

## Lutenski, Leigh (ECN)

---

**From:** Rita M EVANS <rita.evans@berkeley.edu>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 8, 2020 4:33 PM  
**To:** BRCAC (ECN)  
**Cc:** SNA-BRC@googlegroups.com  
**Subject:** Design Standards and Guidelines Section 5--Comments for BRCAC April 8, 2020  
**Attachments:** DSG Section 5 Comments BRCAC 4-6-20 Evans.doc

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Attached are comments regarding one Guideline and one Standard in Section 5 of the Balboa Reservoir Design Standards and Guidelines Draft:

- G.10.1, Litter & Receptacles
- S.5..8.1, Native Plants

These are submitted for the Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee meeting being held today, April 8, 2020.

Rita Evans  
Judson Avenue

--

Rita Evans

Comments submitted to Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee April 8, 2020  
April 8, 2020  
Rita Evans, Judson Avenue  
*Balboa Reservoir Design Standards and Guidelines, Draft, Feb 2020*

## **LITTER & RECYCLING RECEPTACLES**

### **Litter & Recycling Receptacles, G.5.10.1**

*Litter & recycling receptacles shall be provided **when regular maintenance and cleaning is available**. They shall be attractive site furnishings which contribute to the quality of the street and provide options for landfill, recycling and compost. They should also be able to open from the side to allow easy access for maintenance. Waste receptacles shall be located at areas of high pedestrian traffic, such as near pedestrian crossings.*

We object to this guideline for several reasons. It states that "...receptacles shall be provided *when regular maintenance and cleaning is available*" but there is no statement of what entity is responsible for providing the maintenance and cleaning, nor any indication of what entity can determine whether such cleaning and maintenance is available and therefore whether such service will be provided.

This Guideline, for a project with streets, a park, walkways, and common areas, also fails to address the issue of litter on the ground.

Further, since this is a guideline and not the standard it should be, no minimum number of receptacles is specified, no schedule for maintenance is specified, no responsible party to perform the maintenance is designated, and no mechanism for ensuring compliance is specified.

Without stronger guidelines and such standards with relevant performance measures, we envision a handful of overflowing receptacles, trash swirling in the wind, and no one responsible for emptying the receptacles or picking up the trash.

**A Standard must be provided requiring AvalonBay Communities + BRIDGE Housing to provide a sufficient (minimum) number of receptacles and to adhere to a regular maintenance schedule with compliance monitoring and enforcement action.**

**AvalonBay Communities + BRIDGE Housing must be required to provide litter and trash removal on streets, sidewalks, Reservoir Park, pathways, and all other common spaces on a regular basis to address trash that is not deposited in receptacles. Again, this must be a Standard with performance requirements, monitoring, and enforcement.**

## **NATIVE PLANT RATIO**

### **Standards S.5.8.1**

#### **Native Plant Ratio**

*All 50% of groundcover and shrubs planted in regular and stormwater planting area shall be native species.*

We object to this Standard. The standard appears to contain a typo as it says both “All” and “50%” of groundcover and shrubs shall be native species. Given the paucity of available native street trees, it may make sense to allow for exotics in the selection of trees. There is no such argument in favor of using any exotics for groundcover and shrubs.

**With an abundant variety of native plants available, this project must specify 100% native plants for groundcover and shrubs.**

## Lutenski, Leigh (ECN)

---

**From:** Harry Bernstein <riquerique@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 8, 2020 7:13 PM  
**To:** BRCAC (ECN)  
**Subject:** April 8, '20, virtual CAC meeting, DSG guidelines, ELDP status and timeline

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

comment by Harry Bernstein on Item 3, on an aspect of the DSG, for CAC members--  
=====

Governor Newsom approved the Balboa Reservoir Project's designation as an Environmental Leadership Development Project (ELDP) on December, 30, 2019, from AB 900—the Jobs and Economic Leadership Act of 2011, as amended 8/26/16. Qualifying projects are rewarded by receiving expedited judicial review of CEQA issues. By the way, the ELDP status is highlighted on p. 25 of the Design Standards and Guidelines for the project (DSG).

According to one relevant clause of the Public Resources Code, **SECTION 1. 21178 (c)** The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

> this legislation applies to “large projects...that would replace old and outmoded facilities with new job-creating facilities to meet those regions’ needs...”  
-----

Since the Balboa Reservoir project is for a new facility rather than an old and outmoded one, it appears questionable as to whether it actually qualifies—see documentation below.

The other issue is that although the Planning Department filed its application on June 25, 2019, it is assumed that the public, including the BRCAC, whether inadvertently or otherwise, was not informed of this application between then and the time that public comment period closed on July 28, 2019. One BRCAC member, Mr. Ahrens, said that he first became aware of the Public Resources Code and the ELDP designation on August 7. So today there is a request, courtesy of aj, for all BRCAC members to submit personal statements for the Reservoir Project administrative Record to answer two questions:

- 1 ) Was the community informed about the AB 900 Application to the State Clearinghouse to allow for public review within the allotted timeframe?
- 2 ) Were you and the BRCAC notified in a timely manner about the opportunity for public review and comment of the Balboa Project's application for ELDP status.

This can be sent to [cpc.balboareservoir@sfgov.org](mailto:cpc.balboareservoir@sfgov.org). [The specific subject is the timeliness of notification for the AB 900--Application SCH # 2018102028.]

Being able to comment on the prospect of expedited review for this process would have been of interest to many members of the community who have been attending BRCAC meetings. After all, CEQA review was already underway at the time that the AB 900 Application was open for public comment, but a person cannot comment on something he or she does not know about.

=====

## DOCUMENTATION—

SECTION 1. **21178.** of the Public Resources Code, as amended on 8/26/16

The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

*21178 (c) There are large projects under consideration in various regions of the state that would **replace old and outmoded facilities with new job-creating facilities to meet those regions' needs** while also establishing new, cutting-edge environmental benefits to those regions.*

notification for the AB 900 Application SCH # 2018102028 was filed by SF Planning Dept on 6/25/2019.

AB 900 is enacted in PRC Div 13, Ch. 6.5 "Jobs and Economic Improvement Through Leadership Act of 2011", Sections 21178-

21189 [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes\\_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=PRC&division=13.&title=&part=&chapter=6.5.&article=](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=PRC&division=13.&title=&part=&chapter=6.5.&article=)

## Lutenski, Leigh (ECN)

---

**From:** Lisa Dunseth <dunsethl@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 10, 2020 2:24 PM  
**To:** BRCAC (ECN)  
**Subject:** Balboa Reservoir neighborhood

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Regarding the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood:

Dear Sir or Madam,

The parking lot at City College is underused and should be developed. However this project is way too big.

The City of San Francisco does not have the infrastructure (sewer, water, fire, transportation, local grocery shops) to support the density of the neighborhood as it currently is. The city will definitely not be able to support and sustain this new Balboa Reservoir neighborhood. As the pandemic has shown us, density is not always good--except for the developers who will be making money on their projects.

In addition, the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood will block the views of the Pacific Ocean from City College's historic campus. The grand entrance leading up to the Science Building, which faces west at the top of the rise, and which has endured neglect for so long, will also lose claim to its stately view.

That is a sad fact, adding insult to City College's ongoing injuries.

Please consider how to protect this aspect of City College.

Thank you,  
Lisa Dunseth  
94112

April 8, 2020

Balboa Reservoir Citizens Advisory Committee  
Jon Winston, Chair

RE: Balboa Reservoir Design Standards and Guidelines

I am writing to comment on the Balboa Reservoir Design Guidelines presented on Wednesday April 8, 2020 CAC Meeting:

- A. I applaud the efforts of the design team on their presentation and their efforts to design a greenhouse neutral development.
- B. Bicycle and pedestrian access at San Ramon Paseo is essential:
  - 1) To provide safe entry parallel to Ocean Avenue into the new development and the amenities specifically parks, childcare, walking trails and bike paths as well as easy access to City College and the Muni transit center on Frida Kahlo Way;
  - 2) To allow Westwood Park residents and other neighbors direct and easy access to the same amenities that will be available in the new development;
  - 3) To fully and seamlessly integrate this new neighborhood into the general community.
- C. In addition to the comments and recommendations regarding designs, building materials and colors that take into consideration our general environment which includes strong ocean winds, fog, humidity that encourages mold, I would also like to *point out the grime from heavy street traffic and pigeons.*
- D. The area along Ocean Avenue has had a history of flooding. I recommend that where ever possible permeable pavers or like materials be incorporated in the design and building materials.
- E. I support both concepts having accessible places and stoops where people can gather and watch kids play, get together to have conversation or just sit and read. Would a stoop with a ramp be a possibility?
- F. The concept that the Unity Plaza Design Committee had was that the Plaza would be a gateway and to that end joining the Plaza to this new community via the PUC access area is very important and it seems to me to be achievable.
- G. I also support public comment regarding peaceful areas in the newly designed park be made available as well as spaces for play for children and adults.

H. Finally, I wish to thank the Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee for their due diligence in making this such an effective forum.

By way of reference, I am a resident of Westwood Park (42+ years) and active in the community. I am currently a member of the Ocean Avenue Association Street Life and Business Improvement Committees, the OMI Cultural Participation Project (Board Member), and other organizations supporting the Ocean Avenue/Ingleside neighborhoods, Arts and Culture District and retail corridor. I am a former member of the Westwood Park Association Board of Directors (President 2009-2016), and Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Board (Vice Chair 2015-2016) and member of the Mercy House and Unity Plaza Design Committees.

Sincerely,



Kate Favetti

C: Leigh Lutenski, OEWD  
Seung Yen Hong, Planner



## Lutenski, Leigh (ECN)

---

**From:** Jennifer Heggie <jdheggie@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 8, 2020 8:57 AM  
**To:** BRCAC (ECN)  
**Subject:** Comments for BRCAC 4/8/20, Part 1

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear BRCAC members,  
Here is my first set of comments/questions. There are more to follow.

1. With implementation of the SUD, can existing SF codes for noise and other environmental impacts be ignored? My question is based on Page iv, Relationship to the Planning Code and the content of the SUD: "In the event provisions in this DSG directly conflict with those in the Planning Code, this DSG will control so long as the DSG remains consistent with the SUD. "

This follows the following context: "Applicability of the DSG"—"The DSG is applicable within the boundaries of the Special Use District (SUD); the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Retained Fee Parcel shall be exempted from the DSG. "

2. 1.2 Project Goals makes no mention of constructing in an environmentally friendly manner that does not harm the neighborhood. This is particularly startling in this era of experiencing the impacts of poor planning and inadequate consideration of our public health. The goal includes "Ensure Project Feasibility, to meet the urgent need for mixed income housing.... All elements of the project will be carefully evaluated against the project goals to ensure an economy of means so that Balboa Reservoir is funded and constructed in a timely manner." Protecting the public health of our existing neighborhoods should be a goal.

3. The Page 11 Project Overview provides a misrepresentation of the current use of the space, inaccurate at most and incomplete at a minimum. The space was used for multiple purposes prior to our lockdown, including band practice, motorcycle and other training, and student parking: The Overview states "Today, the 17-acre site is essentially a blank slate, with no remaining buildings nor original landscape elements. This presents a rare opportunity in San Francisco, to imagine a new and bold urban form that can unite the eclectic surrounding elements from different periods into a cohesive whole. "

Regards,

Jennifer Heggie

4/8/2020 BRCAC meeting comments re DSG:

1. Is the purpose of the SUD to get around meeting San Francisco ordinances such as the Noise Ordinance? Please respond to this question. Is it possible that SF codes for noise and other environmental impacts will be ignored based on Page iv, Relationship to the Planning Code , “In the event provisions in this DSG directly conflict with those in the Planning Code, this DSG will control so long as the DSG remains consistent with the SUD.” “ This is not acceptable in an area so close to residents in older homes, daycare centers and a school.

This follows the following context: “Applicability of the DSG”—“The DSG is applicable within the boundaries of the Special Use District (SUD); the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Retained Fee Parcel shall be exempted from the DSG. “

If so, this is cruel and destructive in an area so close to residents, many of whom are in older homes; as well as to the adjacent daycare centers; City College and Riordan High School, which is also a boarding school. There will be public health consequences, particularly if residents must self-isolate in their homes.

2. 1.2 Project Goals makes no mention of constructing in an environmentally friendly manner that does not harm the neighborhood. The goal includes “Ensure Project Feasibility, to meet the urgent need for mixed income housing.... All elements of the project will be carefully evaluated against the project goals to ensure an economy of means so that Balboa Reservoir is funded and constructed in a timely manner.”
3. The Page 11 Project Overview provides a misrepresentation of the current use of the space, inaccurate at most and incomplete at a minimum: The Overview states “Today, the 17-acre site is essentially a blank slate, with no remaining buildings nor original landscape elements. This presents a rare opportunity in San Francisco, to imagine a new and bold urban form that can unite the eclectic surrounding elements from different periods into a cohesive whole. “
4. The Site is currently zoned P, “Public,” and is in the 40-X height and bulk district (page 12, para 1) Page 13 shows that Sunnyside is made up of 40-X zoning. When did the heights rise to 40x outside of the Monterey corridor? My understanding was that the zoning could rise up to 28ft like Westwood Park.
5. The Ocean Avenue Safety Project is focused on improving access, safety, and connectivity from Balboa Park BART station to the Ocean Avenue Community Corridor. There is no focus on Frida Kahlo Way and no attention to Judson Avenue and other Sunnyside streets. It is to improve the walking experience and a balance of transportation uses. The focus of SFMTA is from Unity Plaza to the BART station along Geneva and Ocean Avenues. Some of the most impacted communities are being ignored.
6. Page 13: Consultation and coordination with City College is misrepresented. Staff has not been in consultation with the developers unless within the last month or two. Not only does this project exclude consideration of the expected construction of a much taller STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Math) building next to the PAEC (which is a smaller Diego Rivera theater), the City College Facilities Management Committee had no discussion or coordination on this proposed Balboa Reservoir development since VP Smith left City College. The developers were not even aware when VP Reuben Smith, the person ultimately responsible for facilities, left City College.

7. Page 14, Figure 1.7-1 has inaccuracies. The reservoir wasn't reconfigured until the late 2000s/early 2010s so that City College would own the upper reservoir rather than the northern reservoir. That switch was not made in 1991.
8. Page 24, figure 2.5.2 The restored Typography figure identifies the neighborhood just North of Riordan HS as Sunnyside. That is not accurate. It is part of Westwood Park.
9. Page 28, figure 2.9-1. The sides of the building adjacent to Riordan become private on the East at Lee Avenue and on the West at West Street. Doesn't that limit the entrance and exit from the garage? If the garage entrance is only on North Street because the other two are private, it is most likely to cause a congestion backup.
10. Page 29, Figure 2.10-1 indicates that as we brought up in many meetings, the ocean wind will be re-directed, possibly funneled, smack at Sunnyside. This part of Sunnyside is already hard hit by ocean winds that have toppled trees and destroyed new saplings.
11. Page 30, Figure 2.11-1 The greywater treatment will be in the most affordable housing buildings. How do the developers plan to ensure this doesn't release a bad smell? And what mitigation measures are there to fix a stench if for some reason the measures don't work? Riordan HS and Sunnyside are downwind of one of the greywater treatment buildings.
12. Page 30, Figure 2.11-1 incorporates City College student housing buildings as well as the original design for the PAEC. As stated earlier, it does not include a STEAM building.
13. What assurance is there that privately owned, publicly accessible streets will be maintained? If they provide part of an entrance/exit to Riordan or the public parking garage, they will need to be maintained. Are the developers relying on Homeowners Association fees to take care of maintenance of the private streets?
14. Page 35. The childcare facility will include a portion of the outdoor space which may be from the adjacent SFPUC open space or Reservoir Park, thus reducing the area open to everyone which was requested to be at least four acres in the Request for Proposal.
15. Retail spaces of not more than 7,500 feet in aggregate may be located on the ground floor of multiple buildings. This space does not include possible kiosks and machines. Retail space was purposefully not included as part of the principles and parameters.
16. \*\*Page 36 S.3.4.1--Public parking no more than 750 public spaces. Public parking is not required on the reservoir site!!! Refers to Section 7.21. This violates the principles and parameters. Above grade public parking can only be in blocks A or G.
17. Per page 104, the 28 foot fire lane on the North West side of the Balboa Reservoir is being considered open space and a loading zone. Designated open spaces on the North side need more greenery to absorb noise next to and from the athletic field of the school. Open space needs to be true open space that provides respite and greenery near the dense and outsize adjacent buildings. Calling paved areas for parking and loading open space cheapens the concept of needed open space for fresh air, human recreation, mental health and social distancing.

To be continued.

## Lutenski, Leigh (ECN)

---

**From:** Pauline Jue <pjdiva1994@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 8, 2020 1:30 PM  
**To:** BRCAC (ECN); mikeahrensS@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Fwd: Tonight's Balboa Park Reservoir CAC meeting and tomorrow's Planning Department meeting

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **pjdiva1994** <[pjdiva1994@gmail.com](mailto:pjdiva1994@gmail.com)>  
Date: Wed, Apr 8, 2020, 12:00 PM  
Subject: Tonight's Balboa Park Reservoir CAC meeting and tomorrow's Planning Department meeting  
To: <[norman.yee@sfgov.org](mailto:norman.yee@sfgov.org)>, <[seungyen.hong@sfgov.org](mailto:seungyen.hong@sfgov.org)>, <[brcac@sfgov.org](mailto:brcac@sfgov.org)>, <[jeanie.poling@sfgov.org](mailto:jeanie.poling@sfgov.org)>  
Cc: Anita Theoharis <[atheoharis@sbcglobal.net](mailto:atheoharis@sbcglobal.net)>, <[board@westwoodpark.org](mailto:board@westwoodpark.org)>, <[mikeahrensS@gmail.com](mailto:mikeahrensS@gmail.com)>

We've been involved with this proposed project for 2 years. Now the Planning Department is moving ahead with a virtual meeting? This is touted as a way to conduct and continue the process but anyone who does not have Internet access or receive their emails will not know about or can participate in these meetings. (You can call in to hear the meeting but how were these instructions sent out? By email!)

After 2 years of working with the community to involve them in a "transparent" process, this move to have a meeting without complete access exposes the fact that "progress" at any cost is more important than public participation.

I think these meetings should be postponed until all who want can participate can do so.

Pauline Jue

Sent from Samsung tablet.

## Lutenski, Leigh (ECN)

---

**From:** Benjamin Schneider <benjaminmosesschneider@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 8, 2020 3:46 PM  
**To:** BRCAC (ECN)  
**Subject:** Please Approve Balboa Reservoir Project

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To Whom It May Concern,

I am an Ingleside Terraces resident who lives within a mile of the Balboa Reservoir project. I have viewed the presentation slated for today, and am getting even more excited about this projects. The project's extensive environmental mitigation measures are impressive, as are the landscaping and public space amenities. I only wish the project would include even greater density. Our neighborhood desperately needs more housing, especially reasonably sized, reasonably priced apartment housing, and this project represents a major step in the right direction.

I implore you to grant this round of approvals and turn this project into a reality.

Best,

Benjamin Schneider

## Lutenski, Leigh (ECN)

---

**From:** aj <ajahjah@att.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 20, 2020 1:02 PM  
**To:** BRCAC (ECN); sunnyside.balboa.reservoir; mikeahrens5; Brigitte Davila; Jon Winston; Peter Tham; jumpstreet1983; cgodinez; rmuehlbauer; tang.mark  
**Cc:** CPC-Commissions Secretary; Hood, Donna (PUC); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Maybaum, Erica (BOS); SNA BRC; Public Lands for Public Good; John Rizzo; Thea Selby; Shanell Williams; Ivy Lee; Alex Randolph; Tom Temprano; studenttrustee@mail.ccsf.edu  
**Subject:** For 4/27/2020 meeting: DSG in full context of rezoning

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

BRCAC:

DSG is once again on the agenda for the 4/27/2020 meeting.

However the DSG topic avoids addressing the broader subject of rezoning...Rezoning that the Planning Commission is being asked to approve.

Early on in the Reservoir Project's "public engagement process" in 2015-2016, people in the community had raised the issues of zoning and density. The Reservoir Team avoided addressing these (unspeakable?) issues during the Principles & Parameters period.

It was only after the RFP process had concluded that it was revealed that the Project was proposing 1,100-1,550 units.

The programmatic Balboa Park Station Area Plan, to which the Reservoir Project is subsidiary, talked about 425-500 units; not 1,100. It was unconscionable and dishonest for the Planning Dept/OEWD to deliberately avoid addressing the issues of zoning and density until after the RFP selection.

It is only now that Planning Dept Staff is asking for the Planning Commission to make major changes in zoning via a "General Plan Amendment."

The proposed General Plan Amendment makes MAJOR changes to the Balboa Park Station Area Plan's Housing Element and Open Space Element.

**The 1,100-unit privatized Reservoir Project is not compliant with the existing Balboa Park Station Area Plan and San Francisco General Plan. The Reservoir Project is being reverse-engineered via the proposed General Plan Amendment to make it such.** The cart had been knowingly placed before the horse from the git-go.

Planning Dept/OEWD's manipulation of the General Plan Amendment shows egregious lack of integrity. Why were the issues of rezoning from "Public" to "Special Use District" avoided and hidden from public view until recently?

Rezoning of "Public" to private needs full airing out--not just from a stage-managed Staff presentation--but from the public in more than mere 2-minute snippets.

--aj

## Lutenski, Leigh (ECN)

---

**From:** Harry Bernstein <riquerique@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 20, 2020 2:31 PM  
**To:** BRCAC (ECN); sunnyside.balboa.reservoir; mikeahrens5; Brigitte Davila; Jon Winston; Peter Tham; jumpstreet1983; cgodinez; rmuehlbauer; tang.mark; aj  
**Cc:** CPC-Commissions Secretary; Hood, Donna (PUC); Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Maybaum, Erica (BOS); SNA BRC; Public Lands for Public Good; John Rizzo; Thea Selby; Shanell Williams; Ivy Lee; Alex Randolph; Tom Temprano; studenttrustee@mail.ccsf.edu  
**Subject:** Re: For 4/27/2020 meeting: DSG in full context of rezoning

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello, all

I appreciate aj's continuing efforts to focus on the planning procedures that have led us to the present juncture. aj is no doubt right about this less-than-transparent planning process, and the community would have recognized what was being pushed (in terms of zoning) if the planning goals for project density had been more clearly stated. Planning and OEWD might have foreseen the proclivities of the Planning Commission. At the hearing on April 9, one or two of the members went out of their way to commend the use of a General Plan Amendment to update an existing plan. In this case, since the result of the amendment is to provide more housing--an overarching objective of the current City administration--it's seen as a means to an end. The gross process was certainly pointed out by some. The estimated density from the Housing Element was explicitly mentioned at the hearing. The meticulous and lengthy process for approving the original Balboa Park Station Area Plan, lasting eight years or so, was articulately highlighted in a comment from a resident of Westwood Park. That's even longer than it has taken the Balboa Reservoir project to get from the initial public meetings of 2014 to the present, which several of the YIMBY folks contemptuously ridiculed. But you can add another two years or so to that early timeline if you go back to the Golden Shovel real estate challenge of 2012, which produced two detailed analyses of the Balboa Reservoir. (It was intended as advice for the SFPUC, which also happened to be one of the sponsors of the competition.) In 2016, aj summarized one aspect of the winning competition from UC Berkeley:

> Unlike the City Team's unwillingness to acknowledge the importance of parking for CCSF and the neighborhoods, the UC students saw parking to be of obvious importance."The proposal also took advantage of the site's unique topography to provide below-grade replacement parking at close to above-grade costs. "As the largest student parking area on campus, replacement parking was a focal point of both the CCSF and the local community," says D'Orazi.

=====

The developers of the project are not against more parking facilities than what they have already proposed. It's just that if CCSF wants additional parking, they'll have to provide it, at an unbelievable cost per space, and probably on their own land. (Note that in the above quote, the suggestion was made for underground parking.)

When the project was at a more preliminary stage, the planning process always seemed to give it the benefit of the doubt--initial approval of a TDM (a Transportation Demand Management plan, which is required for any large housing development) or the ENA (Exclusive Negotiating Agreement), officially recognizing and granting negotiating rights to the developer of the proposed project. The bodies that gave their initial approvals were quick to point out that this was not final approval. There would be a stage further down the line to evaluate the total impact of the project. (At that point, it would have become hard to stop, especially if it was merely about quibbles



concerning the transparency of the early planning process. With the familiar adage about broken eggs in mind, the planning process seems to be most concerned with the end product; that is, it's more about erecting omelets than preserving the integrity of eggs.)

This is not to say that it's misguided to continue to raise our voices and to battle inequities and improper procedures. How can such arguments be useful as the development team is beginning to see the end in sight, later this very year--when it comes before the Board of Supervisors in July. If that is a straightforward vote at a virtual meeting, efforts have to be intensified at the remaining preliminary approval procedures continue to come up.

Harry B.

On Monday, April 20, 2020, 01:01:47 PM PDT, aj <ajahjah@att.net> wrote:

BRCAC:

DSG is once again on the agenda for the 4/27/2020 meeting.

However the DSG topic avoids addressing the broader subject of rezoning...Rezoning that the Planning Commission is being asked to approve.

Early on in the Reservoir Project's "public engagement process" in 2015-2016, people in the community had raised the issues of zoning and density. The Reservoir Team avoided addressing these (unspeakable?) issues during the Principles & Parameters period.

It was only after the RFP process had concluded that it was revealed that the Project was proposing 1,100-1,550 units.

The programmatic Balboa Park Station Area Plan, to which the Reservoir Project is subsidiary, talked about 425-500 units; not 1,100. It was unconscionable and dishonest for the Planning Dept/OEWD to deliberately avoid addressing the issues of zoning and density until after the RFP selection.

It is only now that Planning Dept Staff is asking for the Planning Commission to make major changes in zoning via a "General Plan Amendment."

The proposed General Plan Amendment makes MAJOR changes to the Balboa Park Station Area Plan's Housing Element and Open Space Element.

**The 1,100-unit privatized Reservoir Project is not compliant with the existing Balboa Park Station Area Plan and San Francisco General Plan. The Reservoir Project is being reverse-engineered via the proposed General Plan Amendment to make it such.** The cart had been knowingly placed before the horse from the git-go.

Planning Dept/OEWD's manipulation of the General Plan Amendment shows egregious lack of integrity. Why were the issues of rezoning from "Public" to "Special Use District" avoided and hidden from public view until recently?

Rezoning of "Public" to private needs full airing out--not just from a stage-managed Staff presentation--but from the public in more than mere 2-minute snippets.

--aj

## Lutenski, Leigh (ECN)

---

**From:** Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 23, 2020 4:08 PM  
**To:** BRCAC (ECN)  
**Subject:** Public comments virtual meeting balboa reservoir...

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

As I am unable to call in or attend due to an injury please accept the comments below.

1) in a similar vein to other large scale institutional growth plans and housing developments in SF efforts on infrastructural changes and forward mass transit policy is lagging very behind these development projects. Muni and Bart cannot and have not stepped up their larger scale planning endeavors to meet the population growth from these projects. It is critical to provide infrastructural investment in transit capacity and system linkages even if in secondary means. I have suggested a joint development of a "high-line" e-shuttle and walkway that would directly connect the reservoir area down the southern edge of CCSF over to Tony Sacco way and Balboa Park Bart station. It would link to CCSF planing for a garage entry on the eastern edge parking lots and provide the police station and LWHS and park area adjacent with a connective system. Bikes pedestrians and the e-shuttle would run on this planted median walkway above traffic and have elevators and escalators at the ends and mid section to allow movement.

It's more conceptual in nature. It it would be a very solid step to solving part of the problems along CCSF's southern and eastern edge and loss of Parking concerns. Muni and Bart also have impacts parking wise so the joint development of an east side plinth platform with parking below and student and faculty housing above l'm the existing bungalows and parking areas adjacent to the freeway would be a win win situation.

I have spoken prior on the needs for a more collaborative process but like SFSU-CSU parkmerced and stonestowns redevelopment projects and domino effects it falls on deaf ears unless everyone is brought to the table and force to work with the same cards dealt.

I would gladly walk the area and sketch the issue but this project provides some housing affordability but misses the mark on other issues for infrastructural changes and a more collaborative solution pushed forward on transit.

With congestion on ocean ave during school periods at a standstill and the freeway off ramp project yet to begin there will be more concerns when construction delivery vehicles and workers begin parking in the area for this large project alongside the CCSF projects....

Please take this into account and push for a more transit collaborative solution listening to prior input by the balboa park area plan cac and members of that panels concerns on the redevelopment of the reservoir.

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman D11 resident

(Former chair BPSCAC)

## Lutenski, Leigh (ECN)

---

**From:** aj <ajahjah@att.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 25, 2020 5:16 AM  
**To:** CPC-Commissions Secretary; Board of Supervisors, (BOS)  
**Cc:** Public Lands for Public Good; BRCAC (ECN)  
**Subject:** Fw: Failure to record and respond to DSG comment-- Re: Comment on Implementation Documents: 1. Special Use District (4/6/2020 BRCAC meeting)  
**Attachments:** 5. zoning map 0-0-0-1591.pdf; 6. Open Space Maps-- BPS Area Plan, General Plan, GPA.pdf

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Planning Commission, Supervisors:

The Balboa Reservoir CAC process has been essentially a platform to promote the privatization of public land. Viewpoints and analysis outside the parameters set by Staff and developers are limited to 2-minute snippets.

Without actually allowing for substantive input, the CAC process merely provides a phoney appearance of public engagement which is lacking in substance.

Please see email to Reservoir Staff and CAC, below.

Alvin Ja, District 7

----- Forwarded Message -----

**From:** aj <ajahjah@att.net>  
**To:** BRCAC ECN <brcac@sfgov.org>;  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 25, 2020, 4:49:43 AM PDT  
**Subject:** Failure to record and respond to DSG comment-- Re: Comment on Implementation Documents: 1. Special Use District (4/6/2020 BRCAC meeting)

Leigh, CAC:

I have looked at the CAC website entries for the 4/27/2020 meeting.

Although I had submitted a written comment on your DSG presentation in a timely manner prior to the 4/8 CAC meeting, I see neither a record of, nor a response to, my comment.

I commented on the Staff's PowerPoint presentation "DSG presentation with script." The PowerPoint itself had the heading "The Balboa Neighborhood Design Standards and Guidelines (DSG)." Under "DSG Overview", I commented on "Implementation Documents", below.

Because the CAC format does not allow for substantive discussion outside of what is presented by Staff and developers, I have made the effort to provide you with analysis outside your permitted boundaries of discussion.

Please at the very least put it on the record !

Sincerely,  
aj

On Monday, April 6, 2020, 12:10:10 PM PDT, aj <ajahjah@att.net> wrote:

BRCAC members:

You need to be clear on the significance of the Special Use District.

The current zoning for the Reservoir is "P" Public. Public zoning means exactly that--PUBLIC. The Reservoir parcel is currently zoned for public, not private ownership. The essence of the rezoning from Public to a Special Use District is the PRIVATIZATION OF PUBLIC PROPERTY.

The current P zoning is intrinsic to the Balboa Park Station Area Plan that came out of the BPS Program-level EIR.

The lower-level Reservoir Project does not comply with the existing higher-level BPS Area Plan.

Because the lower-level Project is non-compliant with the higher-level BPS Area Plan, the project sponsors seek to change the higher-level BPS Area Plan. They seek to rezone the Reservoir parcel from Public to a Special Use District to enable the privatization of public property.

The project sponsors will be presenting a "General Plan Amendment" to the Planning Commission on 4/9/2020. The main feature of the General Plan Amendment will be to rezone the Reservoir from P to Special Use District.

The following, with 2 attachments (Zoning Map and Open Space Maps), has been submitted to the Planning Commission:

- Planning Commission: March 31, 2020

SUBJECT: Balboa Reservoir General Plan Amendment Initiation

You are being asked by Staff to initiate a General Plan Amendment to accommodate Reservoir Community Partners, LLC's development of the Balboa Reservoir.

The proposed General Plan Amendment makes substantial changes in the City & County's General Plan and the associated Balboa Park Station Area Plan.

The proposed change in zoning contained in the GPA is a BIG DEAL.

The biggest deal is the change in zoning from P-Public to a Special Use District. "P" zoning prohibits private ownership. The proposed Special Use District eliminates this public use requirement.

Instead, the rezoning to "Special Use District" will pave the way for the privatization of public land.

This privatization scam has been deceptively marketed as 50% affordable. "50% affordable" is a misrepresentation. Here are the facts:

Reservoir Community Partners will develop:

- 550 market-rate units, and
- 363 affordable units

The 550 market-rate/ 363 affordable unit split is the reality of the Reservoir Community Partners development. Reservoir Community Partners is NOT developing 50% affordable.

"50%" only comes about by Reservoir Community Partners taking undeserved credit for an additional 187 units that would be paid for with public monies, as confirmed by the BOS Budget Analyst's Fiscal Responsibility and Feasibility Report.

**Please vote NO on the staff's Resolution to initiate the GPA.**

## **AMENDMENTS TO HOUSING ELEMENT**

The Balboa Park Station Area Plan's Housing Element proposed 425-500 units. This number is eliminated in the GPA to allow for the proposed 1100+ units.

- The BPS Area Plan's figure of 500 units took into account the limited roadway network in the Reservoir area. Even with proposed mitigations in the EIR, the Reservoir vicinity will be unable to sustain the doubling of units from the BPS Area Plan's 500 units to the Reservoir Community Partners, LLC's 1100 units. The Reservoir Project's True Believers, with ideological blinders, just wish away the problem.

Planning Dept Staff asserts in its documents that the current PUC Reservoir bulk-height zoning is 40-X and 65-A. THIS IS FACTUALLY INCORRECT.

The adoption of the BPS Area Plan included the rezoning/upzoning of the PUC Reservoir to 40-X (NOT 65 ft. as the GPA erroneously presents--see attached Zoning Map for proof). As shown in the Zoning Map, the 65-A zoning applies **solely** to the CCSF Reservoir; not to PUC Reservoir.

## **AMENDMENTS TO OPEN SPACE ELEMENT**

The maps contained in the General Plan and BPS Area Plan show open space taking up at least **50%** and up to **90%** of the 17.6 acre PUC Reservoir.

The GPA shrinks it down a fraction: a 2-acre Reservoir Park (2 acre park /17.6 acre plot = **11%**), but with an additional 2 acres of privately-owned publicly-accessible open space. Please refer to attached maps of General Plan, BPS Area Plan, and GPA.

The BPS Area Plan's Policy 5.1.1 description of Open Space for the Reservoir is removed in its entirety. Privatization is not a good reason to eliminate this section in its entirety.

## **BOTTOM-LINE:**

**The Reservoir Community Partners development has been deceptively marketed as a "50% affordable" project. The facts tell otherwise.**

**The essence of the General Plan Amendment is to facilitate the privatization of public land. Please do not intitate the GPA. Keep public land in public hands. VOTE NO TO STEALTH PRIVATIZATION.**

Submitted by:

Alvin Ja, District 7

## Lutenski, Leigh (ECN)

---

**From:** aj <ajahjah@att.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 25, 2020 6:57 AM  
**To:** BRCAC (ECN); sunnyside.balboa.reservoir; mikeahrens5; jumpstreet1983; bdavila@ccsf.edu; rmuehlbauer; marktang.cac@gmail.com; cgodinez; Jon Winston; Lutenski, Leigh (ECN); Peter Tham; Maybaum, Erica (BOS); sna-brc@googlegroups.com  
**Cc:** Yee, Norman (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Board of Supervisors, (BOS)  
**Subject:** Written comment for 4/27 /2020 Reservoir CAC--Cherry picking of 220 parking spaces

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

BRCAC, Board of Supervisors:

The Material for 4/27 /2020 CAC meeting includes "Responses from sponsor on DSG."

One of the responses stated :

"RCP references a CCSF commissioned study by Fehr and Peers (March 2019). This study reports on parking counts conducted in June of 2018 and the first week of the semester in August of 2018. Based on these surveys and a consideration of CCSF growth, the current parking need is projected at ~220 spaces.

- CHERRY-PICKING OF THE 220 FIGURE

Reservoir Community Partners has presented a cherry-picked "Unmet Parking Demand" for "2026, with core TDM" of 220 spaces.

RCP has used the Fehr-Peers CCSF TDM document to minimize the Reservoir Project's responsibility to mitigate harms to the City College community.

The data from the Fehr-Peers CCSF TDM document was cherry-picked. The facts have been fixed around the policy, like the "facts" that were used to justify the Iraq War.

In actuality, the CCSF TDM document referenced by RCP/Planning Dept Staff provided 3 scenarios for unmet parking demand for "2026, with core TDM":

1. Scenario 1: Parking Demand with PAEC
2. Scenario 2: Parking Demand with Balboa Reservoir Housing Project
3. Scenario 3: Parking Demand with PAEC and Balboa Reservoir Housing Project

Planning Dept Staff has cherry-picked in two ways.

First of all, the 220 figure comes from Scenario 2, in which PAEC is left out. This non-PAEC figure is used by Planning Dept Staff despite the Reservoir Team's continual and deceptive assurances that future CCSF needs and plans would be accounted for.

Secondly, the 220 figure for the PAEC-excluded Scenario 2 is just the low-ball figure of a range. The upper figure of that range is 1,007 spaces:

*"to accommodate the peak demand at 11:00 AM, by 2026 the removal of the Lower Reservoir parking facilities would lead to a shortfall of 614 to 1,540 parking spaces during the 11 :00AM hour. If core TDM programs were provided, there would be unserved demand for around 220 to 1,007 parking spaces during the peak hour." (Fehr-Peers page 34)*

If Planning Dept Staff and RCP were to be sincere about upholding and preserving City College interests, Scenario 3--*not* Scenario 2--would be used in assessing unmet demand.

Scenario 3 (PAEC and Balboa Reservoir Housing Project) reflects the future more accurately than Planning Dept Staff's cherry-picked Scenario 2. "Unserved Demand" for "2026, with core TDM", Table 14 shows **980** spaces (Typical Day) and 1,767 spaces (Peak Day):

*"If core TDM programs were provided, there would be unserved demand for around 980 to 1,767 parking spaces during the peak hour." (Fehr-Peers page 35)*

The pronouncements by the Reservoir Team (RCP/Planning/OEWD) need to be regarded with skepticism because much of what they present is skewed for easy and unthinking consumption by those who don't read the fine print--which is almost everybody!

I urge CAC to open your eyes to how you are being duped with cherry-picked "facts."

Say no to privatization of public land.

Sincerely,

aj