

**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, September 12, 2016**

6:15 PM

Regular Meeting

Please note that a supplemental audio recording of this meeting is included on the Planning website via the following link: www.sf-planning.org/brcac

Documents received during this meeting are in a document titled balboareservoir_CAC_Public_Documents_Received_and_Emails-091216 available via the following link: www.sf-planning.org/brcac

Committee Members Present:

Howard Chung, Brigitte Davila, Kate Favetti, Christine Godinez, Rebecca Lee, Robert Muehlbauer, Jon Winston

Committee Members Absent:

Maria Picar

Staff/Consultants Present:

Emily Lesk, Mike Martin, Phillip Wong, Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Sue Exline, San Francisco Planning Department; Christopher J. Wong, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission; District 7 Supervisor Norman Yee, Jen Low, Office of District 7 Supervisor Norman Yee

1. Call to Order and Roll Call.

- a. Roll Call

2. Opening of Meeting.

- a. Amendments to 7/11/16 Minutes.
 - i. CAC Comment.
 - 1. Robert Muehlbauer
 - 1. Page 9. Geneva and San Jose Safety Charrette, it's not going to be staffed by San Jose, it's going to be staffed by MTA.
 - ii. No public comment.
 - iii. Motion to approve 7/11/16 minutes with amendments: Favetti, Second: Chung
 - 1. Ayes: Chung, Davila, Favetti, Muehlbauer, Winston
 - 2. Noes: [none]
 - 3. Abstain: Spinali
- b. Amendments to 08/08/16 Minutes.
 - i. CAC Comment.
 - 1. Howard Chung.
 - 1. Page 1. I was absent. Remove from present.
 - ii. No public comment.
 - 1. Jennifer Heggie.
 - 1. Page 10. Roman 10, No. 3. It says SNA supports more open space and the 2 consecutive acres. It's a minimum of 2 consecutive acres of open space.
 - iii. Motion to approve 08/08/16 minutes with amendments: Favetti, Second: Winston
 - 1. Ayes: Davila, Favetti, Godinez, Muehlbauer, Spinali, Winston
 - 2. Noes: [none]
 - 3. Abstain: Chung

3. Final Review of Development Parameters.

- a. Public Comment.
 - i. Jennifer Heggie. Sunnyside
 - 1. SNA wants to express appreciation for the addition of a preamble that provides context for the various principles and parameters we worked on individually.
 - 2. We would like to add to the existing preamble that open space is important for integrating the development with its surrounding neighborhoods.
 - 3. We understand that changes to the City's residential design guidelines are being discussed. We would like to understand what is being proposed, the process for approval, and how changes to current guidelines might affect the Balboa Reservoir project.
 - ii. Bob Burn. SNA.
 - 1. There's going to be a development proposed, for planning purposes of 500 units.
 - 2. There's currently about 1200 parking spaces that will disappear.

3. If the 500 units are planned they only have 0.5 of the parking spaces replaced that's only 250 spots. Is that being addressed?
- iii. Rita Evans. SNA.
 1. Principles and parameters for the proposed development are very focused on details but there are some omissions of a broader perspective.
 2. How to replace parking used by City College students, faculty, and staff has not been adequately addressed nor has the link between access to parking and CCSF's enrollment.
 3. The continued decline in enrollment poses an ongoing threat to this unique community asset.
 4. The revised document assumes residents of existing neighborhoods will absorb the impacts of increased traffic, greater parking demand, more transit demand, etc., rather than directing those impacts to the new residents and the developer.
 5. Third, we have pressing transportation and environmental concerns.
 6. A clear commitment to concrete solutions such as a developer-funded shuttle and construction of replacement parking; those things are needed for neighbors to support the project.
 - iv. Steve Zeltzer. United Public Workers for Action.
 1. We are opposed to this privatization of this property.
 2. We think this is Mayor Ed Lee and his relationships with developers that is pushing this forward to steal this land from the people of San Francisco.
 3. This should be reserved for CCSF and used for public education.
 4. Speculators are driving this.
 5. Student parking should be a priority for the City.
 6. We can have public funding and public construction.
 7. What about the arts center? That should be discussed here, but that's not on your agenda, why not?
 8. We're wasting tax money with this whole process.
 9. This should not be done by this group here who are appointed.
 10. There is no labor or union representation.
 11. We're going to organized against it and stop it.
 12. We need more working class housing.
 13. It shows where the direction of this City is going.
 14. This whole thing has to be stopped and actually you're not representing the people of San Francisco you're representing the developers.
 - v. Ellen Wall. SNA. CCSF Faculty.
 1. Our previous speaker was so brilliant I had to get up and say yes that's exactly what needs to be done.
 2. We need to rally to march against this thing.
 - vi. Hedda Thieme. Westwood Park.

1. Mayor Lee is forced to build housing and that will add another 100,000 inhabitants to San Francisco. Where are they going to be educated if you're limiting property space for City College?
 2. I think its poor city planning. You will regret that later in 20-30 years.
 3. Rethink this.
 4. Keep the property for City College.
 5. You don't even have a provision that says that housing will be only for those that work in San Francisco. There is no one, no agency that will control that.
 6. You are so close to the 280 freeway, people will try to get a cheap apartment and work in Silicon Valley. This doesn't solve our problems.
- vii. Corey Smith. SFHAC.
1. You all are doing an amazing job.
 2. You're balancing a number of different opinions, I don't think that anybody in this room is 100% happy, but that's not what this is about.
- viii. Chris Peterson. Resident.
1. I support the proposal.
 2. I think it's vital for this property to be used to create a significant amount of additional housing for the City.
 3. I agree there are significant transportation challenges.
 4. Use this site as housing for CCSF students, staff, and faculty. A way to address housing needs without generating more automobile traffic.
 5. Wrong approach is to create a lot of parking because that will create the situation of people moving here to commute to Silicon Valley.
 6. Transit-oriented and pedestrian-oriented development.
- ix. Madeleine Mueller. CCSF.
1. Language is going to be okay.
 2. Page 14 (or wherever you talk about City College master planning). Where you talk about the City College master planning effort. We followed the Oregon Experience. It's really the users of the institutions that need to be paid attention to.
 3. The master plan is really being more conceived by consultants and administration.
 4. Put users in the language, so it's not just a dialogues with administration and consultants.
 5. The facilities master plan must be approved by the Board of Trustees. This sounds watered down.
- x. Theodore. Excelsior.
1. My motivation to go to these meetings is because we need more housing.
 2. I don't care if the developers make a profit or not.
 3. People are not waiting for the tech bros to move out when they grow up. They need some place to stay.

4. More housing here and many other places in the City and throughout the Bay Area is crucial.
- xi. Chris Hanson.
1. My last comment, I didn't characterize anything about the Board of Supervisors resolution.
 2. There was something in there about creating the request for proposals. I had a hard time finding it, while I was on vacation writing that. I wanted to correct that.
 3. I don't feel that this document will really protect the community.
- xii. Alvin Ja.
1. I would like to ask the CAC members to break up the vote into 2 sections on the preamble and then the development parameters.
 2. The preamble very well summarizes what the community wants.
 3. The development parameters do not.
 4. Until the development parameters align with the preamble, it should be voted no on.
 5. *Submitted a document re: voting on the preamble.*
- xiii. Roberto.
1. Hearing this gentleman on the right with the video camera. I agree with him.
 2. I don't know when on the timeline of when this was approved.
 3. Look at Ocean Avenue, increasing amount of apartments in this neighborhood.
 4. I live close to City College.
 5. Less parking for students.
 6. Everyone has cars.
 7. Bike riding has increased but people will always have cars.
 8. I have to deal with people parking in front of my house.
- xiv. Harry Bernstein. CCSF.
1. I would like to put in a request to see that if there is the 450 to 500 units, there could be even more, the developers should have a requirement to provide replacement parking because I don't see that coming from any other source.
 2. I'm concerned about the compatibility of a large development and City College restoring their enrollment.
- xv. Laura Fry. Westwood Park.
1. *Submitted written public comment.*
 2. Urban Design. 2.c. "will fall in a range of 25'-65'"
 3. Add heights over 40' up to 65' will be on the southeast side only.
 4. Still concerned that there has not been a discussion of number of units.
 5. Size of the project has the most impact.
 6. RFPs rarely get changed to decrease density.

7. Planning department has a tough job but 95% of funding comes from developers.
 8. Project RFP has a defined size.
- b. CAC Discussion.
- i. Kate Favetti.
 1. Thank you to staff.
 2. You have addressed my concerns with disability access and access generally.
 3. You have specifically identified the neighborhoods.
 4. The concern of the neighborhood is the replacement parking for City College. 1:1 replacement has not been made specific.
 5. 33% of affordable housing should be allocated to the middle class.
 6. The west side of the project will not be more than 28 feet. Adjacent to San Ramon, Wildwood.
 7. Open Space will be a minimum of a 2 acre park.
 8. 500 units as a maximum has not been specifically stated.
 - ii. Chung.
 1. Appointed by the Mayor and representing businesses.
 2. This is not something that everyone will be satisfied with.
 3. We want to build a consensus but that's not always possible.
 4. We aren't setting forward scripture.
 5. These will be taken by the developers.
 6. It's been an interesting process.
 7. I don't support everything in these parameters but I hope it's something we can live with.
 8. Other people in my shoes that have participated in the process and have been moved.
 - iii. Brigitte Davila.
 1. Regarding housing. Principle 1. I see 33% affordable housing. Our consensus was at least 50%. Make clearer.
 2. City College faculty housing should be in principle 1.
 1. Lisa Spinali.
 1. Add to 2.c.
 3. Also add to principle 3.
 4. The lack of faculty housing at the SFUSD level.
 5. Transportation. City College is using the Balboa Reservoir for parking right now, but I think we need to look at all the transit studies. I don't see the garage that the Board of Trustees has recommended. We asked for a flexible green garage. The flexibility aspect could be turned into another use if we no longer needed parking.
 1. Lisa Spinali. Is it for this project or for the CCSF master plan?
 2. Brigitte Davila. It was included in the Board of Trustees resolution for the site.
 6. Parking should be near the freeway.

7. Our enrollment has been hit and we've seen a drastic decrease in our enrollment.
 8. We need to coordinate the transit studies.
 9. I'm not going to say we need every single spot until we determine that we need every single spot.
 10. In Transportation 1.c. Recognizing that parking is for the CCSF community I would like that to start the principle.
 11. Any master plan needs to meet the needs of the CCSF community.
 12. Reference the parking garage in principle b.
 13. Principle 2.f. City College's collaboration should be mentioned here.
 14. Principle 3. Does A refer to relocating parking to the freeway site?
 15. Principle 4. E or F. The last numbered part of the Board of Trustees resolution included identifying the capital projects planning committee as the one that we would be collaborating with.
 16. Public Realm. Principle 1, replace that child care facility to any child care facility.
 17. Urban Design. 2.a. Discusses the site. Reflect local character, design. It mentions neighborhoods and schools adjacent. I would like to identify specific building within City College.
- iv. Christine Godinez.
1. What can people do without? Basic needs, housing, clothing, food.
 2. People need housing to get to the next level.
 3. I want this group to think about what we can do without.
 4. I would much rather focus on what people need to survive.
- v. Robert Muehlbauer.
1. City College and SFSU are important institutions.
 2. Growth is going to come, can we manage it?
 3. What is going to come is ADUs and boarding houses because we don't have a lot of local housing.
 4. How many people have garages used for parking or storage?
 5. Our attitude needs to change.
 6. Traffic congestion is going to increase anyway.
 7. Enrollment will go up 50%.
 8. Its guess work.
 9. We need to be honest with ourselves.
 10. I don't think we're ever going to get to a place where we have no impact.
 11. I'm not ready to say no development here.
 12. I think that City College needs to be more intricately involved with this development.
 13. How can the master planning be better involved with this process?
 14. Isn't this an opportunity and isn't this is a missed one by not including it?
 15. Better self-interest and motivation for City College's involvement.

16. If we can build market-rate housing to subsidize affordable housing, funds can be used elsewhere.
17. Mixed-income housing reflects the diversity of the neighborhood.
18. The way this is envisioned is reflective of this neighborhood.
19. What if the market-rate housing was used to build student and faculty housing? Wouldn't it be worth it even for a little additional congestion?
20. Let's not view this as this is my side and this is your side.
21. As it applies to these development parameters this is the first step.
22. We've gone over this two-three-four times, let's see what this yields. See what the development community comes up with. We can say no at a later date.

vi. Maria Picar.

1. Submitted comments in writing. Lisa Spinali reading.
2. Principle 1, child care also reflect preschool.
3. Principle 3.c., make sure that community space is accessible to everyone.
4. Difficult locating community space.
5. On transportation, have a spare the air day when transit is free.
6. Principle 4 in open space. There are many little critters that inhabit our neighborhoods, I want indigenous, drought tolerant plants.

vii. Jon Winston.

1. I have to look at this project through the lens of this City as a whole.
2. The City has voted to build more housing.
3. Many of us aren't able to re-buy our own homes.
4. Housing is this number one issue.
5. We want to provide housing to the largest number of people.
6. I don't want to look at numbers I want to see the maximum we can do without impacting the neighborhood too much.
7. I recognize there are a large number of people drive to City College.
8. A lot of people don't see their commute as a done deal, but driving is the cheapest and easiest way.
9. I would be against a parking garage as part of the parameters, but I would like to see how many trips we can divert. Parking spaces cost about \$50k to \$70k per spot. If we were to replace 1:1 parking spot it would cost 1 billion dollars.
10. I would like to keep it misty on purpose.
11. Have less congestion on the streets.
12. Our communication with City College. We want to proactive with City College, but we have to look at how to actually make this happen.
13. I'm prepared to vote on these parameters.

viii. Rebecca Lee.

1. I can speak to the ratepayer's perspective.

2. Consensus represents unanimous agreement, but we don't have that. We represent a diverse set of voices.
 3. I have consulted with my fellow SFPUC CAC members and have had robust conversations.
 4. I think these parameters are within the ballpark of what our members would like, but we did not have unanimous approval.
 5. I became a half-time student and commute from my rent-controlled home.
 6. It's actually accessible besides the necessary pedestrian safety improvements.
 7. I'm generally comfortable with what we have here so far.
- ix. Lisa Spinali.
1. San Francisco is about diversity.
 2. Page 18, RDG guidelines, strike it. Principle 2.d. Minimize impacts on privacy and light. RDG guidelines are changing citywide.
 3. Aligning the TDM work with the CCSF work.
 4. We should have a monthly update. The TDM could be helpful but without transparency will not be as good as it could be.
 5. We call it a transportation hub, but it is not a hub. We're transportation rich but it's not well coordinated. We need to coordinate with SFMTA. If transportation does not work, people will drive.
 6. I echo the sentiment of how can we go ahead one year ahead of the master plan? How do we integrate the community?
 7. We really need to amp up City College's involvement.
 8. The skinniest piece that gets housing is middle income.
 9. Middle class housing subsidy comes from market-rate housing.
 10. The one thing the document doesn't do is the burden on the developer. It isn't that the neighboring communities absorb the impact; how is the developer going to do this in such a way that minimizes the impacts?
 11. I'm ready to move forward because there are a lot of principles.
 12. There are compromises that might need to be made such that if you want a three acre park then you might need denser housing.
- x. Brigitte Davila.
1. Housing is a big issue.
 2. I feel fortunate to have bought a house here. It puts me in a different ballpark.
 3. You can't understand what a big deal it is for young people to be able to buy a home.
- c. CAC Vote on Approving the Development Principles and Parameters.
- i. Rebecca Lee – Yes
 - ii. Jon Winston – Yes
 - iii. Kate Favetti – No

- iv. Robert Muehlbauer – Yes
- v. Christine Godinez – Yes
- vi. Brigitte Davila – Yes
- vii. Howard Chung – Yes
- viii. Lisa Spinali – Yes
- ix. Maria Picar – Abstain
- x. Yes – 7; No – 1; Abstain – 1

4. Remarks from District 7 Supervisor Norman Yee

5. Overview of RFQ Process.

- a. Staff Presentation [see PDF available at: www.sf-planning.org/brcac]
- b. CAC Discussion.
 - i. Lisa Spinali.
 - 1. Reword 3rd to last slide. Ability to work effectively with the community throughout the process. I want it to be proactive instead of reactive to community concerns.
 - 2. I want us to have a spirit of we're in this together as a collective community.
 - 3. This is not your average planning process; we have a large group of people involved and we will stay involved.
 - 1. Emily Lesk. To clarify. That particular bullet refers to how they have worked with communities in the past. And how effectively and willingly they have responded.
 - 4. Maybe then at that point you need to ask about them proactively working on the front end as well.
 - ii. Robert Muehlbauer.
 - 1. In the RFQ/RFP process you talked about developing a short list. Can you talk more about that? Is it 3 developers, 5 or 1? I don't want to see us get to a point where we only have one proposal. I would like to see a range of 3 proposals that is more competitive.
 - 1. Emily Lesk. We're shooting for 3, provided there are 3 that are truly qualified.
 - iii. Kate Favetti.
 - 1. Asking more about the community process and that will look like. Is that already scoped out? How long a process will that be and will the community be actively engaged?
 - 1. Emily Lesk. First step was writing these parameters. Through the RFQ and RFP panel we want community representation on them. Once the proposals come through the RFP, to have an opportunity for community feedback.

2. Presentations from developers in a community forum; CAC meeting. We would receive live feedback and written feedback.
 3. The panel would evaluate how the developer is responsive to the parameters and feedback from the community.
- iv. Christine Godinez.
1. Is it typical to choose someone who has come to meetings to sit on the panel? A community member from audience on panel?
 1. Emily Lesk. I'm not aware that has ever been done. What we are trying to do is find someone who is representative of as broad a number of constituencies as possible.
- v. Jon Winston.
1. Outline the CAC's role as we move forward with this process? Our meetings.
 1. Emily Lesk. Defer to Lisa largely, but the legislation/ordinance that created the CAC outlined two very discreet roles. First was advising the City and staff on the parameters, which we've finally done. The second big role is being the convener and body for community feedback as the developer comes on board. Presents the project as its evolving. Conducts meetings through final approvals at the SFPUC Commission, the Board of Supervisors.
 2. We'll continue to be a clearinghouse for the community. Community members will still have a forum.
- vi. Lisa Spinali.
1. Map out the next steps in the community process going forward.
 2. I also want to use these meetings as an opportunity for us to be able to come together as a collective community.
 3. I'd love to get a meeting from City College to really understand them and their place in the larger community and the challenges they face. Similarly to do the same for Sunnyside and perspective by perspective.
 4. We want to continue to build community and we have only just begun.
 5. We need to inform our communities so that the charrette is successful.
 6. This body will be intended to be used for communication, education and creating cohesion.
 7. We continue to use the website for materials.
 8. This presentation will be available online. We'll continue to be transparent and post everything online as a resource.
- c. Public Comment.
- i. Rita Evans. Sunnyside.
 1. I personally believe certain agencies are in the developers' pockets.
 2. I don't believe that this applies to the CAC.

3. Thank you very much for all you're doing.
- ii. Steve Martin Pinto. SNA.
 1. Back in the 1920s when the M and L line were built, they went nowhere and afterwards the neighborhood filled in.
 2. We would be remiss to not consider traffic first; otherwise we're setting ourselves up for disaster.
 3. I take MUNI or walk for intra-city transit. For inter-city transit you need a car. I need a truck to visit my parents in Fairfield.
 4. The hierarchy of needs; we need to focus our design based on the bare minimum in mind, we're selling ourselves short.
- iii. Yonathan Randolph. Ingleside.
 1. In the RFQ evaluation criteria slide. 70% regards how big is the company? Do all applicants need to be big companies?
 2. Do we have a list of all the big developers that can apply? Is there a way for smaller developers to enter?
 3. In the timeline, some commenters last month we're wasting the EIR from the Balboa Park Station Area Plan. I want to give voice to them.
 4. Is there any scenario where there wouldn't be an EIR necessary for this development?
 5. When we're in the exclusive negotiation phase, what leverage does the City have?
- iv. Chris Peterson. Ingleside.
 1. It's looking likely under this projection that nothing will happen on the ground for 5 years on the ground.
 2. My perception of City projects is that the initial estimate is a gross underestimate.
 3. People should take into account how long it takes to go from procedure after procedure.
 4. There are real costs to delays.
- v. Theodore. Excelsior.
 1. Typically how many proposal alternatives do the developers present?
 2. How much leeway do we give them to violate the design constraints?
 3. I would still like to see much higher height limits.
 4. Would any developer be able to show how many units we would be losing by sticking to these parameters.
 5. Would a developer be able to show a more tasteful design that might not meet the criteria?
- vi. Laura Fry. Westwood Park.
 1. We talked about the scoring rubric for the RFQ and the RFP. We didn't see that for the RFP.
 2. How is community feedback tabulated and how much is part of the scoring?
- vii. David Tejeda.
 1. Thank you for all of your time.

2. Shovels are not going to hit the ground for at least another 5 years.
 3. Improve MUNI. Show that the public transit can work.
- viii. Harry Bernstein. CCSF.
1. Interested community members be involved with the RFQ evaluation team.
 2. The panel is heavily on the City staff side.
 3. Alvin Ja asked for separate approval for the preamble and the principles and parameters. Have you approved everything yet?
 4. Agreed with the speaker to focus on transportation first.
 5. The reservoir property has not been declared surplus.
- d. Staff response.
- i. Emily Lesk.
 1. First question is about whether you need to be a really big company to apply and if there are opportunities for smaller developers to get involved. This is such a large project, it's going to take a lot of money and expertise to do. We typically see a large developer on the team with that kind of experience and access to capital to realistically be able to do it, but it's common to see joint venture partnerships that bring non-profit developers and smaller local teams into the table. It's unlikely we would see a small developer go it alone to meet the experience and financial capacity qualifications.
 1. Lisa Spinali. When you say given the parameters around what we want, it's likely it will be a joint venture because the specific skill set and acumen around affordable housing is different.
 2. Will there be another EIR in addition to the Balboa Park Station Area Plan EIR? Yes, there will be full environmental review of whatever is proposed here. Program level environmental review for the Area plan. Project level environmental review when the project is scoped and proposed.
 3. When we have the ENA what leverage does the City have? A lot. The various regulatory approvals have to approve the project. There's no way to get a building permit for the project unless it gets the regulatory approvals from very political bodies.
 4. Can the developer present different alternatives, how much deviation can there be? Often proposals that come back include a menu of different alternatives showing trade-offs. We didn't ask for that, but often we get it even when we don't ask for it. My personal opinion is if it didn't include a strong alternative that was compatible with the parameters and all of the objectives, if I was proposing it's something I probably wouldn't do.
 5. The RFP rubric, we haven't focused on it yet. When we actually draft that document we will come back to you and give you a more detailed description.
 1. Lisa Spinali. Great example of what will be on a future agenda.

6. The SFPUC Commission has not made a surplus property findings yet. We will need to consult with them to understand when exactly that will happen.
 1. Lisa Spinali. It's normal that it hasn't happened yet.
 2. Emily Lesk. Yes, there is more process that needs to take place.
 - ii. Rebecca Lee.
 1. The real estate management team within SFPUC has been paying a lot of attention to the discussions happening here. At the time when something is needing a vote that's their last opportunity to declare it surplus. Transaction approval and declaration in one meeting to done separately. It's not any time soon. They also want to see that whatever the use is aligns with their mission and ideals.
 2. Lisa Spinali. Standing agenda item on SFPUC.
-
6. **Ongoing Coordination among CCSF Master Plan, TDM, Balboa Park Station Area Plan and Balboa Reservoir.**
 - a. Lisa Spinali.
 - i. Might be good to have a page on the website for updates on meetings such as for the City College facilities master plan.
 - b. Harry Bernstein.
 - i. Can we have more people on the panel?
 - ii. Mike Martin. We talked some about the process. What I want to come back to, the community input into what the RFP is and the community's ability to provide specific feedback on the proposals during the process is fairly unprecedented. There aren't many other situations where the City has had that deep a level of community involvement. We felt by augmenting that with a member of the CAC to further put that into the scoring process. Putting more people from the community on the panel creates a slippery slope of is every single community represented. This is typically a land owner's panel because there are conflicts of interest where the panel is supposed to be a fiduciary to make the transaction work. This is a mix that makes sense.
-
7. **General Public Comment.**
 - a. Public Comment.
 - i. Francine Lofrano. Westwood Park.
 1. Reviewed the responses. Did not see my question or an answer regarding the cost of the 2009 Balboa Park Station Area Plan EIR.
 2. What did the whole plan cost?
 - ii. Simon Hanson. Excelsior. CCSF.
 1. Showed up at the first meeting and to this point thank you very much.
 2. The City has been so efficient with getting everything together with your comments and to a developer.

3. Developer is not going to do this without a profit.
 4. You're dealing with a public resource; you're fiduciary duty is to the public.
 5. With an ENA you're going to define what is affordable.
 6. Glad to hear questions of if there is going to be greater community representation.
 7. Doors have closed at City College and things have gone away because people have made deals.
- iii. Ellen Wall. City College.
1. I didn't appreciate the time put into this.
 2. People have come up time and time again saying don't build this.
 3. The parameters that were just passed took in none of the problems around traffic and parking.
 4. I don't know why you passed it.
 5. Since Norman Yee is still here, this did not represent me. Many people meeting after meeting have said no, don't do this. Help City College instead.
- iv. Chris Hanson.
1. We greet the new City College facilities director with optimism.
 2. Please do not allow for OEWD to be further intertwined into the future of City College.
 3. Administrators were inserted after the state take over and are meeting regularly with SFPUC, Planning and OEWD.
 4. We didn't learn about these meetings until Mark Zacovic told Harry Bernstein.
 5. The CAC should consider meeting with the department chairs, elected by faculty.
- v. Yonathan Randolph. Ingleside.
1. Thank you to the CAC.
 2. There are neighbors that do recognize a critical need for housing.
 3. Addressing housing addresses the future health of future generations of our City.
 4. Would you be able to rebuy your home now?
 5. We're pricing out younger folks in similar situations.
 6. Would you sell your house to someone in a similar position as you when you were buying your home?
 7. We homeowners are speculators when we sell our homes for a net profit.
- vi. Steve Martin Pinto. SNA.
1. City SF 850,000 people in 46.7 square miles; comparing to other less dense regional municipalities.
 2. We're never going to satisfy everyone's need to live in the City.
 3. What is the City government doing to address what is actually a region-wide problem?

4. If we build this project, let's build it right.
5. Let's build it such that it is compatible with Westwood Park and Sunnyside.
6. High-rises are not compatible.
- vii. Corey Smith. SFHAC.
 1. We're encouraging City to get involved with a development proposal of the Brisbane Baylands.
 2. If you want to get involved let me know.
- viii. Harry Bernstein. CCSF.
 1. First year of accreditation crisis. Faculty, students and staff reached out to the City to see if they could help. Eric Mar did an economic study, \$300 M of economic value.
 2. Mayor Lee had his eyes sharply on the value of this land. He's allied with people willing to sacrifice the needs of City College.
 3. You're excluding community interest in the process.
 4. There's more than fiduciary trust, there's trust in the City.

8. Adjournment.