
From: Joe Kirchofer <Joe_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com>
Sent: Monday, October 01, 2018 4:02 PM
To: Kearstin Dischinger; Shaw, Jeremy (CPC)
Cc: Lesk, Emily (ECN)
Subject: RE: Balboa Reservoir Draft PowerPoint - October CAC

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I agree with all Kearstin's points. With the final one being most important. All these slides will be secondary to the discussion of the City Policy Option.

One additional comment on the slides:

On the timeline on slide 2, I think the dates are a bit more conservative than what we had last showed. I think we were aiming for a DEIR in Summer 2019, and then RTC at the end of 2019.

From: Kearstin Dischinger [<mailto:kdischinger@bridgehousing.com>]
Sent: Monday, October 01, 2018 12:55 PM
To: Shaw, Jeremy (CPC) <jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org>; Joe Kirchofer <Joe_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com>
Cc: Lesk, Emily (ECN) <emily.lesk@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Balboa Reservoir Draft PowerPoint - October CAC

Thanks. First thoughts. . take them or leave them.

Purpose of CEQA

- I think a key purpose of CEQA is public process around these issues – that's why there is all these timelines and etc. Seems like a nice selling point to the public. . this process was built so you could be a part of the process!

Slide 6

- The graphic is hard to read, hopefully that will get improved with graphics team?
- No public space assumption listed in the city policy option
- I prefer if you break up the parking into two rows residential and public garage
- also don't we have a variant with no garage ie. garage offsite? Maybe you wrapped that into the city policy option? I don't recall, let's just confirm with EP (if you haven't already).

Slide 8

- Might be nice to call it opportunities to comment

Seems like there might could be a slide or two about the city policy option. I think people will want to hear more about why the city is proposing it and what it might look like. Also there should be some really clear and well vetted talking point here. I think we should answer these questions in the presentation:

1. Is the policy option consistent with the cac parameters? If not why did the city develop it after working with the CAC for two years?
2. Can the city force the developers to build the policy option?

3. Will the city policy assumption still include 50% affordable housing? If so how will that be funded?
4. Did the developers work on or propose the policy option?
5. Does this mean the developers are really going to build 1500 or 2000 units? What happened to 500?

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

From: Shaw, Jeremy (CPC) [<mailto:jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org>]
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 5:39 PM
To: Kearstin Dischinger <kdischinger@bridgehousing.com>; Joe Kirchofer (Joe_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com)
<Joe_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com>
Cc: Lesk, Emily (ECN) <emily.lesk@sfgov.org>
Subject: Balboa Reservoir Draft PowerPoint - October CAC

Hello Everyone,

Please see work in progress CAC powerpoint, attached for further discussion.

NOTICE: This message, including any attachments, is proprietary to AvalonBay Communities, Inc., intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information designated as internal use, confidential, and/or attorney-client privileged work product doctrine information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this message are prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please destroy it and notify the sender immediately.