

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

**MEETING MINUTES**

Online Meeting  
**Wednesday, April 27, 2020**  
**6:00 PM**  
Regular Meeting

**Please note:** Meeting minutes are only intended to serve as a summary of the meeting. For a full transcript of the meeting, refer to the audio recording of the meeting available online at <https://sfplanning.org/project/balboa-reservoir#cac-and-community-meetings>

Documents received during this meeting are in a document titled CAC Comments on DSG via the following link: <https://sfplanning.org/project/balboa-reservoir#cac-and-community-meetings>

Committee Members Present:

Michael Ahrens; Brigitte Davila; Amy O’Hair; Maurice Rivers; Mark Tang; Peter Tham; Jon Winston

Committee Members Absent: Christine Godinez

Committee Seat 5: vacant

City Staff/Consultants Present:

Supervisor Norman Yee

Project Team: Kearstin Dischinger, Wendy Mok, Brad Wiblin, Joe Kirchofer, Nora Collins

Office of Economic and Workforce Development: Leigh Lutenski

San Francisco Planning Department: Sue Exline, Seung Yen Hong, Reanna Tong, Leslie Valencia

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency: Mark Dreger, Tony Henderson, Kristin Michael, Carli Paine, Michael Rhodes

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

## 2. Opening of Meeting

### Approval of April 8, 2020 Minutes

Updates to Minutes:

- Motion: Approve minutes
- Moved: O’Hair; Seconded: Tang
- Ayes: Ahrens; Davila; O’Hair; Tang; Tham, Winston; Noes: [none]; Abstain: [none]

### Announcements

Supervisor Norman Yee: Thank you to the CAC members, particularly Robert Muehlbauer, one of the original CAC members and who provided much input during this process. I will be introducing several pieces of legislation tomorrow. The CAC was started in 2015 and will be sunseting soon. The CAC and public members will continue to need a forum to provide input. I plan to extend the CAC so that it will not sunset until July 1, 2021. The other legislation that will be introduced tomorrow is the ordinance on the Development Agreement and the ordinance to establish the Special Use District. The Development Agreement is based upon the CAC’s work, including 50% affordable housing, of which the developer is covering 33%.

## 3. Design Standards and Guidelines (DSG) Document

Jon Winston mentioned that the questions and responses to the public comment on Design Standards and Guidelines document are available the website and the Balboa Reservoir CAC page, “Responses from Sponsor on DSG.”

### A. CAC Questions and Discussion

- Mike Ahrens: Will defer response to parking until the section on transportation later in meeting. Would like to send further questions and responses in the next day or two and continue DSG conversation at next CAC meeting.
- Brigitte Davila: DSG conversation will take too long for tonight’s meeting and would like to push further DSG questions to the next meeting.
- Amy O’Hair: Objection to allowing use of skinny strip owned by Westwood Park Association for access at San Ramon Way (page 6 of questions/comments) was not addressed in developer responses on DSG. Would like to hear addressed at some point.
- Mark Tang: No additional comments or questions.
- Peter Tham: No additional comments or questions.
- Jon Winston: Would like to see a way to open up passageway at Westwood Park to pedestrians and bicyclists without having a parking problem. There could be a way to work that out in the future.

### B. DSG Public Comment

1. Laura from Westwood Park. When we were talking last week about the open space, I wanted to add that in this whole community process, the choices were “open space” or

“programmed space,” and overwhelming people wanted “open space.” This is what I meant by “quiet space.” When you break it up and have other things going on, that makes it less quiet. In the survey, people wanted “open space,” not “programmed space.”

#### **4. Transportation Improvements at Project and in Area**

##### **A. Presentation**

Carli Paine, Michael Rhodes, and Mark Dreger presented SFMTA transportation updates. Leigh Lutenski presented on City College collaboration. Seung Yen Hong presented on project sponsor transportation mitigations. Kearstin Dischinger from project sponsor team presented on the Transportation Demand Management.

##### **B. CAC and City Staff Questions and Discussion**

- Mike Ahrens: BRCAC has yet to hear how SFMTA plans to accommodate the influx of new residents and actively promote transit use. CAC did not get answers to questions posed in annual report. Propose that project should not proceed until answers are provided. No concrete plans have been presented by SFMTA. Fehr and Peers TDM dated March 2019 has good comments about how to solve problems. TDM measures cost a lot of money and we don't know if the developer or City College will pursue any of these measures. Parking problem has not been solved under the scenarios presented. Detailed these issues further in memo available on Balboa CAC webpage.
- Brigitte Davila: One of the offsets of traffic is supposed to be homes allotted for educators and staff at City College. That's only 150 homes. COVID-19 impacts on transit planning need to enter these discussions. Hope to see a sustainable site and that the plans can be implemented. Also agree that it's not clear about any solid plans. Retaining wall at City College will be knocked down to widen sidewalk, funding for this is available due to bond. Can provide a better timeline at next meeting. Transit passes for students and shuttles to BART could help offset traffic in area.
- Amy O'Hair: Big part of walk to BART is the sidewalk that goes over freeway. Working with Caltrans may be a constraint but needs to be a part of improving the walk to BART. Sidewalk is noisy, ugly, and narrow.
- Mark Tang: Encouraging more people to take public transit requires making it more comfortable. Support widening sidewalks at CCSF. Would like to see Lick Wilmerding sidewalk improvements emulated at CCSF sidewalk. North side of BART station, crossing a few crosswalks is confusing to get to 49 bus stop and is an uncomfortable walk. BART station improvements should be coordinated with Balboa Reservoir in order to encourage transit use and improve the last mile connection. Encourage bike share on north side of BART station. Would like to see the plans for platforms for double car MUNI trains. Balboa Reservoir car share should be explicitly stated as electric vehicle. Supports that TDM provides subsidized car share and bike share—is this funded?
- Peter Tham: Rideshare use (Ubers and Lyfts) will increase along Ocean Avenue. SFMTA should consider what to do given the increase in traffic and pedestrians. Eliminating

left turns on Ocean Avenue does not prevent rideshare drivers from turning right into adjacent neighborhood and turning around. These are hazardous actions for pedestrians. Pedestrian experience should be improved all along Ocean Avenue, even west of City College.

- Jon Winston: Would like transit signal priority for all the buses on Ocean Avenue, which would increase speed at which buses get a green light when approaching a signalized intersection. Shuttles to BART would be duplicative of what existing buses are doing. TDM plan mentions that there will need to be a coordinator who reports to Planning Department every three years. Would like to coordinate the CCSF and Balboa Reservoir TDMs or create one single TDM for both. Need for subsidized fast passes on buses—making trains and buses more accessible.

### C. Public Comment

1. Jean Barish, CCSF Instructor and member of Public Land for Public Good, a group of people that are very concerned about the impact of this project on City College. Thank you very much for all the information that was provided today, but I do have some concerns in particular about the vagueness of the plans that MTA has for improving transit in this area. I heard words like “Aspiration. This is at a sketch level. We have goals, we’d like to share ideas.” But I didn’t hear anything that was specific regarding the improvement of public transportation in this area, which is essential in view of the fact that 3,000 or more people are going to be moving into the Balboa Reservoir Project and there’s going to be hundreds if not over a thousand parking spaces removed from City College which means that thousands of City College students will now have to have an alternative form of transportation which likely will be public transit. Anyone who lives in the Marina or the Richmond or the Sunset is not going to be riding a bicycle to City College and it seems in appropriate for a project to go forward until these aspirations are more concrete. Right now this feels like a puff piece that was presented us by MTA and I’m urging the CAC not to support this project until there is more concrete information from SFMTA about how public transit will be improved. Thank you.
2. Hello, this is Theodore Randolph, a resident of Excelsior. On the whole part, I like this transportation plan. I think it has a lot of good features and the vagueness is not necessarily a bad thing because I think any good plan is going to have to be able to adjust according to on the ground realities as the plan gets implemented, iterative process. One thing I was wondering about this plan is how does this point system work? How did you come up with this number of 30 points as a goal and how do you determine how many points each item gets? It seems like this idea of sustainability goes into features and points for design guidelines, you’re talking about how many points it will be to be LEED certified. It’s not clear to me how do you make sure that these points are actually adding up to a livable experience for the people in the neighborhood and in the proposed neighborhood. So wondering about that. Thank you.
3. Hi, Chris Hansen. I’d like to address Carli’s statement that because of the project the city agencies have a closer relationship with City College and unfortunately, that’s not true. What they’ve built was a closer relationship with state takeover administration, multiple level managers who have since left in closed door meetings including James Sohn, whose last day was the 24th and now the city agencies have a relationship with City Colleges consultants. That is still not a relationship with City College and what that isn’t,

for example, is an ongoing dialogue with the City College facilities committee, which represents multiple stakeholders within the school and is made up of teachers, administrators and students. But instead you're speaking to the facilities team which is led (I am guessing because actually we don't really get this information) by a consultant who has had very little contact with the school community, who has just been promoted to the top administrative position. Basically, you're having a conversation with a group of consultants. They may be very smart consultants with very good ideas and they are definitely highly paid, but if you're not having an ongoing actual conversation with a group like the Facilities Committee, and I mean an actual conversation, not simply reporting what your team and the City College Consultant Team has come up with, then you are not talking to City College. Beginning to work with the Facilities Committee as a way for you to truly be able to build a closer relationship with City College, and this would ultimately add to long term benefits of the work you're doing reviewing the draft Development Agreement with you is a good place to start allowing the CAC and the public to view. That is crucial. And I'm addressing this to the people from the City agencies who are still I hope listening to this conversation. And I would also like to thank the CAC for all of their hard work through all of these years. Be safe, thank you.

4. My name is Hedda Thieme from Westwood Park. This is a response to Michaels K line announcement. Michael, do you know two wagons of K line will block the cross traffic when the K line stops on red light on Ocean Ave. It is hilarious because that means no direction can move. I am also very disenchanted about the north side exit of BART, how it connects to the streetcars. Originally it was meant that the streetcars were pulling forward to the big opening in order to have a transfer. Now there's a streetcar stop very close to ocean Ave on a platform where everyone has to take steps down in order to go around about to the North entrance of the BART station. That should have never been redesigned that way. There should not be any stairs going down on Ocean Avenue sidewalk. Please have a look at it. And thirdly, I think rental cars for this project of 3,000 to 4,000 people is so necessary. Maybe you can have fixed baby seats in there, I don't care. I wish the whole thing would be transportation free, that means without any cars, but I was objected to this. I thank you for listening.
5. Good evening members of the CAC, Corey Smith on behalf of the San Francisco Housing Action Coalition. First one is just sending my appreciation to staff in the project team for the presentation. I feel like I must have been watching a different presentation because I did hear a variety of ideas from ways to allow more people to board on Ocean Ave, to bigger sidewalks, to car share. And the transportation piece to this is not fully baked out and it is still an ongoing conversation. And I've been attending these meetings since 2016 and totally agree that the transportation improvements are so key to the long term success of this community, especially related to the pedestrian experience between the site and BART station. But we do have to get creative when we look at a voter mandate to develop a transportation plan that reduces car use and we have to understand also that subsidized affordable housing cannot be asked to solve all of these problems, especially related to City College, so looking at transit passes or different permit options. Again, rideshare shuttles. Putting out ideas and presenting options, I think, is the really effective way to continue to move this process forward. I do understand how CAC members are looking at this through the lens of how it will impact them and it makes sense that immediately impacted neighbors would have a great insight as to how these new homes in the community should get built, but at times the condescending attitude and frankly disrespect to all of the professionals working on this

project is wildly inappropriate. This is an important project for the city as a whole and frankly the region and I'm really thankful to have some great folks working on. Trying to get the best proposal out there for everyone. Thank you.

6. Hello, this is Christopher Peterson. My comment relates to the relationship between the TDM plan and the public parking garage components of the project. Specifically, I'm concerned the public parking garage size and how it's managed could really undercut the goal of the TDM plan to minimize automobile use. So, for example, the plan gives significant amount of credits in the project for having a relatively low amount of parking that's specifically reserved for use of the residents, but then it's totally silent about the presence of the public parking garage which creates additional parking supply and sort of defeats the entire point of having a low parking ratio for the residents. So it seems like additional issues that should be addressed are how the size of the public parking garage should relate to the aggressiveness of the TDM measures. In addition, if the public parking garage component can be used by residents of the project, then the project should be getting reduced credits for having on paper a low parking ratio. Also, it seems like the plan should address the management in the parking garage and how that can be done in ways to avoid encouraging additional driving. For example, what kinds of pricing strategies can be used to hopefully keep use of that public parking garage to a minimum. Thank you.
7. Hi. This is Laura Fry from Westwood Park. First, like everybody, I need to thank all the people that are about this project: the committee, the planners, all the neighbors, everybody else in the city because it's such a huge project. I just had a question about it. I don't know if this is in the TDM that was put on the website on Friday, so if it's in there, then you can ignore it, but if it's not in there, it was mentioned by the presenter that there's \$10 million that the developer has to put in for transportation, but then they said something to about \$200,000 fee for something. Just watching how much things cost in the city \$200,000 doesn't get much of anything done in the city, it seems. Parking for City College, I think has to really be taken seriously as a thing that has to be really done right. Thanks for time.
8. Hi, this is AJ. I'm a retiree from Muni. I used to operate on the K line. I also was an instructor on the K line and the buses in the area, so I do have some expertise regarding Muni. Early on, one of the planners talked about K line extending the island for two cars. That's fine with me, but the real issue is a matter of a constraint, and that constraint is the fact that there's very limited roadway network in the area and Balboa Reservoir Project is subsidiary to the Balboa Park Station area plan. The area plan took the constraints into consideration and what they took into consideration was density of the housing and also access in terms of streets. They took into consideration that on the EIR had posed 420 units. Later on when it went up against the Board of Supervisors it was increased to 500 units, as opposed to the 1,100 that proposed right now. The other aspect is in the Balboa Park Station EIR, City College had proposed an entrance to the City College parking lot via Lee Ave. And SFMTA opposed it and the EIR opposed at entry via Lee into the Reservoir area, and I don't think you can overlook that. And the reason for that is that because of the limited two lanes on Ocean Ave.
9. Hi. This is Jawhe, I'm calling from Ingleside. Great, thank you for the presentation. First, I'm excited to hear about wider sidewalks when City College moves the retaining wall. I hope they also consider space for bicycles here. It's an important stretch of Ocean Avenue for BART connectivity. But there's a lot of fast moving traffic from the freeway,

so making protected space for bicycles when moving the retaining wall would do a lot to help folks use BART. Second, I'm happy to hear that encouraging transit use as part of the TDM plan. I'd like to see Clipper card memberships offered as an alternative to car share passes or supplementing them to reduce driving and parking demand to the area. Earlier commentor mentioned wayfinding at the north ocean exit to the Bart station and I'd just like the echo those comments. Wayfinding is pretty hard. There's a lot of crosswalk some tracks running everywhere. It's hard to figure out where to go to get to your connection. I think I remember the CAC mentioned that the transit priorities signaling would be really useful going up the Hill there and I'd like the echo that too. It seems like there's a lot of congestion there and transit should be a priority. Thank you for listening.

10. My name is Wynd Kaufman and I'll be speaking on behalf of Public Lands for Public Good. So I prepared this to speak about the transportation aspect about the Balboa Reservoir for you tonight. I'm an engineering instructor at City College and I'm talking for a large can of ragtag constituency of different groups of students and faculty. So the group that I most participate with is called Public Land for Public Good, but there's also Defend City College Alliance, there's the CCSF student collective, there's a student assembly. So I just want you to realize that there's a lot of various groups that really care about what's going on at the Balboa Reservoir.

I want to talk about the fact that the land is about to be rezoned. The Planning Department staff is asking the Planning Commission to rezone the land from Public which it is currently, to a special use district. The way this is going to happen is via the general plan amendment which are amendments, likely to the Balboa Park Station Area Plan and the San Francisco General plan. So these amendments are going to change those plans in pretty significant ways in terms of the housing element and the open space element and also perhaps the transportation element. One possibility is that the zone change may allow public transportation schedules to increase their acceptable time delays. You know, often, it's actually a joke in my classes when a student comes in late they just say one word, Muni, because everybody knows that the buses are always late and this zone change may make that situation even worse. So, you know, this rezoning, I think is very troubling, because if it actually avoids addressing the non compliance with these established area plans. These area plans had broad community input. This rezoning is favoring the needs of the private developer and it really needs a more robust hearing before the public before it happens. And so I just want to alert everybody to that which will be happening pretty soon in front of the San Francisco Planning Commission, I'm not sure exact date. It was originally supposed to be for April 30<sup>th</sup> but I think it's been off a week.

The thing that I want to talk about are the traffic congestion, Muni and Bart, and parking. I don't want to say "parking" because nobody likes that word, but really, it's the same thing as student access. In the principles and parameters document that was published in September 9, 2016 and was a result of 16 citizens advisory committee meetings with broad public input, the preamble to that, which is speaking to perspective RFQ respondents, says this, "We want to highlight three key areas of overall importance and priority. To be successful, any project will need to effectively integrate these priorities into their proposal: transportation and neighborhood congestion, City College, and affordable housing. So from the get go, it was acknowledged that transportation and neighborhood congestion was something that had to be held up and looked at

closely and make sure that there is no adverse impacts on it. However, the draft supplemental environmental impact report identified three environmental impacts that actually can't be mitigated. Traffic congestion's the first. The others are construction pollution and construction noise. So it's acknowledged that this project is going to have a serious environmental impact on traffic congestion which cannot be mitigated. These mitigations may be waived because of the overriding considerations, but I think we have to acknowledge that it's not going to be mitigated. There is going to be a lot more traffic congestion than the area can handle. In fact, Supervisor Mar has taken a stand on the way transit planning and development interact. Last December, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority both passed resolutions that opposed SB50 unless it was amended. Specifically, they want to make sure that there is adequate planning and funding for transit when new housing developments are planned.

OK, let's talk about Muni now. The developer is actually counting on 15 percent reduction in City College student parking in order to achieve a special project status under AB 900. But the assumption that these students will transition to public transportation is actually not realistic. Like I said, students often complain about the long wait times for Muni and the fact that it always makes them late because sometimes there's two or three buses that pass them by without even stopping. It's both Muni and Bart have capacity issues that need to be addressed before any parking or alternative transportation options are illuminated. That's just the current ridership. When the new residents move into the Balboa Reservoir Project, they will significantly increase the population density and hence significantly increase the demand for public transit, so it's only going to aggravate the already unreliable service. I really need to ask what plans are being put into place to beef up the capacity of both Muni and Bart. And the Bart Shuttle is an idea that actually needs to be looked at. The walk from Bart, which I've done many times, is my morning workout. It's a three quarter mile walk which is not very long, but you have about 118 feet elevation gain with an average of five percent grade when you're carrying a heavy backpack this is a workout to get from the Bart Station to my office in the science building. Surveys have shown that people want the shuttle from BART. They want an easy way to get there.

We need a Bart Shuttle. Skyline has one and the Fehr and Peers Report said that it would cost over a million, but Skyline is running there for \$300,000 so you know we need to figure out what they're doing that we should be copying. In the preamble to the principles and parameters it was very clear that the community cares deeply about City College, its long term health and growth, and we're especially concerned that the Balboa Reservoir development is going to displace the surface parking lot currently utilized by students. That report was commissioned in order to reduce single occupant vehicle trips by college staff faculty students in neighborhood residence. The conclusion was preordained, nobody asked the students if that was actually practical. We need to study what students need and how they access their higher education. There's a report from the Inside Higher Ed Journal that surprised itself when it found that the fifth biggest challenge that community college students report is parking. A key conclusion of City College's own education masterplan says that the main obstacles to completing education and training programs are the cost, commuting, and scheduling. The TDM programs, even if they are provided, there will still be an unserved demand for approximately 220 to 1,000 parking spaces in the peak hours, so in that scenario with the low ball of 220, did not account for the steam buildings. If they had, then the



demand would have been more in the range of 980 to 1,700. So the the developer used cherry picked data and we're still waiting for the developer agreement.

So citizens advisory committee I ask you're the last you're the voice of the community and I ask, you to use it. We need to tell San Francisco Planning that the current plans need revision. The environmental impacts identified need to be mitigated, not waived, student access to higher education must be preserved, viable transportation options must be put into place before current ones are eliminated. And also we're living in a pandemic. Right now we don't know what the world will look like on the other side. So I would say that it would be prudent to delay decisions that might further hurt the working classes of San Francisco. We know that City College will be one of the drivers in the recovery efforts of the working class.

11. Hi I'd like to know why the presentations stopped at the Muni slide. And if there's a way to at least show the rest of the presentation. We may not able to coordinate it with the speaker but it would be nice for people to be able to see those other slides. Thank you.
12. This is Jennifer from Sunnyside. Thank you for giving me a chance to speak. I just want to thank Mike Ahrens and Wynd and everybody for their comments about the inadequate parking for City College. I do hope the Ocean Avenue improvements actually improve traffic and pedestrian safety on the South end of the project and appreciate that the SF MTA recognizes that Sunnyside also has concerns about traffic in our neighborhood. We recognize that the population of the new development on top of all the students at City College will generate a lot of traffic in Sunnyside because there's less parking for the students and there are a lot more people in the area. Sunnyside hosts many families, many childcare centers, and schools including two elementary schools, so we would like to know, what will be done to ensure traffic and pedestrian safety in Sunnyside on the North side of the project? I didn't see any mention of that. Thank you.
13. Hello this is Madeline Mueller. I'd left last time with the concern that we not rush into things while the college gets its new folks in line. We have an interim chancellor and the search will start very soon for a year's worth, but we have three months worth right now, and that should be on board whoever that is in July. And we have an interim vice chancellor of facilities. Again, for just a month or two. The job is closing the announcement May 1. This has all been something announced today at the facilities committee, which I'm on. Earlier Chris Hansen pointed out to talk to the real college. You're going to get a chance but it will take maybe another two months at best to get people in line, to get them on board, knowing what's up. We went through a process today at the Facilities Committee. We think we got it all kind of lined up to get real college input and I really would like this project to have real college input. You have not had real college input, and that that can only make people crazy down the road but there is a chance now in another couple of months, I give you my promise that you will have actual official college input, so I hope you hold off things until that happens.

#### **D. CAC Responses to Public Comment**

- Mike Ahrens: Appreciate Jean Barish's comments with respect to aspirational aspect of TDM. Coordinating or combining CCSF and Balboa Reservoir TDM is a good idea. Should publish Fehr and Peers report on website.
- Peter Tham: Bike docking station, with increased use of bike share, will need increased

bike parking along Ocean Avenue if we expect new residents to be using businesses along Ocean Avenue.

- Maurice Rivers: CAC needs to get a lockdown on the parking issue before sunseting.
- Jon Winston: Removal of CCSF retaining wall and transit signal priority could really increase capacity of Ocean Avenue. Does not make sense to build additional parking for one week out of year when students are signing up for classes, especially when each spot costs \$50,000 - \$100,000. Could prepare and educate students on transportation options ahead of time.

## 5. General Comment & Close of Meeting

### A. Introduction of Resolution

Jon Winston introduced a resolution that has been sent to CAC members, but not the public. CAC members will vote on it next month. The resolution urges the Board of Supervisors to fund improvements on the Frida Kahlo Avenue to Mission Street on Geneva Avenue portions of the Ocean Avenue Corridor Design plan that was finished in 2015. This will prepare the neighborhood for future increases in density from the Balboa Reservoir and Upper Yard.

### B. CAC Comments on Resolution Introduction

- Amy O’Hair: supports resolution and moving to next meeting
- Mark Tang: support resolution, but wondering if this is within the bounds of the CAC. Can discuss further at next meeting.

### C. General Public Comment:

1. This is Harry Bernstein. I know Mr. Yee says that he would be presenting some of this material to the board tomorrow. He mentioned the development agreement that several of the speakers said that they were interested in but I realized that what happens often is that somebody comes before the board and then there's a 30 day hold period, so I'm just trying to get an answer to whether the development agreement will be made available to the public immediately because I know Mr. Yee said he wants to have extra time for discussion. The Balboa Reservoir TDM, for instance, only became available two days ago, and there were hints at it in their published documents weeks ago, but we didn't know what it was until they finally released it. So the same thing here, when will we get the development agreement available because I think there are going to be a lot of things in there that we'll have to look at the language very carefully.
2. Hedda Thieme. Could you please tell me if Supervisor Yee is speaking about the special use district tomorrow, and what kind of meeting is this going to be tomorrow and where and when. Thank you.
  - a. Jon Winston response: This is the Board of Supervisors meeting tomorrow at the regular Tuesday Board of Supervisors meeting which will be on the Web if you can get out if you can watch it there and you can, I believe call in these days as well.

3. I'm Theodore Randolph and I think any calls to say we should slow down the reservoir, that maybe we might not need the housing in the future, I think that's very much not the case. We should have finished this. It shouldn't take this long to do a housing project. This is too much time and the housing shortage that this project is doing one very small part to help alleviate has been building up for decades. I think even with all the unemployment now, we still need a lot more housing to be built in San Francisco if you want San Francisco to be affordable. Thank you.

#### **D. CAC Closing Comments**

- Mike Ahrens: Transportation issues must be addressed before moving forward with project. We do need input from City College.
- Amy O'Hair: Following up on Jennifer's comment. Will follow up with SFMTA to address the situation for pedestrians and bicycles at Judson and Frida.
- Maurice Rivers: Seconding Theodore Randolph's comment that this project is taking too long and still stuck on rudimentary things that should have been taken care of much earlier on. We should be further ahead than we are now.
- Mark Tang: Get this project done with good public input.
- Jon Winston: Tribute to Robert Muehlbauer.