

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

**DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC DURING
10/2/17 SPECIAL MEETING**

AND

**EMAILS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC VIA BRCAC@SFGOV.ORG**

Period: 6/16/17 – 10/2/17

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

**DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC DURING
10/2/17 SPECIAL MEETING**



95 Brady Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
415 541 9001 tel
415 431 2468 fax
info@sfhac.org
www.sfhac.org

SFHAC Staff Statement: Let's Create 2,500 Homes at Balboa Reservoir

The San Francisco Housing Action Coalition (SFHAC) would like to congratulate the development team of AvalonBay Communities, BRIDGE Housing, Mission Housing, Pacific Union Development Company, and Habitat for Humanity of Greater San Francisco for their selection to develop the Balboa Reservoir site. As a staff, we're proud that the winning team features so many business members and we want to share our thoughts on the winning proposal.

Housing: Located next to the Balboa Park BART Station, the Balboa Reservoir is one of the few under-utilized lots of its size left in San Francisco. Creating well-designed, well-located, multi-family housing has been the core of our advocacy since our inception nearly 20 years ago. After looking at recent housing proposals and analyzing the site, we believe the site should include no less than 2,500 homes. More housing would help reduce the public dollars used to make 50-percent of the homes subsidized for low- and middle-income families. More affordable housing at less costs to taxpayers is a win-win.

Community: SFHAC staff has regularly participated in the Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings for the last two years. We have spoken to people who live next to the site and we value the thorough community engagement that is underway. We encourage all San Franciscans to participate in the process so they can help shape the future of this new community. This project has the potential to be a place thousands of people, of all income levels, can one day call home. Thorough public feedback coupled with a shared vision that responds to San Francisco's housing needs will result in a great neighborhood.

Transit: Unlike the local chapter of the Sierra Club, SFHAC is interested in achieving our state's environmental goals and we understand that housing near transit encourages people to use public transportation and reduces the private car use. Emissions from automobiles is one of the leading causes of climate change. Every home not built at Balboa Reservoir will require a Bay Area employee to live elsewhere, even as far away as the Central Valley. Locally, we understand the importance of integrating the Balboa Reservoir with future transit improvements in the area that encourage alternative modes of transportation. We view the pedestrian experience between Balboa Reservoir and Balboa Park BART as critical to the success of the project.

Todd David

Corey Smith

Rob Poole

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

**EMAILS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC VIA BRCAC@SFGOV.ORG**

Period: 6/16/17 – 10/2/17

Shanahan, Thomas (ECN)

From: aj <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, September 29, 2017 1:19 AM
To: BRCAC (ECN); Shanahan, Thomas (ECN); Wong, Phillip (ECN); [REDACTED]; Michael Ahrens; Brigitte Davila; Robert Muehlbauer; [REDACTED]; Rebecca Lee; Christine Godinez; Jonathan Winston
Cc: Jennifer Heggie; Monica Collins; Rita Evans; Steve Martinpinto; Amy O'Hair; Ken Hollenbeck; Ray Kutz; Bob Byrne; Anita Theoharis; Anne Chen; MP Klier; Laura Frey; Caryl Ito; Kishan Balgobin; Adrienne GO; Kate Favetti; Francine Lofrano; Tim Emert; Aaron Goodman
Subject: Fw: Evidence of undue influence
Attachments: EL-JS edit of CCSF Responses - 5 1 2017 EL - JS.docx

Reservoir City Team:

Please enter this into the public record for the Reservoir Project.

Thanks,
aj

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: aj <[REDACTED]>
To: Linda Shaw [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] Brigitte Davila
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2017 10:30 PM
Subject: Evidence of undue influence

SFCCD:

Several months ago, I had asked for "SFCCD's Handling of Balboa Reservoir Project" to be placed on the BOT agenda.

Within that submission, I wrote:

I request that "SFCCD's HANDLING OF BALBOA RESERVOIR PROJECT" be placed on BOT agenda:

1. *Has the Balboa Reservoir City Team (Planning, Mayor's Office, PUC staff) had "undue influence" on SFCCD Administration at the expense of CCSF stakeholders' interests?*
2. *Is SFCCD fighting hard enough to assert its CEQA standing as an adversely affected public service?*
3. *Trustees Davila, Rizzo, and Randolph had earlier brought up the idea of the transfer of the PUC Reservoir to SFCCD. This idea was supported in a Resolution by the PGC.*

Signing of an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement to sell the PUC Reservoir to the developer will be the next step once the finalist is chosen.

- a. *Has the Reservoir been declared surplus by the Public Utilities Commission?*
- b. *After property is declared surplus, Government Code 54222 (c) requires an offer to, among others:*
(c) A written offer to sell or lease land suitable for school facilities construction or use by a school district for open-space purposes shall be sent to any school district in whose jurisdiction the land is located.

SFCCD should revisit this possibility to preserve CCSF stakeholders' interests.

4. *Issue a demand that the Reservoir Project pay for all costs for the building of the FMP's replacement parking that is necessitated by the Reservoir Project's eviction of student parking.*

I am sure that you are aware of Accreditation Standard IV.C.4 which requires you to defend the school and protect it from undue influence and political pressure.

I have received Sunshine Ordinance records from OEWD and Planning Department recently. I wish share one document (attached) that constitutes evidence of undue influence.

The document is City College's response to "Questions for City College, Submitted by Balboa Reservoir RFQ Respondents."

CITY COLLEGE DOCUMENT EDITED BY RESERVOIR CITY STAFF

Although it is a City College document, Emily Lesk of OEWD, and Jeremy Shaw of Planning had the privilege of making editorial changes to the City College document.

- The 2nd bullet of Question #3 originally referred to "mitigations required." The final version, incorporated Emily Lesk's removal of the term "mitigations" because "it implies CEQA." In place of mention of "mitigation", the Reservoir Staff inserted this into the CCSF Response: *"City College does not have any regulatory jurisdiction over the SFPUC-owned Balboa Reservoir property but is recognized by the City as an important stakeholder."*

This is evidence of direct intervention into SFCCD business that is not justifiable. It reflects the City Team's understandable desire to place its own Reservoir Project in a more favorable position. However, this is unethical behavior on the part of the Project Staff.

The evidence and example of undue influence provided above makes the requested agenda item of "SFCCD's Handling of the Balboa Reservoir Project" all the more relevant.

--aj

Shanahan, Thomas (ECN)

From: aj <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2017 11:03 AM
To: BRCAC (ECN); Shanahan, Thomas (ECN); Wong, Phillip (ECN);
[REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Cc: Jennifer Heggie; Monica Collins; Rita Evans; Steve Martinpinto; Bob Byrne; Ray Kutz; Amy O'Hair; Ken Hollenbeck; Anita Theoharis; Anne Chen; MP Klier; Laura Frey; Caryl Ito; Kishan Balgobin; Adrienne GO; Kate Favetti; Westwood Park Association; Francine Lofrano; Harry Bernstein; Christine Hanson; Michael Adams; Wynd Kaufmyn; Madeline Mueller; Vicki Legion; Muriel Parenteau; Lenny Carlson; Alan D'Souza; Timothy Killikelly; Yee, Norman (BOS); clerk@sfcta.org; Low, Jen (BOS); Maybaum, Erica (BOS); Choy, Jarlene (BOS); Aaron Goodman
Subject: CEQA obligations
Attachments: 2017-9-29 City Team-Public Records.pdf

Balboa Reservoir City Team:

In August 2017, I had made Sunshine Ordinance requests to OEWD and Planning Department for records regarding the Reservoir Project's Staff's relationship with City College principals.

The Sunshine Request asked specifically for records regarding:

1. "Information and communications between Reservoir Project City Team and City College principals regarding the elimination of student parking and regarding CEQA-related adverse impacts on, and mitigation measures for parking and traffic.
2. "Information and communications between Planning and SFCCD principals regarding how to manage or handle complaints about Reservoir parking being eliminated by the Reservoir Project.

As experts in the field, you should be very knowledgeable about CEQA. As such, you should be aware that City College, being a public educational service, constitutes an environmental factor that requires mitigation.

Yet in reviewing the public records produced by OEWD and Planning Department, I have not been able to find any mention of the Reservoir Project's CEQA obligation to remedy the elimination of the existing condition of student parking. How is this possible?

Could it be because Planning Dept is responsible for its own CEQA review?

Throughout your public engagement process, the only solution that you have offered to the community is Transportation Demand Management which—push comes to shove—dumps the burden of mitigation onto CCSF and neighborhood residents.

Although I only speak for myself, I am pretty sure that a lot of people in the CCSF and neighborhood community find it outrageous that the Balboa Reservoir Project has avoided addressing its own CEQA obligations and has engineered a pre-ordained outcome using a "public engagement process" that was one-sided and, in the main, dictated by the Mayor's Office.

Submitted by:
Alvin Ja

September 28, 2017

Shanahan, Thomas (ECN)

From: aj [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 6:00 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN); [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Cc: Shanahan, Thomas (ECN); Wong, Phillip (ECN); Rich, Ken (ECN); Lesk, Emily (ECN); Yee, Norman (BOS); Jennifer Heggie; Ray Kutz; Monica Collins; Rita Evans; Bob Byrne; Anita Theoharis; Francine Lofrano; MP Klier; Anne Chen; Tim Emert; Kishan Balgobin; Steve Martinpinto; Amy O'Hair; Ken Hollenbeck; Laura Frey; Kate Favetti; Adrienne GO; Caryl Ito; Vicki Legion; Muriel Parenteau; Lenny Carlson; Michael Adams; Christine Hanson; Harry Bernstein; Madeline Mueller; Timothy Killikelly; Alan DSouza; Wynd Kaufmyn; Athena Waid; Jessica Buchsbaum; Jenny Worley; Otto Pippenger; Juan Gonzalez
Subject: Sunshine Ordinance Request to OEWD
Attachments: 2017-9-18 SOTF FILE #17090 for CAC.docx

BRCAC:

FYI, I have submitted a Sunshine Ordinance Request to OEWD for public information regarding what I see as undue influence and political pressure on City College from the City Team.

OEWD has denied the Sunshine request.

Attached is a summary of the issue that is going to be heard by the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

Please enter this into the record.

Thanks,
aj

Shanahan, Thomas (ECN)

From: aj [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 29, 2017 3:27 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN); Shanahan, Thomas (ECN); Wong, Phillip (ECN); Hood, Donna (PUC); Carlin, Michael (PUC); CAC@sfwater.org; Wendolyn Aragon; Tracy Zhu; Iwata, Ryan (PUC)
Subject: INHERENT INEQUITY IN THE BALBOA AREA TDM FRAMEWORK
Attachments: INHERENT INEQUITY IN TDM FRAMEWORK.docx

Tom, Phillip:
Please distribute the attached to BRCAC members and enter into public record.

Donna:
Please convey to Commissioners.

Thanks,
aj

INHERENT INEQUITY IN THE BALBOA AREA TDM FRAMEWORK: DUMPING THE BALBOA RESERVOIR PROJECT'S RESPONSIBILITY TO MITIGATE ITS ADVERSE IMPACTS ONTO ITS VICTIMS

CEQA principles call for new projects like the Balboa Reservoir Project to mitigate adverse impacts on the existing setting.

Being a public service, City College has CEQA standing as an "environmental factor" that would require the proposed Reservoir Project to mitigate its adverse impacts.

From the very beginning of the Reservoir Project's public engagement process, CCSF stakeholders have complained about the adverse impacts on student enrollment and attendance that would be generated by the Project's eviction of existing student parking.

GENESIS OF BALBOA AREA TDM FRAMEWORK STUDY

In order to assuage community concerns regarding parking and traffic, the Reservoir Project initiated the Balboa Area TDM Study.

People in the community were expecting the study to be an all-around and objective analysis of transportation issues. What people in the community did not realize was that the TDM Study's general conclusions had already been pre-ordained.

The Balboa Area TDM Study had been given its marching orders:

"The Planning Department and SFMTA are proposing a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) study in coordination with CCSF Ocean Campus to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips by college staff, faculty, students, and neighborhood residents."

WILLFUL DISREGARD FOR HARD DATA

The City Agencies have managed the Reservoir Project in a manner similar to how the Iraq War had been promoted. Just like the Iraq War in which, according to British Intelligence's Downing Street Memo, "... the

intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy”, the recommendations and conclusions of the Nelson-Nygaard study have been fixed around the pre-determined TDM policy.

The Balboa Area TDM Framework has been fixed..... with willful disregard for the hard data from surveys that would refute the pre-determined TDM dogma.

PLANNING DEPT’S WILLFUL EXCLUSION OF COMPREHENSIVE PARKING ASSESSMENT

The Balboa Area TDM Framework states that it is “built upon a comprehensive Existing Conditions Report”.

Sunshine Ordinance documents reveal that this statement is a falsehood.

In 2014, the AECOM Transportation Analyst had proposed performing a comprehensive supply- demand assessment for all on-street and off-street parking in the neighboring vicinities. Jeremy Shaw of the Planning Dept put a stop to AECOM’s proposal to perform this comprehensive assessment. Instead, in a 2014 email to the AECOM Transportation Analyst, Planning Dept told AECOM to confine their study to the Reservoir parking lots alone:

“...edits made in the attached word document reflect the current thinking in SF transportation analysis...

“Comment [JS4]: We’d recommend just looking at the parking lots. --- Off-site parking analysis is nice to have. But really we want to focus the effort on what will drive the on-site design and what kind of trips that design will generate – rather than worry about off-site impacts and mitigations...”

So from the very beginning, starting with the AECOM Existing Conditions’ Transportation Analysis, a full and objective assessment and analysis had already been stopped in its tracks by the Reservoir Project Staff.

“THE CURRENT THINKING IN SF TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS”

What was--and is--the “current thinking?”.....The thinking is: **Don’t “worry about off-site impacts and mitigations.”**

DELIBERATELY OBSCURED: CONTEXT OF RESERVOIR BEING A NEW PROJECT

The TDM Study was a response by to community concerns about transportation issues that would be generated by the new Reservoir Project, impacting the existing setting of City College and the surrounding neighborhoods.

The TDM Framework obscures this context by placing the new Reservoir Project on an equal footing with City College and the surrounding neighborhoods. The Balboa Area TDM Framework delineates three sub-areas: 1) City College Ocean Campus, 2) Balboa Reservoir , and 3) Balboa Area neighborhoods.

Instead of disclosing the fact that the Balboa Reservoir sub-area, as a new proposed project, is responsible for mitigation of its adverse impacts, the TDM Framework presents the Reservoir Project as a fact-on-the-ground with equal –if not greater—standing with City College and the neighborhoods.

THROWN OVERBOARD: STUDENT INTERESTS OF ACCESS TO EDUCATION

By putting the Reservoir Project on equal footing with City College and the neighborhoods, the Reservoir Project has been, with a sleight-of-hand, absolved of its CEQA responsibility to mitigate its adverse impacts on the existing setting. Instead, mitigation has been dumped onto the Reservoir Project’s victims. Instead of the Reservoir Project being held responsible for providing replacement parking for students, City College’s FMP has had to respond by proposing new parking structures on SFCCD property.....but with no realistic funding sources for such structures necessitated by eviction of student parking.

INEQUITY IN BALBOA AREA TDM FRAMEWORK

The TDM Framework has set up car-use reduction targets for the City College students and employees, and for the new Reservoir residents. It has also proposed Residential Permit Parking for the neighborhoods:

- The target for City College is **20%**.

- According to Figure 4 “Current and Recommended Mode Split, CCSF’s Ocean Campus”, the TDM Framework calls for student drivers be cut back from 35% to 20% (a reduction of 43%).
- The TDM Framework calls for CCSF employee drivers to be cut back from 45% to 20% (a reduction of 56%).
- The TDM Framework sets an initial target for new Balboa Reservoir residents to be **60%**.
 - In comparison, CCSF student car use is already 35% and CCSF employee car use is already 45%. Further cuts to 20% mean that CCSF students and employees are being expected to sacrifice access to City College in order to benefit new Reservoir residents.
- The TDM Framework has called for neighborhood residents to initiate Residential Permit Parking to mitigate spillover parking generated by students who will no longer be able to park in the Reservoir and to discourage new Reservoir residents to park in the surrounding neighborhoods.
 - This is another shameless example of dumping mitigation responsibilities onto the victims of the Reservoir Project instead of the new Project taking responsibility for its own adverse impacts.

OVERARCHING GOALS

The TDM Framework sets up 4 overarching goals:

1. Reduce vehicle-miles traveled
2. Reduce auto trips
3. Reduce traffic congestion
4. Reduce transportation costs to preserve housing affordability

FALSE EQUIVALENCE: REDUCING CAR USE vs. STUDENT ACCESS

Conspicuously missing from the list of overarching goals is: ENSURING STUDENT ACCESS TO EDUCATION. Other than providing vacuous perfunctory talk about “*the importance of accessible education and striv[ing] to establish equitable transportation choices...*” the TDM Framework proffers no realistic or effective solution to the priorities shown to be important to CCSF stakeholders in data collected in the CCSF Transportation Survey. Hard data from the survey shows that “Reducing Travel Time” and “Arriving on Time” are overwhelmingly the most important considerations in choosing transportation mode.

CONFLATING MEANS WITH ENDS: THE OVERARCHING IMPORTANCE OF THE DESTINATION

A fundamental flaw of the TDM Framework is that it only treats the issue of reducing car usage in isolation.

It should not take a lot of mental effort to realize that transportation is only an issue if and when there’s a destination involved. Lacking a desired destination, transportation and parking are a non-issues. The TDM Framework fails to recognize the fact that transportation is just a way to get to a desired destination. Instead, it dogmatically asserts that parking in and of itself generates traffic.

CITY COLLEGE’S MISSION: STUDENTS FIRST

Is it more important to keep cars off the road, or is it more important to keep students in school?

Very simply, City College’s mission is to provide education to students. In fulfilling the mission of providing education to its students, SFCCD wants to do it in a sustainable fashion. However its fundamental mission of education comes first. Being a commuter school, access to education takes priority over discouraging car use.

Accreditation Standard III.B Physical Resources requires SFCCD to assure student access to education. The TDM Framework’s overarching goals of “reducing vehicle miles travelled” and “reducing auto trips” are not contained in Accreditation Standards.

RESERVOIR PROJECT'S TDM FRAMEWORK EMBEDDED IN CITY COLLEGE'S DRAFT FMP—WHY?!

The TDM Framework states: “The *TDM Framework* supports existing TDM goals embedded in the City College Facilities Master Plan and Sustainability Plan...”

This statement is constructively a tautology. It's a tautology because the Reservoir Project's TDM Framework documents have been embedded in their entirety into SFCCD'S draft FMP!

Somehow, the Reservoir Project City Staff was able to get SFCCD Staff and consultants to incorporate the Nelson-Nygaard TDM Framework documents verbatim into the draft FMP. This constitutes a case of SFCCD Administration violating its own mission and its duty towards its own constituencies.

TDM FRAMEWORK: SPEAR-CARRIER AND PROPAGANDA FOR BALBOA RESERVOIR PROJECT

The main significance of the TDM Framework is that it functions as a means for the Reservoir Project to avoid its responsibility to mitigate its adverse impacts

The Nelson-Nygaard TDM documents serve as spearhead documents to advocate for the interests of the Balboa Reservoir Project, NOT for the interests of City College stakeholders.

City College provides immeasurable public benefits to the entire Bay Area community. Its interests cannot be sacrificed for a narrow-minded focus on getting City College students, faculty and staff out of cars.

--Alvin Ja 8/21/2017

Shanahan, Thomas (ECN)

From: Micheal [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 24, 2017 5:51 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Balboa reservoir plans

This will end up costing City College dearly, you are taking away nearly half the parking spots if you remove the lower reservoir parking area, and while your impact study calls this area as "under used" one needs to only look at it on a day like today to see that it is in fact well used.

As it stands you've already turned the drive in front of CCSF along Phelan avenue a logistical nightmare, with the bike lanes halving the total traffic volume, and the 4 ill timed lights along that street creating a backup nightmare that during school hours can take 5-10 minutes just to drive across the front of the campus. Now you want to put living spaces in there which will end up creating even more traffic.

So I know you're already decided on this project, and that all other things be damned, but here's a rundown of what's going to happen. You're going to make it more difficult for students to actually get to school, which is going to lower enrollment numbers, as an example look to other campus enrollment numbers that are supposed to be in densely populated parts of the city (e.g. Chinatown campus). Less students means less money, less money means less teachers and support staff, so you are literally going to be putting people out of work all for what? a hundred housing units?

Disgusting

Shanahan, Thomas (ECN)

From: aj [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 2:17 PM
To: SNA Brick; Jennifer Heggie; Monica Collins; Bob Byrne; Ray Kutz; Rita Evans; Amy O'Hair; Ken Hollenbeck; Steve Martinpinto; Pauline Levinson; Wpa Balboa. Reservoir; Westwood Park Association; Anita Theoharis; Linda Judge; MP Klier; Michael Ahrens; Laura Frey; Adrienne GO; Caryl Ito; Francine Lofrano; Kishan Balgobin; Tim Emert; Kate Favetti; BRCAC (ECN); Wong, Phillip (ECN); Shanahan, Thomas (ECN); Yee, Norman (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Maybaum, Erica (BOS)
Cc: Linda Da Silva; Jay Field; Erika Delacorte; Madeline Mueller; Muriel Parenteau; Suzanne Pugh; Steven Brown; Lenny Carlson; Vicki Legion; Athena Steff; Joe R. Jah; James Rogers; Jeffrey Kelly; Bouchra Simmons; Brenna Stroud; Teresa Villicana; Rebeca Chavez; Pam Mery; Jorge Bell
Subject: More thoughts on data collection and TDM

All--

When the Reservoir Project began its public engagement process, I postulated that the fix was in. I believe that the "done-deal" opinion that I had offered at the beginning has been borne out as accurate.

I offer the TDM study as an example.

Many in the community brought up the importance of parking and traffic issues. This was brought up early and often. As a sop to those expressing these concerns, the Reservoir Project City Staff set up a Balboa Area TDM Study. People in the community were expecting an objective study with conclusions based on evidence and data.

But what the City Staff didn't tell the public was that the broad conclusions and parameters for the TDM Study had already been decided before any data collection had even taken place. Very simply, the broad conclusion--with no data/evidence involved-- was that in order to facilitate the Reservoir Project, neighborhood residents and CCSF students, faculty, and staff would just have to suck it up. The conclusion was pre-ordained:

"The Planning Department and SFMTA are proposing a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) study in coordination with CCSF Ocean Campus to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips by college staff, faculty, students, and neighborhood residents."

And then to mitigate "spillover" parking from new Reservoir residents and students who won't be able to find parking in the Reservoir anymore, neighborhood residents are asked to institute Residential Permit Parking.

Fundamentally, all this means is that the Reservoir Project dumps the responsibility of mitigation of adverse impacts caused by the Reservoir onto the impacted parties themselves.

WILLFUL DISREGARD OF DATA

The whole idea of TDM is to get people to use public transit, walk, and bike.

As I have cited repeatedly, the CCSF Survey asked: **"What would encourage you to use other transportation modes?"** The survey showed that reducing "Travel Time" and "Arrival on Time" were overwhelmingly the most important considerations (90.1% and 73.2%, respectively). Despite this data, the City planners insist on the ideologically-driven, pre-conceived, unrealistic "solution" of TDM for the Reservoir Project's impact.

The hard data from surveys show that travel time and reliability are the predominant factors in whether or not to choose the sustainable alternatives of walking, biking and public transit. Ignoring this data, the Nelson-Nygaard TDM Framework:

- sets a target for CCSF to reduce the percentage of students who drive from 35% to 20% (In other words, for 35 students out of 100 who drive, TDM will get 15 students to stop driving, leaving only 20 who drive).

- sets a target for CCSF to reduce the percentage of employees who drive from 45% to 20% (In other words, for the 45 employees out of 100 who drive, TDM will get 25 employees to give up driving, leaving 20 who will continue to drive).

Are these TDM targets of achieving a 43% reduction in student drivers, and a 56% reduction in employee drivers anywhere near plausible?!!!

This would only be plausible if student enrollment and attendance were to be similarly reduced.....Would this be a public benefit or a public harm?

The Reservoir City Team had the Dept of Environment conduct a 2-part Community Transportation Survey last year. One of the questions in the survey was:

"What is most important to you when you choose how you get to work? (Select up to 3)"

- ◆ *Ability to make stops on the way to work or home*
- ◆ *Comfort and Safety*
- ◆ *Convenience/Flexibility*
- ◆ *Cost*
- ◆ *Reliability*
- ◆ *Reducing pollution, conserving energy*
- ◆ *Stress*
- ◆ *Travel Time*

Despite the existence of data for responses to this survey question, the Nelson-Nygaard Study withheld results for this question. Could it have been because the responses did not fit into TDM dogma? Do you think that "Travel Time" and "Reliability" may have come out far ahead of the desired answer of "Reducing pollution, conserving energy"?

Fundamentally, the Nelson-Nygaard TDM Framework is a piece of PR that is not based on objective analysis of data and evidence. Less diplomatically, it's propaganda.

--aj

Shanahan, Thomas (ECN)

From: aj [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, July 16, 2017 10:36 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN); Shanahan, Thomas (ECN); Wong, Phillip (ECN)
Subject: summary of Reservoir Developer Proposals
Attachments: Reservoir Developer Proposals - Sheet1.pdf

BRCAC:

Although the period for feedback on the Developer Proposals is over, the attached short summary could still be helpful to your understanding of what I consider to be variations on the City's done-deal of privatizing public property.

--aj

Shanahan, Thomas (ECN)

From: Alvin Ja [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, June 25, 2017 1:42 AM
To: Shanahan, Thomas (ECN); Wong, Phillip (ECN); BRCAC (ECN)
Cc: Rich, Ken (ECN); Russell, Rosanna (PUC); Exline, Susan (CPC)
Subject: Fw: For 6/28/2017 CAC Meeting: Request correction of Minutes of 5/24/2017 CAC meeting

Phillip, Tom:

Please ensure that the following email to SFCTA/SFCTA CAC is entered into the official record for the Balboa Reservoir Project.

Thanks,
aj

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Alvin Ja [REDACTED]
To: Amber Crabbe <amber.crabbe@sfcta.org>; "CAC@sfcta.org" <CAC@sfcta.org>
Cc: Peskin Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Katy Tang <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; Malia Cohen <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>; Norman Yee <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Ahsha Safai <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Farrell Mark (BOS) <mark.farrell@sfgov.org>; Fewer Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Hillary Ronen <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Breed London (BOS) <london.breed@sfgov.org>; Jane Kim <jane.kim@sfgov.org>; Jeff Sheehy <jeff.sheehy@sfgov.org>; Low Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Erica Maybaum <erica.maybaum@sfgov.org>; BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>; Shanahan Thomas (ECN) <thomas.shanahan@sfgov.org>; Westwood Park Association [REDACTED]; Wpa Balboa. Reservoir [REDACTED] SNA Brick [REDACTED] Amy O'Hair [REDACTED] Ken Hollenbeck [REDACTED]; Steve Martinpinto [REDACTED]; Save CCSF Coalition [REDACTED]; CFI [REDACTED]; Thea Selby [REDACTED]; Brigitte Davila [REDACTED]; Linda Shaw <lshaw@ccsf.edu>; John Rizzo [REDACTED]; Alex Randolph [REDACTED]; Shanell Williams <swilliams@ccsf.edu>; Tom Temprano <ttemprano@ccsf.edu>; Rafael Mandelman [REDACTED]; Linda Da Silva [REDACTED]; Steve Bruckman <sbruckman@ccsf.edu>; "joe kirchofer@avalonbay.com" <joe_kirchofer@avalonbay.com>; "nathan_hong@avalonbay.com" <nathan_hong@avalonbay.com>; "wwitte@related.com" <wwitte@related.com>; "susan.smartt@related.com" <susan.smartt@related.com>; Oz Erickson <oz@emeraldfund.com>; "rmarks@mercyhousing.org" <rmarks@mercyhousing.org>; "marc@emeraldfund.com" <marc@emeraldfund.com>; PODER <jessie@podersf.org>; CCHO--fernando <fernando@sfic-409.org>; "tilly.chang@sfcta.org" <tilly.chang@sfcta.org>
Sent: Sunday, June 25, 2017 1:24 AM
Subject: For 6/28/2017 CAC Meeting: Request correction of Minutes of 5/24/2017 CAC meeting

CAC Chair Waddling, SFCTA CAC members, Deputy Director Crabbe:

Approval of the Minutes for the 5/24/2017 SFCTA CAC meeting is on your upcoming 6/28 Agenda Item 3.

I gave oral public comment at the 5/24/2017 CAC meeting. However, the minutes failed to accurately characterize the essence of my comments.

The Minutes for 5/24 reads:

During public comment, Alvin Ja stated that he had sent the CAC a letter the previous day regarding the item. He stated that people needed to use less resources and the city should encourage people to bike, walk and use public transit instead of using

single-occupancy vehicles. He said he had worked for Muni for 33 years at the Muni Metro Balboa Park Station as an operator and was very familiar with the existing conditions in the area. He stated that the Balboa Reservoir project would basically eliminate student parking but noted that City College was important to communities of concern as it was one of the more affordable colleges. He said the city should be worried about providing student access to this inexpensive education source and that this was missing from the TDM plan.

I said that we, in the USA (not just in SF), used the world's resources disproportionately. I said that we (in the USA) should reduce consumption of resources.

But the actual main point of my comment was to point out that the **proper context for the Balboa Reservoir Area TDM Report was lacking**. This is not reflected in the 5/24 Minutes. **The main point was that the proper context for the TDM study was the impact that the Balboa Reservoir Project would have on the Reservoir neighborhood**. The main point was that the reason for the commissioning of the Nelson-Nygaard study was to provide the community with an objective study of transportation and parking impacts that the Balboa Reservoir Project would have on the Reservoir area (Instead, the TDM Report has been used to shift the burden for mitigation of adverse impacts of the Balboa Reservoir Project onto CCSF stakeholders and Ingleside, Westwood Park, and Sunnyside neighbors).

I had also submitted the following to you on 6/10/2017:

SFCTA Commissioners, SFCTA CAC, Deputy Director Crabbe:

I will be unable to attend your 6/13/2017 meeting. I offer Written Comment instead:

AGENDA ITEM 2: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

I made oral public comment on the Nelson-Nygaard Balboa Area TDM Report at the 5/24/2017 CAC meeting.

In reviewing the minutes of that meeting, I find that the main points of of my oral comment have not been correctly presented.

The main points of my oral comment had been to show that the TDM Framework would result in harming "communities of concern" by reducing their access to education:

Present a proper context with which to evaluate the Balboa Area TDM Framework. I believe that I emphasized clearly that Balboa Area TDM Framework had to be viewed in the context of it being a response to how the Balboa Reservoir Project would affect the existing conditions and settings in the Reservoir area; and that elimination of student parking by the Reservoir Project would harm attendance and enrollment.

Due to enforcement of the 2-3 minute time limit, I was unable to complete one of my points. I had wanted to say to the CAC that, with my 33 years of first-hand experience as a MUNI employee, any future MUNI real-world service improvements in the Balboa TDM plan would fall far short of providing the reliability that would be needed to make students, staff, and faculty (who place highest priority on Travel Time and Arrival on Time according to the City College Transportation Survey) jump on board MUNI instead.

The CAC minutes refers to a letter submitted to the CAC. The submission had been addressed to SFCTA Board, in addition to the CAC. I had asked SFCTA Staff to distribute it to both bodies. This is the letter, along with the "TDM Non Sequitur" attachment:

SFCTA, SFCTA CAC:

It is important to remember the context for the creation of the Balboa Park Area TDM Framework Study.

The BP Area TDM Framework Study was the consequence of concerns expressed by the community regarding the adverse impact that the Balboa Reservoir Project would have on the existing setting and conditions in the immediate area of the Reservoir.

People in the community had been left to believe that the TDM Study would be an objective all-around examination of parking/ transportation issues in the area. The City Team failed to enlighten the community that TDM was actually the pre-ordained "solution" to the adverse traffic and parking impacts of the new Reservoir Project on the Reservoir neighborhood. That replacement parking was never considered as a possibility within the TDM Framework was never clearly communicated to the community.

Instead of just being presented as a general overall plan to "encourage sustainable travel choices and reduce...auto trips and traffic congestion in the Balboa Area," it is imperative that the TDM Study be seen in the context of the Balboa Reservoir Project's adverse impact on the neighborhood and especially on its adverse impact on student attendance and enrollment.

TDM is not a true solution to the eviction of student parking that would discourage student attendance and enrollment. TDM as a solution to the eviction of student parking is not grounded on fact or evidence; in reality, the TDM "solution" to the elimination of student parking and the addition of 1,000+ new Balboa Reservoir residents is merely based on hope and wishful thinking.

Please correct your 5/24 Minutes to accurately reflect my comments prior to approval of the 5/24/2017 minutes.

Thank you for your cooperation in correcting the 5/24 minutes,

Alvin Ja

Shanahan, Thomas (ECN)

From: Alvin Ja [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 23, 2017 1:16 AM
To: Walton, Kim (MTA); A. Mullaney; Aaron Goodman; Aditi Mahmud; Ahsha Safai; Amber Crabbe; bertolli1; Bill Makarewicz; Bill Worthington; Bob Byrne; Bob Herman; Bob Masys; Bonnie White; Brent Rotenizer; Brian Manford; Brian Marabello; BRCAC (ECN); Shanahan, Thomas (ECN); Rich, Ken (ECN); Russell, Rosanna (PUC); Hood, Donna (PUC); Michael Martin; Linda Da Silva; Marian Lam
Subject: Balboa Reservoir Project
Attachments: 2017-3-18 updated version-- UNADDRESSED FLAWS IN BALBOA RESERVOIR PROJECT.pdf

Mr. Shanahan:

Please enter this into the official record of public input regarding the Avalon/Bridge proposal. Please distribute this to Avalon, Bridge, Habitat for Humanity, and Pacific Union. Thanks.

Mr. Mahmud, MHDC:

I see that Avalon and Bridge have made you secondary partners in their Balboa Reservoir proposal.

In handing over a publicly owned asset to developers, the Balboa Reservoir project will only provide 33% legally-defined affordable housing. Low and moderate-income folks will only be given crumbs to be handed out by Habitat for Humanity and MHDC in exchange for most of the Reservoir public property (50-66%) being transferred to private profit-making developers in perpetuity.

The Reservoir Project will take away an existing public benefit of providing access to education for "communities of concern" (SFCTA/Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program terminology).

The Reservoir Project has forced SFCCD to add parking structures into its Facilities Master Plan to make up for the lost Reservoir parking caused by the Reservoir Project. If selected, Avalon/Bridge needs to pay for all costs for SFCCD's replacement parking.

FYI, I have attached my analysis of the Balboa Reservoir Project for you review. I hope that you will give it your consideration.

--Alvin Ja
Sunnyside resident, CCSF lifelong learning student