
From: Shaw, Jeremy (CPC)
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 2:15 PM
To: Kearstin Dischinger; Teague, Corey (CPC)
Cc: Lesk, Emily (ECN)
Subject: RE: TSP and Balboa - so many questions

Hi Corey,
Just wanted to make sure you saw this.
Jeremy

JEREMY SHAW | *Senior Planner* | SF PLANNING | 415.575.9135

From: Kearstin Dischinger [<mailto:kdischinger@bridgehousing.com>]
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 2:11 PM
To: corey.teauge@sfgov.org
Cc: Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); Lesk, Emily (ECN)
Subject: TSP and Balboa - so many questions

Hi Corey,

I'm hoping you can help the Balboa team work out how TSP would apply to Balboa – based on the code. I'm writing you because you are the department's EXPERT on all things TSP and even I can't decipher this complicated fee code.

Ok – here are my two main questions

1. Shared commercial and residential parking garage. Yesterday you indicated it would pay the non-res fee. However thinking about it further if the commercial garage is replacing a larger surface parking lot that is currently a commercial lot – I think the fee would not apply? From nexus land logic, the transportation impact of the existing parking would give us 'credit' for the GSF or spaces of commercial parking. How would we do this math – based on GSF v GSF or based on total number of parking spaces? At the moment we are most interested in understanding how the ZA would interpret this calc. Assuming a parking lot, though not a structure would still 'count' as existing GSF.
2. In the case of Balboa we have a master development with multiple buildings – each with varying AMIs. Some of the buildings are 100% affordable at or below 80% AMI so they get a waiver based on 406(b)(1). Also we propose some buildings which will be part of the master development but then later an individual 'project' which will target 120% AMI. So they meet the affordability requirements of 406(b)(4): "(4) Residential uses within projects where all residential units are affordable to households at or below 150% of the Area Median Income (as published by HUD) shall not be subject to the TSF" However I'm not sure if they meet the threshold of "projects where all res. Units are affordable at or below 150% AMI" as the buildings are meeting that but they are part of a master development which includes 100% market buildings as well. Please opine on the intent and interp of the drafters of this fine code. I know it was hotly debated and thought through.

Thanks a million,
Happy Friday.

Kearstin

Kearstin Dischinger | Project Manager and Policy Planner

