

**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, May 23, 2016**

6:15 PM

Special 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-050916 available via the following link: www.sf-planning.org/brcac

Committee Members Present:

Brigitte Davila, Kate Favetti, Christine Godinez, Maria Picar, Lisa Spinali, Jon Winston

Committee Members Absent:

Howard Chung; Robert Muehlbauer; Rebecca Lee

Staff/Consultants Present:

Jeremy Shaw, Sue Exline, Planning Department; Emily Lesk, Mike Martin, Phillip Wong, Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Carli Paine, SFMTA; Martin Gran, Christopher J. Wong, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission; Jen Low, Supervisor Norman Yee, Office of D7 Supervisor Norman Yee; Beth Rubenstein, Office of D11 Supervisor John Avalos

1. Call to Order and Roll Call.

- a. Roll Call

2. Opening of Meeting.

3. Parameters Regarding Project's Relationship with City College.

a. CAC Comment.

i. Davila.

1. Based on this two other trustees and I drafted a resolution, which we will be presenting at a meeting of the Board of Trustees; the Board of Trustees has to approve everything and some of the parameters don't reference that, and maybe that can be layered.
2. New Principle 4, with CCSF and the master-planning consultant; that ultimately comes through us; clean up that language.
 1. Emily Lesk. The resolution is posted online on the Board of Trustees website.
 2. Spinali. Post a link to the resolution.
3. We are presenting the resolution on Thursday 5/26.

ii. Favetti.

1. 3.b. Related to parking and traffic. Westwood Park wants this settled before inclusion in parameters.
 1. Emily Lesk. Yes, it would be appropriate to include before project approvals.
2. Prior to the development of the Balboa Reservoir the TDM strategies would be finalized and ready for implementation.

iii. Winston.

1. Agree with Kate that it has to all be settled and we can't think straight until the TDM is done as it applies to CCSF or anywhere.

b. Public Comment.

i. Aaron Goodman. District 11.

1. We have no idea how traffic will flow with increased enrollment. There's a precedent with SFSU; students end up parking in the neighborhood which is a huge impact.
2. Principle 2. Getting this stuff done prior to development, e.g. walkways and pathways. Getting from the site to Balboa Park Station BART.
3. Submitting written documents along with comments regarding CCSF and transportation comments. Available online at www.sf-planning.com/brcac

ii. Laura Fry. Westwood Park.

1. There's no talking about the fact that this is displacing a lot of CCSF parking; there should be some talk about replacement parking.
2. Shared parking does not address issue of replacement parking.
3. At least a certain number of parking spaces will be for CCSF, should be noted in the RFP.

iii. Francine Lofrano. Westwood Park.

1. 1.a. Do not develop the Balboa Reservoir or SFPUC property without explicit CCSF agreement; the way it is written makes it seem like CCSF needs to have an agreement with itself.
 1. Mike Martin. This language stemmed from people looking at the AECOM study that showed access roads through the PAEC. We have not proposed to build on CCSF property. We want to be clear that anything that we did do would be subject to an explicit agreement with the CCSF Board of Trustees, which is why it refers to CCSF needing explicit approval of anything being built on CCSF land; separate from SFPUC approvals.
- iv. Harry Bernstein. District 11.
 1. 4.b. Local resident informed me more about TDM. It deals with mitigation for parking?
 1. Spinali. We'll talk about this during the next agenda item. The TDM study is to understand transit needs for the surrounding area. It is not as narrowly defined as originally presented.
 2. When that is resolved when will it be made available?
 1. Spinali. TDM is a large study that's being worked on so the language in that principle is to ensure the PAEC will be involved in that study, ensuring there's enough parking.
 3. The original AECOM study, Planning asked the analysis not to analyze the parking impacts to the surrounding area.
 1. Spinali. The trouble is if you don't come to every meeting, makes it a little more complicated because we talk about them here and the conversation has shifted. The AECOM was done by a consultant, not by the planning department, and things have evolved. We'll try to identify ways to bring Alvin up to speed.
- v. Hedda Thieme. Westwood Park.
 1. Principle 4. The attitude of Mayor Lee is to elevate the population of San Francisco to approximately 800,000 that means 100,000 people more. Don't they also need parking at CCSF and education? Are we including the future growth of the population?
- vi. Madeleine Mueller. CCSF.
 1. 3.b. Underlying misunderstanding of CCSF, talking about sharing parking. Garages with the same spaces will be used by residents during nights and weekends and accessible to students and faculty during weekdays. This is a bad misunderstanding of the enrollment. We have been told by administration not to cut evening courses, they are vital to the residents of San Francisco. It's a very active night.
 2. Bring your night school enrollment and offerings back up.
 3. Don't have the typical 18-24 year-old day student group living at home. We are a very big night school program.

1. Spinali. We understand our CCSF student population. We understand it's about diversity and knowing our students are older and are single mothers. If you look at sentence 3.b. The first sentence is the main sentence. The secondary piece starts with the word "if", which means exploring the possibility that if there's an opportunity to use a parking space to create shared parking then a CCSF student and resident could use it. Don't think about it as just adding parking structures for residents and one for CCSF, we're looking for overlap.
4. Clean up the stuff in parenthesis. It seems to switch in parentheses.
- vii. Davila.
 1. The TDM is going to be key here. We don't know what is going to go on until we have the completed study.
- viii. Favetti.
 1. I'm concerned that there was public comment from Westwood Park. I want to make sure people understand there has been a revision to the revised parameters, and that is the TDM will be completed with implementation prior to any development at Balboa Park. Not prior to the RFP but prior to the development.
- ix. Jennifer Heggie. Sunnyside.
 1. Recipient of CCSF master survey. In the survey, they asked about participant's level of comfort through many modes of transit on a scale of 1 to 5. They did not include public transit. Information on participants experience on public transit could have been enlightening and helpful. Perhaps it was covered in another survey.
- x. Spinali.
 1. Cleaning up the language around 3.b. to not it have it be so pigeon-holed that it's not about weekends and non-peak hours for residents and students, a shared opportunity might be a way to say that and not be that specific.
 2. Also include prior to development TDM and parking plan will be finalized.
 3. Principal 4. CCSF master plan is subject to Board of Trustees approval.
- c. Consensus – *see chart attached to this document*
 - i. Winston – 5
 - ii. Favetti – 2
 - iii. Godinez – 4
 - iv. Picar – 4
 - v. Davila – 3
 - vi. Spinali – 4
 - vii. Consensus reached with revisions to principles and parameters.

4. Transportation Parameter Revisions.

- a. Jeremy Shaw TDM Presentation – ***see PDF presentation online at www.sf-planning.org/brcac***
- b. Clarifying Questions.
 - i. Winston.
 - 1. The RFP is basically aspirational. RFPs are generally not this detailed. The idea is to find out what the community wants, what the CAC is using to find consensus. Then the real fun begins with the developer. It's not the be all and end all when the RFP is issued.
 - 1. Jeremy Shaw. It really is just the beginning.
 - ii. Spinali. TDM Understanding, what's the floor of what the understanding is going to be?
 - 1. Jeremy Shaw. The idea is that the developer needs to demonstrate a mastery of TDM. And we need to have confidence they have that knowledge. The RFP has a lot of guidance and to some degree has more detail than a typical RFP would. So the developer respondents have a lot of direction but we don't know what the development program is, so when they propose a development program (e.g. open space, housing type) they need to show they know what TDM is and what will work with the type of housing and development and if they don't jive that's a red flag.
 - iii. Aaron Goodman.
 - 1. Question about a map, limited to study area. We are trying to create networks to improve systems, so you can't complete this in isolation. It seems like you're not including people walking to the station or to the area. So we should include people down here.
 - 1. Jeremy Shaw. I agree with both points. We have practical limitations to how far we can extend the boundaries. But just because it's not shown on the map, access to Balboa Park station is indeed on the City's agenda. Robert Muehlbauer is helping us improve pedestrian access at San Jose and Geneva, and there are a number of BART and MUNI lighting, ADA, and other pedestrian access improvements being considered. Unfortunately this study cannot do everything, but the consultants are aware and will be including as much as they can.
 - iv. Favetti.
 - 1. How are you coordinating with other organizations within the community with regard to Ocean Avenue and the TDM? I was at a meeting that there isn't coordination with other organizations.
 - 1. Jeremy Shaw. We've heard comments to that effect. My view is that since this CAC process has begun the amount of coordination has grown. Just as a couple of examples, Robert Muehlbauer, he's on this CAC and the Balboa Park Station CAC, and I maintain daily communication with MTA. In regards to

Ocean Avenue, Public Works and Planning carried out a streetscape improvement process, the Planning piece of it was initiated two years ago and Public Works is finally implementing. The other piece of Ocean Avenue I'm working on with the County Transportation Authority in coordination with the Ocean Avenue Association. There is a fair amount of communication.

v. Jennifer Heggie.

1. This seems like a big step. Does this mean that if down the road there needs to be a major change because of the results of the TDM we can do that? Can there be major changes to the RFP/development if the TDM is completed before the RFP?

1. Jeremy Shaw. Yes is the short answer. The neighborhood wide TDM plan will be completed this year, far behind any development plan for the site. Probably before community design workshops. There's going to be a lot of design and assessing after the TDM is completed.
2. Spinali. Although I'm no expert, it seems like the draft parameters is to give a general idea of what can happen on the site to see who's interested. You need someone who wants to do work with sustainability, with different types of affordability, parks, retail, and various other items. The reality is this is just a general idea. A developer has to be interested or would avoid it because of all the detail already set. This is a general framework. We're building housing with parking and something that's unifying for the neighborhood. Then a developer can create a compelling proposal and then we can dig into the details with the TDM being completed and having a clearer idea of what should happen. Full enrollment won't come into play with the principles, that will happen when we have all the data and from there it will be clear what can and cannot be built. I think the notion is that the community design process is a very malleable phase where a lot can change. A lot of work is going to continue as part of the next piece.

c. CAC Comment

i. Winston.

1. I think it's a really good document. It brings up a lot of thoughts that will come up during the community design process.
2. For instance, transit isn't really discussed here, but maybe because it doesn't have anything to do with this area.
3. I think we need more than frequency of the 43. I think MUNI really needs to do some planning around this. They are good at service planning but not land use planning; we need to help them. There has to be improved access to the site, public transit, and CCSF.

4. Access to clipper cards for residents and students. There are a lot of things pending the TDM to improve bicycling. I ride a bike but I'm intimidated by this intersection (Ocean @ Phelan). Create more access for alternative transportation should be part of the plan.
 5. We already have a car share pod, but with the development we could probably use a bit more.
 6. Bike share is growing and will be doubling in size, and we need a chute that comes out to the BART station. 2 or three on the site and on CCSF would do a lot to reduce car usage.
 7. Walking – we're working on implementing the new streetscape designs for Ocean Avenue, but walking to BART – BART is not on the TDM list – has no dignity; it shouldn't feel like that to walk to BART.
 8. If everyone brings a car per unit or 2 cars per unit, we're screwed. We need to make the walk to BART friendlier; wider sidewalks and maybe some trees. Reconfiguring of this interstation to allow bikes through.
 9. Crosswalks to be more efficient. If you want to get to the BART station, you have to cross twice to get there.
 10. Parking – I like the idea of decoupling parking from the rent, so that you can choose to get parking by paying extra. I think a lot of people will choose not to because they'll have great access to MUNI and BART and other amenities. But it leaves the option open for those that want a parking spot.
 11. Jeff Tumlin mentioned that parking is very expensive and it takes up a lot of space.
 12. \$75,000 per parking spot – Tiffany Gardens at Mission and 30th. If we built one to one parking, we'd be talking 22 to 36 million dollars.
 13. That money and space could be used for more and better housing, open space, amenities, and wouldn't be generating the traffic that we just can't have in this neighborhood. Is this possible?
 14. This is happening all over the city; 22 Franklin, no parking.
 15. The Octavia Area Plan calls for 1:4 parking ratio. To get more parking you have to get a variance.
 16. At 1110, Mercy Housing, 72 units, 4 parking spots for deliveries; it happens, it can be done, and it's functioning.
 17. I strongly advocate for the 0.5:1 ratio; 1 parking spot for 2 units. I would like to see it go lower but it's a compromise. To plan is human, to implement is divine. There has to be fail safe such that if things go wrong they can be straightened out.
- ii. Spinali reading Robert Muehlbauer's written statement. *Attached to this document.*
 - iii. Favetti.
 1. Reiterating Robert Muehlbauer, coming back from BART is difficult and I do it on a regular basis; it could be so much better.

2. I want to thank the Planning department re: off hour use and recognizing commuters in 3.d. Synergy in being able to utilize parking for individuals who want to commute on BART.
 3. Serious concern for those in Westwood Park; they have a great support for CCSF.
 4. We can't go forward without a plan for replacement parking; it's in direct conflict with our primary principles. We must have a larger planned transportation infrastructure that must be planned, funded and implemented before any development can be started. That must be a component of any parameter we have.
 5. For the people that are paying for market-rate housing, are they going to want to have zero parking?
 6. We need to explicitly and specifically address special communities (i.e. seniors, families, the disabled, and others that cannot use other modes of transit)
 7. The principle parameter that Westwood Park wants addressed is a 1:1 parking ratio absolutely; more than 90% of survey respondents.
 8. Direct conflict with 2.a. and 3.b. for Westwood Park.
 9. Appreciate there has been some movement as far as recognizing the public comment that has been submitted.
 10. If we have a consensus vote tonight, I would have to say this is a no go on transportation.
- iv. Godinez.
1. I use public transportation very regularly, I BART every day.
 2. I would drive if I could, but traffic is so bad.
 3. Public Transportation is expensive.
 4. Driving is cheaper.
 5. Oftentimes it takes longer to use public transportation than to drive. Time is money. This is why I will often choose to drive.
 6. A lot of students fall in lower socioeconomic backgrounds; if we lose all these parking spots what will happen to them?
- v. Picar.
1. I live in the neighborhood and I walk to BART all the time and I went to CCSF and it's really hard to walk from CCSF and Ocean to BART.
 2. Lighting is a big issue; walking is scary because the lighting is not feasible for a lot of people.
- vi. Davila.
1. I take public transit a lot and I understand the cost.
 2. You can get stuff done on public transit that you can't do while driving.
 3. I walked here today. I live near Santa Rosa and San Jose; it's an okay walk, its worse to come up San Jose towards Ocean.
 4. I used to try to ride my bike to work, but it's dangerous. Cars come speeding up.

5. We haven't acknowledged the lack of planning that has created the current situation. It has grown and added here and there.
6. CCSF's master plan is looking to have a new face on Ocean Avenue and reconfiguring how it looks to everyone.
7. I'm looking at a holistic view, whether advocating for bikes or cars is not easy.
8. We have to understand CCSF's needs, especially given our anticipated enrollment growth, and the night classes.
9. The Balboa Park BART station and changes coming there should be configured with our master plan and Balboa Reservoir; we have a tall order.
10. I don't see how we can have a 1:1 parking ratio with what we need to do here. Maybe there's a mechanical way, but I don't see how it can happen.
11. I want to make sure we have parking for all the students that need to park and the families, seniors, and disabled.
12. There's no way to keep doing what we're already doing.
13. Residents of Sunnyside and Westwood Park know how bad congestion is. I hope we do something innovative to access amenities at CCSF and public transit. If we have less cars maybe we can cut right through to where we need to go.
14. We really need to take all of these things into account.
15. We can't go on in the way we have been.

vii. Spinali.

1. We've done a better job in other parts of the City to make streets more community oriented (e.g. Valencia).
2. If you were doing a count of the number of people that walk to BART it would probably be a large percentage, and there would be an inverse relationship with the quality of the walking experience.
3. Could you have a sustainable trolley, or solar powered driverless car?
4. Turn this into something more useful instead of as an off-ramp extension of a freeway. The principle needs to underscore that.
5. I think that it would be a disservice to the new residents to not have something that is vital for everyone.
6. I'm of two minds – aspirational and pragmatic; aspirational me wants to go to 0.5:1 parking ratio, but pragmatic me says when they find out it's going to cost them an extra \$10,000 a year for parking, they're going to keep their cars they're going to park in the street. How do we get that balance?
7. How do we figure out the right ratio that gets us to be able to attract middle class families that will need one car and not have them park in the street?
8. I don't think that we can use this project as the petri dish.

9. If it doesn't work we're going to have huge impacts to traffic and congestion.
10. What if we learn something and do we have time to change? That's great during the early stages but once things are built there's going to be a lot less wiggle room.
11. Thinking about the future of CCSF and growing it back to its full enrollment as it supports many people in the region. There's land that's part of the CCSF site, there was a parking structure considered in an older plan. What's the relationship of CCSF owning it's parking requirement for its student separate from it being on Balboa Reservoir but the site overall. I'm not sure what the cooperative relationship looks like, but I think that also gets added.

d. Public Comment.

i. Madeleine Mueller. CCSF.

1. Fix 3.c. the parenthetical.
2. We did the land swap in 1991 and after this similar issue. *Document submitted and attached here.*
3. When I started here, I learned the school is positioned the way it is to welcome folks from the Pacific Rim into San Francisco. The welcoming is to the world.
4. It's a nice vision that San Francisco welcomes the world.
5. We are the only really college of this town, and unfortunately for the neighbors that's why we need the PAEC.
6. We have the largest institution in the state of California in the middle, and it's not true of any other institution in San Francisco.
7. We are the most crowded campus around.
8. We can have two entrances coming off of BART, but I would hate to lose the lovely building when you come from Ocean Avenue as a lovely welcoming to the rest of the world.

ii. Laura Fry. Westwood Park.

1. Mechanical lifts for cars, Ocean and Miramar has a two-story garage there are elevators for cars.
2. My impression of CCSF is that when I was attending CCSF I didn't use a car, there was a lot of variety.
3. I wasn't a single parent, I was working, but it was still difficult. I can't imagine having kids or having to take care of an elder and have to take the bus and attend. It would be impossible.
4. 3.b. I think having a maximum of 0.5:1 parking ratio is bad; change it to a 1:1 parking ratio. The way the sentence is set up with family unit only being allowed 1 parking space and 1 to 4 for student units, it doesn't talk about all the types of units in between that. The way it's written it could end up being 0.15:1 or 0.2:1 parking ratio per the ratio of family units to other unit types.

iii. Hedda Thieme. Westwood Park.

1. I'm a walker, I have never owned a car and I'm still alive.
 2. I come from a country where we have neighborhoods with no cars.
 3. People park in the reservoir and leave in the evening similar to a funeral procession. If you live without a car or if you're financially not able to afford a car or its maintenance, give the people an opportunity to save. A car cost more than \$3000.00 a year to maintain.
 4. Why should we not be avant garde in San Francisco like other European cities?
 5. If you want to include old people and people with children you can't put stops 200 yards apart. It does not work. This has happened over the last 5 years.
 6. Those who are rearranging stops are the ones who do not walk and who do not take public transportation. They could not care less if I have to walk for a stop and a half.
 7. When you buy new buses they need shock absorbers because it's hard to ride for those with back problems.
- iv. Francine Lofrano. Westwood Park.
1. I feel unbundling will create a situation wherein car owners will opt to save money and park their cars in the neighborhoods; I don't think unbundling is a good idea.
 2. As far as CCSF, we need to preserve parking for them and especially for those in evening classes. When I took evening classes I drove because it was safer.
 3. This side of the City is kind of a suburban area.
 4. This is not a destination like downtown where everything is at your fingertips, so people want cars to drive somewhere else.
 5. There's not that much shopping here at this point. If you're going to do a lot of shopping you're going to take your car, not the bus.
 6. A lot of talk on millennials, well I'm a part of the baby boomer generation and it's a huge step back. I have an aging mother and there's no way I could take her on a bus.
 7. People with kids need cars because they are on a fast track schedule.
 8. Public transit is too expensive and it takes too long.
 9. CCSF enrollment levels increasing will create more traffic.
 10. Someone should write to MUNI to increase safety, I have seen and experienced many issues on the 43 and on the K-Ingleside. No one is going to want to ride the bus when you're getting attacked.
- v. Aaron Goodman. District 11.
1. Agree with Robert Muehlbauer's letter and comments; a lot of positive ideas.
 2. I hope we have more experts on the overall concept.
 3. People tend to focus on the two sites here and forget all the other things here.

4. Connectivity and bridging aspect is important; the Bridge serves a function.
 5. There's ways of developing solutions regarding parking and creating access and connectivity.
 6. Principle 2. Improve the experience of accessing and utilizing; this will help people prioritize using their feet and not using their cars. You need to provide them with something they want to go to (e.g. the Highline in New York City).
 7. In the principles, 60% automobile mode share, this sounded alarms for me; City is looking at other options for car share or getting federal or state grants.
 8. This is not a petri dish. This is a dense urban City with a lot of congestion and a lot of problems. How do we solve it? We don't just implement small solutions. We need to address the community concerns not just the business concerns.
- vi. Corey Smith. SFHAC.
1. First time I came to a meeting I took BART with a colleague and I was going to take a Lyft and my colleague was going to take BART, but they opted not to because it was too late to be traveling on BART alone.
 2. I like how the City pointed out different ratios for different units, where students are different from two or three units; there are different needs there. I hope students won't be taking cars.
 3. A 1:1 parking ratio across the City is very excessive; it's really expensive and means there are more cars. We're not seeing 1:1 parking ratios around the City.
- vii. Jennifer Heggie. Sunnyside.
1. The many changes and revisions to the parameters and the responses to questions demonstrate our comments have been considered and incorporated. Thank you.
 2. One area of concern is in the Q&A document on page 5 around queueing on Phelan. Much of the signalization is around improving pedestrian and bicycle activity, it is not SFMTA's plan to revert bike and pedestrian safety measures. However, some congestion could be alleviated by removing street parking to add turn pockets/ turn lanes.
 3. If a dedicated bike lane is incorporated in the Balboa Reservoir in the RFP, why can't the bike lane on Phelan be returned to a traffic lane? An extra lane of traffic could be used to augment the existing lane in the direction of greatest congestion similar to other traffic minimizing efforts in the Bay Area.
 4. Request the City to keep the option available of providing an additional lane to handle expected future increased congestion.
 5. 2.e. If Lee Avenue is going to have a dedicated bike lane; please ensure there's some signal to warn cyclists that are entering an area with trucks and other motor vehicles.

viii. Ray Kutz. Sunnyside.

1. You definitely laid out that this is a complex problem.
2. This is a very complex problem. There are so many issues at stake here. CCSF is a major one.
3. We need to plan around its peak enrollment, not what it is today.
4. I pray the TDM study is going to look at what we have today instead of assuming another 30 percent or more in the future.
5. I support Robert Muehlbauer's comment; figure another vision for this area.
6. People from other parts of the City want to come here, how do we deal with that?
7. I see this document and it's full of aspirations.
8. How do we balance aspirational versus pragmatic?
9. I could do without a car, but I have one so I'll use it. It's cheaper on a per trip basis. But for the life of the car it's more expensive. That's where you have to make a shift in mindset, but that's because I grew up with a car.
10. I have lived in areas with less than a 1:1 parking ratio; my first place of dwelling in San Francisco didn't have parking so I worked it out; I did without until I needed one. It can happen, but it's not easy; it's what people are used to.
11. We talk a lot about infrastructure but we don't talk about those services people need and need access to easily and immediately in the neighborhood.
12. SFUSD uses a lottery system; you don't know if your kid will be send clear across town. How do I get my kid to school? It's not a bus service. There are other issues facing families that we have to deal with.

ix. Harry Bernstein. District 11.

1. In the box, on page 1, my comment earlier was about the nature of the TDM strategy, my understanding was it was a way of controlling or mitigating rather than assessing what the true needs are; I see yet again the intent of the Balboa Area TDM plan is to study the area cohesively in order to minimize transportation plan impacts from a Balboa Reservoir development. I don't see how that follows up with what you said about the TDM not being about too many negatives.
 1. Spinali. Think about it having two components.
 2. In order to minimize transportation demand impacts, that's the final outcome. But to minimize those impacts you have to understand all of the different pieces going into it to form recommendations to optimize the final program of how many housing units, how big the park is, and all the other components. The outcome is to minimize the impact of congestion of cars, but you need to understand the inputs first. This is really the outcome of the TDM overall, that is minimizing

the amount of impact from the development. In order to do that we have to understand all the variables going into it. We're not going into it with the mindset saying we're going to give everyone red zones and everyone a car. You have to understand the variables, this is what it looks like and we need to provide this many cars to CCSF students and we need to do these types of programs to create incentives to use bicycles; expanding the existing bicycle program.

3. The idea is to ensure that the program surrounding the site is taking into consideration all the current demands and minimize the future demands based on what we know what is the current state plus the additional enrollment and the number of units that will be developed.
4. Do you think there's better language we could use?
2. I don't understand the process, I'll have to see what we find the process of this analysis is, that it covers everything and is cohesive. There's something I read about that there was a measure at the state level allow developers to be removed from local planning controls if they provide a minimum amount of low-cost housing as low as 5%.
 1. Mike Martin. There are a couple pieces of legislation being talking about. One is known as "as-of-right" zoning, so if you propose a housing project in zoning for housing and you provide a certain percentage of affordable housing you get to have a more streamlined approval process. The other is a density bonus. Neither of these apply to this site because this site is currently zoned "public" not for housing. So you're going to see a lot of reporting on those two items and you're going to say, "all that stuff about process is not going to happen?" I want to make it clear that does not apply to this site.
- e. City Response.
 - i. Mike Martin.
 1. Kate Favetti, in your comments you referenced two of the parameters in particular you found troubling: 2.a. and 3.b. Can you explain what about 2.a. is part of that comment? 3.b. I assume is about parking.
 1. Favetti. It was about 60% automobile mode share.
 2. Auto-mode share is the share of total trips that are made by a private automobile; it's not car share it's not saying that we're going to add 60% car share. It means we're going to try to get 40% of these trips to not be car trips for the people at the project.
 3. 60% is too high?
 1. Spinali. They will drive more.
 4. The auto mode share will be higher? So it's too low.
 1. Favetti. Yes, it's too low.

5. This parameter is meant to address what we're talking about the petri dish; so we want a target for how much people will drive, and we've heard all this anecdotal evidence about the need to drive. We need to make it so that people that need to drive can drive, but to improve congestion we need to find a way for those that don't need to drive other ways to go. We're saying this target is 60% of trips are cars and we're going to find other ways for the 40% for the people that can do other ways. The parameter also says we're going to monitor that. And if it's not hitting that, we're going to change what we're doing to get to that target; it's not going to work in a petri dish.
6. I'm asking this question because it seems like what you're asking is the opposite of what you and your constituency wants to see happen.
 1. Favetti. Add clarifying definition to auto mode share
7. I just want to make sure what I said makes sense.
 1. Laura Fry, Audience. You're saying maximum 60% car trips and 40% non-car trips. So if you're for parking you're for a higher percentage of car trips, like 80%?
 2. Spinali. I'm a resident I take 10 trips, 6 trips are by car, and 4 are not car.
 3. Mike Martin. Correct.
8. To Laura's comment if you're for parking. Setting the car trip target higher means more cars on your roads.
 1. Laura Fry. It's not setting the goal, the reality is the City might not be able to follow through with making up that 40%. If you build what you build and it really is an 80% 20% mode share will the City come forward and say we need to get more buses or more whatever to make it 40%. Will the City follow through?
 2. Carli Paine, SFMTA.
 1. If it's 80% car trips the City is going to have a hard time following through with the roadway capacity to carry those cars. If we are saying 80% of all trips are driving trips, the things we are hearing from the community on traffic congestion, they are only going to get worse.
 2. In no reality it doesn't get better if we are supporting more driving. Even if we make fixes in the short term to add more throughput that quickly gets consumed by latent demand, e.g. people who are leaving for somewhere and decide to take the bus so traffic runs more smoothly.
 3. Taking away a bike lane for a lane of traffic helps, but then after 3 years you return to the slowness and congestion and now you don't have the bike lane and you lost that option.

4. The City and multiple agencies collaborated to collect data at sites and neighborhoods throughout the City, looking at the relationship between providing parking on-site and the number of car trips.
5. What we found that, this is true for residential and non-residential and it's true throughout the City, when people have dedicated parking on-site they are more likely to drive by a great amount.
6. In fact, people without dedicated parking on-site are about half or 50% less likely to make car trips. This research has been amplified by other findings across the nation that not only finds a relationship but a causality between providing parking on-site and choosing to drive, that doesn't mean the City is saying we have a transit first policy so no one has access to parking, but it obligates us to seriously consider how much parking to provide for people understanding that it does induce additional car trips.
7. Another suggestion is that if someone doesn't have parking on-site then they'll park in our neighborhood. That's a valid suggestion. But there are some policy actions such as residential parking permits, or saying people from this site would not be eligible for residential parking permits in the neighboring areas.
 1. Spinali. What you're saying makes it sound like our comments are falling on deaf ears. Not to be disrespectful. There are challenges here with the neighborhoods historically suburban nature, and the fact that because of the five schools in the neighborhood, a lot of people have to drive as teachers and park on the streets. So we know that anything we do will increase what already exists. I think there was a flippant response from Jeff Tumlin that says put in neighborhood parking and get permits, but its pockets that experience this so now it's something people have to pay for that wasn't paid for before. We know that something that was a privilege quickly becomes an entitlement. I think one of the things that we want to be careful about not have a knee-jerk reaction that we can just do this or do that. Specifically about this site we need to

identify the needed parking for CCSF knowing the profile, family units and need for those trips.

8. To be clear auto mode share is not the same as what Jeff was suggesting, which is a trip cap. A trip cap is an absolute cap. Auto mode share is a percentage. The way I would monitor would be a survey and then it would be a percentage of all trips for that day. Auto mode share is what we support from a transportation policy stand point and we shouldn't be doing more things that induce parking.
 1. Spinali. I am not suggesting a trip cap.
9. With regard to the mode share. We have models we have out there because of the geometric constraints we have to target mode share or we wouldn't get anywhere. The 60% car trips is consistent with our 2040 transportation model; it's not an onerous demand, it's more to set the expectation for developers that we are looking at mode share and we hope you are as well. As the development program or phasing program how that mode share monitoring and number goes forward our City agencies can discuss this and then it goes through environmental review. I hear your comments, this is not controversial in the transportation modeling world, and it's just another reference point. In 2012 the mode share target considered the neighborhood its single family homes, and it is 70%. Having multi-family homes on the reservoir site and it be 60% is not an onerous task, it's more so the minimum to prevent worse congestion.
 1. Carol Ito. What you're speaking about is aspirational. What is going on in this neighborhood now?
 1. Jeremy Shaw. The current number is 70% from 2012, and it's not about changing your behavior. It might be different, hopefully better now. There's all the room in the world for existing residents to stay at that level and build the reservoir and still achieve the 60% target. If you take developments on Ocean Avenue, it's possible to achieve 60% and not affect existing residents or traffic patterns.
 2. Carli Paine. And the target of 60% applies only to the new residents.
 2. Carol Ito. It still doesn't address unbundling and people parking in our neighborhoods, and that's happening now. We're calling for 72 hour restrictions.
 1. Mike Martin. Concerns about parking in neighborhoods. The person parking on the site or in the neighborhoods it will come back on the survey as an auto trip. It's a

really developer focused process that says, “developer you need to find ways to get some level of those people outside of their cars on transit and find other ways to get people out of their cars.” They need to get it back down so that surrounding neighborhoods can deal with it. People that buy into this development need to be able to utilize what results from the TDM and developer negotiations. It’s focused on the developer and we need to constantly, actively focus on figuring out how to get people out of their cars and off the roads.

1. Aaron Goodman. I have a point on that developer comment. We know that on the west side we had a developer provide \$100.00 for Uber or Lyft. You can say developer you’re in charge of doing this but is there any enforceability is there any way to back track and re think this?
2. Carol Ito. Parkmerced had a 1:1 parking ratio. Is that correct? In addition to \$100 for Uber and Lyft.
3. Emily Lesk. The Parkmerced Development Agreement, adopted in 2011, includes a robust TDM plan that seeks to achieve a 1:1 parking ratio so residents can have one car and have the option to use other modes. That is a set program they negotiated with the City. They decided independently beyond what they agreed to with the City to add this Uber credit. It’s an either or, it’s a both that this development decided to do.
4. Spinali. Jeremy was responding about the parameters. Do you have any clarifying questions?
5. Laura Fry. I just threw out the 80%. I just never seriously read this. I understand what auto mode share and it seems like a policy statement used to justify low parking. What’s the easiest way to have low auto mode share? Have less parking spaces. That’s why there’s some concern because it’s just policy used to justify less parking.
6. Carli Paine. We looked at auto mode share targets in development agreements in San Francisco for a number of years. One of

things that's appealing to neighbors is that it performs like a commitment to the neighborhood. This is how the project is going to function. Regardless of what is in the specific TDM plan there is a commitment from the developer/property manager if these things don't work that this project will abandon their commitments on performance.

7. Spinali. Within that percentage, whatever the ratio that is, cross reference with the parking ratio.
8. Francine Lofrano. How is that enforced?
9. Spinali. If this is not clear, let's specifically write what this is. We need a definition of what this means. This is separate from a parking ratio. This is specifically about the number of trips by car or other based on the percentage of cars on the site.
10. Carli Paine. Part of the development agreement has a monitoring and compliance component. Monitoring can be from some amount of surveying and total counts of people coming in and out to get an auto mode share, also having a reputable third party that does not have a stake in the outcome. If those performance metrics are not being met, we'll figure out what's not going right and we'll give them an opportunity to come into compliance and the next step is fines to the developer. Treasure Island development has a 50% mode share target, if they are not in compliance there's a step to work with the City, if they still can't they have to pay one million dollars to the City every year for five years.
11. Francine Lofrano. This seems cumbersome.
12. Carli Paine. It's not complaint based, this is set up so that yearly there's monitoring; it's a requirement. The City has enforcement staff. The Planning depart recently added a monitoring and reporting staff person in addition to two new staff coming on.

13. Jeremy Shaw. The point is a development agreement is an agreement between two parties and there are obligations on both sides. Developer collects data and reports on them to the City to say they are in compliance or they are not but are providing corrective measures. It's on both the City and the developer.
14. Spinali. Let's get refocused back on the principles.
10. We can add clarification language to 2.a. to help readers understand what we mean by auto mode share.
11. 3.b. We agree it's hard to find a number; we know there are certain minimum requirements – we want families to have one space and we don't want to change that, what if we removed the last clause about the overall ratio because we have a lot of different unit types with other requirements. Then like most of the other parameters we have the developer propose the solution and we start a community conversation around it.
 1. Winston. I would like to keep the 0.5:1 parking ratio but make it more aspirational. Change the language to make it "should be no greater than 0.5.
 2. Spinali. We should "aim". If you start to the math with the different types it gets really difficult. It'd dependent on the mix. So the spirit of the principle is to have the right amount of parking given the development program.
 3. Jeremy Shaw. Yes, and it also needs to take into account of all the TDM measures. We want the solutions to come from the developers and to work with the housing program. Why it was "should" was to set the developers expectations and to reduce congestion because again it is one of the biggest influences as to why people drive if parking is free or available.
 4. Winston. Petri dish, if we have an oversupply of parking we can end up with grid lock. You can have a fatal under or over supply. There needs to be a balance.
 5. Favetti. CCSF replacement parking is a big issue.
 6. Jeremy Shaw. We're hoping the CCSF parameters addressed it. They both have that language.
- ii. Spinali.
 1. Revise the principles based on the articulated and we'll take a consensus vote at the beginning of the next meeting because we need more members here to take the vote. I feel particularly with this one the entire CAC needs to be well aligned.

- iii. Jeremy Shaw. Was there anything more specific in the parameters other than 2.a. and 2.b.? We heard a lot but nothing else.
 - 1. Spinali. Understanding the role of SFMTA needs to be called out strategically. The coordination of how to work together. To Harry Bernstein's comment in the box on page one being more specific about the TDM plan's inputs. Add a paragraph from your slides to explain the input piece compared to the actual plan.
- iv. Harry Bernstein.
 - 1. We see a lot of uncertainties based on not knowing behavior.
 - 2. If it's determined that there will be too much congestion can we reduce a variable, will we reduce the number of units in the development?
 - 1. Spinali. Phase 1 is the test.
 - 2. Mike Martin. That was to do with mode share. As part of that community engagement and further environmental review piece the actual land plan will actually be evaluated against actual vehicle miles traveled to see if we can actually do this. And at that point as part of project approvals we'll have that data in front of us to see whether or not we're going to say yes to this. So it doesn't make sense to put that in the parameters something that's going to happen because the developers are going to propose a number of units and all the things to make that number work from which we will evaluate it as a community to see if it works.
- v. Spinali.
 - 1. 3.a. Unbundling. I'm wondering if we can change the language.
 - 1. Jeremy Shaw. This is already a part of the Planning code; the idea of unbundling was written as a tool for those reading this but it's already on the books; it's non-negotiable; all the parking is unbundled Citywide.

5. General Public Comment.

6. Close of Meeting.

7. Adjournment.

To: Lisa Spinelli, Chair, Balboa Reservoir CAC (BRCAC)

Alex Mullaney, Chair, Balboa Park Station CAC (BPSCAC)

From: Robert Muehlbauer, Committee Member, BRCAC and BPSCAC

Re: Comments to Revised Transportation Development Parameters

Date: April 14, 2016

This memo responds to Chair Spinelli's request that I provide my comments concerning City staff's revised transportation development parameters to the proposed draft RFP for the Balboa Reservoir. The item was on the April 13, 2016 BRCAC agenda; however, it was continued to a future special meeting with a date uncertain, and given that I will be out of the state until the next regularly scheduled meeting on May 8, 2016, will not be able to attend a special meeting. This particular development parameter is significant to the work programs of both CAC's and is therefor being addressed to both chairs.

Traffic, circulation and parking at and around the proposed new neighborhood at the unused reservoirs is argueably the most significant of those under discussion by the BPRCAC. On the face of it, if one envisions a 500 unit buildout at the site, a number previously used for illustrative purposes by staff, it is clear that traffic, circulation and parking in and around the reservoir area will be stressed further than today's conditions. This is a common complaint heard consistently at both bodies of CAC's at their respective meetings. When CCSF recovers from its 30% reduction in enrollment now that its accreditation crisis appears to be settled the stress will be greater still.

The Revised Transportation Development Parameters are, generally speaking, full of state-of-the-art, innovative ideas and concepts reflecting current best practices around a goal of encouraging residents to get out of their cars and onto their feet, bicycles and local transit networks. Will they work? Good question. There are a myriad of elements in the revised transportation parameter and not one is a magic pill. Some have varying degrees of complexity and others are of limited duration. Taken as a whole, and if the whole were to be the best mix possible when held up to the mirror of the impending Transportation Demand Management Study (TDM), and assuming that the whole effort once implemented was very successful, it would still not be a winning argument or a good bet to conclude that traffic, circulation and parking upon completion of the housing project would be anything but further deteriorated beyond present conditions. It is

difficult to get beyond this essential truth and trying to convince the public otherwise seems disingenuous. As a CAC member I also have trouble believing that market rate units leased or sold to buyers above 150% AMI will be satisfied with less than one dedicated parking space. This area is, after all, still the urban frontier of San Francisco where existing residents and prospective new buyer's parking expectations continue to lean more suburban than close-in urban.

It makes me wish that something substantial could be done that would contribute towards meaningful infrastructure improvement supporting alternate *people* and not simply *traffic* circulation in and around the project area. The notion here goes beyond providing discounts on public transit or something like that (ideas that may be decent ones), but a more "bricks and mortar" nature that John Q Public will see every day and know that they came about because of the reservoir housing project. The infrastructure vision being expressed here would need to be built not only within the reservoir project, but outside and around the project area, and connecting the housing complex to the Phelan/Unity Plaza bus loop and beyond to Balboa Park Station. The vision is for something distinctive with an enduring quality that would clearly link the reservoir housing to our local district's regional transit station. One hears public comment after public comment at CAC meeting nearly screaming about the abysmal, intimidating walking environment from City College to Balboa Park Station. They seem to implore: can't the City at least do something about that?

Every building era throughout San Francisco's history has left its signature on the urban geography. Wouldn't it be significant and substantial if one of the signature statements and outcomes stemming from the reservoir housing addressed the problem of improving pedestrian circulation to Balboa Park Station in a highly visible and durable way?

Aaron Goodman
25 Lisbon St.
SF, CA 94112

Balboa Reservoir CAC
brcac@sfgov.org

RE: **BRCAC meeting on May 23, 2016 - 6:15pm**

Committee Members;

I write to you not knowing if there will be time allotted to adequately discuss all the issues on your agenda tonight. I hope to relay and include some basic items for your info. in advance as considerations.

City College Revised Parameters

Principle #1 and #4 – the principle should include the wording “educational mission, housing, transportation, open space, and operational needs”

Principle #1, #4 – Item d – there should be direct means stated of resolving conflict and problems in the transportation impacts and should be convertible to actionable solutions so we don’t stand in grid-lock waiting for a stop sign to be removed.

Principle #2 – wording noted in red should read not just to “allow-for” but to **BUILD** and **DESIGN** for, *with emphasis on getting it done pre- or simultaneous to the actual buildout of CCSF or any proposed buildings at Balboa Reservoir*. It is critical to include and change the last sentence to “particular attention to connections to improve pedestrian access to Balboa Park Station.”

Principle #3 – E – denotes the “may include but are not limited to” – does not emphasize the criticalness of the issue of getting walking especially to transit as a means of a safe and environmental method of getting to public transit. Emphasis should again be not on the “may” but that the BRCAC and BPSCAC both desire a more focused attention on getting people across Ocean Ave Safely, through development of concepts that bridge, or build and connect quicker and faster with appropriate safety efforts to improve the access to the station. Partnerships should also include MUNI, and BART to promote regional connectivity and “pay-in” to the re-build of Balboa Park station as a possible solution long-term and short-term.

Principle #4 – the effort is not two way but three way and should include the **Balboa Park Station Area Plan**, as mentioned as part of the “well-coordinated and complimentary” planning processes that need to be communicated with, and ensure proper and adequate coordination between CAC’s so that the BRCAC does not inadvertently ignore principles of the BPSCAC in processing decisions.

Transportation Development Parameters

Principle #1 – Item D – “coordinate onsite connections with SFMTA pedestrian and bicycle access improvements beyond the site, especially to and from City College, and the Balboa Park Station and BART/MUNI mass transit boarding points.

Principle #2 – needs to include in the wording **“improve the experience of ACCESSING and utilizing ... to the Balboa Reservoir Site, to City College, and the Balboa Park Station transit access points, and adjacent neighborhoods.**

Principle #2 – Item A – the 60% Automobile Mode Share (AMS) sounds distinctively like UBER-LYFT and GOOGLE-BUS options, vs. looking at really reducing the impact through more public funded amenities. The AMS share should be drastically reduced, or controlled to ensure that new AMS car vehicles that may begin to use the area for profits are taxed or regulated to ensure that additional population at City College and Balboa Reservoir site do not negatively impact the ability of public mass transit to function on the roadways as a priority. **AMS should be secondary and noted as secondary in the principles to mass transit funding and solutions.** The section where it states “deploy measures to improve mode share” should be changed to **de-emphasize AMS** and improve the investment in mass-transit strategies over AMS vehicle trips. It should also change the “other measures as needed” to include **“for improved pedestrian routes and access to the all sites, Balboa Reservoir, City College and the Balboa Park Station.”**

Principle #2 – Item C – the text should be changed to read **“Implement projects UPFRONT to be completed in timely fashion prior to the implementation of increased density that enhance the adjacent public realm and projects ...”** Also under this item the last bullet point should include information on the # of people that may use these stops, so that bus and transit shelters are adequately designed for the people and inclement weather noted at these locations due to the free-way overpass locations and safety/lighting/wind concerns of the area.

Principle #2 – Item F – I would like to emphasize or improve the issue and sub bullet point of **“stronger pedestrian safety and access along Ocean Avenue and into adjacent neighborhoods”** and would request that the **BRCAC provide extra emphasis on this item to improve connection between D7 and D10/D11 with the Balboa Station and Reservoir as being a “central HUB” to the three districts.** The other sub-bullet at the bottom of page 4 of 6 should include **improved intersection design, turning SAFETY controls and IMPROVED signal timing for pedestrians as a priority, not the cars or other AMS or vehicles that may ply the roadways.**

Principle #3 – Please note the concern for basing parking availability on City College Enrollment “goals”, and that **SFSU-CSU’s impact shows the direct issue with increased enrollment, demolition of existing parking areas for development, and the impact on surrounding neighborhoods as a precursor to what will occur here, if we do not enforce and demand equitable investment and shared costs in terms of transportation impacts.**

Principle #4 – Item B – should not include just “bike-to-work-day” options, but increased education signage and improvements along with events to promote change for walking and the safety and pedestrian improvements that coincide with a walkable community, such as closing that stretch of Ocean Ave, for Street walking days, and improving the notion that we should walk more than drive the neighborhoods. Planters, benches, and improved landscape and side-walk creation at the overpass and between neighborhoods like Ocean Ave to Mission St.

Sincerely



Aaron Goodman
amgodman@yahoo.com
c: 415.786.6929

San Francisco Chronicle

BAY AREA

AND CALIFORNIA

 EDITORIALS
 PANORAMA

 PAGE A20
 PAGE A21

Approval Expected on City College Land Swap

Deal for South Balboa Reservoir to be voted on today by S.F. Board

*By Louis Freedberg
Chronicle Staff Writer*

After years of bickering and two failed ballot initiatives, a long-standing land dispute between the city of San Francisco and City College of San Francisco has been resolved.

The Board of Supervisors is expected to approve a complicated land swap today that will turn over a large tract of unused land owned by the city Water Department directly across the street from City College's main campus on Phelan Avenue. The exchange does not affect an adjoining sliver of land at Phelan and Ocean avenues — the

target of ballot initiative Proposition L — where a nonprofit developer wants to build low-income senior housing.

The tract of unused land, known as the South Balboa Reservoir,

Chancellor Dobelle initiated talks with Mayor Agnos

will be used by City College to expand. The 30,000-student college is thought to be the largest — and one of the most crowded — community colleges in the country.

The campus now occupies 56 acres, almost three times less than the average community college in California.

"We can complete our campus that we have never been allowed to do since we were initially constructed in 1935," said Chancellor Evan Dobelle, who initiated discussions on the site with Mayor Art Agnos shortly after taking office in November.

Three times during the 1980s, voters defeated a controversial proposal to build low-cost housing. Two water reservoirs, which have not been used for years, now occupy the site.

In exchange for use of the 11.1-acre South Balboa Reservoir site, and air rights to the 14.1-acre North Balboa Reservoir site, City College has given a piece of land it owns on the corner of 17th and Folsom streets in San Francisco to the Water Department. City College officials say that when, or if, the North Balboa Reservoir is rebuilt by the city, they want to put a parking lot on top of it. According to city officials, low-income housing will eventually be built on the Folsom site.

Several city agencies, including the Public Utilities Commission, were involved in completing the transaction.

