

## Balboa Reservoir- Infrastructure Meeting 11/7/18

Emily Lesk (EL)	MOED
Derek Adams	PUC
Katie Pilat	Consultant to PUC
Molly Petrick (MP),	PUC
Brandy	PUC
Jason	PUC
Ken	Public Works
Jeremy Shaw (JS)	Planning Department
Sueng Yuen Hong	Planning Department
Lisa Fisher	Planning Department
Joe Kirchofer (JK)	AVB
Nora Collins	AVB
Karen Murray (KM)	VMWP
Peter Waller	PYATOK
Brian Scott (BS)	BKF

### 1. Introductions

- Karen provided overview of Balboa Reservoir project
- Project approvals will include Development Agreement with conceptual infrastructure plan as an attachment
- Early feedback from City agencies will ensure that the concept level infrastructure plan is consistent with City standards and goals
- Infrastructure Plan will be submitted early 2019 and City agencies will have opportunity to review
- These meetings will help us anticipate major issues
- Meeting once a month this fall with a separate agenda for each.
- BKF shared handouts of infrastructure diagrams, attached.

### 2. Proposed Public Utilities

#### Non Potable Water Ordinance

- Team has looked at both district wide and building by building compliance. Given phasing and different ownerships, Building by building is probably most feasible.
- No calculations have been completed on non-potable water. Looking for general guidance from City
- Four of the buildings will be affordable. SFPUC still investigating whether these are exempt from Non-potable requirements.
- Phase I would include buildings around park plus townhomes, Buildings A, B & G would be phase II. All roads and utilities in first phase
- AVB will own and operate three buildings, BRIDGE will own and operate two buildings, Mission Housing and HFH will each operate buildings
- Our understanding is that a central district scale plant is not feasible or economic as a for-profit operation at this scale.
- Building by Building approach is an option; however, SFPUC would encourage us to look more closely at cost of district scale plant. It may prove to be less expensive

- District system would also require pipes crossing public roads. That is not a problem if the District system is dedicated to the City.
- Molly: PUC would have to evaluate whether it makes sense to own and operate a plant at this modest scale. This site is challenging because it is small and because there are multiple developers.
- Lisa: District scale system does not mean having to do treatment facility. Look at other Mission Rock and other plans doing systems. [BS1]
- Lisa: City is excited about affordable housing, could district system help offset utility cost for affordable housing by supplying greywater?
- District scale: Do not necessarily need to collect from every building, just need to collect enough to meet demand, including irrigation at Park.
- Development Agreement allows options that are not in the baseline code.
- Molly: Public parks need to use non-potable water for irrigation? Molly and Emily to confirm
- Lisa: Central SOMA development – public park irrigation water being supplied by private developer
- Lisa: Coordinate Better Roof goals with non-potable
- It is possible to do district wide storm water management and building by building non-potable. It is mostly a math problem in terms of assigning credits for non-potable water systems to storm water system.

### **Townhomes**

- Are single family homes subject to non-potable ordinance? Yes
- PUC not aware of any examples to date of THs that have done non-potable water on parcel by parcel basis
- There may be a way to create an offset on other blocks so that THs do not have to meet non-potable requirement, meaning no separate piping to WCs
- Sarah: The whole site is a project – need to meet the water equation project wide. Challenging because of multiple owners.
- Molly: will there be a master HOA that includes all the Owners? JK – yes, but trying to keep that arrangement as simple as possible
- One water service under master HOA? Does that work given multiple phases?
- Total number of THs still in flux

### **Stormwater Management Ordinance**

- BKF review storm water calculations. Pervious area slightly increased from existing to proposed.
- Reviewed options for concentrated and distributed treatment areas. These options do not include credit for non-potable water compliance. Will likely do a combination of these two approaches.
- Block G – locating large storm water treatment area a bit more challenging due to slope. Design team to study options
- Infiltration is probably good on site, mostly sandy type soils, including the berm material that will be redistributed on site.
- SFPUC: Will need soil engineer to do an analysis of infiltration. Make sure Rockridge analysis is consistent with PUC guidelines. Consider most limiting soil within the upper 10 feet.
- BKF will assume a C type soil for master planning purposes which is probably somewhat conservative in terms of infiltration

- A lot of potential to minimize on grade BMPs by utilizing green roofs. Project is subject to Better Roof ordinance. Talk to Jeremy Shaw and Jeff Horn at Planning.
- Better Roof Credit for bio-retention or planters on structure/podium
- BKF – may also look at linear below grade retention/infiltration systems
- Surface drainage from roads needs some form of pre-treatment/management before entering below-grade infiltration system
- Public Streets – can we get credit for street treatment by oversizing treatment at private areas? We will not direct street water to management areas on private parcels.
- OK, as long as over sizing is met in the early phases. 5m, Potrero and other projects are pursuing something similar.
- Park is assumed to be privately owned at this stage
- BKF has done water budget –
- WSA – Annual water demand calculations have been provided to the EIR consultant. SFPUC to prepare WSA based on these calculations.
- Storm water easement at PUC land adjacent to Library – needed for storm drainage outfall and for possible connection for AWSS.
- Access adjacent to Library – that easement is controlled by Library in deal negotiated with Supervisors office. Will need to negotiate with Library. PUC's only concern is maintaining access to valve; otherwise they have no reservations about pedestrian access.
- Unity Plaza/Mercy Housing – be conscious about limitations on the PUC land. Did allow for permeable paving on PUC. Can be self – treating.

#### **December Meeting Agenda**

- Update on PUC power?
- Focus on storm water discussion
- Non-potable water – SFPUC has less control over that.
- Emily recommends another big tent meeting with MTA, PUC, PW
- Open space uses on PUC parcel?

#### **Key items for DRAFT infrastructure Plan**

- PUC calculator Ok for planning purposes.
- Show phasing and ownership
- Storm water management in separate section
- Address Better Roofs ordinance.
- Submit first or second meeting in January.

#### **Outstanding items**

- Waiting on SFPUC power feasibility analysis from PUC
- Fire Department follow up

#### **Background**

- SF may be facing 40% reduction in water supply during dry years, depending on negotiation with the State Water Board
- City trying to figure out what to do if this happens.
- This could impact all projects in approval phases, and cause the schedule for review to sl