

**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
Wednesday, April 13, 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-031416 available via the following link: www.sf-planning.org/brcac

Committee Members Present:

Howard Chung, Brigitte Davila, Kate Favetti, Rebecca Lee, Robert Muehlbauer, Maria Picar, Lisa Spinali, Jon Winston, Maria Picar

Committee Members Absent:

Christine Godinez

Staff/Consultants Present:

Jeremy Shaw, Sue Exline, Planning Department; Emily Lesk, Mike Martin, Phillip Wong, Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Martin Gran, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission; Carli Paine, Keith Tanner, SFMTA; Jen Low, Supervisor Norman Yee, Office of D7 Supervisor Norman Yee; Beth Rubenstein, Office of D11 Supervisor John Avalos; Jeff Tumlin, Pete Costa, Nelson Nygaard Consulting Associates; Keith Tanner, Balboa Park Station CAC

1. Call to Order and Roll Call.

- a. Roll Call

2. Opening of Meeting.

- a. Amendments to 3/14/16 Minutes.
 - i. CAC Comment.
 - 1. Kate Favetti.
 - 1. Page 7 and 8. Add my husband and I were in entry level clerical jobs when we moved to the neighborhood 40 years ago.
 - 2. This was a discussion item not an action item; so this is not the final, final decision. The consensus reached at the 3/14/16 meeting was calendared as a discussion item.
 - 3. Page 2. The recommendation at the time was to add other adjacent neighborhoods. It did not say delete Westwood Park. Westwood Park is respectfully asking that it be worded as CCSF, OMI, Sunnyside Westwood Park, and other adjacent neighborhoods. If we can have the document changed so that it reflects that position.
 - ii. No public comment.
 - iii. Motion to approve 3/14/16 minutes with amendments: Favetti, Second: Winston
 - 1. Ayes: Chung, Davila, Favetti, Lee, Muehlbauer, Picar, Spinali, Winston
 - 2. Noes: [none]
 - b. Spinali.
 - i. Tonight we are focusing on the Transportation development parameters
 - ii. City College will be subject of May 9 meeting; tonight's meeting and May 9 meeting will be interconnected.
 - iii. We are looking at the principles silo by silo and then we look at how the whole documents hold together.
 - iv. We did not take a vote to approve the housing principles; we took a consensus to see if we were comfortable with it and did it reflect feedback over the few meetings regarding it, then the question is when we combine all of the parameters to create one collective Request for Proposals (RFP) will it hang together nicely. Then we'll take a final vote at that point.
 - v. Welcome Keith Tanner, MTA Liaison to the Balboa Park Station CAC. We will be working to make sure we are in good alignment with the Balboa Park Station CAC.
 - c. Jeremy Shaw.
 - i. Introduction of staff and consultants.
 - ii. Many of the transportation issues and needs brought up over the course of this projects meetings are beyond the scope of the reservoir or need to be addressed at a neighborhood level. Supervisor Yee and the TA funded the Transportation Demand Management Study (TDM). Due to the volume of things going on in the area, many issues are being concurrently addressed by the Balboa Park Station CAC. Carli Paine will be providing an overview of the projects happening the Balboa Park Station Area. Then, Jeff Tumlin, a consultant from Nelson Nygaard, will be presenting on the TDM study. Then,

we will all have the same knowledge of the transportation issues that will allow for an informed discussion of the transportation parameters just on the reservoir.

d. Supervisor Norman Yee Remarks

- i. Make sure CAC is the go to body to figure this out.
- ii. I put together a CAC because the initial discussions did not seem to be going well, and it didn't seem like the voice of community was being heard as much as I'd like.
- iii. I made sure there was enough community representation; and members of the CAC are volunteers.
- iv. Thank you to members of the CAC.
- v. Discussion has moved from a non-discussion to a discussion.
- vi. We won't get to 100% agreement but we're getting to a point where people are feeling somewhat comfortable.
- vii. Transportation and traffic discussions is critical to this project being successful; otherwise it's a dead project.
- viii. The issues of traffic, transportation, and parking are all important; more than a year ago the issue of traffic came up many times over, which is why I proposed the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) study.
- ix. We may not have the funding for all of the recommendations but hopefully we can rally enough resources to get them done.
- x. Two parking issues: existing parking, without solving this problem we're not going to have a project, the developer, CCSF, and the City need to work together to create a solution; parking for new units, anything under a parking ratio of 1:1 is positive; maybe some of the larger units should have a parking space, how can we move it a little further between 0.5 and 1.
- xi. I'm pushing for family housing, wherein families may end up having to drive.
- xii. Regarding housing, what we have is a solid way of looking at the issue and moving in the right direction; I want to look at some language that would in a minor way tweak the housing element – this would not change the parameter, rather it would enhance it.
- xiii. Much of it is whether it's at least 50% affordable or a goal of 50%.
- xiv. Are we going to build for low- and moderate? We need to make sure we include middle-income.
- xv. I won't present the tweaks today because it is not on the agenda, but I want to emphasize to the developer, it's not about a goal, this is what you need to do for us.
- xvi. Jen Low will get you the language for the next meeting.

e. Spinali.

- i. In the presentation we heard regarding the various efforts around transportation we'll be looking to Supervisor Yee's leadership to help us facilitate the complicated coordination.
- ii. We tried to put the language in the parameters such that the various parking ratios would be predicated on the type of housing units.

- iii. Work with Supervisor Yee and Jen Low to add housing to the May 9 meeting.
 - 1. Supervisor Yee. The funding for the TDM was because I heard the need to address this issue. I was able to marshal resources to fund it. I want the study to work closely with the Balboa BART plan. I tried to utilize the existing infrastructure and groups. Thank you to staff; they have been real flexible and making the adjustments that I have suggested.
- f. Davila.
 - i. It would be helpful to be more precise with the RFQ/RFP so that the developers knows exactly what we're asking for.

3. Balboa Park Station Area Transportation Background.

- a. Jeremy Shaw.
 - i. Many of the transportation issues and needs brought up over the course of this projects meetings are beyond the scope of the reservoir or need to be addressed at a neighborhood level. Supervisor Yee and the TA funded the Transportation Demand Management Study (TDM). Due to the volume of things going on in the area, many issues are being concurrently addressed by the Balboa Park Station CAC. Carli Paine will be providing an overview of the projects happening the Balboa Park Station Area. Then, Jeff Tumlin, a consultant from Nelson Nygaard Consulting Associates, will be presenting on the TDM study. Then, we will all have the same knowledge of the transportation issues that will allow for an informed discussion of the transportation parameters just on the reservoir.
- b. Presentation by Carli Paine, SFMTA, introducing Balboa Park Area Transportation Initiatives. **[Presentation available online at www.sf-planning.org/brcac]**
- c. Presentation by Jeff Tumlin, Nelson Nygaard Consulting Associates, on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) **[Presentation available online at www.sf-planning.org/brcac]**
- d. CAC Comment
 - i. Chung.
 - 1. With increasing incomes, even with the different generations, do you get more car ownership/usage?
 - 1. Jeff Tumlin. Yes, auto ownership increases with income generally. But geography in San Francisco is a greater determining factor of auto ownership than income. Bayview, which has less transit accessibility and less of a complete set of retail, has more auto ownership than the wealthiest parts of Nob Hill and Russian Hill. We find that in any income category there's a broad spread of household auto ownership interest. To what degree are we building new housing to accommodate that full spread and are we building in the right location? Are we accommodating folks that want fewer cars in places where they have better choices, and are we accommodating folks that

- live in areas with lower traffic congestion, easier auto accessibility, and fewer choices?
2. Seems like unbundling housing from parking makes perfect sense, but does that create two classes, for the low-income units, are they not able to buy parking spaces? Do the market-rate buyers end up owning all the parking spaces?
 1. Jeff Tumlin. For income-restricted affordable units you can, if you like, also have the price of parking be pegged to income, which requires cross-subsidy; money to subsidize parking for low-income people has to come from somewhere else – increase rent for market-rate units, or decrease the amount of money spent elsewhere. A better question is if you have a limited resource to create opportunities for low-income people what's a better way to spend that money? Instead of parking, you could spend money on subsidized daycare; you should ask your target demographic group how they would want limited subsidy spent.
 3. In the projects that are unbundled, do the market-rate owners end up owning most of the parking?
 1. Jeff Tumlin. Not necessarily. Low-income households, particularly single mothers have some of the most complicated lives of all San Franciscans and place an extremely high value on their time; they are oftentimes the people that most need a car and want to drive because that means being able to spend more time with their families. While there is certainly a relationship between auto ownership and income, it is not a perfect relationship. Let individuals make choices because choosing to subsidize one thing takes away the ability to subsidize another.
- ii. Muehlbauer.
1. Presentation illustrates the many moving parts of the TDM. It gets complicated; there a lot of gears turning and a lot of variables. It's especially complicated to get the right mix for any particular development; that's our challenge here. As we get proposals from developers, how is a proposal hold up to this very complicated TDM analysis? How can you really tell, in looking at a proposal with a TDM with several pieces, is this the right mix here or is it guesswork?
 1. Jeff Tumlin. It's partly guesswork. People's lives are very complicated. We can predict some aspects of people's lives but we know we're going to get it wrong to a certain degree. I tend to recommend that when you're working on an RFP or planning a neighborhood to focus on outcomes. What are the desired outcomes? One outcome can be motor vehicle traffic generation; how much traffic generation would you accept

from a new development project? Then let the developer teams figure out how to achieve that goal. One outcome you may want is a certain housing affordability target or a range of demographics that you want to make sure can be accommodated. Can multigenerational households live in this new neighborhood? Can a family without a high income and three or four children live in this neighborhood? You can break these out and discuss the outcomes such as new services; expected contributions, new developments can produce new money. What's the priority list for new infrastructure or programs and then you can start discussing the trade-offs. You'll receive an array of different proposals; one may provide a lot of housing affordability but generate very little revenue for necessary infrastructure projects in the neighborhood. Another proposal may generate a lot of revenue but be mostly luxury housing that will generate a lot of traffic. There's no correct answer. Identify, clearly define, and articulate your values. Then describe the outcomes you want to achieve and prioritizing those outcomes makes it easier for the developer to give an effective response. To the extent that you're interested in outcomes, how will those outcomes be measured and what happens if the expected outcomes are not met. Some outcomes cannot be fixed, but others outcomes like traffic can be fixed through measures like on-going monitoring over time.

iii. Favetti.

1. Appreciate improving the walkway to Balboa Park.
2. There's a real generational gap between seniors and the millennials and I would like to have more information on that.
3. Seniors between the ages of 64 and 75, 1/3 are working full-time; that's going to be a changing demographic going forward and the kinds of jobs seem to be very highly mobile. I'm wondering if those kinds of things will be addressed.
4. Study presented on KCBS regarding lowering the usage of public transportation. Would like more information on that.
5. I'm concerned about the City College students, especially those that come at night and I don't know that we address those issues.
 1. Jeff Tumlin. We are collecting a lot of data particularly CCSF students.
6. I tried to use City Carshare at 5 AM and it was not a safe place to get a car.
7. Will you be doing more studies?
 1. Jeremy Shaw. The study hasn't started. Everything you asked about will be addressed.

8. We need to start addressing those issues now; it currently feels like something is missing.
- iv. Winston.
 1. Subsidizing neighborhood parking permits. Is there a way we could have a neighborhood parking permit program without the huge cost? It's something we need for the neighborhood, and it benefits everyone equally. I think people feel it's unfair to have to pay a lot to park in front of their house; although it is their property. Is there a happy medium?
 1. Jeff Tumlin. MTA neighborhood permit program is priced at cost recovery so the City is not really generating revenue; to my knowledge no exceptions to that in SF. Developers elsewhere have paid to subsidize the cost; this would be a challenging precedent to set. We can look at it but it will have implications. The cost is 50 cents a day for the permit.
 2. The class pass at SFSU and under consideration for CCSF. I think that the class passes for the students and clipper cards for residents should have cash on them not monthly passes, or at least the choice; if people have cash they will use it. Also they will be able to use them on Caltrain.
 1. Jeff Tumlin. The proposal at SFSU is Citywide MUNI access and a discount on BART. One reason not to put cash is to make them non-transferable. Pasadena City College and Santa Monica College are two other colleges with Universal Transit passes that are tremendously successful.
 3. Thinking about those who want to work in Mountain View or those that live in Palo Alto and want to commute to City College.
 1. Jeff Tumlin. Caltrain has a different fare system and is quite expensive. Looking for more data where students live; many are in San Mateo County. Also of the students at CCSF, how many need to commute to interesting job opportunities along the peninsula? There are several great jobs there
 4. We are expecting another 50,000 to 100,000 people in the City in the next couple years. If we build too much parking, we're going to end up with \$75,000 parking stalls that we can't do anything with.
 1. Favetti. We can create parklets.
 2. Jeff Tumlin. Returning to Mountain View, they are already recognizing that they have more parking than they will ever need. How to make sure parking is retrofittable when it is no longer needed. In the suburbs there's an 80% in parking demand over the life of buildings being built today.
 5. Should we include retrofitting in the parameters?
 1. Jeff Tumlin. Yes, this is already happening in San Francisco; in the Castro on 18th street residential garages were converted

into store fronts. We'll always have need for storing stuff especially in San Francisco. Yes, we should think about retrofitability.

v. Lee.

1. Broad theme of reducing vehicle miles traveled and congestion management.
2. I think there's a third component, because of public health issues cities are targeting alternative fuel strategies, especially for large-scale development. It's easier to put in infrastructure than retrofit.
3. Would shared electric parking be a part of the TDM.
 1. Jeff Tumlin. Usually a supply side issue, but it could be demand if there is a goal for improved air quality and CO2 reduction. Other than a requirement for a certain number of charging spaces, also making sure that the fleet become increasingly electrical there's a need to be able to quickly retrofit parking spaces so that all the spaces can be converted into electric vehicle spaces.
4. You can have spaces that are electric car ready.
 1. Jeff Tumlin. Resolving these issues now in the design standards can help avoid problems in the future.

vi. Davila.

1. At SFSU some students were adamantly opposed to being charged for the class pass because they have to drive from the east bay and will not benefit. I said wouldn't this make more space for you on the road. It's not a forgone conclusion that this is going to happen. I expect that this might happen here but we can learn from what's happening at SFSU.
2. Have a parking garage to accommodate the PAEC. A green parking garage with charging stations and bike parking, and with open space on top. I think that would have this more viable if we had some kind of parking structure.
3. Discussion in Mission Terrace, putting a lid on the freeway; for additional open space and parking spaces, which might alleviate some of the issues.
 1. Jeff Tumlin. We looked at it closely in 2000-2002. I own a car and I drive and I'm not suggesting that we should have no parking. We need to think closely about the cost of parking and its implications. In order for me to be able to drive here when I need it is likely cheaper to give everyone a free MUNI pass than to build an additional parking space for me. Parking is really expensive and if were to charge the full cost of providing that parking to motorists few people would drive. Parking less than \$25.00 a day, someone is paying for your parking. What's the right amount of parking to build given our objectives?

vii. Picar.

1. CCSF students I work with often ask about MUNI schedules, are there plans for putting up MUNI schedules?
 1. Jeff Tumlin. There are great transit apps on smartphones. But for folks who don't have smartphones we can look at other products, such as transit screens in the lobby of buildings. Sometimes you might have wind in your neighborhoods and it's sometimes nicer to wait in the lobby of your building and know exactly when you need to leave to get your bus on time.

viii. Spinali.

1. There's an elephant in the room. I think everyone would be in favor of taking public transit if it worked. If we can't get the transportation fixed then it doesn't work. We need to make sure we are well coordinated with MTA.
2. We're thinking about building housing in CCSF's neighborhood. CCSF is 80,000 students collectively, so we're going to add housing in their backyard. So we need to make sure we fully understand their needs; we need to understand everyone who is currently driving and parking; if we can understand the demographics, then we can better ensure that especially low-income students can matriculate and we don't want to prevent that.
 1. Jeff Tumlin. CCSF is more important than ever. Creating pads out of poverty. CCSF is geographically ideal due to its transit access. Helping CCSF thrive is personally important to me.
3. If we want to create economic prosperity for young people we need to be able to make sure they have access to locations with jobs. You also mentioned a lot of single parents that are students and you mentioned being able to take care of them.
 1. Jeff Tumlin. Yes, a lot of single mothers make up the student population at CCSF.
4. Can we think about working with MTA and CCSF to have more busses at certain times? Knowing what we know about the data can we create schedules around class times?
5. How does the TDM run in parallel with the CAC process?
 1. Mike Martin. It's along the lines of what we have been talking about. Where we are long the RFP process is developing the very first step to having a detailed conversation of the Balboa Reservoir Project. The idea is to start the conversation with the right set of parameters. TDM recommendations come in during the negotiation phase with the developer. This is a long process. We will then go into the CEQA process which now focuses on vehicle miles travelled. We will be ready to step into those processes with the right thinking to be able to craft an

idea. We're not tasking the RFP with answering all the question; it's posing them.

6. How does what we know to date get integrated into the principles to be strategic as opposed to the long-term studies? By the time we get to the end of the process, based upon what we know and what we discover we want to make sure that's integrated.
 1. Mike Martin. The RFP and the proposal are a starting place. The recommendations will mold what we get from the developer and what the choices are that will manage all the things were discussed today. The TDM recommendations won't come out until after the RFP is issued, hopefully.
7. Under the parking spaces we have it at 0.5 and different sized units would have different ratios. Is that enough? Are we putting enough there there?
 1. Mike Martin. You put enough there there so the developer knows these are items that are important to the community. They come back with their best guess with the mix of units, size wise. We talked about the spectrum with family units that need parking and there may also be student units which wouldn't need parking. I think to try and micromanage where you are on the spectrum before the developer is able to show you what they envision based on the parameters is a fruitless exercise.
8. I get that we don't want to drill down too specifically because they have to have the leeway to figure it out. It's more do we have the best thinking in place with the parameter thus far? We'll think about it when we come to the principle.
 1. Jeremy Shaw. One thing Jeff mentioned are performance measures or outcomes. One of those, the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), is already part of principle 2. With regards to best thinking, the City has initiated a Citywide TDM programs that's very robust and encompasses a lot of what Jeff talked about and that thinking is reflected in the parameters. The first piece of the TDM plan is a robust employee and student survey, which we are ready to go with.
9. I want to know more about how you're going to get to those students. I want a survey on an iPad and incentives. I want to make sure the surveys are easily accessible.
 1. Jeremy Shaw. We can show you the plan and we have positions staked out.
10. I think that would be important to share because a lot of people here are CCSF connected.

e. Public Comment

- i. Linda Judge. Westwood Park.

1. Overall we are concerned about replacement parking for CCSF. How much, where, and who pays for it?
 2. Second concern what's the baseline now. Identify what is. How does that compare to what a development on the site might bring?
 3. Specific to Jeff Tumlin, how long will the study take, and when will it be published?
 4. Do you have data on how Uber and Lyft increase congestion in this area?
 5. Agree with Lisa and others, seems key to have CCSF data on the students to identify how many commute, how many are single parents, and how many are working students?
 6. Jeff Tumlin: Can your firm run sensitivity analysis for the CAC members. If you go up on parking, how does it affect traffic congestion?
- ii. Ike. Sunnyside.
1. Question on TDM principles and automobile mode share. I see there's a proposed 60% automobile mode share. Is there information that can be shared with the community about what would be an appropriate benchmark?
 2. We want to mitigate the negative impact of automobiles. What are other examples of automobile mode share programs we should be considering for this project?
 3. Have an automobile mode share program doesn't seem like the right direction for this project.
- iii. Yonathan Randolph. Ingleside.
1. When I was growing up my family did not have a car. One of the wonderful things about San Francisco is that you can grow up without a lot of income and be mobile without a car.
 2. That is something that is unique about this City versus other cities.
 3. I know a lot of people cherish living in the suburban-like northside of Ocean Avenue.
 4. Many want to live in an urban environment. There's an overwhelming desire to live an urban lifestyle. We need to plan for that by providing more urban housing over the next generation.
 5. Using some of the tools that were presented we can limit the number of cars/traffic without limiting the number of people living here.
 6. A lot of people have objections to traffic and loss of parking but there are ways are ways of limiting the number of cars without limiting the number of people.
- iv. Chris Hansen. Excelsior.
1. Neighborhood permits, there was a reference to CCSF spill over.
 2. I didn't like that phrasing that the students are referred to as spill over.

3. Describe specifically in your principles and parameters, say existing CCSF parking. I don't see it anywhere. I think that specific phrase should be mentioned.
 4. San Francisco is the hub of 3 freeways. To get to San Rafael from Pacifica you have to across city streets. I don't see this ever considered in any studies.
 5. I have a hard time conceiving trend is towards fewer cars because most of the new car sales went up 11%.
 6. We don't want to do this without data. I think as much data and as transparent a process on how the data is collected.
- v. Madeleine Mueller. Faculty, CCSF.
1. I want to mention that the emphasis is on walking. 25,000 to 30,000 students walking to CCSF is not possible.
 2. It's not easy to get to CCSF, there's a lot of verticality and a lot of hills.
 3. The public system is okay, but they are packed.
 4. We did this kind of research 30 years ago and we had the same issue. 50% of our students were taking public transit; if you put multiple thousands on, yes, we need better public transit.
 5. It's expensive to build parking but it's even more expensive for the college to shut down.
 6. We've had parking there since the college was established.
 7. I have documents showing housing for CCSF.
- vi. Anita Theoharis. Westwood Park.
1. Six months ago the SF Business Times sponsored a seminar in Redwood Shores for real estate professionals. Current trends now indicated millennials are staying here for 5 to 6 years, getting married and having kids here. This should be considered when the actual report is done.
 2. Strongly urge a really hard look at CCSF. Really need a count on how many students live outside of San Francisco. How many are evening students? How many parents are going to school here?
 3. There are many that cannot afford a four-year university that have to go to CCSF.
- vii. Carol Ito. Westwood Park.
1. Reinforce Kate Favetti. Hard project where millennials would like to live in the future.
 2. We are seeing many moving new families moving into our neighborhood.
 3. Many perhaps want to live in the City and possibly they'll want to drive.
 4. Speakers to seniors, we are working longer as we are living longer; I will probably still need my car even if I were to downsize to a studio if I still was choosing to work.

5. I'm a percentage of people that will continue to work and will need a car.
- viii. Bob Burn. Sunnyside.
1. Trying to find parking on my narrow street is becoming more difficult. I have the luxury of a driveway but oftentimes there are cars parked on the edges of my driveway that prevent me from pulling in or pulling out.
 2. I'm a senior citizen and still work in San Mateo; parking and driving are a necessity for me not a luxury. My commute takes me on Phelan between Phelan and Judson and I've been stuck for as long as 15 minutes.
 3. Let's fix the problems we have now before we create a greater one.
 4. Provide sufficient parking so that people who want to drive can park, and fix the problem on Phelan so people can get where they need to go.
- ix. Muriel Paranteau. Faculty, CCSF.
1. I need a podium to put a hand on.
 2. We can't project into the future, but I can tell you that the population of disabled people in San Francisco will go up.
 3. We need to factor in the students, seniors, and community-members with disabilities.
 4. Student with disabilities that cannot take public transit and do not qualify for paratransit must drive.
 5. Not everyone can walk, take public transit, or ride a bike.
 6. I took the 43-Masonic for 20 years and it's a disaster.
 7. The lift on public transit breaks 75% of the time.
 8. Until we fix public transit any other plan sounds crazy.
 9. If you give someone a parking space and they don't use it, you rent the space.
- x. Jennifer Heggie. Sunnyside.
1. This neighborhood is made up of several educational institutions.
 2. Do you have examples of other neighborhoods where you draw your expertise?
 3. I'm concerned about not having the data, and it would be helpful to have the data before moving forward with the RFP.
 4. Thank you Rebecca for incorporation of electrical infrastructure for parking.
- xi. Cory Smith.
1. My generation that hates traffic congestion and looking for parking.
 2. The idea of Lyft and Uber, and the ride-share model will continue into the future.
 3. Some developments downtown are looking at loading zones in front of buildings; I think that will be the trend going forward.

4. At a conference with Oakland Mayor Libby Schaaf. She discussed development for future cities moving away from roads. Her thought is forward-thinking getting away from one person and one car.
5. Gif out of Seattle, what 40 people look like in 40 cars versus on one bus versus on one rail; efficiency in moving people around.
- 6.

4. Close of Meeting.

- a. Spinali.
 - i. We got lots of feedback and it will be a great study.
 - ii. Ensure great transparency.
 - iii. If the CCSF study is done let's post that.
 - iv. If we can take the same spirit in the process with the principles that would be helpful. Walking the talk of good community engagement.
 - v. Transportation Parameters will be discussed at a future meeting. We will be back with dates.

5. Adjournment.