



Responses to Parameter Comments and Questions
Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
August 8, 2016

Note: A number of additional comments and suggestions have been addressed in the most recent revisions to the Development Principles and Parameters. Below are staff's responses to all other questions and comments received at the August 8, 2016 CAC meeting and in written communication associated with that meeting's materials.

	PUBLIC COMMENT	CITY RESPONSE
1	Do our parameters address ADA and accessibility issues adequately?	All aspects of the project will be automatically subject to San Francisco's accessibility requirements, regardless of how the Parameters discuss accessibility. The Mayor's Office of Disability and/or the Public Works Disability Access Coordinator thoroughly review all projects in San Francisco for accessibility and compliance with ADA. The process is iterative and applies to site design, park design, street design and building design.
2	Require a green parking garage.	The Development Parameters focus on principles, values, and performance measures rather than specific designs and technologies. A "green" or "flexible" parking structure may be one of many solutions in pursuit of these principles and performance metrics. However, it is the task of the developer to do the detailed research and design work required to propose the most effective suite of parking/ transportation measures.
3	Ongoing data collection and evaluation are needed to make sure that transportation measures work.	Staff agree. Transportation parameters 1b and 2a include requirements for monitoring. In addition, San Francisco's citywide TDM ordinance, Development Agreement practices, and environmental review process require ongoing mitigation and monitoring. Transportation expectations, as well as the monitoring and data-related parameters, will be referenced in the developer solicitation documents (RFQ and RFP).
4	What traffic data will the developer have to work with?	Developers will have access to traffic data that have been collected from a number of projects in the area, including the TDM study currently underway. As with any environmental review process, if conditions have changed enough from the time previous data was collected, the developer will be

		required to collect additional data. If additional data is collected by other parties, such as by City College as part of its masterplan process, the developer would be wise to utilize that as well.
5	How does TDM and the TDM ordinance fit into overall process?	The draft TDM Ordinance notes that projects with development agreements (such as this project) may use distinct approaches to meet the goals of the ordinance. In practice, the city expects more from projects with development agreements in terms of transportation obligations and commitments to minimizing new driving trips. The TDM study currently underway will serve as a tool that can help local projects, including Balboa Reservoir, meet the requirements of the TDM ordinance.
6	<i>How does an economic downturn affect the affordability breakdowns of the site? If values drop significantly, are 120% and 150% of AMI still the appropriate cutoffs?</i>	<p>If an economic downturn causes incomes to decrease, the income levels associated with each AMI percentage will also drop. For example, if median incomes for a particular household size dropped from \$100,000 per year to \$80,000 per year, the income level for a low-income (55% of AMI) unit would drop from \$55,000 (55% of \$100,000) to \$44,000, and the maximum rent for that unit would drop accordingly.</p> <p>The housing parameters already include a protection in case market rate housing costs drop so low that middle-income people no longer need affordable housing. Per Parameter 1(a)(2), the AMI level would be dropped to correspond with housing prices at least 15% below market rate. The parameter has been revised to make sure that this same safeguard applies to moderate-income units.</p>
7	Get MTA to enforce parking during registration periods each semester.	City staff will communicate this request to SFMTA. But a developer would not play a direct role in public parking enforcement, so it is not appropriate to include it within the Parameters.
8	Should mention the impacts of removing parking for students and the PAEC.	<p>The Balboa Reservoir project's impact on local transportation and parking patterns, including those of City College students and visitors, will depend on what kinds of new TDM measures, including parking supply and parking management, are implemented. Because these are not yet known, it is not possible to assess the impacts.</p> <p>Even so, the Development Parameters strive to address concerns about City College's future access and parking. They stress the need to address parking and identify TDM strategies for City College, acknowledge that City College's enrollment</p>

		may change, and recognize that they PAEC is expected to be built.
9	Where is the data that parking and TDM management will encourage other or transit use, particularly for seniors and people with disabilities.	<p>The relationship between TDM measures and travel behavior is well researched and widely accepted among professionals working in transportation and urban planning fields. Some of this research was recently documented by the Planning Department as part of the TDM ordinance process (see the “TDM Technical Justification” report at http://sf-planning.org/tdm-materials-and-resources). Additional information on TDM measures and justification can be found in the Balboa Reservoir CAC materials at http://default.sfplanning.org/plans-and-programs/planning-for-the-city/public-sites/balboareservoir/balboareservoir_CAC_Presentation-TDM-04132016_FINAL.pdf</p> <p>The Victoria Transport Policy Institute’s TDM Encyclopedia (www.vtpi.org) includes a number of articles that document the importance of transit, paratransit, and other alternatives to driving for people with limited mobility and older adults.</p> <p>TDM does not, however, assume that alternatives to driving are best options for all trips or all individuals. Instead, it provides and elevates choices for those trips and individuals that make sense. Further, a successful TDM program can benefit those who need to drive; by providing equitable and dignified travel choices to those who have the ability to utilize them, TDM can reduce the number of vehicles and vehicle miles traveled competing for limited road space.</p>
10	We need a shuttle system between City College’s various campuses.	City College’s Facilities Masterplan Process, currently underway, is the ideal venue for expressing this idea. If City College decides to implement a multi-campus shuttle system, close coordination and collaboration with the Balboa Reservoir project would be advised.
11	Does TDM appreciate that not all sites are the same and that CCSF needs to grow back to full enrollment?	<p>Absolutely. TDM should be part of the strategy to enable more students, faculty, and staff to access CCSF. TDM strategies are most often a suite or menu of measures tailored to a specific site or neighborhood’s need. TDM planning is typically guided by an overall goal or performance target, not a specific practice or technology.</p> <p>In the case of the Balboa area, unique measures are required to account for City College’s needs in terms of growth, population demographics, key access times, and other factors. It also demands a unique partnership in implementation and monitoring, since the future Reservoir developer, City College and the City will all have a role in managing transportation. The</p>

		need to coordinate between the three entities was the inspiration for the Balboa Area TDM planning currently underway.
12	Some people need parking, but parking should be needs-based. There is no basis for assessing this need.	<p>Parking demand is partly a function of supply and price of parking. What is more definable is the demand for access to a site or neighborhood.</p> <p>TDM addresses access needs by equalizing incentives and disincentives across all modes of transportation. In this way, users have a fair choice in selecting the mode that best matches their needs.</p>
13	Explicitly state a requirement to provide conduit and an outlet at every garage parking space.	<p>Transportation Parameter 2(d) has been revised to communicate that the developer should plan ahead so that charging stations can be easily added throughout the garages if and when electric vehicles become ubiquitous.</p> <p>SF Environment does not recommend requiring charging installation at every parking space because the technology changes so fast. Instead, additional charging stations can be designed closer to when buildings are designs, as we cannot predict how policy and technology may modernize. Otherwise, the project would end up with unused yet obsolete charging stations</p>
14	Add language mitigating the impact of proposed bicycle infrastructure improvements.	<p>All development projects in California are required to go through an environmental review process, which measures impacts and requires mitigations of impacts. The Balboa Reservoir project will not be an exception.</p> <p>Impacts and mitigations can only be measured after a specific project design from which to measure. The RFP principles and parameters, however, focus on the highest priorities for the site and concerns of the community, but do not include specific designs or measurable proposals.</p>
15	We should incorporate wind energy	The goal of Principle 1 is to reduce GHG, not obligate a developer to a particular technology. Wind requires significant clearances on all sides and can require additional building stability. If it is feasible or more efficient than other technologies, the developer will pursue it in support of Principle 1. To this end, text was added to Principle 1c to explore other technologies such as wind. The developer is in the best position to propose what is most energy efficient and feasible when site and building designs are on the table.
16	Construction should utilize all union labor, not a dual gate system.	It is not legally within the City's power to negotiate agreements with organized labor, thus we cannot officially require it in the parameters. However, it is typical for

		developers of large projects such as this one to negotiate project labor agreements with labor unions.
17	Principle #2, Parameter c: What building heights will be allowed next to existing adjacent buildings and the planned Performing Arts and Education Center. Will the new buildings tower over the PAEC?	The parameters include numerous references to respecting context (UD 1a, 1c, 2a, 2c, 2d, 2e, 2f, 3d, 4a, 4b, 4c; PR 1d, 1e, 1f, 1h, 2b, 2c, 2d, 2e, 3c, 4b) . Their intent is to communicate values without prescribing design. In this case, height limits were an exception. The Parameters also set clear expectations about coordinating with City College (City College Principle #4), its master plan process, and plans for the PAEC. Adding further design guidelines in this section would too detailed for the RFQ/RFP stage of the process, while specific parameters regarding City College may be premature since the City College master plan is still in process. However, with continued participation from the CAC, community, and City College, future design workshops and dialogues will be the most effective venue to discuss specific building heights and relationships.
18	Remove the Phelan Ave. bike lanes once safe bike connections have been built at the Balboa Reservoir.	Staff has communicated this request in the past to the SFMTA. SFMTA is aware that the Balboa Reservoir project will include new bike connections. However, Phelan Avenue is not part of the scope of the Development Parameters or the Reservoir Development. The Balboa Park Station Area CAC often addresses neighborhood-wide transportation issues and neighbors are encouraged to communicate these concerns to members of that CAC as well. See http://tinyurl.com/balboaCAC for more info.
19	The reservoir must resolve the loss of parking before development any development	<p>Transportation Parameters 1c and Relationship to City College Parameter 3a and 3b discuss how the developer must coordinate transportation with City College and establish a TDM and parking strategy before start of development. Staff also acknowledge that policymakers are not going to entitle the project without a clear CCSF transportation plan.</p> <p>Resolving parking loss can come in a variety of ways and in phases. For example, the first phase of development only needs to address the impact of that phase, not the impact of the full buildout. Additionally, if TDM measures such as a transit “class pass” reduce driving demand, and if parking management strategies can accommodate more vehicles in existing parking facilities – then there would not be a need to dedicate public resources towards a parking garage for which there is no demand. Those resources could instead go towards other transportation needs or housing affordability. The balance of reducing driving demand and managing parking supply is an ongoing focus for TDM planning between the City and City College.</p>

20	This Balboa Reservoir process conflicts with the Balboa Park Station Area Plan	<p>The Plan did not propose a specific project for the Reservoir; rather it set policy and objectives to guide development on the site. The Plan calls for housing, open space, and development on the Reservoir site that benefits the City as a whole as well the surrounding neighborhoods. It states that development on the site should prioritize affordable housing, respect surrounding neighborhoods, and encourage walking with quality open spaces and streets. See sf-planning.org/balboa-park-station-area-plan for more info.</p>
21	The Balboa Park Area Plan says 500 units is the “worst case scenario”	<p>The Balboa Park Area Plan provides objectives, policies and estimates for the purposes of environmental review – not a specific proposal for the site. Development project proposals or unit numbers for the Balboa Reservoir site are not in the Area Plan.</p> <p>For the purposes of analyzing the impacts of the Balboa Park Station Area Plan, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was conducted. The EIR evaluated the Plan at a general, <i>program-level</i> of detail – not at the level of a specific project on the Reservoir site.</p> <p>This program-level review estimated (in 2006) a reasonably foreseeable development throughout the Plan Area of approximately 1,780 units by 2025. This total was determined by adding the estimated development potential for all the development opportunity sites in the Plan Area, including an estimate of 500 units on the Balboa Reservoir, along with 80 units on the fire station site, 280 units along San Jose Avenue infill projects, 100,000 square feet (2.3 acres) of open space on the Reservoir, and new uses for a number of other sites. The unit numbers are very much estimates and are made with an understanding that conditions can change. For example, it is not likely that 80 units will replace the fire station. Also, the Balboa Reservoir RFP includes parameters for far more than 100,000 square feet (2.3 acres) of open space analyzed in the Area Plan EIR. . To date, 246 units have been built in the Plan Area. Another 74 are in the “pipeline” (at various stages of permit filing or approval.)</p> <p>The “worst case scenario” phrase was from environmental review staff’s written response to a citizen comment on the Draft EIR. It is referring to the overall range of potential impacts from the development program analyzed in the Plan Area (i.e. if all 1,780 housings units were to be built within the Plan Area).</p>