
From: Shaw, Jeremy (CPC)
Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2018 1:03 PM
To: Kearstin Dischinger; Lesk, Emily (ECN); Joe Kirchofer (Joe_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com)
Subject: RE: Planning Coordination on d4d

Kearstin,

Thanks for the updates, responses and additions to the spreadsheet.

I am happy to set up a doodle poll for a kick off meeting.

But a couple of things I was trying to communicate on the phone:

- (1) I agree with the topics you've proposed, but it's not clear to me if they are about the visual site plans or if they are also referring to sections of the written standards/guidelines. While there is sometimes overlap, it can be difficult to get to both topics in one meeting.
- (2) Having ongoing working sessions or interim milestones for the DSG content/chapters/topics before finalizing the first draft can save time in the long run. It can ensure that the designers and the City are on the same page about the form and content before 6 months have passed. And it will reduce the number of comments, fixes, and hours required to edit the first draft. (As an example, the Potrero Power Plant DSG draft had over 500 comments from City staff, and that was *with* regular working sessions. I'm scared to think how many comments there'd be without those sessions).

I can totally sympathize with the need for fewer meetings. And that's fine with me if they're not helpful. But I do think it's helpful to have interim milestones specific to the DSG content/chapters/topics, when 1-2 of us (Seung-Yen, Luiz or I, depending on the chapter) can provide helpful feedback to the design team. I can take your previous concerns into account and not micro-manage the content in the run-up to the first draft, but I feel it's more productive if city staff are engaged on the DSG for the next 6 months.

This is really hard to do over email and I could understand the issues better if we had the design lead in the conversation. Is that possible during our next call? Alternatively, I'm happy to set up a separate call with them.

Thanks
Jeremy

JEREMY SHAW | Senior Planner | SF PLANNING | 415.575.9135

From: Kearstin Dischinger [<mailto:kdischinger@bridgehousing.com>]
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2018 6:55 PM
To: Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); Lesk, Emily (ECN); Joe Kirchofer (Joe_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com)
Subject: Planning Coordination on d4d

Hi Jeremy and Emily and Joe,

I apologize that this conversation has been so piecemeal, I believe that has resulted in us having some miscommunications. Unfortunately our team was unable to address this memo at our regular meeting last week. So, I'll prod folks to revisit. However after reviewing the documents provided by the City and our team I think we are pretty close to on the same page.

The attached word document includes our team's proposal for coordination on the d4d and planning review. The attached excel, especially the meeting milestones tab of the columns A through E are Planning's proposal for coordination.

I added the RCP proposal from the word document to column F.

There are a few differences but I think we are generally on the same page.

- Order of conversations– I asked our team to make their schedule with their proposed workplan. So to the extent we could address topics in the order proposed by RCP, that would make the most sense for their internal work flow.
- Content of meetings – unless I'm missing something I think we all anticipate covering the same topics. One minor difference, planning proposed a kick off meeting that seems to focus purely on the process of D4D. I think that is a good topic – though likely it can get put on a bigger agenda as part of the kick off meeting.
- Frequency of meetings – generally RCP proposed one meeting for every two planning proposed. RCP proposed covering more topics in each meeting, such that every topic is covered.

I understand that planning has recent experience with D4d's that suggest more frequent meetings are helpful. However we are proposing to provide a draft end 2018/early 2019 and seek entitlement an entire year later. This mirrors the schedule we are proposing to process the infrastructure plan – 6month ramp up with infrequent meetings, a formal submittal, followed by a year for review and refinements. I propose we adopt the schedule as proposed by RCP. If the full agenda is not accomplished in a given meeting we could schedule additional meetings. Our design team feels they can turn work around in bigger chunks and have meaningful conversations. Perhaps we book these as 1.5 hour meetings?

Regarding an outline/TOC – I think Jeremy provided some examples last week, so it is on RCP to put together a draft for Balboa. We will try to get that before the kick off meeting.

I'd suggest we schedule the kick off meeting for end of August (after the 20th so RCP key folks can be there). That will also give us some time to get a tighter schedule. If that makes sense could someone set up a doodle poll of some sort?

Thanks, K

Kearstin Dischinger | Project Manager and Policy Planner
BRIDGE Housing | 415.321.3515