



**Responses to Public Comment and Questions on
Proposed Parameters Regarding Project’s Relationship to City College
Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
February 3, 2016**

The following matrix contains City staff responses to questions regarding the draft Parameters Regarding Project’s Relationship to City College. Public comment was raised during the December 14, 2015 CAC meeting and in written form before and after the meeting. The original draft parameters and latest revisions can be found at sf-planning.org/brcac.

Principle #1: Ensure that development at the Balboa Reservoir site does not negatively impact City College’s educational mission and operational needs.

[Originally listed as Principle #4; principles have been re-ordered in response to community feedback.]

	Question/Comment	City Response
1	Add a new principle that addresses how City College and this development will interact in the long term. How will agreements be enforced? As new issues come up, how will they be addressed?	Principle 1(d) has been added in response to this comment.
2	How can the community be assured that promises will be kept?	The newly-added Principle 1(d) requires that the developer work with City College to create a mechanism for ongoing communication and accountability. In addition, the City plans to negotiate a development agreement with the developer, which will provide various enforcement mechanisms for the City. For example, the developer may be required to deliver a particular community benefit before the City will grant a permit for a particular building.
3	Principle #4 is most important; the principles should be reordered accordingly.	In response to this comment, Principle #4 has been re-ordered to become Principle #1.
4	Acknowledge that CCSF Ocean Campus provides a public service that should not be sacrificed for the BR Project.	As currently written, Principle #1 (previously Principle #4), communicates to prospective developers that respecting City College’s importance is critical. This principle has been re-ordered to be first on the list, which further stresses City College’s importance.
5	Principle #4 [now Principle #1] - City College	Noted. City College’s financial decision making

	funds should be prioritized for existing capital needs versus new construction, with the exception of the PAEC.	falls outside of the scope of these Parameters.
6	Principle 4(b) [now 1(b)] – Parking needs and other priorities will change due to construction, the PAEC, the proposed Affordable Housing Bonus Program, and PDA designation of the Excelsior.	Noted. The parameters’ intent is to retain enough flexibility that plans for the Balboa Reservoir project can evolve in response to local and Citywide changes that occur over the next several years.
7	Principle 4 [now Principle 1]: We like the concept of the principle as worded, but because the parameters refer only to the period of construction of the site, we recommend this principle be rewritten to indicate it is about construction of the site rather than the development, which could mean many more things.	Now that Parameter 1(d) has been added, the scope of this principle extends beyond only the construction period, so the overarching principle’s use of the term “development” should now be more consistent with the parameters that fall under this principle.
8	Principle 4 [now Principle 1]: In addition to minimizing access and noise impacts, add “and control dust and other impacts to air quality during construction.”	Principle 1(b) (previously 4(b)) has been revised as suggested.
9	Balboa Reservoir project must adapt to City College’s needs, not the other way around.	Principles 1 and 4 are dedicated to ensuring that City College’s educational and capital needs are supported and met. Principles 2 and 3 explicitly call for the developer to identify solutions and partnerships that can advance mutually-beneficial and shared goals for both sites. For example, the Balboa Reservoir RFP identifies and prioritizes transportation and childcare solutions that would ultimately benefit City College. City College’s success and affordable housing on the Balboa Reservoir are compatible, non-conflicting, and potentially complementary, so it is unnecessary to prioritize one over the other.

Principle #2: In conversation with City College, identify opportunities for the Balboa Reservoir project’s public benefits to serve as resources for the City College community. [Originally listed at Principle #1.]

	Question/Comment	City Response
10	Housing is okay if it fits with City College's mission and operational needs.	The City encourages the formation of partnerships with educational institutions to create student, teacher, and/or staff housing, but the Balboa Reservoir project would create housing for City College affiliates only if City College elected for it to do so. Therefore, City College would have full control to ensure that the housing fit within its mission and operational needs.
11	Housing at the project should focus on City College faculty and staff.	As described in Response #10, The City encourages the formation of partnerships with educational institutions to create housing, but it would be up to City College to determine which members of its community such housing would serve. Because City College has not explicitly rejected the potential for students housing, City staff believes that it is appropriate to leave references to potential student housing in the parameters. The parameters do not, however, state that City College housing would be required to include students.
12	Student housing is okay if for veterans. Student housing should be available to veterans and transition-age youth.	As described in Response #10, The City encourages the formation of partnerships with educational institutions to create housing, but it would be up to City College to determine which members of its community such housing would serve.
13	Does educator housing need to be only for City College staff, or could a percentage be for educators associated with other local schools?	Subject to fair housing law, it may be possible for multiple educational institutions to work in partnership to create, own, and operate a housing development serving their respective staff. This kind of partnership could be a good way to share the associated costs, responsibilities, and benefits among the wider education community.
14	On-site childcare will be a great benefit to City College students and to the neighborhood.	Noted. Childcare is also addressed in the Additional Public Benefits parameters.
15	Support on-site childcare facility.	Noted. Childcare is also addressed in the Additional Public Benefits parameters.

16	Housing is important from a citywide perspective, so we need to find a way for housing and City College to work together.	Noted. Staff believes that the parameters, as currently written, express the importance of collaborating to meet both City College and housing needs.
17	How can the project provide affordable housing for teachers and/or students if SFPUC has to get fair market value for the land? We would need to find other sources of funds.	If City College and/or another educational institution were to express interest in partnering with the developer to create this housing, both the developer and the City's affordable housing staff would lend their professional expertise to finding creative financing solutions. City staff has some preliminary ideas about potential financing structures and sources, which we would vet with City College, or another education institution, if they were to express preliminary interest in creating the housing.
18	Childcare is very important, even if that means having taller buildings in order to create the needed space and revenue to allow for childcare.	Noted. This is a good example of the kind of tradeoff described in the Urban Design & Neighborhood Character parameters.
19	Parameter 1(b) [now 2(b)]: The current state of City College's childcare facilities should not have any bearing on this project.	<p>This parameter is not intended to tie the Balboa Reservoir project and City College's childcare needs in such a way that places unwanted obligations or responsibilities on City College. Rather, the intent is to signal to prospective developers that the new buildings at Balboa Reservoir could be a resource for City College if, and only if, the college is interested in finding new space for its childcare facilities and cannot create suitable space on campus.</p> <p>Parameter 2(b) (originally 1(b)) has been revised for clarification.</p>
20	Principle 1(c) [now 2(c)]: Support for only adding services that do not conflict with existing local services. The developer should be responsible for proving that comparable services are not available nearby.	Parameter 2(c) (originally 1(c)) has been revised in response to this comment.

21	If housing is created for City College faculty and staff, will residents be able to stay there after they change employment or retire?	As described in responses #10 and #11, any housing created for City College students, faculty, and/or staff would need to be controlled by City College. As a result, City College would be responsible for determining the qualification criteria for that housing, including whether retired faculty and staff would qualify.
22	Childcare should be a part of City College.	City College currently operates Child Care and Development Centers, including the Orfaea Family Center, at the Ocean Campus. The draft parameters did not intend to suggest that this childcare center should be replaced by a private childcare center built at the Balboa Reservoir; rather, the intention was to suggest that the Balboa Reservoir developer should consider making space available to City College if, and only if, City College is interested in expanding or moving its Child Care and Development Center to a new facility and appropriate space cannot be found within the Ocean Campus. Parameter 2(b) (originally 1(b)) has been revised to clarify this.
23	Do not build housing on the Reservoir or the City College campus.	City staff is aware that some members of the public do not support the Public Lands for Housing program at Balboa Reservoir; however, San Francisco's current affordable housing crisis necessitates taking advantage of large public sites such Balboa Reservoir to help meet the housing needs of households at a range of income levels.
24	Most, not some, of the project's residential units should be for the students, faculty, and staff of City College and other local schools.	The amount of Balboa Reservoir's housing dedicated to students, faculty, and/or staff will depend on local educational institutions' level of interest. Staff has yet to receive decisive feedback from any school about how much housing they may like to pursue as part of this project.
25	Housing for City College should be built on its property, not the reservoir.	Noted. Housing for City College would only be built on the Balboa Reservoir at City College's election.
26	Parameter 1(c) [now 2(c)]: Include discussion	Parameter 2(c) (originally 1(c)) has been revised

	of nonprofits.	to include non-profits.
27	Any housing should consider incorporating housing faculty, staff and students.	Under fair housing law, housing could only prioritize students, faculty, and/or staff if owned by their associated educational institution(s). See comment #24 for additional discussion of the quantity of school-affiliated housing.
28	Support 1(b) and 1(d) [now 2(b) and 2(d)].	Noted.
29	There needs to be smooth and seamless pedestrian, bike, and car travel into City College and between City College and the Balboa Reservoir project.	Parameter 2(d) (originally 1(d)) has been revised to ensure smooth and seamless travel between City College and the Balboa Reservoir project. It may not be within the scope of the Balboa Reservoir project, however, to address pedestrian, bike, and car travel into City College from locations other than the Balboa Reservoir site. Please also refer to the Transportation Parameters for additional discussion of this topic.

Principle #3: In coordination with City College, design and implement the project's transportation program in such a way that also creates new sustainable transportation opportunities for City College students, faculty, and staff. [Originally listed as Principle #2.]

	Question/Comment	City Response
30	Parking should be provided in a green garage rather than the current type of surface lot. It could include spaces for electric cars to recharge, bike parking, a police substation.	These suggestions will be considered in the forthcoming revisions to the Transportation Parameters. The Planning Code already includes several pedestrian-oriented urban design requirements for new garages as well as bike parking requirements. The Sustainability Parameters encourage the optimal number of electric vehicle charging stations and bike parking spaces.
31	The transportation concerns can be solved, in part through better coordination, a walkway to BART, and an improved transportation system so that more people use public transportation.	Noted. Improvements to the transportation system and improved pedestrian access to BART are two of many potential strategies for encouraging more people to use public transportation.

<p>32</p>	<p>Free parking causes people to drive more often than they really need to.</p>	<p>Noted. While the cause of driving varies for each individual, it has been documented that demand for parking (i.e. driving) is responsive to changes in the price of parking, like almost any other economic good. Many people would choose alternatives to driving if the true public cost of parking (e.g. land for parking) were more fully reflected in the consumer’s price (e.g. parking permit fee or meter fee amount). Others may choose alternatives to driving if given a viable choice, such as if walking, biking or transit were as safe, convenient and affordable as driving. And yet others do not have the choice but to drive.</p> <p>City policy and practice is to better manage public resources by making all of the choices for transportation equally accessible and encouraging those who are able to choose alternatives to driving alone.</p>
<p>33</p>	<p>The City College masterplan, which is getting underway, can also help solve transportation issues. It could look at streetscape on Ocean Avenue, a more direct relationship between City College and Ocean Ave., and making it easier for people to get to BART.</p>	<p>Noted. Staff agrees that City College’s master planning process is another excellent opportunity to help address the area’s existing transportation challenges.</p>
<p>34</p>	<p>It is more appropriate for the City, not the new development, to address the area’s existing transportation problems.</p>	<p>The City has many transportation projects underway, as well as recently completed, in the local area. This kind of work is important because a development cannot singlehandedly address all of the area’s existing transportation needs. See the Transportation Parameters memo on the BRCAC website for a list of many of these projects, and see the SFMTA website for a map of the projects.</p> <p>Also, in response to comments like this one, the City has initiated a “transportation demand management” (TDM) study for the Balboa area, to better coordinate transportation demand to City College, the neighborhood, and the Reservoir site.</p>
<p>35</p>	<p>We should wait until getting the results of the transportation demand management</p>	<p>Staff agrees that thoughtful research and data collection, including that which will occur under</p>

	study before determining the right parking solution.	the TDM study, should inform the design of any specific parking solution. As currently written, the parking-related parameters retain the flexibility for this kind of data-driven, responsive approach.
36	Interested in solutions such as shared parking, increasing pricing slightly to pay for other transportation needs in the neighborhood, a shuttle to BART, bike share, car share, a walkway to BART, removing the freeway entrance onto Ocean, widening the sidewalks on Ocean, a new pathway into City College.	These potential solutions and others will be explored as part of the TDM study, within development proposals, and/or as part of the environmental review process. It is important to note, however, that the Balboa Reservoir project is unlikely to singlehandedly fund major off-site infrastructure projects such as removing a freeway ramp or reconfiguring a long stretch of Ocean Ave.
37	It is important to have good connections between City College and Ocean Ave. retail.	Noted. The Urban Design & Neighborhood Character Parameters and the Transportation Parameters will ensure that a new, bicycle and pedestrian friendly, route between City College and Ocean Avenue, allowing students to avoid the challenging Ocean/Phelan intersection.
38	City College is currently an island unto itself; this is an opportunity to create better connections between City College and the community.	Noted. City staff believes that these parameters, as well as the Urban Design & Neighborhood Character Parameters, signal the importance of this connectivity to prospective developers. City College's master planning process also presents an opportunity to improve City College's connectivity to the larger community.
39	The transportation demand management study is important and should be prioritized.	Staff agrees and is working hard to complete the consultant contracting process and begin work as soon as possible.
40	City College students need parking. It does not need to be free; it can be subsidized. The parking resource should be provided to City College in perpetuity.	Staff understands that some City College students need to drive to class, while others could benefit by having better, more affordable alternatives to driving and parking. Staff is in the process of exploring these needs and will respond in greater detail in conjunction with proposed revisions to the Transportation Parameters.
41	Principle 2(a) [now 3(a)]: What is meant by "project's mode split target"?	"Mode split" refers to the percentage of travel trips, made to and from the Balboa Reservoir

		development, using various modes of transportation. SFMTA will set a target mode split that the project must strive to achieve, with particular emphasis on setting a maximum percentage of trips that may be made in private cars. Although this target mode split will be for the new development only, not for surrounding neighborhoods, neighboring residents and the City College community may benefit from some of the programs that the developer implements to achieve its mode split target.
42	Parameter 2(a) [now 3(a)]: The TDM study should be completed before the CAC makes its recommendations regarding the RFP.	The intent of the parameters is to build in enough flexibility that the final development plan can be responsive to new information that becomes available after the RFP has been issued. Once a developer has been selected, the City, the CAC, and the community will have ample opportunity to ensure that its final development plan is responsive to the TDM study.
43	Principle 2(b) [now 3(b)]: Students' parking needs will overlap with residents' parking needs. Some residents will not remove their cars during the day, when students will need the parking spaces. Students taking evening and weekend classes will compete with residents for parking.	Additional expert analysis will be needed to confirm whether shared parking would be a viable and ideal solution. Parameter 3(b) (originally 2(b)) has been revised to acknowledge this and to indicate that the developer should explore alternative solutions if analysis conclusively shows shared parking to be non-viable.
44	Principle 2(c) [now 3(d)]: Consider local businesses when discussing bicycle-related services and repair.	Parameter 3(d) (originally 2(c)) has been revised in response to this comment.
45	Principle 2(d) [now 3(e)]: Support for most aspects of principle, particularly paratransit and shuttles. Cannot support the TDM study's recommendations without reviewing them first.	Noted. Please refer to responses #35, #39, and #42 for discussion of the timing of the TDM study.
46	City College students need to drive and need the current parking lot.	See responses #40 and #43 for discussion of these concerns and note revisions to Parameter 3(b) (previously 2(b)).
47	Shared parking will create conflict and anger.	Shared parking facilities have a proven track record of providing parking an efficient and cost

		<p>effective way, without causing anger or personal conflicts between parkers from different groups. A conflict-free shared parking facility can be ensured through thoughtful design and good management, for example by reserving certain parking spaces for a certain group (e.g. short-term parkers, who are likely to be students rather than residents).</p> <p>Additional expert analysis will be needed, however, to confirm whether shared parking would be a viable and ideal solution, including an assessment of how many non-residents shared parking could realistically serve. Parameter 3(b) (originally 2(b)) parameters have been revised to acknowledge this and to indicate that the developer should explore alternative solutions if analysis conclusively shows shared parking to be non-viable.</p>
48	<p>Parameter 2(a) [now 3(a)]: City College needs to get better at parking management. It is less expensive to park than to take public transportation, so students who do not need to drive will do so anyway. Hoped that the parameters would address this in more detail, rather than having to wait for the TDM study.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
49	<p>Parameter 2(c) [now 3(c)]: Support bike requirements, suggest adding motorcycle parking for City College students.</p>	<p>Noted. Motorcycle parking is best located established in locations where there is an observed demand for motorcycle parking, in spaces too small for automobiles, and in areas with the consent of abutting property owners. Motorcycle spaces can be incorporated into new parking structures as well. The TDM study can assess demand and recommend future motorcycle parking facilities.</p>
50	<p>How will the Reservoir Project mitigate the elimination of student parking without placing the burden on students? The main obligation to mitigate car usage and parking problems should fall on the BR project and its residents. CCSF and neighbors should not shoulder the main responsibility to mitigate this problem.</p>	<p>Parameter 3(b) (originally 2(b)), as well as the newly-added Parameter 3(c), notify prospective developers that City College student parking is a major concern that will require thoughtful problem solving. It is likely that RFP responses will propose potential solutions; regardless, the developer, the City, City College, and the community will need to work together to</p>

		<p>identify and implement positive changes to help manage not only parking demands but also traffic congestion.</p> <p>It is correct that parking and traffic associated with new residential units will be the Balboa Reservoir project’s responsibility to mitigate. The Transportation Parameters address this item.</p> <p>Additionally, current neighbors have many tools in the SFMTA’s residential parking permit (RPP) program to address non-resident parking in their neighborhood. The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) study will identify other neighborhood-wide solutions to address the need for City College parking. This work will proceed prior to and in parallel with the negotiations for the BR project, as staff acknowledges the community’s observation that solutions are needed now.</p>
<p>51</p>	<p>Parameter 2(d) [now 3(d)]: Pedestrian and cycle traffic should be clearly “navigable and in some cases separated” and not always together to ensure public pedestrian and bike safety. Rules for walking bikes in pedestrian zones should be strictly enforced. Pedestrians should also be fined for improper behavior regarding cell-phone use when on public streets, maybe with a “pull-aside” campaign to reinforce the need to stop and pull over when walking or bike riding or driving in the area.</p>	<p>Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure will be designed once a developer has been selected, with opportunities for community and CAC feedback. City rules governing pedestrian and cyclist behavior will apply, and be enforced, within the new development.</p>
<p>52</p>	<p>Suggestions for City College campus planning: investigate secondary on-ramp for CCSF between Glen Park and CCSF, directly into campus to relieve congestion on Ocean Ave. by locating an eastern side parking structure adjacent to the free-way with a turn back at Lick Wilmerding back east and west onto Ocean Ave. or a secondary route to the north or western edge of campus through the existing campus area; provide direct access to parking structures from the free-way vs. through side city streets; street design</p>	<p>City College’s master planning process, which is now commencing, would be the appropriate venue for this kind of investigation. City staff encourages City College to investigate recommendations like these and can offer technical support where needed.</p>

	involving pedestrian bridge; build new facilities up to the southern property line for better access to transit, new affordable housing development, and other community facilities.	
53	Identify opportunities to build parking facilities that would be shared by the Balboa Park Station, Balboa Reservoir, and City College.	Parameter 3(b) proposes shared parking as a potential solution.

Principle #4: To ensure that the Balboa Reservoir project is sensitive to City College’s mission and operations, work with City College and its master planning consultants to ensure that the Balboa Reservoir site plan and City College’s forthcoming new Master Plan are well coordinated and complementary. [Originally listed as Principle #3. The wording of this principle has also been revised in response to community feedback.]

	Question/Comment	City Response
54	Please clarify the proposed parameter about the developer being a key stakeholder in City College’s master planning process.	The intent of this parameter is to encourage the developer to actively participate in, and remain informed about, the City College master planning process. The intent is not to imply that the developer should be considered more important than other stakeholders. Principle 4(a) (originally 3(a)) has been revised to clarify this.
55	Principle 3(a) [now 4(a)]: The needs of City College should be the top priority and the development of Balboa Reservoir for other purposes should be secondary.	See revisions to Principle 4 (originally Principle 3) and Parameter 4(a), as well as Response #9.
56	It is important to consider the upcoming City College masterplan, which should look into a potential off-ramp on the east side to keep traffic off of Ocean Ave.; an improved southern side; and avoiding the negative impacts of SF State’s master planning around transit, housing, parking, and transportation.	Noted. Note that the contents of City College’s masterplan are outside of the scope of the Balboa Reservoir development parameters, which will direct the Balboa Reservoir developer but not the actions of City College.
57	Describe the City College master planning	Response provided by Interim Chancellor Susan

	process. What is the timeframe, start date and end date?	Lamb during the CAC meeting: It is typically a 15 to 18 month process. City College anticipates having finished the process within two years.
58	Principle 3 [now renumbered as Principle 4]: Should prioritize the needs of City College, not make the college fit into the Balboa Reservoir project.	The overall intention of this set of parameters is to require the project to be sensitive to City College's needs, not to require that City College act in a certain way. This principle (now renumbered as Principle 4) has been revised to clarify this intention.

Additional Questions and Comments Received

	Question/Comment	City Response
59	The Balboa Reservoir project should assume that the Performing Arts and Education Center will be built.	A new parameter, 4(b), has been added in response to comments like this one.
60	Would like to see nonprofits have access to the new space created in the Performing Arts & Education Center.	Noted. The Performing Arts & Education Center is a City College project, so it is not appropriate for these development parameters to take a position on who should occupy it.
61	Students need to be better represented. How can we ensure that students and faculty are better represented?	Staff is looking into how best to engage students and additional faculty members and is open to suggestions. Several suggestions were made at staff's most recent presentation to the City College Board of Trustees.
62	Ensure that previous promises to the community are also kept.	The developer will be expected to comply with all applicable laws and contractual agreements. If the commenter can make City staff aware of specific agreements pertaining to City College and the Balboa Reservoir site, it may be appropriate to revise the development parameters to reference these agreements.
63	Each CAC meeting should include a report on what is going on at meetings	Trustee Brigitte Davila also holds a seat on the Balboa Reservoir CAC and regularly informs the CAC

	<p>of the Board of Trustees, student senate, academic senate, and other parts of the student body.</p>	<p>of the Board of Trustee’s activities related to Balboa Reservoir. As the CAC’s City College representative, Ms. Davila can also serve as a resource for questions about the City College community more broadly.</p> <p>In addition, minutes from City College board and committee meetings can be found online, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Associated Students: https://www.ccsf.edu/en/student-services/student-activities/as.html - Academic Senate: http://www.ccsf.edu/en/about-city-college/participatory_governance/academic-senate/agendas_minutes.html - Board of Trustees (minutes to resume in 2016): http://www.ccsf.edu/en/about-city-college/board-of-trustees/bot_meetings2016.html
64	<p>City College should face onto Ocean Ave. rather than onto a parking lot, with a plaza at the corner of Ocean and Phelan.</p>	<p>Noted. However, the redesign of City College’s campus falls outside of the scope of the Balboa Reservoir project.</p>
65	<p>Affordable housing should also be set aside for first responders.</p>	<p>Noted. Staff shares the commenter’s concern about the affordability challenges facing first responders. However, fair housing law prohibits reserving housing units for people of a particular profession, unless those units are owned by that person’s employer (which would be the case if City College elected to partner with the developer to create housing on the Balboa Reservoir site), and San Francisco’s public safety agencies do not own and operate employee housing.</p>
66	<p>Parameters should address the Performing Arts Center.</p>	<p>Principle #4 has been revised to more explicitly emphasize the need for sensitivity to City College’s mission and operations. In particular, a new parameter, 4(b), has been added in response to comments like this one.</p>
67	<p>Is there a cost estimate for the SFPUC-owned land?</p>	<p>Each prospective developer partner for the project will be required to propose a purchase price for the land. These proposals will provide insight into the property’s value.</p>
68	<p>How will these parameters be applied?</p>	<p>These parameters will be included in the Request for</p>

	<p>Are they legally binding? Who will determine whether they are being complied with?</p>	<p>Qualifications (RFQ) and Request for Proposals (RFP) documents used to select a developer partner for the Balboa Reservoir. The RFQ and RFP will specify that a key selection criteria will be consistency with the development parameters. Prospective developer partners will be more likely to be selected if they propose a projects for the site that most closely adhere, and exceed, the development.</p> <p>The RFQ and RFP will not be legal documents. Rather, members of the developer selection panel will evaluate the extent to which development proposals meet and exceed the development parameters.</p> <p>CAC and community members will also have an opportunity to comment on proposals' consistency with the development parameters. Prior to the panel's consideration of development proposals, RFP respondents will be required to present their proposals at a CAC meeting, and all public comments will be recorded and shared with the evaluation panel.</p>
<p>69</p>	<p>What are the meetings that have occurred between City agencies and the City College administration?</p>	<p>City staff meets periodically with colleagues in other City departments, with other locally agencies, and with community stakeholder groups in order to work effectively and ensure that everyone stays informed. These periodic meetings have included meetings with City College staff, including facilities planners, senior and administration-level staff. It is appropriate for public sector colleagues to communicate with one another, including at in-person meetings.</p>
<p>70</p>	<p>Is it true that if the SFPUC's land is declared excess, it must be given to City College?</p>	<p>This is not true. No laws exist requiring SFPUC to give the Balboa Reservoir property to City College under any circumstances.</p>
<p>71</p>	<p>Is City College required to build a road, or multiple roads, connecting to the Balboa Reservoir site? Is there a signed document requiring City College to build this road?</p>	<p>As part of the May 17, 2012 Access Easement Agreement between City College and SFPUC, City College granted the City a 60-foot access easement running east-west on the northern boundary of the City College parcel. This easement allows for the construction of a 60-foot-wide right-of-way to Phelan Avenue. Also in accordance with the Access Easement Agreement, SFPUC granted City College a</p>

		<p>50-foot access easement running north-south, to be built along the eastern edge of the SFPUC property. The accessway, also known as the Lee Avenue Extension, allows for pedestrian and vehicular access. The transfer agreement ultimately calls for City College to connect the accessway to Lee Avenue.</p> <p>This document has been recorded by the Office of the County Recorder. It is a lengthy document that City staff will email to interested members of the public upon request.</p>
72	Please make changes and provide a second draft.	A heavily revised second draft is being provided concurrently with this matrix.
73	Do not give more land to City College. It should focus on addressing issues on its existing campus.	Noted.
74	Development should minimize obstructing the view of the ocean from Science Circle.	This request is consistent with San Francisco’s Urban Design policy, which prioritizes view of landmarks and orienting features from public spaces, as well as Urban Design parameters 2(f) and 2(g).