

Lesk, Emily (ECN)

From: Ronald Gerhard <rgerhard@ccsf.edu>
Sent: Friday, May 08, 2015 9:54 AM
To: Martin, Michael (ECN); Jeff Hamilton; Fred Sturner
Cc: Rich, Ken (ECN); Lesk, Emily (ECN)
Subject: RE: Tuesday meeting followup

Good morning.

Do apologize for the delayed response. I believe we are all on the same page as outlined below. In response to outstanding tasks:

- Fred will get you on the next CPPC (Capital Projects and Planning Committee) agenda. Some of those individuals were at the community forum earlier this week. Two items that will come up is parking and PAC. We can talk more about those topics later.
- Regarding the coordination of future meetings, Toni would be the best resource to facilitate scheduling those meetings for individuals on our side. She is out on vacation through next Tuesday. So, I will let her know to expect Phillip reaching out to her to facilitate in scheduling both the reoccurring monthly meetings between OWED and CCSF as well as a future meeting with PUC, OWED, CCSF, and Planning.

Regards,
Ron

Ronald P. Gerhard
Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration
City College of San Francisco
33 Gough Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
Phone - (415) 241-2229
www.ccsf.edu

From: Martin, Michael (ECN) [mailto:michael.martin@sfgov.org]
Sent: Friday, May 01, 2015 12:31 PM
To: Ronald Gerhard; Jeff Hamilton; Fred Sturner
Cc: Rich, Ken (ECN); Lesk, Emily (ECN)
Subject: Tuesday meeting followup

Dear Ron, Jeff and Fred-

Thanks again for a good meeting on Tuesday, I believe we made a lot of progress in understanding our mutual objectives. I am writing to provide my sense of the followups from our meeting:

- General next steps:
 - All will work to evaluate the approach to the MOU we discussed as it relates to 33 Gough and Balboa Reservoir. To that end, I propose that the City team drafts an overview the "principles of cooperation" we talked about in advance of the May monthly meeting noted above, to help serve as the agenda for that discussion.

- Ron and Jeff to provide feedback on the City's engagement strategy with CCSF in an effort to provide transparency on the SFPUC site process. (Related note: Andrew Chandler of the CCSF Capital Planning Committee had reached out to us previously, and he has suggested that the 5/13 Capital Planning Committee meeting would be a good place to begin our effort to inform the various CCSF constituencies before the summer break. Would you agree? If so, I think we'd want to move quickly to seek a spot on that agenda since it is now less than two weeks away.)
- Jeff to work with City Planning Department and SFMTA on survey of college staff and students regarding transportation.
- Mike to develop understanding of potential for SFPUC being the 33 Gough power provider.
- Fred to provide further detail on space/infrastructure needs relating to a childcare facility on-site at Balboa Reservoir.
- Next meetings:
 - In response to our discussed adoption of a monthly meeting schedule, a late May meeting with all of the participants from Tuesday (Ron I will have Ken's assistant Phillip contact Toni Lee to coordinate unless you would prefer to handle differently).
 - In the meantime, I would also like to schedule a meeting of OEWD, CCSF, SFPUC and Planning Department staff to discuss opportunities to collaborate in more detail. Please advise how best to coordinate the correct CCSF participants, based on the intended topics below:
 - Potential partnerships in connection with Balboa Reservoir housing proposal (site access, parking, child development center, partnership to build CCSF housing, etc)
 - Strategy and expected process for CCSF master plan update
 - Others?

Please call or email if you have comments, questions or additions to the above. Have a good weekend.

Best regards,
Mike

Michael Martin
City and County of San Francisco
Office of Economic and Workforce Development
Office: (415) 554-6937
[REDACTED]

From: [Lesk, Emily \(ECN\)](#)
To: [mzacovic@ccsf.edu](#); [Fred Sturner](#); [Adam Engelskirchen](#); [Martin, Michael \(ECN\)](#); [Wong, Phillip \(ECN\)](#); [Exline, Susan \(CPC\)](#); [Shaw, Jeremy \(CPC\)](#); [Freeman, Craig \(CWP\)](#); [Russell, Rosanna \(PUC\)](#); [Guy Lease](#); [sbruckman@ccsf.edu](#); [Jeff Hamilton](#)
Subject: Yesterday's City/CCSF Meeting - Recap of Tasks
Date: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 2:40:00 PM

Thanks to all for a good meeting yesterday. Here is a recap of the tasks that we each agreed to take on.

- **Emily** will provide the CCSF team with the proposed Balboa Reservoir development parameters.
- **Rosanna** will send the CCSF team the land swap transaction documents, including the access easement agreement.
- **Mike and Emily** will draft a statement describing current access conditions and obligations, to be incorporated into the Balboa Reservoir RFP, and will share this draft statement with CCSF for feedback.
- **Emily and Mike** will contact **Jeff** in late November/early December to discuss proposed development parameters on "Project's Relationship to CCSF" prior to finalizing those draft parameters for public dissemination. *[Jeff—your colleagues thought you would be the right person for this role, but please let us know if you would prefer for us to work with someone else.]*
- **Rosanna** will provide CCSF with contact information for the City's title officer, who may be able to assist with CCSF's tennis court question.
- **Sue** will speak with Planning Department colleagues about CCSF's tennis court question.
- **Mark** will serve as point of contact for City requests for transportation data.
- **Mark** will disseminate the City's transportation usage survey to the CCSF community.
- **Emily** will reserve a room in City Hall for the December check-in meeting.
- **Emily** will add Steve Bruckman to future meeting invites.

Please let me know if anything is missing or mischaracterized.

Thanks,
Emily

Emily Lesk
Project Manager
Office of Economic and Workforce Development
San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 448
San Francisco, CA 94102

Direct: (415) 554-6162
Email: emily.lesk@sfgov.org
www.oewd.org



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Meeting Minutes

City/City College Collaboration | Monthly Land Use Meeting September 16, 2016, 2-3pm @ SF Planning

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

In Attendance:

- CCSF
 - Linda Da Silva
 - Ron Gerhard
 - Phil Newsom (TBP Architecture)
 - Amy Jane Frater (TBP Architecture)
 - Mike _____ (Sandis, *via phone*)
- SF Planning
 - Sue Exline
 - John M. Francis
- OEWD
 - Emily Lesk (*via phone*)

Follow Up Action Items:

- OEWD
 - Send out meeting invitation for October 21st meeting; 2pm at Planning (Emily)
- Planning
 - Send Linda dates, times, and scope of Nelson\Nygaard data collection effort (Jeremy)
 - Follow up with Carli Paine at MTA re: Chinatown Center white zone relocation/removal (John)
 - Send electronic copy of FMP Options to CCSF team (attached to this file and sent separately)
- CCSF
 - Keep City team informed on outcome of MTA/Chinatown Center meeting re: white zone relocation/removal (Linda)
 - Send City team electronic copy of parking data (Phil/Amy Jane)
 - Keep City informed on next steps for 750 Eddy (Linda)
- All
 - Coordinate integration of Heather Green/City Admin Office into FMP conversation. Ron, please forward email from Heather to City Team.

Detailed Minutes:

1. Rescheduling October Meeting

- October 21 @ 2pm works for everyone, will book at conference room at Planning

2. Facilities Master Plan Options Background

- Phil and Amy Jane provided some background on the ideas that informed the development of the preliminary Options for the FMP
 - o Age of facilities is a driving factor; many buildings on Ocean campus are toward the end of their useful life, facilities on other campuses are more mixed.
 - o There is a lot of excess space based on current enrollment, but the College's goal is to increase enrollment to pre-recession levels
 - o Building renovations will require juggling of existing uses to other facilities while old facilities are renovated; phasing of new construction will play a role in this process.
 - o Planning for campus "flow"; i.e. how people move through and experience the campus, the entry sequence, how uses/facilities are clustered base on use, etc.
 - o Concern from many quarters around parking capacity and demand
 - o Desire to phase out portable classrooms
 - o Many existing classroom facilities are too small
 - o Location of Arts Complex is fairly well established on the site west of Phelan Ave and east of Balboa Reservoir
- Ron received an email from Heather Green at City Administrator's Office requesting a meeting to update her on FMP progress. All agree that it would be good to loop Heather into the ongoing conversations CCSF and City teams have been having and will continue to have over the coming months. Ron will forward City team Heather's email for coordination purposes.

3. Planning Department Feedback on FMP Options

- John and Sue provided a summary of Planning Department feedback on the FMP Options presented to the FMP Advisory Working Group on August 29, 2016. See comments attached below.
- Linda, Phil, and Amy Jane all feel the feedback is helpful and resonates with their vision for the FMP and Campus. Specific points of agreement include:
 - o The desire for a campus that is open, accessible, and well-integrated into the community.
 - o The desire to strike the right balance between parking demand and supply based on solid data; acknowledging the goal to increase the percentage of people taking transit, walking, and biking to campus while strategically managing parking demand over the time horizon of the FMP and beyond.

4. CCSF Parking Data Findings Preview

- Phil provided a brief summary of the campus parking data recently collected by Sandis.
- Would be great if City could have an electronic copy, if possible.
- Overall, parking is not well distributed on campus; some facilities are over capacity while others are under capacity. Goal is to reach an overall level of ~85% capacity campus-wide.
- City's traffic consultant Nelson\Nygaard will be collecting additional parking in and around campus in the near future. Jeremy should let Linda know ASAP when that will occur and what the scope of work is.
- CCSF, the City, and their consultants will use the October 21st meeting for a "deep dive" into the parking and traffic data. Goal is to share data and analyze the takeaways.

5. Balboa Reservoir RFQ Process and Panel

- RFQ language and review panel were finalized by Balboa Park CAC at its last meeting.
- RFQ will be issued at the end of the month.
- Linda will sit on the RFQ panel.

6. 750 Eddy Update

- CCSF has continued to analyze the opportunities to redevelop 750 Eddy as a mixed-use facility.
- Linda will be presenting analysis to the CCSF Board next Thursday (9/22) and seeking feedback on whether CCSF should continue more detailed analysis of the property.

7. SFMTA Proposed Bus Stop at Chinatown Center

- SFMTA is proposing to convert the white passenger loading zone in front of the CCSF Chinatown Center to a bus stop.
- There is concern that the lack of a passenger loading zone will lead to sidewalk and street congestion.
- Unclear whether MTA is planning to eliminate the white zone completely or just move it elsewhere on the block.
- Staff at Chinatown Center is meeting with project manager Kathleen Phu at MTA to understand the full nature of the change. Linda will let Planning know the outcome of this meeting.
- Planning will follow up with Carli Paine at MTA to gather further information.

✕

Total: 88 Insertions: 51 Deletions: 28 Moves: 0 Formatting: 0 Comments: 9

susan exline

Comment [9] **Jeremy Shaw**

Jeremy Shaw

.... Perhaps changing "need" to "cost" will address this comment...

- Strong interest from CCSF in changes to Phelan that knit the east and west sides of campus together, including increased pedestrian safety; making Phelan a seam for connectivity rather than a dividing line. Strong desire between City and CCSF staff to cooperate in the vision for Phelan and other community-interfacing parts of campus.
- Topography is a driving consideration for connectivity and access to and through campus; suggestion (from Jeff Tumlin) to use buildings to assist in overcoming these grade challenges, where possible. Consider other creative ways, particularly on the ceremonial open space in front of the Science Building, to better utilize open space and help with overcoming topography (suggestion from Jeff Tumlin and City staff)
- Parking on campus is not currently distributed well; campus options propose distributing parking better, including under proposed Student Services building at corner of Ocean/Phelan (TbP)
- All agree that structured and subterranean parking is extremely expensive. Subsidizing transit for students, staff, and faculty would be much cheaper. City, with consultant assistance, would be willing to provide a “back of the envelope” analysis exploring the cost of providing new parking structures vs. subsidizing transit. CCSF acknowledges the cost constraints related to structured parking and agrees that reducing the cost for such facilities should be a goal to the extent feasible.
- CCSF plans to size structured and subterranean parking in FMP based on a “worst case” parking supply scenario. However, Jeff Tumlin points out that planning for that much

Jeremy	Del
Jeremy	Del
Jeremy	Del
Jeremy	Del
Jeremy	Del
Jeremy	Del
Jeremy	Del
Jeremy	Del
Jeremy	Del
Jeremy	Del
susan	Del
susan	Del



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Meeting Minutes

City/City College Collaboration | Monthly Land Use Meeting

October 21, 2016, 2-3pm @ SF Planning

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

In Attendance:

CCSF	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Linda Da Silva• Jeff Hamilton
TBP Architecture	Phil Newsom
Sandis	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ron Sanzo• Andrea Fortun
Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sue Exline• John M. Francis• Jeremy Shaw
OEWD	Emily Lesk
MTA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Carli Paine• Keith Tanner
Nelson\Nygaard	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Jeff Tumlin• Peter Costa
SFPUC	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Martin Gran• Chris Wong

Follow Up Action Items:

- **All**
 - Accept new/updated calendar invite for monthly City/CCSF coordination meeting sent by John Francis (next meeting November 7)
- **Planning**
 - Send CCSF consolidated City comments on preferred option (John, Nov. 4th)
 - Share link to existing conditions report of the Balboa TDM study (Jeremy, ASAP)
 - Coordinate with MTA and N\N on parking/TDM cost/benefit analysis; to be included in TDM Plan. Progress report at next meeting (Jeremy, November 7)
 - Coordinate with N\N to share updated neighborhood parking data and speed data with City College
 - Coordinate agenda with CCSF and OEWD for November 7 coordination meeting

- **MTA**
 - Invite CCSF to Balboa Park CAC meeting to present on FMP (Keith Tanner)
 - Continue to coordinate with/provide updates to CCSF on bus stop installation/loading zone relocation at Chinatown Center
- **CCSF**
 - Work with City team (Jeremy, Carli, Jeff) to schedule a time to present to the TDM Study findings to the CCSF Facilities Committee and other CCSF bodies, as necessary (Linda, ASAP)

Detailed Minutes:

1. Next Meeting

- Returning to regular meeting time; note renewed calendar invite from John Francis
- Monday, November 7, 2-3pm @ Planning (4th Floor)

2. Facilities Master Plan Options and TDM Discussion

- Preferred Option for Ocean Campus will combine elements of two alternative options
- Strong interest from CCSF in changes to Phelan that knit the east and west sides of campus together, including increased pedestrian safety; making Phelan a seam for connectivity rather than a dividing line. Strong desire between City and CCSF staff to cooperate in the vision for Phelan and other community-interfacing parts of campus.
- Topography is a driving consideration for connectivity and access to and through campus; suggestion (from Jeff Tumlin) to use buildings to assist in overcoming these grade challenges, where possible (ie buildings that have entrances at multiple grades connected by elevators). Consider other creative ways, particularly on the ceremonial open space in front of the Science Building, to better utilize open space and help with overcoming topography (suggestion from Jeff Tumlin and City staff). See [Simon Fraser University campus plan](#) (link) as a precedent.
- Parking on campus is not currently distributed well; campus options propose distributing parking better, including under proposed Student Services building at corner of Ocean/Phelan (TbP)
- All agree that structured and subterranean parking is extremely expensive. Subsidizing transit for students, staff, and faculty would be much cheaper. City, with consultant assistance, would be willing to provide a “back of the envelope” analysis exploring the cost of providing new parking structures vs. subsidizing transit. CCSF acknowledges the cost constraints related to structured parking and agrees that reducing the cost for such facilities should be a goal to the extent feasible.
- CCSF plans to size structured and subterranean parking in FMP based on a “worst case” parking supply scenario. However, Jeff Tumlin points out that planning for that much parking will increase environmental mitigation requirements, with greater implications for

surrounding roadway, infrastructure, or transportation demand mitigations. The City recommends that the FMP reflect desired (but reasonable) parking scenarios as opposed to “worst case” outcomes. If the “worst case scenario” is necessary for FMP approvals, then the City suggests incorporating options, including an option(s) which utilizes a range of TDM strategies to reduce parking demand.

- Nelson\Nygaard presented highlights from the existing conditions report of the Balboa TDM study (document to be posted online soon—Planning will send out link when available).
- Roads and capacity are geometrically constrained, but there remains the need for both agencies (MTA and CCSF) to provide access to those who have fewest travel choices. TDM measures can support this; many measures can also reduce individuals’ transportation costs. Different measures will be required for different segments of population; parking is one strategy among many.
- If parking charges resulted in full cost recovery for parking infrastructure, the share of alternative travel modes would go up, including uber pool/lyft line.
- The TDM recommendations included in the FMP will not be as exhaustive as CCSF’s previous FMP from 2004. City College suggests that Facilities Master Plan is designed to show how facilities can help achieve Educational Master Plan goals (LD); CCSF’s Sustainability Plan is CCSF’s venue for incorporating TDM strategies into campus planning; the Plan Appendix will be updated in the near future.
- CCSF would like the City to comment on the preferred Ocean Campus option, which will be released the week of 10/24 and then presented at the following venues:
 - o FMP Working Group meeting Oct. 25
 - o Community Workshops on Nov. 1 and 2
 - o BOT Meeting Nov. 17
- Balboa Park CAC would like to invite CCSF to present on FMP updates.
- Generally FMP schedule: Options development in the fall; implementation, sequencing, and cost estimating in Spring semester; board adoption and then CEQA compliance

3. SFMTA Proposed Bus Stop at Chinatown Center

- SFMTA is proposing to convert the white passenger loading zone in front of the CCSF Chinatown Center to a bus stop and move the loading zone 60 feet (approx. 3 parking spaces) up the block.
- The Chinatown Center dean met with project manager Kathleen Phu at MTA to understand the full nature of the change.
- MTA is conducting additional on-site analysis to understand the impact on the CCSF community. Staff went out to the field in mid-October but class was not in session that day so they could not collect sufficient data. They will return in late October and provide Linda and Chinatown Center dean an update on their findings.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Meeting Minutes

City/City College Collaboration | Monthly Land Use Meeting

October 21, 2016, 2-3pm @ SF Planning

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

In Attendance:

CCSF	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Linda Da SilvaJeff Hamilton
TBP Architecture	Phil Newsom
Sandis	XXX
Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Sue ExlineJohn M. FrancisJeremy Shaw
OEWD	Emily Lesk
MTA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Carli PaineKeith Tanner
Nelson\Nygaard	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Jeff TumlinPeter Costa
SFPUC	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Martin Gran

Fax:

415.558.6378

Planning
Informatio

415.558.6378

John M. Francis 10/25/16 5:25 PM

Comment [1]: Team, please assist rounding this out, I know I missed some people/didn't catch everyone's name.

susan exline 10/26/16 9:45 AM

Deleted: xxx

susan exline 10/26/16 9:45 AM

Deleted: xxx

John M. Francis 10/25/16 5:26 PM

Comment [2]: Is there any data sharing/coordination that still needs to happen between N\N and Sandis?

susan exline 10/26/16 9:46 AM

Deleted: ASAP

susan exline 10/26/16 9:47 AM

Deleted: NAME,

Follow Up Action Items:

- All**
 - Accept new/updated calendar invite for monthly City/CCSF coordination meeting sent by John Francis (next meeting November 7)
- Planning**
 - Send CCSF consolidated City comments on preferred option (John, [Nov. 4th](#))
 - Coordinate with MTA and N\N on parking/TDM cost/benefit analysis; send to CCSF (Jeremy, by [DATE](#))
- MTA**
 - Invite CCSF to Balboa Park CAC meeting to present on FMP ([Keith Tanner](#) by [DATE](#))
 - Continue to coordinate/provide updates to CCSF on bus stop installation/loading zone relocation at Chinatown Center
- CCSF**

- o Work with City team (Jeremy, Carli, Jeff) to schedule a time to present to the TDM Study findings to the CCSF Facilities Committee (Linda, ASAP)

Detailed Minutes:

1. Next Meeting

- Returning to regular meeting time; note renewed calendar invite from John Francis
- Monday, November 7, 2-3pm @ Planning (4th Floor)

2. Facilities Master Plan Options and TDM Discussion

- Preferred Option will combine elements of two alternative options
- Strong interest from CCSF in changes to Phelan that knit the east and west sides of campus together; making Phelan a seam for connectivity rather than a dividing line. Strong desire between City and CCSF staff to cooperate in the vision for Phelan and other community-interfacing parts of campus.
- Topography is a driving consideration for connectivity and access to and through campus; suggestion is to use buildings to assist in overcoming these grade challenges, where possible. Consider other creative ways, particularly on the ceremonial open space in front of the Science Building. Open Space is underutilized currently so these are suggestion to improve its utilization. (suggestion from Jeff Tumlin and City staff)
- All agree that structured and subterranean parking = extremely expensive. Subsidizing transit for students, staff, and faculty would be much cheaper. City, with consultant assistance, would be willing to provide a “back of the envelope” analysis exploring the cost of providing new parking structures vs. subsidizing transit. CCSF acknowledges the cost constraints related to structured parking and agrees that reducing the need for such facilities should be a goal to the extent feasible.
- CCSF plans to include structured and subterranean parking in FMP as a “worst case” scenario. However, Jeff Tumlin points out that doing so will require environmental mitigations that meet the standards for associated traffic flows, which would have enormous implications for the types of roadway and other infrastructure facilities required on campus and in the surrounding neighborhood. Is the City recommends that the FMP reflect desired (but reasonable) outcomes as opposed to “worst case” outcomes. If there's a need to provide an option with the most parking feasible given land constraints (not \$\$ constraints) then the City suggests, providing two options, one that is “preferred” and focuses on TDM strategies to reduce parking needs and another alternative option that assumes a higher parking demand.
- Nelson\Nygaard presented the data they have collected for the Balboa TDM study.
- The TDM recommendations included in the FMP will not be as exhaustive as CCSF's previous FMP from 2004. City College suggests that CCSF's Sustainability Plan will be a better venue for incorporating TDM strategies into campus planning; the Plan Appendix will be updated in

susan exline 10/26/16 9:48 AM

Comment [3]: Might want to note here or in the email about our 1st agenda item to get the agenda started for that meeting. you can also ask Linda to contact you with additional agenda items.

susan exline 10/26/16 9:49 AM

Comment [4]: Might want to flesh this out a bit more, because I know I didn't get the concept until jeff elaborated on what he meant.

susan exline 10/26/16 9:51 AM

Deleted: s

susan exline 10/26/16 9:52 AM

Comment [5]: Do you think they really said this last part? I'd love it if they did, but I'm not sure I heard that.

susan exline 10/26/16 9:52 AM

Deleted: It is

susan exline 10/26/16 9:52 AM

Deleted:

susan exline 10/26/16 9:52 AM

Deleted: ed

susan exline 10/26/16 9:53 AM

Deleted: CCSF could

susan exline 10/26/16 9:53 AM

Deleted: e

susan exline 10/26/16 9:54 AM

Comment [6]: Can we link to the study if its' available on our website somewhere?

the near future. Linda chairs the Facilities Committee responsible for this document. City requests to be added to an upcoming agenda to present on TDM Study findings.

- CCSF would like the City to comment on the preferred Ocean Campus option, which will be released the week of 10/24 and then presented at the following venues:
 - o FMP Working Group meeting Oct. 25
 - o Community Workshops on Nov. 1 and 2
 - o BOT Meeting Nov. 17
- Balboa Park CAC would like to invite CCSF to present on FMP updates.

susan exline 10/26/16 9:55 AM

Comment [7]: Should we highlight this action item somehow?

3. SFMTA Proposed Bus Stop at Chinatown Center

- SFMTA is proposing to convert the white passenger loading zone in front of the CCSF Chinatown Center to a bus stop and move the loading zone 60 feet (approx. 3 parking spaces) up the block.
- The Chinatown Center dean met with project manager Kathleen Phu at MTA to understand the full nature of the change.
- MTA is conducting additional on-site analysis to understand the impact on the CCSF community. Staff went out to the field in mid-October but class was not in session that day so they could not collect sufficient data. They will return in late October and provide Linda and Chinatown Center dean an update on their findings.

Re: City/CCSF 10/21 Meeting Minutes

Linda Da Silva

Mon 10/31/2016 2:41 PM

To: Francis, John (CPC) <john.francis@sfgov.org>;

Hi John,

I have a correction to the meeting minutes. Page 3, 5th bullet re the TDM recommendations included in the FMP. I'm requesting that the bullet get reworded as shown below (note the ~~strikeouts~~ and **additions**).

The TDM recommendations included in the FMP will not be as exhaustive as CCSF's previous FMP from 2004. City College suggests that Facilities Master Plan is designed to show how facilities can help achieve Educational Master Plan goals (LD); CCSF's Sustainability Plan ~~will be a better~~ **is CCSF's** venue for incorporating TDM strategies into campus planning; the Plan Appendix will be updated in the near future. ~~Linda chairs the Facilities Committee responsible for this document.~~

Thank you,

Linda da Silva

Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Planning & Construction

City College of San Francisco

50 Phelan Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112

ldasilva@ccsf.edu

p 415.239.3495

c 650.642.7143

www.ccsf.edu

From: Francis, John (CPC) <john.francis@sfgov.org>

Sent: Friday, October 28, 2016 1:10:58 PM

To: Wong, Phillip (ECN); Martin, Michael (ECN); Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); Exline, Susan (CPC); Wong, Christopher J; Ronald Gerhard; Jeffrey Hamilton; Adam Engelskirchen; PNewsom@tbparchitecture.com; gmoon@tbparchitecture.com; Aliza Paz (apaz@nelsonnygaard.com); rsanzo@sandis.net; Peter Costa; Paine, Carli (MTA); Linda Da Silva; Lesk, Emily (ECN); jtumlin@nelsonnygaard.com; Rich, Ken (ECN); Amy Jane Frater; Gran, Martin (PUC); Russell, Rosanna (PUC)

Subject: City/CCSF 10/21 Meeting Minutes

Hi Everyone,

Attached please find the minutes from our City/CCSF monthly coordination meeting on 10/21. Included on page one is a list of follow up action items. If I missed anything, please feel free to email me with any additions or corrections to the minutes by COB Wednesday and I will update them and recirculate if needed.

Please note, our next meeting will be at 2pm on November 7th at Planning. Please let me know if you didn't receive the meeting invitation I sent out earlier this week.

Thanks,
John

10/31/2016

Re: City/CCSF 10/21 Meeting Minutes - Linda Da Silva

John M. Francis

Planner & Urban Designer, Citywide Planning

Direct: 415-575-9147 | **Fax:** 415-558-6409

**San Francisco
Planning**

1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

**SF Planning
Department**



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Meeting Minutes

City/City College Collaboration | Monthly Land Use Meeting November 7, 2016, 2-3pm @ SF Planning

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

In Attendance:

CCSF	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Linda Da Silva• Jeff Hamilton
TBP Architecture	Phil Newsom
Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sue Exline• John M. Francis• Jeremy Shaw
OEWD	Emily Lesk
MTA	Carli Paine
BART	Tim Chan
SFPUC	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Martin Gran• Chris Wong

Follow Up Action Items:

▪ Planning

- Send [concept design for I-280/Ocean southbound off-ramp](#) (link) to Linda/Phil (John, completed 11/18)
- Send Draft [Citywide Urban Design Guidelines](#) (link) to Linda/Phil (John, completed 11/18)
- Send [Ocean and Geneva Corridor Design](#) (link) to Linda/Phil (John, completed 11/18)
- Share info on [proposed bike facility on Lee Ave](#) (link, see PDF page 18) with Linda/Phil (John, completed 11/18)
- Send [Balboa Park Station Area Plan](#) (link) to Linda/Phil (John, completed 11/18)
- Send [Balboa Area TDM Plan Existing Conditions Memo](#) (link) to Linda/Phil (John, completed 11/18)
- C encroachment issues (John, completed 11/10)
- Schedule follow up “charrette” session(s) between CCSF and technical experts on specific topic areas (John, ASAP)
- Coordinate agenda with CCSF and OEWD for December coordination meeting

- **CCSF**

- Send info on campus “goat paths” to Jeremy (Phil, ASAP)
- Provide schedule for next round of design work and community outreach (Linda/Phil, ASAP)

Detailed Minutes:

1. Next Meeting

- a) Monday, December 5, 2-3pm @ Planning (4th Floor)

2. Feedback on FMP from FMP Working Group & Community Workshops

- a) Feedback from Working Group and community generally indicates consensus on major programmatic moves proposed in FMP
- b) Next steps:
 - TBP will now focus on further fleshing out technical details (e.g. building square footage, parking count, etc.) and sequencing of FMP implementation.
 - Further coordination needed with City related to public realm interface, TDM, access.
 - There will be additional opportunities for community input and CCSF/City coordination throughout the Spring semester as the FMP is drafted further.

3. Discussion on TDM Strategies

- a) BART: does CCSF know who is parking on campus? Do they know where they are coming from? As part of a TDM strategy, BART would be interested in working with CCSF to implement a “class pass” for CCSF students; BART already has a similar agreement with SFSU.
- b) TBP: the goal is to write a durable and adaptable FMP
 - For example, if TDM measures successfully shift transportation mode share away from the auto, then parking demand projections can be adjusted in the future.
 - Neighbors will want to see evidence that TDM is working. Explaining the cost/benefit of paying for parking structures will hopefully help with community prioritization.
 - The FMP will not make final decisions related to TDM, but will recommend possible strategies that CCSF could incorporate into the campus Sustainability Plan.
 - Where elements are less certain (Reservoir development, TDM), the FMP will leave flexibility to respond.
 - At parking construction costs cited (\$50,000-\$80,000 per space), CCSF would not have funding to meet all its other needs
- c) Planning: is it possible to incorporate TDM goals (as opposed to strategies) into the FMP?



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Meeting Minutes

City/City College TDM Workshop

December 22, 2016, 2-4pm @ SF Planning

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Attendees

- Linda Da Silva (CCSF)
- Jeff Hamilton (CCSF)
- Phil Newsom (tBP)
- Ron Sanzo (Sandis)
- Carli Paine (SFMTA)
- John M. Francis (Planning)
- Jeremy Shaw (Planning)
- Pete Costa (Nelson Nygaard)
- Calli Cenizal (Nelson Nygaard)
- Tim Chan (BART)
- Martin Gran (SFPUC)

Action Items

- **Phil/Ron**: Send Pete Ocean Campus existing and future student/employee headcount data by 12/30/2016.
- **Nelson Nygaard**: Clarify how and why the two survey results (NN and CCSF) differ, particularly on mode share? What is the significance of the difference?
- **Linda/Phil/Ron**:
 - Obtain raw data from City College transportation survey; clarify if respondents are identified as students/employees/visitors.
 - Provide feedback/comments on TDM Strategy Presentation by COB on 1/6/2017.
- **Linda**: Request to be agendized for March 9 Board of Trustees Study Session. Preliminary agenda items include:
 - Update on the CCSF Sustainability Plan implementation
 - Presentation on Balboa Area TDM Plan and potential TDM strategies that could be adopted by CCSF.
 - Discussion on proposed FMP parking scenario(s).
 - Update on Ocean Campus access and urban design issues
- **John/Linda**: Schedule date of TDM follow-up discussion
- **Jeremy**: Refine presentation based on comments from meeting

Intro

- Jeremy reviews agenda, background and desired meeting outcomes. (See Attached)
- Carli reviews Guiding Goals for TDM (City and CCSF existing Transportation Goals, see attached powerpoint)
 - Phil: parking and enrollment are connected. CCSF feels that parking issue should not hinder enrollment goals.
 - Linda: Also note that CCSF Board of Trustees (BoT) has a transportation-related policy (7.22, Environmental Policies and District Activities) that commits CCSF to “promoting the use of alternatives to single-occupancy motor vehicle use by students, faculty, and staff.”
 - Phil: Also note the BoT list of resolutions related to reservoir site.
- Carli reviews list of high level TDM strategies that can support CCSF FMP goals (see attached powerpoint).
- Jeff: what is timeline of Reservoir RFP?
 - Jeremy: RFQ due mid-January, RFP due May/June (Jeremy)
 - Jeff: Confusion in community around how the process works (RFQ vs. RFP, choosing how developer is selected). CCSF/developer interaction will be very important.
 - Linda is point person for interaction between CCSF and developer selection committee. Questions from CCSF community can be directed to her.
- Linda: likes that FMP is on a track to finish in 2017 to provide context for development on the Reservoir site. Pete seconds this in terms of TDM Plan.

CCSF FMP Update

- Linda:
 - BoT meeting: didn't hear anything that fundamentally changes the course of the FMP process. The locations of facilities are grounded, but still working out program within each facility. Next four months will continue to flesh out the plan.
 - What's in the plan?
 - Buildings: description and cost estimates. Input from BoT: should consider reuse of more existing buildings.
 - Public Spaces: what are activities that will occur in these spaces? Cost estimates.
 - Timing for plan development
 - Sections of the draft plan available end of February
 - Chancellor office and other executive review in April
 - Adoption in May
 - Everything has to be done before summer or else will have to wait for adoption until the fall when school is back in session.

Nelson Nygaard TDM Presentation

- Pete/Calli present (See presentation attached)
- Context and Data
 - TDM is all about providing multiple options and reliable travel information to people trying to access campus to help them make the best/most efficient/cost effective travel decisions for themselves.
 - TDM plan is meant to be complementary to CCSF FMP, goal is to be collaborative/share ideas.
 - Linda: how does mode split data compare to the data CCSF collected?
 - NN included CCSF data in the Balboa Area TDM Existing Conditions Report. Somewhat different methodology (online vs. intercept) but mode splits were similar—maybe slightly more respondents who drive alone in CCSF data.
 - Linda: Is CCSF mode split data broken down by visitor type (student, employee, etc.)? Would be good to resolve or explain any discrepancies between two data sets, if the data is different. CCSF data is online on FMP website.
 - Jeremy: CCSF/City questions were coordinated.
 - Tim: Should clarify the slide for the question “I am interested in trying...” (slide # XX)—confusing as currently designed.
 - Phil: student enrollment at Ocean will be 24K in 10 years, 32% above current enrollment.
- Suggested TDM Measures
 - Real time travel data
 - Linda: how is this implemented/coordinated?
 - Can contract with companies or build in-house (could be a student project).
 - Carli: real time transit data is all open source and publicly available.
 - Carpool
 - Tim: how effective? At Bart we’re seeing carpool numbers somewhat in decline.
 - Pete/Calli: Ride matching is the most difficult part. “Scoop” is a program that facilitates ride matching; financial incentive for drivers (they are paid to drive other people) and riders (because rider cost is quite low).
 - Carli: what is the role of the institution?
 - Pete: Institutions can be fairly pro-active to partner with ride matching services. Listservs help people learn about options.
 - Transit Passes
 - Jeff: how receptive are transit agencies to these programs?
 - Carli: MTA has existing legislation establishing “class pass” program. Administrative component is responsibility of institution.
 - Tim: BART has pilot program. Integrated with Clipper card. SF State: student champions are critical. BART can help coordinate with MTC/Clipper Card.

- Linda: What is benefit to CCSF?
 - Carli: university commits to getting a reduced fee pass for every student. Fee is set so that it is revenue neutral to MTA.
 - Linda: CCSF already has transit voucher program for students in need and pre-tax benefits for employees.
 - Linda has already reached out to Associated Students leadership about organizing around transit passes but has not received a response yet.
- Parking Pricing
 - Linda: Re: education code restrictions—maximum price established by education code unless CCSF can prove cost to provide parking is higher. But it will be politically challenging to raise parking price while in enrollment growth mode—probably not tenable in the near term. Employee parking is free. If want to raise employee parking fees, then it will have to be part of salary negotiations in the labor agreement with employees.
 - Carli: consider TDM suite as part of employee benefits package.
 - NN: This strategy should be considered as part of an entire TDM suite, not just a punitive “stick”—there are carrots too. Parking pricing is an important strategy—makes other strategies much more impactful. Funds are reinvested into TDM practices that support access via other modes.
- Last Mile
 - Purpose is to bridge small gaps between modes.
 - Linda: linkages between campuses are also important.
 - NN: Bike link cards at Bart.
 - Tim: can add more bike lockers at Balboa Bart if desired.
- Develop, Monitor, Refine Plan
 - Tim: make sure to include targets and how you achieve targets.
- Should explore design strategies for adaptable parking facilities—i.e. parking structure design that is flexible and allows the building to convert to other uses over time as parking needs reduce. There are a few examples around the country for this practice. See for example:
 - [“Universal Structures as Long-Term Sustainable Assets,” by Will Macht for the Urban Land Institute, January 2015](#)
 - [“We Need to Design Parking Garages With a Car-less Future in Mind: Building adaptable structures will save time, money, and material waste,” by Eric Jaffe for Citylab, November 2013](#)
- General Discussion
 - Phil: While parking is important, CCSF community is sustainability-minded. FMP will need to address where parking will be placed, but it’s difficult to marry TDM and parking needs in FMP in the short term. FMP can make recommendations about TDM, but there will be a lot of anxiety around whether TDM can deliver as promised. FMP will say “this

is how much parking you have, this is what you'd need if your enrollment meets targets given existing conditions." Determining right parking number and the mix of TDM strategies and going to be a work in progress.

- Linda: Some parts of the campus Sustainability Plan have been implemented since it was adopted in 2006, but the Plan has not moved forward in many areas. This will be on my plate. Perhaps within the context of the Sustainability Plan, it would make sense to share with the BoT the impacts and costs of parking on campus. Let's consider presenting in March—would love help from City in presenting. Let's have an update on the Sustainability Plan that incorporates our current thinking on TDM.
- Tim: If it's helpful for Bart directors lend their support, happy to reach out to them. Let me know.
- What do the next steps look like in communicating with BoT?
 - Request to be on agenda for March 9 Board of Trustees Study Session.
 - Pete: NN will have a draft document ready end of February, so it will be good timing for presenting to BoT.
 - Linda: TDM document should not include any commitments from CCSF.
- Jeremy: can make some refinements on presentation based on recommendations today.
- Linda: Let's have a follow up discussion on TDM in January.
- John F. will send CCSF minutes and presentation for review and comment.
- Jeremy: No construction is likely on reservoir site for the next five years—can focus on non-pricing strategies in the first five years to see what works. Low-hanging fruit.
- Can NN get Ocean Campus current/future daily student/employee headcount from CCSF? Yes.

Follow-Up Conversation: CCSF and Planning

- Linda: presenting Sustainability Plan update and TDM Study/Strategies during a BoT Study Session will allow for a good dialogue on parking/access issues with the Board. Can also provide update on outcome of City/CCSF Access Workshop on January 19. Let's aim for the March 9 Study Session.
- John/Jeremy: City understands the seriousness of the parking question for the Ocean Campus—the City does not want to hinder CCSF's enrollment goals, but also recognizes the limited roadways and college's resource constraints (physical and financial). As such, the City recommends that CCSF include alternative scenarios in the FMP. Since the FMP will be implemented over at least a 10 year period, building flexibility into the plan would allow the college to respond to conditions as they develop. For example, if CCSF implements a suite of TDM strategies and reaches its targets for reducing drive-alone automobile trips, it may be able to plan for and construct fewer parking spaces in the future. Developing scenarios that reflect a range of potential futures will put CCSF in a better planning position in a few years when it will need to make choices about construction projects.

- CCSF to consider the potential for parking phasing strategies and for parking garages designed for future conversion to alternative uses



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Meeting Minutes

Ocean Campus Urban Design & Access Workshop
January 19, 2017, 2-5pm @ Planning

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Attendees

- Linda da Silva (City College)
- Barry Chin (City College)
- Phil Newsom (tBP)
- Gary Moon (tBP)
- Patricia _____ (tBP)
- Ron Sanzo (Sandis)
- Tim Chan (BART)
- John M. Francis (Planning)
- Jeremy Shaw (Planning)
- Patrick Race (Planning)
- Martin Gran (SFPUC)
- Chris Wong (SFPUC)
- John Katz (SFMTA)
- Tony Henderson (SFMTA)

Action Items

- **City College/SFPUC**
 - Record water pipeline easement (in process)
 - Understand limits on trucks/weight over pipeline. SFPUC to provide CCSF available information on depth and load limitations of pipeline.
- **Sandis**
 - Further study geometrics of Wellness roundabout and ideal traffic operations, consider large trucks. Diagram pedestrian and vehicular flow in/out including impacts on EB Muni Metro tracks and how far Ocean Avenue ROW can encroach on City College property
- **Planning**
 - Send CAD of Ocean Avenue design to tBP
 - Provide estimates on incursion on CCSF property if Phelan Intersection Concept 1 is paired with bike lanes.

- **SFMTA/Planning/City College:** Organize small session to examine Muni boarding islands, Howth intersection vis-à-vis Wellness Center driveway, Howth two-way concept, Phelan intersections. Need MTA traffic, transit engineers, operations and designers.
- **SFMTA/Planning/City College:** Explore design alternatives/constraints for southern roadway connection between Phelan Avenue and Reservoir site.

Intro

- John reviews agenda, background, and desired meeting outcomes. (See agenda attached)
- Linda: Nobody wins unless we all win. These meetings are for exploring ideas and potential solutions, with an understanding that we are not committing and that the governing board makes ultimate decisions. Appreciate the opportunity to have productive conversations with City team.

Ocean Ave

- Presentation of *Ocean & Geneva Corridor Design* project by Patrick Race
 - Project Goal: develop design that improves walking experience, balances the needs of many different users, creates more enjoyable and pleasing street
 - Short-term streetscape improvements west of Phelan completed
 - Long term designs (east of Phelan)
 - Parameters include: balancing modes, respecting CCSF master plan vision, enhancing pedestrian and bicycle safety and experience, upgrading or removing pedestrian bridge, upgrading K-line rails
 - Status: Concept plan, cost estimates, and environmental review completed; now identifying funding for detailed street designs and construction; could be coordinated with rail upgrade on K-line
 - Complete street / Expanded Roadway is the ideal configuration.
 - There is room to incur into City College property, perhaps even more than shown if bike lane or sidewalk need to be expanded. City College is open to incursion for bike/ped/access improvements
 - Recommendations include
 - Widen sidewalks into City College (max incursion of 14' into CC property currently proposed)
 - Protected bike lanes
 - Minimize physical and visual impediments to entering campus
 - Active, street-facing frontage on City College campus, including where retaining wall and athletic center are currently located

- Re-aligning Phelan/Geneva/Ocean Ave intersection
 - New planted medians
 - Corridor-wide greening and lighting improvements
- Replace and re-align Muni boarding islands and rail (see discussion below)
- *Ocean & Geneva Corridor Design: Phelan Intersection Alternatives*
 - Concept 1
 - Can accommodate complete street
 - Would incur into City College property around 4 feet near Phelan
 - Preferred by both SFMTA and CCSF
 - Concept 2
 - Shorter pedestrian crossing
 - But more convoluted and probably longer signal
- Discussion of *Ocean & Geneva Corridor Design*
 - Phelan Intersection Concept 1 generally preferred over Concept 2
 - Muni Metro boarding island relocation
 - Moving closer to Howth
 - Would be oriented towards entering the Wellness Gateway/Building
 - Would require regrading
 - Potential for a center island which could save ROW space and limit pedestrians quickly existing into traffic lanes
 - Makes sense for existing conditions (at city college)
 - Moving closer to Phelan
 - Would align with FMP's "City College Plaza" and "Ocean Gateway"
 - Might require more incursion into city college property
 - Pedestrian Experience along Ocean Avenue
 - City College and City would like people to safely cross to north side of Ocean Ave, rather than jaywalk
 - South side is problematic because it not easy to walk (e.g. bus stops, light standards, trees all squeeze the sidewalk), the streetscape is unfriendly at the Lick HS frontage, and pedestrians tend not to walk all the way west to the safe crossing at Howth.
 - The City and City College should engage Public Works and Lick HS to improve sidewalk and streetscape conditions on the south side of Ocean.

- City: recommend including the Ocean & Geneva Corridor Design in presentations to City College community for input and vetting, since it has been some time since outreach for the design occurred.

Howth Intersection/Entry

- Future 49 BRT stop will stay at Ocean Ave, west of Howth
- Sidewalk expansion in front of Lick is limited because of Lick's loading needs
- New Proposed "Racetrack" Design for Howth Entry/Wellness Gateway
 - City comments
 - Need to limit what is built on top of SFPUC water line and be aware that if SFPUC needs to work on the line, access to future parking may be impeded
 - Need to ensure no queuing back onto WB Ocean Avenue , especially with proposed increase in parking on east side of campus
 - Potentially problematic to have EB Ocean Avenue, left turning vehicles crossing Muni Metro tracks at Howth/Wellness Gateway. Further study needed to determine if feasible.
 - City College requests
 - Why not make Howth two-way? This way exiting traffic can more easily access SB I-280, rather than turning onto Ocean and driving through neighborhood to get on freeway
- City College no longer pursuing additional driveway access between Howth and I-280 from Ocean or from off-ramp

Proposed City College Plaza / Student Services Building

- City College wants to activate the street
 - City College does not want another dead zone like Wellness Center created
 - No constraints other than topography on corner of Ocean/Phelan
 - Design has been updated, moving student services closer to Ocean
- Linda: design is meant to create a sense of arrival, rather than to pin-down a particular size or design for the plaza or building
- Building can also help with vertical circulation, still working out all the connections, visual or otherwise
- On FMP Campus Plan, public spaces should be "right-sized" to reflect urban design best practices as well as realistic proportions and construction/maintenance costs.

- Parking under students services would be the “first contact” for many visitors, includes ADA spots. Intent is to have limited parking, some maintenance/drop off zones, but no parking for students or employees. Rather it should make access easy for new visitors.
- Most people accessing City College from the west by transit get off at Lee Ave.
- FMP is moving campus’ center of gravity west.
- Cloud walk – service and emergency vehicles only
- City College is considering secure bike parking and repair on Ocean Campus

West Campus and Phelan Avenue sketch design

- Presentation of Designs/Issues
 - Need to increase connectivity between two sides of campus
 - FMP will be adding more buildings on west side of Phelan, and seek three pedestrian crossings
 - Seeking to identify vision for Phelan Ave in order to inform design of student services building frontage
 - Phelan Ave: sketch alternative presented with tree-lined median, no street parking, and more frequent, prominent pedestrian crossings on Phelan Ave
 - PAEC: Retaining as much as possible from original PAEC design. FMP will move design closer to Phelan to better activate the street and reduce “dead zones.” Frontage on Phelan would be glass/transparent and showcase the Diego Rivera mural
 - Would like to bring as much of Cloud Circle down to the grade of Phelan Ave as possible
 - CCSF is running out of land for parking; propose shared parking with Reservoir near PAEC
 - Lee Avenue should extend North
 - Ongoing design questions:
 - CCSF team is currently testing if Visual and Communication Arts can fit into arts extension as drawn, or needs to have a larger footprint
 - FMP needs to include west campus pick up/drop off area
- City Comments on Phelan Avenue sketch designs
 - Needs bus stops for 43, potentially one less than today (2 total)
 - Need to keep 20 feet clear, per SF Fire Department requirements
 - Removing street parking presents some challenges
 - Removing parking puts more strain on campus parking supply; foresee unease from neighbors

- Street parking does not have to conflict with pedestrian safety or design goal of connecting two sides of campus
- City Comments on West Campus
 - Would like to keep option open for alternative buildout scenarios in the FMP and environmental review that provide some flexibility over the time horizon of the plan and allow City College to respond to changing conditions relative to parking (e.g. alternative parking scenarios or methods to determine future parking demand) and Reservoir development
 - *City College response: City College needs to propose a vision for the college, including parking count and location*
 - Design of parking structure needs to respect surrounding/future residents and pedestrian safety
 - Need to acknowledge neighborhood concerns about peak-hour traffic and queueing
 - Need more connections between Phelan and the Reservoir, e.g. a southern connection near book store
 - Southern connection would need to be designed to support Unity Plaza, connecting pedestrian ways, pedestrian crossing across Phelan, and bus exit

Future potential outreach around today's topics could take place during the following:

- FMP meetings
- Bart Station Modernization project
- Lick Wilmerding effort to establish additional drop off areas
- BART will be seeking more kiss and ride space on Geneva



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Meeting Minutes

Ocean Campus Urban Design & Access Workshop
January 19, 2017, 2-5pm @ Planning

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Attendees

- Linda da Silva (City College)
- Barry Chin (City College)
- Phil Newsom (tBP)
- Gary Moon (tBP)
- Patricia _____ (tBP)
- Ron Sanzo (Sandis)
- Tim Chan (BART)
- John M. Francis (Planning)
- Jeremy Shaw (Planning)
- Patrick Race (Planning)
- Martin Gran (SFPUC)
- Chris Wong (SFPUC)
- John Katz (SFMTA)
- Tony Henderson (SFMTA)

Action Items

- **City College/SFPUC**
 - Record water pipeline easement (in process)
 - Understand limits on trucks/weight over pipeline. SFPUC to provide CCSF available information on depth and load limitations of pipeline.
- **Sandis**
 - Further study geometrics of Wellness roundabout and ideal traffic operations, consider large trucks. Diagram pedestrian and vehicular flow in/out including impacts on EB Muni Metro tracks and how far Ocean Avenue ROW can encroach on City College property
- **Planning**
 - Send CAD of Ocean Avenue design to tBP
 - Provide estimates on incursion on CCSF property if Phelan Intersection Concept 1 is paired with bike lanes.

- **SFMTA/Planning/City College:** Organize small session to examine Muni boarding islands, Howth intersection vis-à-vis Wellness Center driveway, Howth two-way concept, Phelan intersections. Need MTA traffic, transit engineers, operations and designers.
- **SFMTA/Planning/City College:** Explore design alternatives/constraints for southern roadway connection between Phelan Avenue and Reservoir site.

Intro

- John reviews agenda, background, and desired meeting outcomes. (See agenda attached)
- Linda: Nobody wins unless we all win. These meetings are for exploring ideas and potential solutions, with an understanding that we are not committing and that the governing board makes ultimate decisions. Appreciate the opportunity to have productive conversations with City team.

Ocean Ave

- Presentation of *Ocean & Geneva Corridor Design* project by Patrick Race
 - Project Goal: develop design that improves walking experience, balances the needs of many different users, creates more enjoyable and pleasing street
 - Short-term streetscape improvements west of Phelan completed
 - Long term designs (east of Phelan)
 - Parameters include: balancing modes, respecting CCSF master plan vision, enhancing pedestrian and bicycle safety and experience, upgrading or removing pedestrian bridge, upgrading K-line rails
 - Status: Concept plan, cost estimates, and environmental review completed; now identifying funding for detailed street designs and construction; could be coordinated with rail upgrade on K-line
 - Complete street / Expanded Roadway is the ideal configuration.
 - There is room to incur into City College property, perhaps even more than shown if bike lane or sidewalk need to be expanded. City College is open to incursion for bike/ped/access improvements
 - Recommendations include
 - Widen sidewalks into City College (max incursion of 14' into CC property currently proposed)
 - Protected bike lanes
 - Minimize physical and visual impediments to entering campus
 - Active, street-facing frontage on City College campus, including where retaining wall and athletic center are currently located

- Re-aligning Phelan/Geneva/Ocean Ave intersection
 - New planted medians
 - Corridor-wide greening and lighting improvements
- Replace and re-align Muni boarding islands and rail (see discussion below)
- *Ocean & Geneva Corridor Design: Phelan Intersection Alternatives*
 - Concept 1
 - Can accommodate complete street
 - Would incur into City College property around 4 feet near Phelan
 - Preferred by both SFMTA and CCSF
 - Concept 2
 - Shorter pedestrian crossing
 - But more convoluted with longer signal required
- Discussion of *Ocean & Geneva Corridor Design*
 - Phelan Intersection Concept 1 generally preferred over Concept 2
 - Muni Metro boarding island relocation
 - Moving closer to Howth
 - Would be oriented towards entering the Wellness Gateway/Building
 - Would require major regrading of trackway
 - Potential for a center island which could save ROW space and limit pedestrians quickly existing into traffic lanes
 - Makes sense for existing conditions (at city college)
 - Moving closer to Phelan
 - Would align with FMP's "City College Plaza" and "Ocean Gateway"
 - Might require more incursion into city college property
 - Pedestrian Experience along Ocean Avenue
 - City College and City would like people to safely cross to north side of Ocean Ave, rather than jaywalk
 - South side is problematic because it not easy to walk (e.g. bus stops, light standards, trees all squeeze the sidewalk), the streetscape is unfriendly at the Lick HS frontage, and pedestrians tend not to walk all the way west to the safe crossing at Howth.
 - The City and City College should engage Public Works and Lick HS to improve sidewalk and streetscape conditions on the south side of Ocean.

- City: recommend including the Ocean & Geneva Corridor Design in presentations to City College community for input and vetting, since it has been some time since outreach for the design occurred.

Howth Intersection/Entry

- Future 49 BRT stop will stay at Ocean Ave, west of Howth
- Sidewalk expansion in front of Lick is limited because of Lick's loading needs
- New Proposed "Racetrack" Design for Howth Entry/Wellness Gateway
 - City comments
 - Need to limit what is built on top of SFPUC water line and be aware that if SFPUC needs to work on the line, access to future parking may be impeded
 - Need to ensure no queuing back onto WB Ocean Avenue , especially with proposed increase in parking on east side of campus
 - Potentially problematic to have EB Ocean Avenue, left turning vehicles crossing Muni Metro tracks at Howth/Wellness Gateway. Further study needed to determine if feasible.
 - City College requests
 - Why not make Howth two-way? This way exiting traffic can more easily access SB I-280, rather than turning onto Ocean and driving through neighborhood to get on freeway
- City College no longer pursuing additional driveway access between Howth and I-280 from Ocean or from off-ramp

Proposed City College Plaza / Student Services Building

- City College wants to activate the street
 - City College does not want another dead zone like Wellness Center created
 - No constraints other than topography on corner of Ocean/Phelan
 - Design has been updated, moving student services closer to Ocean
- Linda: design is meant to create a sense of arrival, rather than to pin-down a particular size or design for the plaza or building
- Building can also help with vertical circulation, still working out all the connections, visual or otherwise
- On FMP Campus Plan, public spaces should be "right-sized" to reflect urban design best practices as well as realistic proportions and construction/maintenance costs.

- Parking under students services would be the “first contact” for many visitors, includes ADA spots. Intent is to have limited parking, some maintenance/drop off zones, but no parking for students or employees. Rather it should make access easy for new visitors.
- Most people accessing City College from the west by transit get off at Lee Ave.
- FMP is moving campus’ center of gravity west.
- Cloud walk – service and emergency vehicles only
- City College is considering secure bike parking and repair on Ocean Campus

West Campus and Phelan Avenue sketch design

- Presentation of Designs/Issues
 - Need to increase connectivity between two sides of campus
 - FMP will be adding more buildings on west side of Phelan, and seek three pedestrian crossings
 - Seeking to identify vision for Phelan Ave in order to inform design of student services building frontage
 - Phelan Ave: sketch alternative presented with tree-lined median, no street parking, and more frequent, prominent pedestrian crossings on Phelan Ave
 - PAEC: Retaining as much as possible from original PAEC design. FMP will move design closer to Phelan to better activate the street and reduce “dead zones.” Frontage on Phelan would be glass/transparent and showcase the Diego Rivera mural
 - Would like to bring as much of Cloud Circle down to the grade of Phelan Ave as possible
 - CCSF is running out of land for parking; propose shared parking with Reservoir near PAEC
 - Lee Avenue should extend North
 - Ongoing design questions:
 - CCSF team is currently testing if Visual and Communication Arts can fit into arts extension as drawn, or needs to have a larger footprint
 - FMP needs to include west campus pick up/drop off area
- City Comments on Phelan Avenue sketch designs
 - Needs bus stops for 43, potentially one less than today (2 total each way rather than the 3 existing)
 - Need to keep 20 feet clear, per SF Fire Department requirements
 - Removing street parking presents some challenges
 - Removing parking puts more strain on campus parking supply; foresee unease from neighbors

- Street parking does not have to conflict with pedestrian safety or design goal of connecting two sides of campus
- City Comments on West Campus
 - Would like to keep option open for alternative buildout scenarios in the FMP and environmental review that provide some flexibility over the time horizon of the plan and allow City College to respond to changing conditions relative to parking (e.g. alternative parking scenarios or methods to determine future parking demand) and Reservoir development
 - *City College response: City College needs to propose a vision for the college, including parking count and location*
 - Design of parking structure needs to respect surrounding/future residents and pedestrian safety
 - Need to acknowledge neighborhood concerns about peak-hour traffic and queueing
 - Need more connections between Phelan and the Reservoir, e.g. a southern connection near book store
 - Southern connection would need to be designed to support Unity Plaza, connecting pedestrian ways, pedestrian crossing across Phelan, and bus exit

Future potential outreach around today's topics could take place during the following:

- FMP meetings
- Bart Station Modernization project
- Lick Wilmerding effort to establish additional drop off areas
- BART will be seeking more kiss and ride space on Geneva



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CCSF Facilities Master Plan Update

Ocean Campus Urban Design & Access Workshop Minutes

January 19, 2017, 2-5pm @ Planning (1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor)

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Welcome, Introductions, Review Agenda & Goals <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workshop Goals<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Provide opportunity for CCSF and City to share high level urban design and physical access priorities for CCSF Ocean Campus○ Discuss/workshop specific urban design and access challenges as they relate to draft FMP○ Where possible, find consensus on potential solutions and method for incorporating them into the FMP○ Where needed, discuss a framework for continuing dialogue on unresolved issues• Workshop Format<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Focused presentations○ Discussion○ Group sketching (maps, trace, and markers will be provided)	2-2:15pm
---	-----------------

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Ocean Ave

- Ron showing overlay of preferred ocean design with preferred FMP.
- Some challenges with access for team buses at Howth entrance. Trucks accessing corp yard shouldn't have a problem.
- Concern about taking away crosswalk on east side of Ocean/Howth intersection—people will jay walk, but CCSF believes it could improve auto operations into/out of campus. MTA would not support closing crosswalk, want to make crossing as safe as possible for pedestrians.
- What is the path of travel from BART to campus?
 - CCSF prefers people to walk along south side of Ocean
- Major concern around left turns from EB Ocean into Howth/campus
 - There are ways to deal with this, but need to talk through some ideas.
 - Need to set up time to talk through tech details?
 - Number of auto trips is going to be large due to the new parking structure
 - What is the net amount of parking vs. existing? Net will be less than existing. Reconcentrating parking on east and west.

- What are some scenarios that could mitigate the challenges at Ocean/Howth given larger number of vehicles accessing
 - Make Howth 2 way in order to better access SB 280.
 - Why is Howth one way currently?
 - Neighbors didn't want?
 - Signalization at Geneva
 - No reason that it couldn't be 2 way operationally. Would need to quantify the delay to transit at Geneva intersection.
 - Linda: proportionality of impacts is important to consider, given the small number of people who live in Howth.
 - Protected left turns (green arrow)—important for safety even though it slows transit and traffic.
 - Left turn lane—would need more ROW. Concern about queuing—could back up all the way to Phelan.
 - Using Geneva and Howth as an alternative to left turn from Ocean.
 - Automated wayfinding to let people know how much parking is available.
- SFMTA applauds west bound bike lane and Ocean widening—CCSF cautions that it is not a done deal because it is a governing board decision. Having bike facilities on Ocean would mean that proposed bike facilities on Howth wouldn't have to happen. Then Howth could be two way.
- Next steps: sharing data between Sandis and MTA on counts and traffic modeling on ocean. Look at TA study. James: let's make sure we can use the best possible data, not just historical—very concerned about traffic. Also, Howth is a narrow street, which has limits.
- Are we comfortable with a range of options for access? CCSF: yes, will have to be done this way. MTA: but need to have a certain level of certainty that they will work.
- John will help convene exchange of data between MTA and CCSF.
- Send Ron other version of Ocean/Phelan intersection.

Phelan/Reservoir access

- Major points of access are Lee, Riordan access point, currently
- Providing additional access on Phelan raises challenges due to lots of mode conflict.
- Location of proposed crosswalk crossing Phelan is fungible.
- Discussions around what to do with former bookstore site.
- Connection to unity plaza.
- CCSF desire for separation between parking and any new roadway.

- Lots of potential queuing challenges here.
- Would be better to having cars enter stream of traffic on Phelan from Reservoir further north. CCSF: per CCSF Board, we won't bifurcate west campus buildings with a road
- Could direct northern and southern parking areas on their own egresses north and south on Phelan.
- Existing parking structures is just as much a challenge as entering. Is there a way to program parking by user in order to have more control over flow over the course of the day? Yes.
- CCSF team can provide some numbers of cars for each lot in order to understand best potential access points to west campus parking and reservoir.
- Is southern connection too flawed to pursue? MTA concerned if it will work—should be CCSF concern as well. Concern about pedestrian connection as well.
- Lee street and Riordan access are prob going to be main points
- CCSF should show Lee punching through and discuss with PUC
- Is there any opportunity to punch through mid-Phelan? Probably not given push back from Board and CCSF community.
- MTA: Need to have trip generation data to make these decisions. Board also needs to have some understanding of the stakes and potentially compromise. Want City and CCSF to work together to find mutually beneficial solutions.
- Any mode data on where students are coming from?
- Mutual concerns about southern Phelan exit, so looking further at Lee.
- Next Steps...same as for Ocean.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CCSF Facilities Master Plan Update

Ocean Campus Urban Design & Access Workshop Minutes

January 19, 2017, 2-5pm @ Planning (1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor)

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Welcome, Introductions, Review Agenda & Goals <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workshop Goals<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Provide opportunity for CCSF and City to share high level urban design and physical access priorities for CCSF Ocean Campus○ Discuss/workshop specific urban design and access challenges as they relate to draft FMP○ Where possible, find consensus on potential solutions and method for incorporating them into the FMP○ Where needed, discuss a framework for continuing dialogue on unresolved issues• Workshop Format<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Focused presentations○ Discussion○ Group sketching (maps, trace, and markers will be provided)	2-2:15pm
---	-----------------

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Ocean Ave

- Ron showing overlay of preferred ocean design with preferred FMP.
- Some challenges with access for team buses at Howth entrance. Trucks accessing corp yard shouldn't have a problem.
- Concern about taking away crosswalk on east side of Ocean/Howth intersection—people will jay walk, but CCSF believes it could improve auto operations into/out of campus. MTA would not support closing crosswalk, want to make crossing as safe as possible for pedestrians.
- What is the path of travel from BART to campus?
 - CCSF prefers people to walk along south side of Ocean
- Major concern around left turns from EB Ocean into Howth/campus
 - There are ways to deal with this, but need to talk through some ideas.
 - Need to set up time to talk through tech details?
 - Number of auto trips is going to be large due to the new parking structure
 - What is the net amount of parking vs. existing? Net will be less than existing. Reconcentrating parking on east and west.

- What are some scenarios that could mitigate the challenges at Ocean/Howth given larger number of vehicles accessing
 - Make Howth 2 way in order to better access SB 280.
 - Why is Howth one way currently?
 - Neighbors didn't want?
 - Signalization at Geneva
 - No reason that it couldn't be 2 way operationally. Would need to quantify the delay to transit at Geneva intersection.
 - Linda: proportionality of impacts is important to consider, given the small number of people who live in Howth.
 - Protected left turns (green arrow)—important for safety even though it slows transit and traffic.
 - Left turn lane—would need more ROW. Concern about queuing—could back up all the way to Phelan.
 - Using Geneva and Howth as an alternative to left turn from Ocean.
 - Automated wayfinding to let people know how much parking is available.
- SFMTA applauds west bound bike lane and Ocean widening—CCSF cautions that it is not a done deal because it is a governing board decision. Having bike facilities on Ocean would mean that proposed bike facilities on Howth wouldn't have to happen. Then Howth could be two way.
- Next steps: sharing data between Sandis and MTA on counts and traffic modeling on ocean. Look at TA study. James: let's make sure we can use the best possible data, not just historical—very concerned about traffic. Also, Howth is a narrow street, which has limits.
- Are we comfortable with a range of options for access? CCSF: yes, will have to be done this way. MTA: but need to have a certain level of certainty that they will work.
- John will help convene exchange of data between MTA and CCSF.
- Send Ron other version of Ocean/Phelan intersection.

Phelan/Reservoir access

- Major points of access are Lee, Riordan access point, currently
- Providing additional access on Phelan raises challenges due to lots of mode conflict.
- Location of proposed crosswalk crossing Phelan is fungible.
- Discussions around what to do with former bookstore site.
- Connection to unity plaza.
- CCSF desire for separation between parking and any new roadway.

- Lots of potential queuing challenges here.
- Would be better to having cars enter stream of traffic on Phelan from Reservoir further north. CCSF: per CCSF Board, we won't bifurcate west campus buildings with a road
- Could direct northern and southern parking areas on their own egresses north and south on Phelan.
- Existing parking structures is just as much a challenge as entering. Is there a way to program parking by user in order to have more control over flow over the course of the day? Yes.
- CCSF team can provide some numbers of cars for each lot in order to understand best potential access points to west campus parking and reservoir.
- Is southern connection too flawed to pursue? MTA concerned if it will work—should be CCSF concern as well. Concern about pedestrian connection as well.
- Lee street and Riordan access are prob going to be main points
- CCSF should show Lee punching through and discuss with PUC
- Is there any opportunity to punch through mid-Phelan? Probably not given push back from Board and CCSF community.
- MTA: Need to have trip generation data to make these decisions. Board also needs to have some understanding of the stakes and potentially compromise. Want City and CCSF to work together to find mutually beneficial solutions.
- Any mode data on where students are coming from?
- Mutual concerns about southern Phelan exit, so looking further at Lee.
- Next Steps...same as for Ocean.