

**BALBOA RESERVOIR COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**City Hall, South Light Court  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102**

**Monday, February 12, 2018**

**6:00 PM**

**Special Meeting**

**Please note:** Meeting minutes are only intended to serve as a summary of the meeting. For a full transcript of the meeting, refer to the audio recording of the meeting [Available online at [www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC](http://www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC)].

Documents received during this meeting are in a document titled balboareservoir\_CAC\_Public\_Documents\_Received\_and\_Emails-021218 available via the following link: [www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC](http://www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC)

Committee Members Present:

Michael Ahrens; Howard Chung; Brigitte Davila; Christine Godinez; Robert Muehlbauer; Maurice Rivers; Mark Tang; Jon Winston

Committee Members Absent:

Lisa Spinali

Staff/Consultants Present:

Office of Economic and Workforce Development: Emily Lesk, Tom Shanahan

San Francisco Planning Department: Jeremy Shaw; Seung Yen Hong

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call – [Recording: Part 1, 00:00:00]**

**2. Opening of Meeting**

- a. **Norman Yee:** The Balboa Reservoir is in my district, District 7. Mayor Lee's Public Lands for Housing Program was first announced in 2014. The Balboa Reservoir site has been the focus of much hope, as well as, concern in our community. We have had years of community input, and now the development team has prepared preliminary designs. This project will be at least 33%, and hopefully 50%, affordable. Today, we will be reviewing the fiscal feasibility

report. This is a necessary step before we can start a deeper analysis of the project. The fiscal feasibility findings do not commit the Board of Supervisors or the PUC to approving the terms of any transaction. The project will have to undergo environmental review and will be subject to public review. Tomorrow, in conjunction with Supervisor Safai, I will introduce a resolution regarding the findings of fiscal feasibility report.

b. January Minutes:

- i. **Laura Frye, Westwood Park:** “The project principles include the need to work with surrounding neighborhood” should state “the City of San Francisco’s planning principles, stated in various documents, require that new development work with and fit in with the surrounding neighborhoods.” An example of this is more ownership units.
- ii. **Harry Bernstein, Merced Heights:** “50% of all units affordable” should state “up to 50% affordable”. “Respectfully” should be “respectful”. “Esthetics” should be “ascetics”. My comment should state “I don't see how this project fits in with the community, and you're looking to displace the community other than homeowners. You may be forcing transitory people elsewhere; this may be your intention.” My statement should state “I would like to have a list of all projects on City-owned land that were ever offered to schools and nonprofits and not developers over the past 50 years”.
- iii. Motion to approve January meeting minutes
  1. Moved: Ahrens; Seconded: Winston
  2. Ayes: Ahrens, Chung, Davila, Godinez, Muehlbauer, Rivers, Tang, Winston, Noes: [none]; Abstain: [none]

**3. Recap of Process and January CAC Meeting – [Recording: Part 1, 00:16:00]**

*Note: Presentation slides (balboareservoir\_CAC\_presentation\_021218) available via the following link: [www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC](http://www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC)*

**PROJECT HISTORY**

From project announcement to developer selection (3 years)

- Nov. 2014: Balboa Reservoir announced as Public Lands for Housing site
- Nov. 2014 - June 2015: Initial community outreach
- April 2015: Balboa Reservoir CAC established
- Aug. 2015 - Sept. 2016: Development parameters established over the course of 16 CAC meetings
- Nov. 2016 - August 2017: Developer selection process
  - Selected development team: BRIDGE Housing & AvalonBay Communities (master developers) with Mission Housing, Habitat for Humanity, Pacific Union Development Company
- Nov. 2017: Exclusive Negotiating Agreement between City and development team

**NEXT STEPS**

From developer selection to project approvals (2 years)

- Refinement of development plan, site design

- Technical and environmental analysis
- Negotiation of business terms
- Ongoing CAC and community engagement
- Culminates in approval by SFPUC Commission, Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors (by late 2019)

#### **CAC MEETING/WORKSHOP SCHEDULE**

Through March 2018

- Development Team Introductions (Oct)
- Public Open Spaces (Nov)
- Walking Tour (Dec)
- Transportation, Circulation, and Parking (Dec)
- Housing Affordability and Character (Jan)
- Preview of Fiscal Feasibility Leg. Package (Feb)
- Master Plan Updates (March)
- Open House (March)

#### **CAC MEETING/WORKSHOP SCHEDULE**

April –August 2018

- Public Open Space Programming & Design
- On-Site Transportation, Walking, Biking & Autos
- Housing Affordability and Character
- Off-Site Transportation (coordinate with SFMTA)
- Sustainability

#### **Community Feedback from January 22<sup>nd</sup> CAC**

##### **Affordable Housing**

- In future, provide more detail about how many units are in each income band, and what are the rents and income levels for each.
- Provide breakdown of total number of bedrooms and residents anticipated on site.
- Housing for the CCSF community (faculty, staff, and students) is an important part of addressing affordability.
- Consider the ratio of ownership and rental units, especially in relation to surrounding neighborhoods.
- Provide more information and examples of successful affordable housing in other neighborhoods.

##### **Housing Character & Scale**

- Consider a stronger entryway from the northeast and better connection to Sunnyside.
- Put the tallest buildings where they will have least impact on the neighborhoods.

- How are building heights measured? Are there ways to keep the site grade lower so that buildings are not as tall?
- The buildings need to be beautiful and compatible with the neighborhood. (Look at new development on Ocean/Miramar.)
- Provide images that show buildings from various vantage points in the neighborhood.

#### **General Comments**

- San Francisco is a City of neighborhoods with different density levels next to each other.
- We are in a housing crisis, so maximize the number of housing units.
- The proposed number of units does not meet the CAC goal of harmonizing with the surrounding neighborhood.
- Appropriate character and amount of housing are both important. Cannot ignore character, but also cannot ignore the need for housing.

#### **4. Question and Answer: Recap of Process – [Recording: Part 1, 00:29:00]**

**Laura Frye, Westwood Park:** I believe that the ownership rate for the project is closer to 13%, rather than the 50% stated. I would like Bridge Housing to explain the affordable housing policies in greater detail. I don't like the rental policy that if your income rises your rent goes up, but you can stay in the unit. Residents with rising incomes should have to move and make room for someone else.

**Hedda Thieme, Westwood Park:** Traffic in the neighborhood is already bad. Adding more people will make it worse. I want to hear more about the traffic study. The firefighting capacity is insufficient in this part of the City.

**Elga:** Forcing people to move when their income goes up creates instability in communities. This does not help the community.

**Victoria Fierce, Downtown Oakland:** I'm disappointed that previous feedback included asking for what affordable housing developments have been successful. Affordable housing is housing for people that live in it, of course it's going to be successful. I think this is a classist dog whistle.

#### **5. Overview of Fiscal Feasibility – [Recording: Part 1, 00:34:32]**

*Note: Presentation slides (balboareservoir\_CAC\_presentation\_021218) available via the following link: [www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC](http://www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC)*

#### **WHAT IS FISCAL FEASIBILITY?**

- For projects that may require public funds
- These projects must be found “fiscally feasible and responsible” before beginning environmental review
- Compares fiscal benefits to the City against anticipated new City costs:
- Does the project bring in more new tax revenue than what is needed to provide it with City services?
- Different from financial feasibility, which refers to the developer's finances

#### **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PROCESS**

- Votes on a resolution that:
  - Finds project to be “fiscally feasible and responsible”
  - Authorizes submittal of an Environmental Evaluation Application to the Planning Department
  - Does not grant any approvals to build the project
- Considers supporting documents:
  - Development overview
  - Fiscal feasibility analysis, prepared by third-party consultant
  - Report and recommendation by Board of Supervisors Budget Analyst

**DEVELOPMENT OVERVIEW (Supporting Document)**

- General description of anticipated project
- Background information –does not seek approval
- Based on Development Principles & Parameters and developer’s original proposal (but future changes are allowed)
- Also describes processes, milestones that are likely in the future

**RECAP OF DEVELOPER’S PROPOSAL**

**Major Elements Include:**

- 1,100 housing units
- 18% low-income, 15% moderate + 17% low, moderate and middle
- City College collaboration (parking, housing)
- At least 4 acres of open space
- Childcare center and community room
- Residential parking at 0.5 spaces per home
- Shared garage serving City College community
- Transportation demand management and sustainability plans

**FISCAL FEASIBILITY REPORT (SUPPORTING DOCUMENT)**

- Prepared by third party consultant
- Reviewed by Budget Analyst
- Costs and revenues are provided in 2018 dollars
- Numbers are estimates and subject to change as project’s development program is refined

**NEW TAX REVENUE TO THE CITY EACH YEAR**

- General Tax Revenue = \$4 million
  - Property tax (\$2.7 million)
  - Property tax in-lieu of VLF (\$560,000)
  - Property transfer tax (\$390,000)
  - Sales tax (\$260,000)
  - Parking tax (City share) (\$100,000)
  - Gross receipts tax (\$60,000)
- Other Dedicated Revenue to City = \$1 million
  - Property tax dedicated to specific use (\$410,000)
  - Parking tax (SFMTA share) (\$380,000)
  - Public safety sales tax (\$130,000)
  - SFCTA sales tax (\$130,000)

- State Education Funds = \$1.2 million

#### **ESTIMATED CITY COSTS**

- City services provided to the project = \$1.5 million
- Road Maintenance (\$80,000)
- Police (\$850,000)
- Fire Department (\$610,000)

#### **ADDITIONAL ONE-TIME REVENUES**

- Impact Fees = \$23 million
  - Balboa Park Community Infrastructure Fee (\$9.2 million)
  - Childcare Fee (\$2.3 million)
  - Transportation Sustainability Fee (\$11.3 million)
  - A portion of these fees may be credited if project provides certain “in-kind” public benefits
  - Paid when building permits are issued
- Taxes During Construction = \$3.3 million
  - Sales tax (\$1.4 million)
  - Gross receipts tax (\$1.9 million)

#### **HOUSING SUBSIDY COST**

- Public financing needed to achieve 50% affordable housing
- Would pay for 17% of total homes to be permanently affordable (other 33% paid for by project revenues)
- 187 affordable homes (low, moderate, and middle-income housing)
- Current subsidy estimate is \$26 million
- Potential public financing sources may include state sources, reinvestment of net tax revenues, future housing bonds, proposed gross receipts tax increase

#### **ADDITIONAL FISCAL & ECONOMIC BENEFITS**

##### *Job Creation*

- 2,800 construction job-years
- Each job year is one year of full-time employment for one worker)
- 41 permanent jobs on site
- Maintenance, property management, childcare services, parking operations

##### *Benefits to the SFPUC*

- Revenue from land sale (benefits ratepayers)
- Opportunity to serve as power provider

#### **6. CAC Question and Comment: Fiscal Feasibility – [Recording: Part 1, 00:52:55]**

**Jon Winston:** How do the impact fees get spent? I would like to see them get spent at the point of impact. Transportation in the area and the impact from the project are concerns.

**Emily Lesk:** Code requires that some impact fees are spent locally, and some are spent Citywide. Because this project will be a negotiated Development Agreement, there will be an opportunity to tailor these impact fees.

**Mike Ahrens:** What is the state education revenue that was identified in the presentation?

**Emily Lesk:** This is a state requirement that a portion of property taxes go to local education funding. It came out of a concern that local cities and counties were underfunding education. It is a dedicated proportion of property taxes.

**Mike Ahrens:** When can we submit comment and questions regarding the fiscal feasibility?

**Emily Lesk:** Within the next week or so would be best.

**Jon Winston:** The residential parking ratio is set at 0.5 spaces per unit on average. There is also the shared garage with City College. I've seen numbers that the total number of parking spaces would be close to 1,100. I don't want the shared garage to result in a big increase in the parking ratio. I want to know who will be using the shared garage and who will be paying for it.

**Emily Lesk:** We will flag this for the developers at the next parking focused meeting.

**Joe Kirchofer:** We are still looking into how the shared parking will function.

**Robert Muehlbauer:** How did you arrive at the numbers in the fiscal feasibility analysis? \$80,000 for road maintenances seems low.

**Emily Lesk:** The consultant looked at the per capita cost of services, including police and fire, and the per square foot cost of road maintenance. This was extrapolated using the number of residents and amount of new roadway.

**Robert Muehlbauer:** How was the \$26 million subsidy for the additional affordable housing arrived at?

**Emily Lesk:** This was an estimate from the development team. We will be vetting and recalculating this as the development program gets refined.

## **7. Public Comment: Fiscal Feasibility – [Recording: Part 2, 00:00:00]**

**Andrew Sullivan, Haight:** I coauthored 1999's Proposition I. This project should not carve out MTA funding. The City needs more funds for MTA. The Balboa Park BART station is one of the most important stations in the City. Transit and housing are public benefits. The taxpayer would also benefit from more housing.

**Chris Peterson, Ingleside:** I am curious how the parking garage affects project feasibility. If more housing was created instead of parking, what would the impact be? I am not a fan of this parking garage. The City shouldn't be using scarce dollars to subsidize parking.

**Steve Martin-Pinto, Sunnyside:** Transportation in the area needs significant updates to accommodate additional traffic. The fiscal feasibility does not improve this. You cannot expect people to give up cars. This assumes BART and Muni are good enough. We need major upgrades to our transit infrastructure.

**Victoria Fierce, Downtown Oakland:** San Francisco spends huge amounts on SFPD and homelessness. The \$26 million for affordable housing will go very far in reducing homelessness. I agree that the parking garage is unnecessary. If we wanted to improve transit capacity, we should reduce the number of cars on the street. Young people, like me, don't drive.

**Drew Herney, Tenderloin:** I was surprised by how little it costs to build housing in San Francisco. I thought the additional affordable housing would cost much more. I would like any future fiscal feasibility analysis to include the cost of these public meetings.

**Jaap Weel, SOMA:** People have said that a project like this will require transit upgrades. I imagine that a larger number of units could fund more transit improvements.

**Milo Strauss:** I'm glad this meeting is being held in City Hall. It is more accessible for folks not in the immediate project area. Homes are more important than parking. People generate value in ways cars do not.

**Darius, Mission Terrace:** Ocean Avenue needs to be fixed now. I don't think we should reduce the number housing unit. Building tunnels for trains is very expensive. Transit only lanes seem much more cost effective. Low cost and healthy food in the neighborhood can be hard to find.

**Monica Collins, Sunnyside:** I agree with the previous comment. Whole Foods often runs out of products and is much more costly than Trader Joes. I drive much less than I used to, but I don't think car shaming works. Some people need to drive. The price of residential rent is going up. Commercial rents are also rising; this raises the cost of products. This pushes out lower income residents. I work in student services; I meet people who need to use the parking lot. I support truly affordable housing and the performing arts center.

**Sonja Traus, SoMa:** I'm excited this meeting is downtown. When I first started organizing about housing, it was for a Balboa Reservoir meeting. I think it is very important that residents from all over the City are aware of this project and involved. I would like to hear more about the revenue for the City generated by this project.

**Aaron, Russian Hill:** I think this project would be more fiscally feasible with more units. With more units, the project could self-fund additional BMR units. It doesn't seem correct to say that the impact on transit from this project is negative. Building housing in San Francisco is cheaper than building transit infrastructure for people to commute from Pinole.

**Jennifer Heggie, Sunnyside:** This location is near the 280 freeway. There will be many cars. There is no mention of the increased parking costs to students. Once the parking becomes private, there will be no limitation on parking prices. There is no identification of the loss of revenue to City College from a decline in enrollment. Without finishing the parking studying, there is no way of knowing the parking need. This analysis is incomplete.

**Andrew Mensler, Western Addition:** I just graduated from USF. The biggest expense for students is rent. Parking is not that impactful. I don't think we need additional parking. Additional housing is more important.

**Laura Frye, Westwood Park:** The west side of the City doesn't have the firefighting capacity that the rest of the City has. This wasn't mentioned in the fiscal feasibility analysis. City college parking needs to be replaced.

**Harry Bernstein, Merced Heights:** In the executive summary it states that the City has entered into an exclusive negotiating agreement to create a mixed income housing development. This prevents the City from talking about the negotiations. I would like this cleared up. Will the proceeds of the sale go just to PUC or also to the City? I agree with previous comments that students do need parking.

**Francine Lofrano, Westwood Park:** At the December 14<sup>th</sup> meeting, it was noted that enrollment at City College is up 11%. This Balboa Reservoir housing project and the new performing arts center will result in the loss of 2,000 parking spaces. This will jeopardize City College's enrollment. Damage to CCSF is damage to the City. City College committees voted against this project. The findings of fiscal feasibility analysis needs to be delayed until the parking study is completed. Public land needs to stay in public hands.

**Chris Balman, Twin Peaks:** I'm concerned about the density of the project. 1,100 units on 18 acres is too much. This is 4-5x as dense as the surrounding neighborhoods. The West of Twin Peaks neighborhoods are roughly the same density throughout. I don't think you're going to have \$26 million to pay for the additional affordable housing. SFPUC should waive the sale proceeds from the site to build more affordable housing. In calculating the cost of city services to this project, you can't do a prorated share of wear and tear. This project will be higher due to greater density.

**Corey Smith, SFHAC:** The City College Board of Trustees have not voted on this project. In regards to comments about the lost parking, City College is free for San Francisco residents only. The increase in students will come from San Francisco, not the surrounding area. City College's proximity to BART and Muni will allow many of these students to take transit.

**Robert, Alamo square:** When I was a student, a car is a tremendous expense. We shouldn't assume students will drive. This project can have more people if we get rid of the parking requirement.

**Theodore Randolph, Excelsior:** The population of San Francisco is growing to more than one million. Why can't new revenue from the project be put into additional affordable housing?

**Jonah Martin, Glen Park:** I am a former CCSF student. Many of my teachers complained about the high cost of housing in San Francisco, and they commuted from far away because they loved City College. This project could be a boon to our teachers. This will be a benefit to teachers and students. A lot of CCSF students take BART, Muni, or bike and do not commute by car.

**Francine Lofrano, Westwood Park:** I wanted to correct a correction to my statement. I said two important City College advisory committees voted against this project. I didn't say that the Board of Trustees voted against the project.

**Monica Collins, Sunnyside:** City College students have complicated lives and need parking for accessibility.

#### **8. CAC General Comment – [Recording: Part 2, 00:29:12]**

**Mike Ahrens:** Chapter 29 of the Administrative Code states that the Board of Supervisors should look at the direct and indirect benefits to the City of San Francisco. The expert from the City has done this. There are 2,000 parking spaces that are going to be eliminated by this project and the performing arts center. This could be damaging to City College. The developer and City have said that without a deal with City College this project won't work. In 2013, the Budget and Legislative Analyst showed that CCSF generated \$311 million in economic value to the City. If City College is lost, this benefit will be lost. I really hope that the City does a deal to save CCSF. City College has spent significant money to grow enrollment. This fiscal feasibility is premature until we know how the parking issue will be solved and how City College will be impacted.

**Maurice Rivers:** I would really like to see SFMTA involved. We cannot add 1,100 units to the neighborhood with Muni functioning the way that it is. We need more trains and buses servicing the area. I would like SFMTA to come to these meetings and say how they're going to improve transit.

**Jon Winston:** I'm an at-large member to this CAC. CCSF has 1,500 parking spots that will go away as a result of this project and the performing arts center. A semester long parking pass costs \$40. The low price is encouraging people to drive. CCSF needs a transportation plan that isn't cheap plentiful parking. If we replace the parking spots one-to-one, this would be one of the largest parking structures in the City. The cost of constructing indoor parking is \$30-50 thousand per space. The transportation impact fees should be spent in the area to improve Ocean Ave and transit in the area. I understand that some people need to drive, but we have to be able to provide transportation choices for people.

**Robert Muehlbauer:** I'm looking forward to further refining these numbers over the next two years.

**Emily Lesk:** The purpose of the fiscal feasibility analysis is to allow the environmental analysis to begin. The impacts from parking and transportation are not in the scope of the fiscal feasibility analysis. However, approval of the fiscal feasibility analysis allows us to begin environmental review, which will look at these. As a clarification, the exclusive negotiating agreement does not prohibit the City or City College from talking to anyone. It just prohibits the City from negotiating with another development team. The proceeds of the sale will go to SFPUC. SFPUC is an enterprise department. It must pay its own costs from revenue that it brings in. It is required to get fair market value for the land. The proceeds from the sale will go toward building and maintaining infrastructure, which benefits users. In regards to the parking strategy with CCSF, we are committed to working with CCSF on a parking solution that won't negatively impact CCSF. We will have to take the final project to the Board of Supervisors. It won't get through the Board without making parking work. We are asking the Board to allow us to begin environmental review and to begin to develop solutions to these challenges.

**9. General Public Comment – [Recording: Part 2, 00:47:30]**

**Sadie Williams, Mission:** It is great that we're working out all the details, including transit and open space. However, housing is the most important. I would like to move forward with this project as soon as possible.

**Andrew, Mission:** Many people struggle to stay in San Francisco once they have a family. Rent is too expensive for a family. When I see a project like this, it gives me hope. I would like to thank all the proponents.

**Joe Martin, Glen Park:** The K-line should be put underground. However, this location is already a transit hub. We should build housing near transit hubs. We shouldn't delay this project over parking.

**Aaron, Russian Hill:** We need housing. This is a great opportunity for housing. This site could be even denser.

**Steve Martin-Pinto, Sunnyside:** More units of housing will bring in more revenue, but there will also be additional costs. Will more units result in a net benefit to the City? There is also the unquantifiable cost to the neighbors. Neighbors do have a right to have a say in the project and to minimize its negative impacts. We are not against housing, but we do not want to let this housing crisis force us into a poor decision.

**John Olson, NoPa:** We should build more housing. Every day that we delay, it makes the project more expensive and less feasible. The environmental impact of people living on this site will be far lower than the impact of people living elsewhere. The opinions of local residents should not trump all others. Delaying housing construction has consequences.

**Rebecca Peacock, SoMa:** Thank you for holding this meeting in City Hall and after work hours. I moved to San Francisco to be closer to work. This project would be very transit friendly.

**Dan Fingal-Surma, Noe Valley:** When I was diagnosed with cancer, it was very helpful to live near UCSF. My sister moved from Manhattan to be closer. She struggled to find housing. This project needs to move forward much faster and maximize housing. The very long timeline for this project hurts people. City College students have transit alternatives.

**Laura Fingal-Surma, Noe Valley:** My husband has cancer. City College is a scarce resource, but there are other scarce resources. There are five hospitals that could treat him. Two are in the Bay Area. It's great to stay in your own home when struggling with cancer. However, there are many people who cannot afford \$3,500 per month to be near UCSF or Stanford. I think making the M-line a subway is a great idea.

**James Natoli, Richmond:** I know many people who have had to leave San Francisco because it's too expensive. We need more housing for people who want to live in San Francisco. With this project, we can add 1,100 homes. This is not just an opportunity, it is an obligation.

**Alex, SoMa:** It is wrong to have so many people struggling with the high cost of housing. It is wrong to have this many homeless in the richest city in the world. More housing, especially housing near transit, is how we solve this. The idea that housing can always be built somewhere else is what created this crisis.

**Caroline Bosh, Richmond:** I originally wanted to live in the Balboa Park area because I wanted to be near Bart so I could get rid of my car. I was unable to afford the Balboa Park area because I couldn't afford a single family home. I'm lucky to be a homeowner in San Francisco. I was able to get a two bedroom apartment in the Richmond.

**Daniel Camp, Castro:** Often times when I'm walking through my neighborhood at night, I see people sleeping outside. 1,100 units should be the absolute minimum. We should be shooting much higher and moving much faster.

**Joel, Alamo square:** We should drop the garage and build more housing.

**Robert, Alamo Square:** I know two people who own real estate because they are a married couple and their parents helped them out. Is this the only way people can afford property in San Francisco? I may never have a chance to own property in San Francisco.

**Barbacus Sinbaty, Richmond:** I struggled to afford housing in San Francisco. I was lucky my parents were able to help me buy a condo. When parents help their children buy housing, it creates a cycle of inherited wealth. San Francisco needs more housing, please build more.

**Sasha, Potrero Hill:** After college, I was so excited to move to San Francisco. People who are not working in tech can't afford to live here. I support building the maximum number of units.

**Andrew Menser, Western Addition:** How can it not be in the City's interest to build more housing? Increasing the supply of housing will bring down costs. Thank you to the members of the CAC for volunteering their time.

**Marlik, Sunset:** I'm millennial with two young kids. I work in San Francisco. I don't need to own a car to get around San Francisco. I have lived in unsanitary and unsafe housing in San Francisco. Our community and support network are here. I'm here for my kids. 1,100 homes won't cut it. This is a transit hub. There should be more housing.

**Jimmy, Sunset:** I am a student at CCSF. Housing is the biggest expense for CCSF students. When you're a student making minimum wage, it is really tough to get by. My friends and I all take transit. Transit is cheaper and easier than driving. It would be great if the City could invest more in transit and pedestrian infrastructure.

**Jeff Hodgest, Mission:** I've lost count of the number the friends that I've lost because they can't afford to live in San Francisco. This includes people with very good jobs. These are the people who create a vibrant city. Housing delayed is housing denied.

**Jaap Weel, SoMa:** Thank you for having a meeting at City Hall. We need to build homes because people need a place to live. This shouldn't be "us versus them". The practical problems of building more housing can be solved. To fit more homes on land, you stack them on top of each other.

**Norma Guzemon, Sunset:** Last month I was looking at locations to take a night class at City College. I choose to be in a denser and more active location because I felt safer. My family spent 8 years waiting for affordable housing because supply is so limited.

**Isaac Rosenberg, Potrero Hill:** I explained this process to a friend, and he described it as "dumb". How does this process benefit the City? We need more homes.

**Mark Magrind, Potrero:** I feel lucky to have been able to remain in San Francisco. Many of my friends have had to move. Please build as much as possible.

**Corey Smith, SFHAC:** Thank you for having this meeting downtown. This is a big regional project that is near a regional transit hub. The current pedestrian walk to BART from the site is terrible. As part of the project, this will be improved.

**Victoria Fierce, Downtown Oakland:** I live in downtown Oakland. I pay \$2,000 per month in rent and live with my partner. We would each prefer to live on our own but cannot afford to. This project affects the future and the whole Bay Area.

**Hedda Thieme, Westwood Park:** I don't own a car; I walk and take transit. This housing situation is partly manmade. There are three empty houses on my block. This should be addressed. The 1,400 parking spots represent 5% of student body. This is not a lot of parking.

**Mike, Glenn Park:** I used to live a block from the Reservoir site. We would take transit everywhere. I think it's great that the site will have a child care center. It would be a shame to waste this opportunity.

**Milo Trauss:** The people who say they are not against housing really are. People who live in a nice neighborhood may not want to share. The people who are against this project really just want to protect their privilege.

**Jennifer Heggie, Sunnyside:** I waited a long before I was able to buy. Sunnyside is a family friendly area. San Francisco is lacking in good neighborhoods for children and families.

**Michael Chen, Lower Pacific Heights:** I used to live in Russian hill. I have friends that are concerned about being priced out of San Francisco. The neighborhoods around the reservoir would be lucky to have my friends as neighbors. A denser neighborhood can support more community amenities. Please approve this project.

**Sonja Trauss, SoMa:** One of the advantages of having a meeting downtown is that it is more accessible. It also shows that more than just the immediate neighbors matter. The Trinity project at 8th and Market Street is the densest development in San Francisco right now. We could have built 400 units per acre at Balboa. This would be 6,000 units. This current design feels like a loss.

**Laura Frye, Westwood Park:** If you build housing near CCSF, it will only be housing for a very small share of CCSF students. The reduction in traffic will be small. I worked two or three jobs to live here. To say that the ones with houses are being selfish is unfair.

**Alex, District 8:** I grew up in Brooklyn in a dense neighborhood. People say you can't raise kids in a dense neighborhood, but it was great. I have never owned a car. I take public transit everywhere. This is right on a transit corridor. Please build housing for as many people as possible.

**Francine Lofrano, Westwood Park:** I take issue with the idea that those that oppose housing are selfish. I've made major sacrifices to live in Westwood Park. We are not against housing. We are against having too many units. I resent being labeled a privileged white person.

**Steven Bus, Mission:** High housing costs have forced many people to leave San Francisco and California. If this project won't house all the CCSF students, then the solution is to build more. Our future won't be built by saying no.

**Alika, Oakland:** I'm in support of housing. It is absurd that we need to subsidize median income housing, but that is how expensive San Francisco has become. Going forward, we need transit oriented development. The site plan should have a better streetscape plan. The scale is not human. The public space should be activated in order to be safe.

**Steve Martin-Pinto, Sunnyside:** The population density of San Francisco is 19,000 people per square mile. Daly City is 12,000 people per square mile. The housing crisis is a Bay Area wide problem. San Francisco can't be expected to carry the whole burden.

**Chris Balman, Twin Peaks:** 1,100 units on 18 acres. This is the density of Manhattan. This is the Manhattanization of San Francisco. My grandparents moved here in the 1880s. The westside of the City was built as suburbia. They want to destroy suburbia. There's not one assurance that the housing will go to people in San Francisco.

**Harry Bernstein, Merced Heights:** Students need parking. Students have commitments and are coming from many different places. Transit and biking won't work for all of them. Phelan Avenue is very busy at commuting times. There is lots of traffic, and the layout is poor. There was originally going to be 500 units, now there is 1,100. It's untenable. The performing arts center should be a priority. The voters approved it in 2001 and 2005. It was supposed to be built in 2008, 2010, and 2012. The accreditation problems held it up. I know housing is still needed, and the college needs to take over that land.

**Christine Godinez:** I hear this talk about losing CCSF students because they won't have parking, but what about losing students because they won't have housing. It is a privilege to own a home, and with privilege comes responsibility.

**Robert Muehlbauer:** I want to thank everybody for being here. The Balboa Park Station CAC is in the process of developing priorities for the next year, including affordable housing at the Upper Yard. The next meeting will be March 20<sup>th</sup>. There are significant BART improvements taking place right now.

## **10. Adjournment – [Recording: Part 2, 01:50:06]**