It should be located in the files and prior emails received.

The concept was looking at the big shifts being made on land-use at the Reservoir site, and how to get people directly (via walking, bike, or mini-bus system) over to the Balboa Park Station...Often people are looking still at Ocean and Phelan roads (existing) infrastructure, and not playing or toying with the idea of **NEW public infrastructure**.

The micro-bus (electric shuttle) self-driving... Could be a smaller integrated solution to the Balboa Reservoir and bring people directly down and into the Bart Station
The southern edge of the CCSF site, up to Phelan could be transformed using a "high-line" design (walkable and bikable and shuttle driving system) that brings people on an elevated system from the Phelan loop area and Admin building at the SW corner of the site back down to the BART and across the freeway into the station platform areas.

A repetitive support structural system could be simply designed and deal with the topography issues out and down to the BART station with stops at the needed locations including the wellness center, and down to a parking structure with buildings on top on the SE corner and eastern edge of the site where we suggested a parking structure and direct off-ramp into it from the freeway.. (think of a jetson's space-like loop that shifts cars off Ocean and directly into the garage structure heading west-bound on I-280...

The ride-share loop shuttle could operate safely along an elevated and seperated walking and bike path... providing direct connection to the BART station, CCSF and reservoir site. as a loop system... eliminating many vehicle trips around the area... Coupled with the density and proposal to build over an eastside garage *(funded and paid for by many adjacent neighbors and public investment philanthropy, you could join LWHS, Balboa Park and Pool, SFPD Ingleside, CCSF, Reservoir, and other new adjacent developments with a small tax to levy in the construction of the system...)

I am just afraid that the CCSF masterplan is already too "set-in-stone" as their maps show "parti" plans for the SW corner of the site a building that would not solve urban planning wise the needed links and removal of the existing pedestrian bridge on Ocean which has been deemed hazardous, and needing removal as part of plans to transform the Ocean crossings at Phelan/Ocean/Geneva and Howth.

Toyota reveals vision for driverless vehicles that switch function on demand



Toyota reveals vision for driverless vehicles that switch function on de...

Toyota has unveiled an autonomous, fully electric concept vehicle that could function as a communal taxi or deli...

Items I and M (misabeled as J) pointed to the need for infrastructural proposals with CCSF's planning efforts.

and the ongoing Balboa Park Station transformations... We need to have a larger more "robust" planning for the Balboa Park Station...

It was noted that the "Building Progress 2017 Facilities Framework" item discussed at the SFMTA CAC Oct. 25 2017 did not include in discussion the Balboa Yards, on both areas behind the Geneva Car Barn and over at the actual Station (Bart facilities) and repair barn at San Jose and Ocean Ave. This was a glaring omission since the area is seeing robust growth, and impacts by D7, D10, and D11 development pressures, coupled with the need to solve for the "terminus" of the M-K-J-T lines that may need to in the future be planned to directly link and drop passengers at or into the BART station designs...

It calls for more seriously designed, and shown alternatives in the EIR process especially on transit inter-modal linkages. Those linkages can provide solar, water collection systems, and be designed more future-minded on the sustainability as kit of parts and components such as the walkway and cover-systems (solar, or planted and bio-friendly-green-walk-ways) The older walkway crossings that exist the 280 overpass, and the pedestrian fenced bridge that cross to the Balboa Pool and Park indicate some of the more poorly envisioned systems of getting people crossing vis-a-vis pedestrian friendly systems...

I hope to see the proposals for the transit alternatives in the EIR be inclusive with CCSF and Balboa Reservoir on ideas, and open to the solutions of a "high-line" concept that gets people directly from CCSF and Balboa Reservoir development and density and down into the station as directly as possible...

Sorry for the e-mail blast, but wanted to be sure that all cc'd are aware of the points, and issues, by doing a quick charette with the CCSF planners and Balboa Reservoir teams on how to route or solve for this solution could be a real eye-opener, for the CCSF Masterplan, and

Balboa Reservoir projects, by stitching together the fabric of the neighborhoods torn apart by the free-way that never was re-designed for modern communities of the future...

Caltrans is not cc'd so if you have the link or email of their planners, key to forward this as well to them as they have the 280 off-ramp planning under-way and it would be more critical to get them solving for the direct off-ramp into a garage... distances, and curve-designs to integrate with a parking east-side solution closer to the BART station and co-funded by BART, MUNI and other public entities....possibly also Caltrans... (since they use the facilities as well...)

Regards,

A.Goodman D11

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Shaw, Jeremy (CPC) <jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org>

To: Aaron Goodman <[REDACTED]>; BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>; Exline, Susan (CPC) <susan.exline@sfgov.org>

Cc: jtumlin@nelsonnygaard.com <jtumlin@nelsonnygaard.com>; Susan Lamb <slamb@ccsf.edu>; Tim Chan <tchan1@bart.gov>; Wong, Phillip (ECN) <phillip.c.wong@sfgov.org>; Shanahan, Thomas (ECN) <thomas.shanahan@sfgov.org>

Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2017, 4:10:42 PM PST

Subject: RE: Discussion BRCAC - in regards to big picture moves....

Aaron,

Thanks for the added clarifications and continued attention to transportation issues in the area. We'll review these and make sure that they're included in the CAC public comments' packet.

Jeremy

From: Aaron Goodman <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 10:42 AM
To: Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); BRCAC (ECN); Exline, Susan (CPC)
Cc: jtumlin@nelsonnygaard.com; Susan Lamb; Tim Chan
Subject: Discussion BRCAC - in regards to big picture moves....

BPRCAC / Jeremy / Sue and Jeff Tumlin

Busy discussion last night, but wanted to be sure it was understood my comments and the concerns of the BPSCAC

a) shuttle services to BPS will be MORE congested due to BRT program as proposed to be implemented along Geneva Harney to BPS.

b) the BPS does not have the capacity nor maneuverability for large buses due to already heavily congested areas from Geneva/Mission up to Balboa and over to Ocean and San Jose due to the on/off ramps.

c) The new opened/proposed D11 Garden over on Geneva near San Jose should be seen as "bandwidth" for the future needed changes to link BRT/LRV lines to Balboa Park Station

d) a stronger concept that looks at integration and crossing of Geneva at San Jose of the M-extension from Parkmerced to provide a link/loop in systems (J / M /K / T future LRV line) to BPS is needed.

e) There is a possible below/grade, or above grade method of crossing Geneva and that needs to be determined (best method, cost, route, for future linkage and turn-back or looping of systems. (Ex: taking a J and sending it out on the M-Line or a K train out to the Geneva/Harney route to Caltrains.

f) think of the BPS yards, and storage areas diagonal from each other and imagine a (4-chamber) transit system pumping the trains in 4 directions vs. just dead -ends...)

g) Growth will impact these areas, and corridors along the routes can be up-zoned if the designs help to transform the area, with retail/office and housing

h) above and below ground options may be needed due to topography... So determining the costs and simplicity of routing is key.

i) increased access to the caltrains and shopping at Candlestick, along with the business areas of brisbane's development may also help link jobs and housing closer along east-west transit systems.

j) A simple "highline" park/pedestrian crossing from a parking structure on the east side of CCSF could provide desperately needed housing above, and parking below (teach housing on the top, access from freeway below, and parking available direct off the freeway, with parking managed for teachers, transit workers, students, and needed BART and MUNI parking spaces for further construction at BPS station for future major projects. Fees could help CCSF with construction costs long-term.

k) I pointed the SFSU TDM due to the lacking solutions that link to Daly City BART, and no real "teeth" to the document (19th Ave Transit Study, and Developer Agreements) leaving us in D7 with more traffic, parking and transit problems with a development steering (3) proposed stops into Parkmerced while SFSU-CSU did not do enough to pay into the transit solutions... Nelson Nygaard was the transit consultant on SFSU-CSU and Parkmerced I believe, so there is some concerns about real efforts at outside the box solutions on transit, and if the proposals did enough infrastructure proposal wise. Peter Albert (SFMTA) was a voice on the further extension to Daly City, and Liz Brisson as well talked some but did not push enough on the Tier-5 future extension which costs the most...

l) Lick Wilmerding (Bike Path) and congestion is a serious hazard, and the funnel and speeds are the danger eastbound and westbound, with Lick Wilmerdings upcoming project and need to widen the area for drop-off and not parking its crucial to have a discussion between agencies on the pathway adjacent to the school down to the BART station and entry.

j) Infrastructure was mentioned but we have not seen any concepts that may drive the energy and water issues for the site (BPR) with the RFP we hope to see concepts that can envision not just

block housing but Open Space with housing and infrastructure integrated... The site should not just be a parking garage below (Parkmerced) and should have water-retention and energy creation as a solution.

Unlocking Transit Funding, and ensuring we plan for future density and development, requires a bigger step forward, and getting a project and proposal vetted and developed to garner interest.

The City College Parking Structure and off-ramp would directly pull traffic OFF of ocean ave. Solve some of the parking issues for BPR and CCSF provide some future funding to the pedestrian bridge and overpass needed to access BPS BART. and create a more positive pedestrian bridge/parkway to campus over Ocean Ave and the I-280 interchange...

As noted prior a plinth design with stacker units or vertical parking below the plinth could solve a lot of issues (tennis courts above, fields above, and even teacher housing and more park-like commons for campus amenities could poke up and down in the plinth providing both views, niches for campus needs, and lower floors for parking and essential services and systems (water collection etc!)

The concept alone could be a VERY positive new design concept for the eastern edge of the campus and its connection to BART, and I highly recommend the CCSF Facilities and BART reps to link up on this.

Sorry for the longer email but wanted to be sure all were informed on the issues, and it can be included in the comments for the meeting as the 2 minutes allotted did not provide time to ask really the questions on the grouped presentation which was excessively long and limited public comment time from 3-2 minutes (reminder planning commission does it on highly contentious issues, but this was a FEEDBACK session on TDM, therefore comments need to be included and time should not have been reduced...no matter how tired or the time constraints....)

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman D11