

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

MEETING MINUTES

**City College of San Francisco
Multi-Use Building, Room 140
55 Phelan Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112
Monday, October 15, 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].

Documents received during this meeting are in a document titled balboareservoir_CAC_Public_Documents_Received_and_Emails-101518 available via the following link: www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC

Committee Members Present:

Brigitte Davila; Christine Godinez; Robert Muehlbauer; Amy O’Hair; Maurice Rivers; Jon Winston

Committee Members Absent:

Michael Ahrens; Howard Chung; Mark Tang

Staff/Consultants Present:

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

San Francisco Planning Department: Jeremy Shaw, Josh Switzky

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

2. Opening of Meeting

a. Approval of July and April Meeting Minutes

i. Updates to minutes:

1. Chris Hansen: add: “surprised SFMTA representative said that Charmaine Curtis was the liaison to this project” ...“Charmaine has not been to facilities committee meetings”

2. Laura Frye: change: "The plan diverges from the parameters on height" to "The current plan diverges from the BRCAC parameters on height, and therefore also on density. The parameters said that heights would range from 25' on the west to 65' on the east with heights tapering down on approach to the neighborhood. In the current plan, there are 55'/45' buildings right next to the townhouses, which is not "tapering down.""
 - ii. Moved: Muehlbauer; Seconded: O'Hair
 - iii. Ayes: Davila, Godinez; Muehlbauer, O'Hair, Rivers, Winston; Noes: [none]; Abstain: [none]

3. City College Master Plan Update

Rueben Smith, CCSF: Since May, City College has been working on outreach related to the facilities master plan. We want to get specific feedback from various stakeholders in the campus community. We've been conducting workshops with different groups, and we want to get back to the Chancellor's Office with this feedback soon. We will be holding a public workshop on November 5th.

4. Environmental Review Update

Supervisor Yee: Thank you to Jon Winston for stepping up as CAC chair, and thank you to Amy O'Hair for joining the CAC. For the purpose of EIR scoping, the project was released with two versions—the project that has been discussed and a version with higher unit counts. The actual number will be decided after much more discussion. This study should include feedback from the community and also a study of a lower unit count option. The mitigations required under a higher unit count option may be too expensive to go forward with the larger project. I want to make sure the community has input on the number of units.

Purpose of Environmental Review:

- To provide a public process in analyzing environmental consequences
- To identify a range of potential environmental impacts
- To identify measures or additional alternatives that reduce impacts

CEQA Topics

- Land Use and Land Use Planning
- Population and Housing
- Cultural Resources
- Transportation and Circulation
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Wind and Shadow
- Recreation
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Public Services
- Biological Resources
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral and Energy Resources

- Agricultural and Forest Resources

CEQA Review Does Not

- Approve a project
- Evaluate the merits or benefits of the project
- Analyze social, demographic, and economic impacts

What is Being Analyzed in EIR?

- 5 scenarios (options + variants)
- Studied to understand the impacts before further decisions
- Smaller buildings/more townhomes along the western edge
- 4 acres of open space
- Better access to Sunnyside from North Street
- 50% affordable housing

Developer Proposed Option (previous draft at right)

- Submitted range of units, 800-1300
- EIR will analyze as 1100 units
- Includes public parking garage in addition to residential parking

Why Analyze an Additional Housing Option?

- Decision makers and Planning Commission asked staff to identify more housing opportunities
- With ongoing housing crisis, have to keep the door open to additional housing
- Comparable sites around SF are analyzing taller and denser options
- Unique opportunity near transit & City College
- Smaller projects are “covered” and still possible when a larger project is analyzed

Comments should focus on the scope of environmental review:

- Methods used for environmental analysis
- Measures that would avoid or lessen an environmental impact
- Information that would help inform environmental impact analysis
- Suggestions for alternatives to be evaluated in the Draft EIR

Opportunities to Comment on EIR Scope

Public scoping period: October 10 – November 12

Public Scoping Meeting:

Tuesday, October 30, 2018, 6-8 pm

Lick Wilmerding High School - Cafeteria/Ann Maisel Café
755 Ocean Avenue

Email by November 12, 2018:

jeanie.poling@sfgov.org

Mail by November 12, 2018:

Jeanie Poling
San Francisco Planning Department

1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco CA 94103

5. CAC Comment: Environmental Review Update

Bridgette Davila: Is sustainability of the buildings being studied as part of the EIR?

Josh Switzky: There are a variety of topics that are studied in the EIR process. These include water-use and emissions. The buildings are required to meet the City mandated minimum standards.

Bridgette Davila: Would the transportation and circulation plan be the same in the larger unit count plan?

Jeremy Shaw, Planning: There needs to be a plan for all the variants, but one variant may require additional measures. The notice of preparation doesn't get into a specific discussion of transportation measures.

Amy O'Hair: Are City College's construction and development plans being included in the study?

Josh Switzky: Yes, any development in the area will be included, so long as it is known. The study will look at the project plus things in area that are expected to change.

Robert Muehlbauer: Are these project designs included under the Balboa Park Area Plan EIR?

Josh Switzky: This EIR will be a subsequent EIR that updates the Balboa Park Area Plan EIR. This plan would study a higher number of units than under the Balboa Park Area Plan.

Robert Muehlbauer: Will this EIR look at other projects that are being built under the Balboa Park Area Plan?

Josh Switzky: Yes, anything that is known will be studied.

Jon Winston: Supervisor Malia Cohen asked that a higher number of units be studied. Who are the decision makers regarding approval?

Josh Switzky: The Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the Mayor are the key decision makers. The PUC Commission will likely also be involved.

Jon Winston: Are parking and congestion being studied?

Josh Switzky: Vehicle miles travelled, which correlates with greenhouse gases and air quality, is the vehicle metric that is studied. Circulation impacts are captured by looking at transit delay and impacts to pedestrians.

Maurice Rivers: I think we need to be sensitive to the neighbors. If the City and the developer don't listen, we are doing the neighbors a great disservice.

6. Public Comment: Environmental Review Update

Marla van Molen: I support building as much housing as possible. I think we should build more than 1,500 units.

Jennifer Heggie, Sunnyside: Has there been a study of pedestrian miles traveled for this project? The neighborhood has very small sidewalks and cannot handle a lot of pedestrians. As we discussed, a public garage is very important for City College. Parking is also needed for the PAEC. We also feel it is very important to have two acres of continuous open space.

Yonathan Randolph, Ingleside: Who are the decision makers for the scoping process? People will look at the EIR and think this is the absolute maximum when maybe more units could be built.

Chris Hansen, Excelsior: Please talk about the special use district (SUD). How do variants reconcile with the fiscal feasibility analysis? This has gone in the opposite direction of City College's needs. I urge everyone to submit comments on the EIR scoping.

Rita Evans, Sunnyside: Who decided which variants would be studied? How was limiting access through San Ramon determined?

Hedda Thieme, Westwood Park: Who writes and reviews the EIR? Who appoints them? Maurice Rivers's comments best represent the neighborhood's feelings.

Paul Anderson, Monterrey Heights: There are many residents who think that maximizing the number of units is important.

Steve Martin-Pinto, Sunnyside: I would ask that City College's plans for 500 units be considered in the EIR. These units could be squeezed out if they are not included in the EIR. The fact that no one from SFMTA is in attendance really concerns me.

Harry Bernstein, Merced Heights: I thought 500 units was the cap for the reservoir site. The Chancellor is now looking at dormitories on campus. Why not turn the campus into housing? The fact that the 50% affordable rate requires public subsidy is never mentioned.

Madeline Muller, City College: San Francisco is more dense than Hong Kong or Tokyo and second only to New York in America. I don't see why the goal for San Francisco is to become denser. I challenge that there is a housing crisis. There are units that are being left vacant. City College is very dense. The college can't fit dorms on campus.

Laura Frye, Westwood Park: I am concerned that vehicle miles travelled is determined by the amount of parking included in the project. Just because you don't provide parking, doesn't mean people won't drive.

Max Kahn, Ingleside: I think that it's great that we're looking at 1,550 units. The City and the region are in a dire housing crisis.

Monica Collins, Sunnyside: This project is far too dense and tall.

Corey Smith, SF Housing Coalition: The EIR is not requiring a larger project. It is just making the entire range of unit counts available and providing options. In five or ten years, we may want more units.

Jerry Vahy, Sunnyside: I understand that the housing situation is very bad, but the infrastructure problems in this area are really bad also. Why don't we build more parking for City College students? The low income housing needs to be monitored so it's not sold.

Laura Clark, SF Renter: By building more units we get more affordable housing. We have really great affordable housing managers in this city. If we don't build housing, people will get pushed further and further out.

[Not stated]: Why build thousands of units here? I don't understand it. I read an article that we are in a housing bubble.

7. Design Update

City/Community Feedback

1. Improve Pedestrian Flow between Sunnyside and Ocean Ave
2. Maximize Wind Protection and Solar Orientation
3. Activate the Park with Ground Floor Uses
4. Revise Block Configuration
5. Refine Relationship to Westwood Park and City College

Massing vs. Concept Architecture

- Massing Model: Shows general height and size of buildings. Rough shapes/Block
- Diagrams to understand program, number of units etc.
- Architectural Model: Shows actual building design. Breaks down the massing to create architectural effects, shows materials and architectural style.
- Massing = big and blocky
- Architecture = finished product

Design Process

1. Determine approximate massing: Ensure that building program (total size, proper dimensions) fit within envelope.
2. Add articulation: Break down the massing to create more defined shapes, identify important features
3. Concept Architecture: Start to show a stylistic direction and consider materials, details.

Next Steps

- EIR “Public Scoping” Meeting: October 30, 6-8pm at Lick-Wilmerding High School
- Architecture/Sustainability Update and End of Year Festivities: December 5, 6-8pm at Ingleside Presbyterian Church
- Email & Website Feedback: balboareservoir@gmail.com

8. CAC Comment: Design Update

Amy O’Hair: The Sunnyside neighbors are concerned with the height next to Riordan. There is only a step down towards Westwood Park.

Robert Muehlbauer: This design is a big improvement. With regard to the massing, it just looks like blocks. I am looking forward to seeing the design with architecture. I hope that we don’t see slab sides like on the existing AvalonBay building.

Maurice Rivers: It made me happy to see different designs in the slides. I would like to see some of the architecture from Westwood Park incorporated into the design of this project. I think that the new buildings on Ocean Avenue are boxy and ugly.

Jon Winston: I’m interested in the open space. The public space will be defined by the buildings. I like that the community rooms and public rooms face the open space. I would like to see the buildings situated up to the street. I would also like to see the parking garage wrapped in an active use. The project design should be thoughtful.

Christy Godinez: Is it possible to have someone from Riordan here? They’ve been brought up several times, but I don’t think they’ve come to these meetings.

9. Public Comment: Design Update

Madeline Muller, City College: It startles me that the design shows a roadway above the PAEC building. I’m not sure that the height listed for the PAEC building in these designs is correct.

Steve Martin-Pinto, Sunnyside: I would like to see the townhomes detached. I think that varying the architecture between buildings is a great idea.

Jennifer Heggie, Sunnyside: I like the pattern on the ground of Unity Plaza. It would be nice to see something similar at the Reservoir. I would also like to see art in this project.

Michael Howely, Sunnyside: I work for the State of California monitoring air quality on development projects. I am impressed by how well this project is situated in the neighborhood. It is not highly visible from the surrounding area.

Chris Hansen, Excelsior: The access road on the site design shown is different than that in the NOP. Why is this road shown if the facilities master plan is still in development?

Karen Murray, VWMP: The NOP shows both locations of North Street. The north access road across City College property shown in the design update is not set in stone, it’s a suggestion. The EIR will study both road locations.

Laura Frye, Westwood Park: The Northside configuration is a good thing, if it helps with the wind. I am concerned that the park is geared toward programmed space. The public feedback requested more true

open space. The density is too great. I would like to see story poles used to represent the height of this development.

Jerry Vahy, Sunnyside: Will this project be condos or rentals? What neighborhood is it technically in or is it a new neighborhood? It would be nice to connect Sunnyside to Westwood and the library. What is the plan for connecting to Westwood Park? I would like Phelan to be four lanes again.

Yonathan Randolph, Ingleside: I like the access on San Ramon, and I hope it stays.

Karen Murray, VMWP: The project will mostly be rentals. The townhomes and the Habitat for Humanity units (about 100) will be for-sale. The remaining units (about 1,000) will be rentals.

Gary Strang, GLS Landscape Architecture: The connection to Westwood Park is currently envisioned as pedestrians only. It is narrower than in the previous scheme. We appreciate the comments for more open space, habitat, and active recreation; we need to continue the dialogue.

Joe Kirchofer, AvalonBay: We wanted to include a small commercial space in the EIR to preserve it as an option. However, we haven't included this in our designs because we will most likely not include it in the final design.

Jeremy Shaw, Planning: In all the variants being studied, there is an assumption that there will be parking on the City College campus. We understand that the Facilities Master Plan is in progress, so the amount of parking is not set. The City will work with City College to meet student and employee parking demand, regardless of the variants. We will include in analysis the latest public draft of City College's Facilities Master Plan that City College is comfortable with. A special use district is a zoning tool applied over an underlying zoning designed to meet a specific intent that is unique to the district, such as arts districts or development agreements like this. North, South and West drives will be publicly owned and maintained. The other access roads will be designed to public standards and provide public access.

10. General Public Comment

Harry Bernstein, Merced Heights: The previous reservoir proposal was a big giveaway to developers. The current sale price has not been released. AvalonBay has been opposing proposition 10. They are not interested in the welfare of San Francisco. They should not be given special regard.

Madeline Muller, City College: It has been mentioned that City College should have built parking a long time ago. However, we always assumed that the reservoir would be ours so we did not plan for alternatives.

Steve Martin-Pinto, Sunnyside: I would consider leaving the connection to Westwood Park open for emergency services.

Chris Hansen, Excelsior: The CEQA process is a precise legal process. Unfortunately parking is not an accepted reason to challenge a project. City College needs parking for students.

Yonathan Randolph, Ingleside: I think the design is important, but affordability is the most important thing.

Laura Frye, Westwood Park: I think Plymouth should be limited to just northbound traffic.

13. Adjournment