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Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee Meeting  
November 14, 2016  
Materials for Agenda Item #5: Debrief of First Phase of CAC Process, Lessons for Future Meetings

As we reflect on past meetings of the BRCAC and plan for the next stage of our process...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What has worked well?</th>
<th>What would you change going forward?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) In the past, the member of the CAC listened to each other</td>
<td>1) no mansplaining!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Public comment fair and inclusive</td>
<td>2) understand limitations of Brown Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) CAC became very helpful to moving process</td>
<td>3) most feedback has came from westwood &amp; sundan neighborhood association. it would be fair to solicit feedback from younger groups included CCAF straws, POCR, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Our president has done a great job</td>
<td>4) not only go our process for public comment but now you will need to go over procedures for board member who want to speak to an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Respect of board members for each other</td>
<td>5) better纳the survey and need TOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Mostly ended weekly by 8:30 pm yay!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Slack planning helps promotes helpful ART sessions and keeps guest speakers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As we reflect on past meetings of the BRCAC and plan for the next stage of our process...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What has worked well?</th>
<th>What would you change going forward?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I liked the even temper of Lisa Spinelli. And tolerance.</td>
<td>I think the process should go faster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The detailed minutes are great.</td>
<td>Thousands of people here are homeless and many tens of thousands more are under housed, present tense. We should build housing faster in general all over the region. We can start here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like how we try to have amplified sound and</td>
<td>It would be nice to have an online video of the consultant reports, I am thinking of the reports from the transportation demand management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stenography for accessibility.</td>
<td>Are we sure the chair is allowed on the RFA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As we reflect on past meetings of the BRCAC and plan for the next stage of our process...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What has worked well?</th>
<th>What would you change going forward?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THIS QUESTION ASSUMES ONE THINKS THINGS WORKED WELL. MANY PEOPLE DO NOT THINK THIS PROCESS WORKED WELL</td>
<td>CAC SHOULD HAVE HAD LESS MAYOR APPOINTEES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMPACTED NEIGHBORHOODS SHOULD HAVE &quot;LOUDER&quot; VOICE IN THE PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS - THEY OFTEN GO UNRECORDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOT ENOUGH TIME TO REVIEW INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEETINGS ACCORDING TO CO-OWNER TIME RATHER THAN BE-COMMITTED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As we reflect on past meetings of the BRCAC and plan for the next stage of our process...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What has worked well?</th>
<th>What would you change going forward?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions need to be answered at the meetings, all we are permitted is make statements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As we reflect on past meetings of the BRCAC and plan for the next stage of our process...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What has worked well?</th>
<th>What would you change going forward?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- E person identifies what neighborhood they reside in</td>
<td>- More time between CAC city meetings, i.e., more time given before the meeting of posters/proposed parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pre-meeting overview for new attendees was good</td>
<td>- Each person in the audience/public that is coming to the meeting is a paid staff person of an organization identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Info at front door of meeting was good</td>
<td>that they are pd. staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Any City affiliation of people on CAC stated when @ member introducing themselves at beginning of meeting was good (that’s why we got on committee! CAC) 
  - Better communication w/neighbors (i.e., at the beginning of this process)        | The city being transparent about the size of project being proposed (which they still have not done)                       |
| - Representation was mainly Mayor, Vice-Mayor, other “leaders” of representatives    | - Being more detailed, i.e., how things relate (which they talked about as being “offered/sold the property”             |
|                                                                                        |                                                                                                                            |

- Government
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As we reflect on past meetings of the BRCAC and plan for the next stage of our process...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What has worked well?</th>
<th>What would you change going forward?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City staff was on top of almost everything</td>
<td>1. Making sure meetings do not go beyond 8:30 pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa did a great job.</td>
<td>2. Outreach to community (Think about how to reach people that can’t go to meetings. Disenfranchised, young people, students, =&gt; rely on Change Your Rituals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules re decorum were good. Please continue</td>
<td>4. Arvada Mercy Housing Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As we reflect on past meetings of the BRCAC and plan for the next stage of our process...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What has worked well?</th>
<th>What would you change going forward?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern about how feedback to RFPs be provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community engagement having input from how housing is managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large open meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brown Act/Sunshine Ordinance Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As we reflect on past meetings of the BRCAC and plan for the next stage of our process...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What has worked well?</th>
<th>What would you change going forward?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The community meeting process</td>
<td>create a list of questions generated from community meetings. Provide electronic and hard copies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging the public in the process</td>
<td>create a succinct response of questions asked w/ as much detail as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a usable open space in the development process</td>
<td>Develop more common open space for recreation. The 4½ acres (including walkways, etc.) is not enough space to accommodate the new development and existing residents. Increase height of southern building to increase Open Space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to feedback</td>
<td>Import how we provide feedback on topics by allowing more time and topics of concern w/ updated responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions on public transit and parking/traffic patterns</td>
<td>Define exactly where issues will be improved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating Westwood Park and other neighborhoods input</td>
<td>Add WWP, Sunny Side, and Avalon to the committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As we reflect on past meetings of the BRCAC and plan for the next stage of our process...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What has worked well?</th>
<th>What would you change going forward?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having representatives from different groups (CIW, San Bruno, CCSF, etc) on the CAC</td>
<td>Due to tonight's misunderstanding about the letter to the Board of Supervisors, perhaps more clear communication or expectations of actions required before the meeting. Better coordination between Balboa Park Station, CAC, Balboa Reservoir, CAC, and CCSF Master Plan is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q &amp; A's from CIC</td>
<td>Aslan veg?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mercy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As we reflect on past meetings of the BRCAC and plan for the next stage of our process...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What has worked well?</th>
<th>What would you change going forward?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RE: ENSURING INVOLVEMENT — THE REASON INVOLVEMENT HAS FALLEN OFF IS BECAUSE OF THE FACT THAT PUBLIC INPUT REGARDING SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES HAVE BEEN IGNORED/BYPASSED. PEOPLE FEEL THAT THEIR INPUT IS FUTILE BECAUSE OF OUTCOMES HAS BEEN PRE-DETERMINED.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF YOU WANT INVOLVEMENT, THE CITY NEEDS TO ADOPTE AND INCORPORATE SUBSTANTIVE INPUT. (EXAMPLE: PARKING, TRANSPORTATION)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EMAILS RECEIVED FROM PUBLIC VIA BRCAC@SFGOV.ORG

Period: 9/14/16 – 11/14/16
Hi my name is Isaac Rosenberg and I live in San Francisco. My life has been significantly affected by the housing crisis in the Bay Area.

When I first began working on my company full time, me and my co-founder moved in together. But the only place we could find walking distance to downtown SF that was "affordable" was a 1 bedroom in the tenderloin. As it turned out, it had bedbugs. We had to get it cleaned out of bed bugs 3 times over the 5 months that we stayed there. And the rent? $2,500 a month. It's a staggering amount for such horrid living conditions.

I love this city, I love this whole Bay Area, and I want more people to live here. Balboa reservoir would help accomplish that. Please build a meaningful amount of housing here.

Isaac

--
Isaac Rosenberg
Oneminute | Founding engineer
San Francisco, CA
Forward for BPSCAC and BPRCAC

Without the T-line extended or looped up Geneva Harney and out to BVHP this will exacerbate the transit/traffic problems at the BALbo park station and major thoroughfares throughout the SE sector and affect neighboring areas.

Key is to get the housing WITH the transit uplift and links/loops solved for early bi-county or u end up with a major development with only bus links....


Sent from my iPhone
Brisbane pushes huge development without housing

By C.W. Nevius  |  September 21, 2016  |  Updated: September 21, 2016 4:58pm

The Bayshore Roundhouse, which was once a hub on the old Southern Pacific railyard, sits abandoned and decaying on open space land between Bayshore Boulevard and Highway 101 in Brisbane, Calif. on Thursday, Sept. 3, 2015. The historic roundhouse will be restored as part of the Baylands mixed-use development project which is planned for the 660-acre site.

Photo: Paul Chinn, The Chronicle
The residents of sleepy little Brisbane are extremely excited about developing Baylands, a 684-acre site on the edge of town. In fact, they’ve been getting a little carried away.

When he was running for Brisbane City Council in 2009, Clifford Lentz, who is now mayor, said, “The Baylands project has the potential to change the world. This may sound like an exaggerated statement, but I believe it is true.”

The owner of much of the property is developer Universal Paragon Corp., which wants to build 4,434 homes, condos and apartments in addition to 6.9 million square feet of commercial space.

The city, however, doesn’t like that mixed-use proposal. It’s pushing two alternatives, and neither has housing. One would let developers create a huge commercial and industrial complex with 8.3 million square feet of commercial space and the other would allow for a sustainable commercial community with a wind farm.

But, the city’s alternatives seem incomprehensible in a Bay Area climate where everyone agrees creating housing is a priority. Yet the tiny town — population 4,282 according to the 2010 census — thinks it can erect a large business center and let others worry about where everyone would live.

“We’ll provide the commercial,” Lentz said this week. “San Francisco will provide the housing.”

The groans you heard were from housing advocates, who continue to say the Bay Area is way behind in the creation of housing.

A group of them intends to go to next Thursday’s meeting of the Brisbane City Council to push elected leaders to face the reality of the lack of homes, particularly for low- and very-low-income residents.

And this isn’t the Coalition to Build Wildly Expensive Condos masquerading as concerned citizens. Matt Vander Sluis is a
program director for the bicycle-friendly, open-space-advocating Greenbelt Alliance.

“We want an option that helps solve our transportation nightmare and housing affordability crisis,” Vander Sluis said. “The most sustainable decision the City Council could make is to allow homes next to transit.”

It will be an uphill struggle in Brisbane.

A recent city-commissioned survey found that 71 percent of the Brisbane residents polled “feel that Brisbane would be better off if portions of the Baylands were developed.”

But when the survey asked residents what should be done with Baylands, “housing” scored just 16 percent.

“Local land use policy is just that — local,” Lentz said. “People are entitled to come to the meeting and say what they want. But it is going to be up to Brisbane to decide if housing should go up.”

Tim Colen, executive director of the San Francisco Housing Action Coalition, who is pushing for a plan that has plenty of housing, admits Universal Paragon’s proposal would have a huge impact on the city. “In fairness,” he said, “the proposal we like would double the size of the town.”

That’s not going to be popular with the residents, who cherish their Main Street USA ambience.

“That’s why people move here,” Lentz said. “They want something that is more small town, friendly and safe, where you know your neighbors.”

But advocates for housing, like Vander Sluis, say that’s exactly why homes, condos and apartments need to be part of any development. Vander Sluis says statistics from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission show that combining housing with transit options gets cars off the road and discourages gridlock.

“People in the Bay Area who have access to transit within half a mile of where they live are five times more likely to use transit,” he said.

Actually, transit is one area of agreement. All sides would like to upgrade the lonely Caltrain station, which is hardly used by commuters. The plan is to bring in SamTrans buses and build a connecting extension to the Muni T-line.

But the debate about housing is going to define the discussion.

Lentz says that “we’re already feeling the pressure” to create living spaces. And there’s likely to be a concentrated push from state politicians and housing advocacy groups.

But for now, Lentz says, Brisbane is thrilled to have the opportunity.

“Any city in the world would love to have this project,” he said.

Let’s see how he feels in a year.

_C.W. Nevius is a San Francisco Chronicle columnist. His columns appear Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday. Email: cwnevius@sfchronicle.com Twitter: @cwnevius_
Deputy City Attorney Ambrose,

In reviewing the 5/10/2016 PUC minutes, I found this regarding the PUC CAC’s Balboa Reservoir Resolution:

Commissioner Courtney thanked Ms. Aragon for her leadership. He asked that City Attorney provide formal instruction regarding the SFPUC’s fiduciary and other obligations to address the issues presented. City Attorney Ambrose stated she would provide confidential legal advice on the underlying SFPUC Charter responsibilities of the SFPUC, other City Departments, and the Mayor, regarding entitlements for development. Ms. Ambrose stated the appropriate public process will take place regarding the property. Brief discussion ensued.

I wish to bring your attention to the following 9/9/2016 submission that was sent to the Balboa Reservoir CAC, City Team (Planning, OEWD, PUC staff), PUC, and PUC CAC. I hope that you will take it into consideration when you give your advice to the relevant City Departments and the Mayor:

---

**UNADDRESSED FLAWS IN BALBOA RESERVOIR PROJECT (9/9/2016)**

I have been fairly conscientious in pointing out flaws in the City Team’s Principles & Parameters over the course of the past 1-1/2 year. I have submitted my critiques based on research and documentation.

The City Team has sidestepped my critiques. My submissions have been ignored and the concerns raised have not been addressed.

Here is a digest of my critiques from my submissions that have remained unaddressed by the City Team.

**CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: PUBLIC LAND FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD**

1. Public land should be used for the public good.
2. Affordable housing for homeless, low-income and moderate-income people contributes to the public good.
3. The California State Surplus Land Statute and the City’s Surplus City Property/Public Lands Ordinance were set up to help address housing targeted for homeless, low-income and moderate-income people.
4. The intent of both State and City laws were not meant to subsidize high-cost housing.
5. As defined by law, “Affordable Housing” covers moderate-income housing going up to 120% Area Median Income only.
6. Balboa Reservoir Project only requires that 33% of the BR housing to be legally-defined “Affordable Housing.” The remaining 67% of housing falls outside the bounds of the original intent of State and City targets of Affordable Housing--as defined by law--for low-income and moderate-income people.

7. The result of this 33% Affordable Housing/67% non-Affordable Housing ratio is that public land will be transferred to private interests and higher income owners in the guise of “Affordable Housing.”

8. Using 33% “Affordable Housing” to subsidize the 67% high-cost housing is contrary to the intent of the original legislation.

CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

1. CEQA requires public agencies to avoid or mitigate significant adverse environmental impacts caused by a project.

2. City College is a critical public service that serves the entire Bay Area. CCSF is the central economic, educational and cultural feature of the Reservoir vicinity. However the Balboa Reservoir Project has failed to acknowledge CCSF’s primacy.

3. Housing on Balboa Reservoir is a component of the Balboa Park Station General Plan, based on an Initial Study conducted in 2006, referenced in the BPS Final EIR.

4. The proposal of 425-500 units in the Reservoir was arbitrary. There was no documentation, evidence, or argumentation presented to support the proposal for 425-500 units in the 2006 BPS Initial Study/BPS Final EIR/BPS Area General Plan.

5. The BPS Area General Plan, Final EIR/Initial Study determined that, on the BPS Program-Level, that there would be no significant impact to school facilities.

6. The BR Project’s 2014 AECOM Study incorrectly extended the Program-Level determination of non-significance to the Balboa Reservoir Project’s Plan-Level. This caused the BR Project to ignore adverse impacts that the Project will have on City College and neighboring schools.

7. The City Team has refused to acknowledge the reality that the use of the Reservoir for student parking is an existing public benefit. It is a benefit that helps provide access to quality education.

8. Instead, the Balboa Park Station Area Plan mischaracterizes the Reservoir as simply being an “unpleasant void in the neighborhood” despite the reality that it serves an important and needed public purpose for students.

9. The Balboa Reservoir Project can be characterized as constituting an eviction of an important Bay Area-wide public service--City College. A public good is being eliminated for the benefit of private developer interests.

10. The City Team operates on the unfounded assumption that housing on the Reservoir is of higher importance than the importance of City College to the community.

11. The City Team shifts the burden of mitigation of impending adverse impacts of the Project onto the surrounding neighborhoods and CCSF stakeholders. It addresses the BR Project’s adverse impacts by calling for the impactees to bear the burden by practicing TDM and requesting Residential Permit Parking.

12. The City Team argues that it is too expensive to build parking. If the Reservoir were to be left as-is to provide student access to education, there would be no need to build new parking. It’s cheaper to keep it as-is.

13. Eviction of CCSF from western Reservoir will harm student access to education.

14. The State Surplus Property Statute (Govt Code 54220) targets use of housing for those of “low” or “moderate” income (up to 120% of Area AMI). It was under this concept that San Francisco’s Public Lands for Housing Program was originally formulated. The idea was for surplus public property to be used for the public good to create Affordable Housing (120% AMI).

15. “Affordable Housing” is legally defined as up to 120% AMI (Administrative Code 23.A.4) The Principles & Parameters only requires 33% to be legally-defined Affordable Housing.

16. In reality 67% will be unaffordable housing. Although the City Team presents the Project as market-rate housing subsidizing affordable housing, this is an inversion of reality. In reality, the 33% affordable
housing is cover for the reality that this transfer of public property will benefit private interests at the expense of the public. The reality is that the 33% “affordable housing” will be subsidizing private interests.

PUC LAND USE POLICY
1. PUC’s Land Use Framework policy allows sale only if: “Use of the land sold will not result in creating a nuisance.”

PARKING vs. TDM
1. The City Team argues that it is too expensive to build parking. If the Reservoir were to be left as-is to provide student access to education, there would be no need to build new parking. If construction cost is the consideration, then the best option is to leave the western Reservoir as-is.
2. TDM is the third component of the City’s Transportation Sustainability Program. TDM requires new developments to provide on-site amenities that prioritize sustainable alternatives to driving.
3. The Balboa Reservoir Project will not exist in isolation from the surrounding neighborhoods. The TDM outcomes within the boundaries of the Project itself will probably be highly successful. However, BR Project’s internal TDM success will come at the expense of the surrounding neighborhoods when BR residents park their privately-owned vehicles and drive their privately-owned vehicles outside the Reservoir Project’s own boundaries.
4. FROM EARLIER SUBMISSION TO CAC REGARDING TDM:
   - Most importantly: TDM Study is not a comprehensive and unbiased assessment of parking and circulation issues in the Reservoir vicinity; and it was never meant to be a comprehensive study. The scope/parameters of Nelson-Nygaard’s study were very specific according to SFCTA documentation:
     o The Planning Department and SFMTA are proposing a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) study in coordination with CCSF Ocean Campus to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips by college staff, faculty, students, and neighborhood residents.
   - PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BENEFITS
     The Balboa Area Transportation Demand Study will develop clear strategies for reducing single-occupant vehicle trips and outline a coordinated framework for future TDM programs and policies between CCSF, the Balboa Reservoir project, and the City of San Francisco. Potential TDM activities will produce a wide-range of benefits to individuals and the transportation system as a whole, from reducing traffic congestion, vehicle emissions, and fuel consumption to supporting physical activity and enhancing safety. Additionally, TDM activities will make existing transportation investments perform better, extending the life of existing infrastructure and improving the outcomes for new transportation investments.
     o TDM Program: proposing TDM solutions unique to the area comprising CCSF Ocean campus, Balboa Reservoir and neighborhoods as consistent with emerging TDM policy.
   - Bottom-line: TDM solutions, by definition and intent, exclude parking. Within TDM parameters, the issue of parking is given significance only via the TDM solution of making parking “more difficult and expensive.” That’s why the elimination of student parking is ignored. That’s why the City Team promotes 0.5 parking spaces per residential unit.
   - Fatuous TDM arguments:
     o "Parking Produces Traffic Congestion--Every parking space is a magnet for cars" and "If you build it.........they will come."
     o In earlier submissions I had written: As I have pointed out in another e-mail, there are 3 main traffic magnets in our area: schools, freeway entrance/exits, and the BP Station transit hub. If reduction of car traffic in the area is the goal, these magnets need to removed. Obviously, this is neither an appropriate nor realistic solution.
BP Station and freeway entrance/exits are part of transportation infrastructure. However CCSF is different. CCSF is not transportation infrastructure. People are not just passing through on the way to someplace else. CCSF is a destination in and of itself.

Rather than parking producing congestion, it's the existence of a desired destination that induces traffic. Parking is but a means to accommodate those who want to get to the desired destination.

Case-in-point: When school is not in session, there are very few cars in the Reservoir parking lot and there's very little traffic on Phelan. This demonstrates the falsehood of the "parking produces traffic congestion" premise.

**Bottom line:** Parking, in and of itself, does not promote congestion. Rather, congestion is the product of people trying to get to a desired destination. Student access to education, which includes driving and parking, should not be subordinate to the Balboa Reservoir Project.

- "Spillover [parking] from City College"
  - Both Sunnyside Neighborhood Assn and Westwood Park Assn have made clear that the neighborhood supports CCSF and its students. The Nelson-Nygaard Study calls for preventing "spillover from City College" by making parking for them difficult via RPP and enforcement. Rather than making parking difficult for students, the neighbors have called for the Balboa Reservoir Project to provide adequate on-site parking for student needs.

**Bottom line:** Instead of shifting the burden of mitigation for the elimination of student parking by the TDM solution of "reducing single-occupant trips by college staff, faculty, students, and neighborhood residents", the Reservoir Project needs to take responsibility for replacing lost student parking.

--Alvin Ja
Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Martin, Michael (ECN); Lesk, Emily (ECN); Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); Exline, Susan (CPC); Russell, Rosanna (PUC); Carlin, Michael (PUC); BRCAC (ECN); Hood, Donna (PUC); Tracy Zhu; Wendy Aragon; Jennifer Clary; sunnyside.president@gmail.com; Kate Favetti; Maria Picar; Brigitte Davila; Robert Muehlbauer; Howard Chung; Rebecca Lee; Christine Godinez; Jonathan Winston; Ambrose, Noreen (CAT); Yee, Norman (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS)
Cc: SNA Brick; Wpa Balboa. Reservoir; Linda Da Silva; Ronald Gerhard; Marian Lam; Steve Bruckman; Susan Lamb; Save CCSF Coalition; PODER; CCHO--fernando

Subject: RFQ Resources (Relevant Policies, Standards, Codes) excludes PUC’s "LAND USE FRAMEWORK"

City Team, PUC. PUC CAC:

The Balboa Reservoir RFQ makes no mention of a fundamental PUC document, PUC’s LAND USE FRAMEWORK:

From the PUC website:

The focus of the Framework document is to affirm and identify general principles and/or considerations for the SFPUC in the management of real estate assets in three key areas for lands not otherwise subject to specific policy guidance:

1. Leases or Permits for Secondary Uses on SFPUC Land,
2. Disposition of SFPUC Owned Lands; and
3. Acquisition of Land by the SFPUC.

By adoption of the Framework, the Commission is seeking to advance the analytical and decision-making process surrounding the administration of real estate assets under the SFPUC’s exclusive jurisdiction.

The exclusion of the PUC’s own Land Use Framework from consideration constitutes a fundamental violation of PUC’s duty to the public.

In my submissions to the City Team and the BR CAC during the public engagement process, I have brought up and quoted from the Land Use Framework document multiple times. Here is one of them:

Balboa Reservoir in context of PUC’s Land Use Framework

The sale of PUC property is governed by the PUC document, “FRAMEWORK FOR LAND MANAGEMENT AND USE.”

The document lays down conditions for sale of PUC land to include economic, environmental, and community criteria.

The Balboa Reservoir Project has been promoted as part of the Public Land for Housing Program whose purpose is to build affordable housing. PUC’s Land Use Framework’s economic criterion requires that the sale of Balboa Reservoir “must achieve fair market value compensation for the benefit of ratepayers.” Because of this condition, 100% affordable housing will be unfeasible.
Public Land for Housing, in the context of Balboa Reservoir, will fail its overarching goal of affordability. Instead, Balboa Reservoir will achieve 67% unaffordable housing, in exchange for 33% affordable housing. OEWD/Planning’s Principles & Parameters state a goal of 50/50%, but this target is unlikely to be reached. If this 50/50 target is reached, the outcome would be about 250 affordable units, and 250 unaffordable units. Would even this 50/50 ratio justify ceding public property in perpetuity to private interests?

OTHER LAND USE FRAMEWORK CRITERIA

The PUC Land Use document states:

**ECONOMIC CRITERIA:** Land may be sold or transferred when:
1. The sale or transfer does not jeopardize the future use or potential sale of functionally related and/or adjoining SFPUC land.
2. The sale or transfer will result in savings of operational costs expended to manage the property.
3. The sale or transfer does not result in a change of use of the property that would increase SFPUC exposure to liability related to conditions in the soil or structures that are not warranted by the return to SFPUC from the sale or transfer.

Sale of Balboa Reservoir fails to fulfill Condition 2 of “Economic Criteria.” Selling off Balboa Reservoir will not result in saving operational/management costs for Water Enterprise.

Instead of selling off the Reservoir to private developers, retaining this large tract of land constitutes “money [public assets] in the bank” for PUC and citizenry.

The Land Use document also states:

**COMMUNITY CRITERIA:** Land may be sold or transferred when:
1. The sale or transfer is evaluated under SFPUC Community Benefit and Environmental Justice policies and objectives.
2. The sale or transfer would not significantly adversely affect the implementation of an adopted resource agency plan for the area.
3. The sale would not increase the risk of loss, injury or death to SFPUC employees or others on or near the parcel.
4. Use of the land sold will not result in activities creating a nuisance.

The Balboa Reservoir Project as envisioned by OEWD/Planning fails Condition 4 of “Community Criteria.”

The current plan removes existing parking for City College students. It deliberately limits parking within the Reservoir to 0.5 parking spaces per residential unit in the unrealistic expectation that this will discourage car ownership by new Reservoir residents.

Given the limited street parking in the surrounding neighborhoods, and the fact that the main (practically and probably the only) ingress/egress to the Reservoir Housing project will be Phelan Avenue, the 500 unit Balboa Reservoir Project will result in creating a substantial traffic and parking nuisance [The word “nuisance” understates the problem].

The Balboa Reservoir Project as set forth in the OEWD/Planning Principles & Parameters fail to comply with PUC’s “Framework for Land Management and Use.”

The sale of Balboa Reservoir to private developers would provide a short-term cash infusion to PUC Water Enterprise. However the short-term gain of quick cash doesn’t justify losing this valuable piece of public land in perpetuity to private developers in the guise of “affordable housing.”
I can only conclude that this exclusion of the Land Use Framework from the RFQ was a conscious decision by the City Team.

I also wish to note that the 11/10/2016 Memo from the City Team entitled "Overview of Balboa Reservoir CAC Process, Prepared for Board of Supervisors Report" was a very sanitized Overview that gives the impression that the community has had effective input into the Development Parameters. In reality, the "public engagement process" was mainly and effectively a one-way, top-down affair in which the community was only allowed token input. The process was rigged, with a pre-determined outcome: contrary to CEQA principles of a new project fitting in with the existing setting, CEQA has been turned upside-down by telling the community to adapt to the new project.

Submitted by:

Alvin Ja
City Team, BR CAC, PUC, PUC CAC, Board of Supervisors:

- The RFQ is on PUC website.

The RFQ’s Section 4 "Applicable Land Use Policies" fails to list or even mention PUC's own "Land Use Framework". What's up with that? Why isn't PUC's own policy on land use even mentioned?

- Monday’s CAC meeting has Annual Progress Report to BOS on the agenda. The Report to BOS is supposed to be from the CAC to BOS. The CAC Ordinance states:

  (d) No later than one year after the inaugural meeting of the Advisory Committee, and at least once every 12 months thereafter, the Advisory Committee shall submit to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor a report describing the Advisory Committee’s activities and recommendations.

However it appears that the Report is actually a Report written by the City Team. The Report’s perspective is more of the City Team’s than the community’s.

The Report is a sanitized version of the actual CAC process. The actual CAC process gave the City Team full control of what could or could not be discussed. The City Team was given the preponderance of the time while community input was limited. The balance of power weighed 99% on the side of the City Team, while community input was limited to making changes to minor details.

Fundamentally, public and community participation was just TOKEN. The reality was that the public engagement process was merely a way to manage and direct public input to conform to the City Team’s predetermined outcome. The public engagement process was in reality a process of manipulation towards the City Team’s desired outcome.
The Report reads like propaganda. It fails to address the fact that overwhelmingly popular critiques from the community regarding the Reservoir Project’s adverse impact on parking and circulation were ignored and or, at best, sidestepped with fatuous arguments.

- Also on Agenda: Debrief / Lessons from First Phase of CAC: "What would you change going forward?"

My suggestions:

- City Team should not act like dictators. Incorporate public input about preserving parking for City College students.
- No to eviction of CCSF students without full mitigation of adverse impact to students and school. TDM is an inadequate remedy.
- Comply with CEQA principle of a new project fitting in with existing setting. End the City Team's MO of making stakeholders that will be adversely affected by the new project bear the burden of the adverse impacts.
- Abide by PUC’s "Land Use Framework" policy
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