



ACTION ITEM

AMENDED – JULY 28, 2016

DATE: July 28, 2016

PRESENTERS: Trustees John Rizzo,
Brigitte Davila, Alex Randolph

SUBJECT: Resolution on the Development of the Balboa Reservoir Property

ITEM NO. 160728-XI-223

WHEREAS: The property now known as the "Balboa Reservoir" is occupied by City College of San Francisco (CCSF), is known as part of the "West Campus" and is dedicated to the public good; and

WHEREAS: From 1946 to 1956 City College operated student housing for veterans along with many other full campus facilities on the site now proposed for housing by the City; and

WHEREAS: Planning for the long anticipated and voter-approved Performing Arts and Education Center (PAEC) has resumed at CCSF; and

WHEREAS: The PAEC would not only serve CCSF's mission, but also the residents of San Francisco, by filling a need for small performance spaces that are in short supply, and therefore help revitalize San Francisco's arts community, particularly in an area of San Francisco not well served by art and performance spaces; and

WHEREAS: Changes to traffic flow on Phelan Avenue by the City and County of San Francisco (the City) in recent years have made traffic worse and slowed Muni buses that our students and staff depend on; and

WHEREAS: The City has proposed to build on the western portion of the Balboa Reservoir a housing development of mixed affordable and market-rate units; and

WHEREAS: The Balboa Reservoir has been the site of existing city college parking for 60 years. Furthermore, the site of the proposed development is currently used by CCSF for the parking of up to 1,000 students and employees, and is often filled to capacity; and

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

**RAFAEL MANDELMAN, PRESIDENT • THEA SELBY, VICE PRESIDENT • DR. AMY BACHARACH
DR. BRIGITTE DAVILA • STEVE NGO • ALEX RANDOLPH • JOHN RIZZO • BOUCHRA SIMMONS, STUDENT TRUSTEE
DR. GUY LEASE, SPECIAL TRUSTEE
SUSAN E. LAMB, INTERIM CHANCELLOR**

WHEREAS: In its presentation to the Board of Trustees and in its materials posted online, one of the options the City has proposed includes the creation of new streets through the CCSF owned parking lot; and

WHEREAS: CCSF is the central educational, economic and cultural focus of the neighborhood where the Balboa Reservoir property is situated;

WHEREAS: CCSF's interests cannot be secondary and must be taken into account in coordination with City efforts regarding the planned development on the "Balboa Reservoir"; and

WHEREAS: The development of the publicly owned Balboa Reservoir represents a valuable public resource that will provide a unique opportunity for the City to serve the public good, provide badly needed-affordable housing and support the mission of CCSF to provide accessible, quality education to all; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the City College Board of Trustees submit the following priorities for the continued discussion with the city regarding the proposed "Balboa Reservoir" development:

1. CCSF cannot grant the city a roadway between the Multi-Use Building and the planned PAEC
 - o The Board of Trustees may exchange one or more roadway accesses/ easements through CCSF owned property only if the City reimburses CCSF with other land in the reservoir or a monetary payment
2. The City's Balboa Reservoir project should be at least 50% permanent affordable housing with a preference for dedicated faculty and staff housing.
 - o The Board of Trustees acknowledges that significant engagement by CCSF staff and administrators is required to create dedicated housing for faculty, staff and, if possible, student dormitories.
3. In order to avoid the loss of enrollment from students who must commute by car and loss of parking for audience members of performances at the PAEC, City College of San Francisco requires important mitigation measures to offset the loss of existing parking with the following:
 - o A flexible* parking structure that includes electric car charging stations, bicycle parking, share car parking to accommodate overflow parking and performances at the PAC,
*(flexible parking structures accommodate transitions from parking alone to a range of other uses as parking ratios decline with further mixed-use development and increased use of shared parking and public transit.), and
 - o A comprehensive transit study, with input from CCSF. As well as and transit alternatives, including MUNI / BART Passes for all students and residents of any housing structure built on the Balboa Reservoir property, and
 - o Car and bike sharing options for residents, neighbors, and members of the CCSF community
4. The City shall prioritize including open, accessible common space throughout the development to be used as parks, gardens, playgrounds or other types of open space that will enhance the CCSF community and neighborhood. The City must recognize that the open

campus of CCSF is designated as a park and any development must be consistent with this designation and the master plan.

5. The City, in coordination with the CCSF master plan, must make improvements to Ocean Ave and Phelan Ave to accommodate increased traffic flow, to ensure timely transit of the Muni buses and streetcars, and to improve pedestrian safety

6. The City, in coordination with the CCSF master plan, must place a new crosswalk on Ocean Avenue near the exit from the Balboa BART station, which is used by thousands of CCSF students, staff and faculty every day,

In addition, the City must undertake measures to overall increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety.

7. CCSF Administration shall work with the City to explore locating the new Child Development Center onsite at any Balboa Reservoir development to provide high quality child care for residents, students, faculty, and staff

8. That the City College of San Francisco – Capital Projects Planning Committee (CCSF-CPPC), which is comprised of all City College stakeholders and is in the best position to review the Balboa Reservoir Development in concert with CCSF Master Planning (now in progress) and the Balboa BART Station Parameters. This committee shall, in coordination with the PGC and the Balboa Reservoir CAC, provide regular feedback and input to the Board of Trustees for further discussion and action, if necessary.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That the Board of Trustees directs the Chancellor to communicate these priorities to the City and instruct the Administration to ensure that CCSF's interest are acknowledged and recognized in accordance with the primary stated goals of CCSF's Vision and Mission statements: to continue "to provide an accessible, affordable, and high quality education to all students", ~~as we continue our discussion with the City to create a housing development that benefits the whole community without harming CCSF's mission.~~



Educate. Empower.

Resolution: Public Land Must Stay in Public Hands

Executive Director
Tim Paulson

President
Mike Casey
Unite Here 2

Secretary Treasurer
Olga Miranda
SEIU 87

VP for Affiliate Support
Larry Mazzola, Jr.
Plumbers 38

VP for Community Activities
Conny Ford
OPEIU 29

VP for Political Activities
Alisa Messer
AFL 1121

Executive Committee
Alysbeth Alexander
SEIU 1021

Danny Campbell
Sheet Metal 104

Vince Courtney
IUBNA 261

FX Crowley
UTSE 14

Jane Doherty
IBEW 6

Margaret Dugan
CNA

Mark Gleason
IBT 66A

Art Gonzalez
IAM 1414

Rudy Gonzalez
IST 856

Vernell Hawkins
AFWU

Michael Hennesberry
IUPUI 5

Ulan Larson
UFCW 448

Gunnar Lundeborg
SUP

Larry Mazzola Sr.
Plumbers 38

Greg Muscat
IUPUI 2

Natalie Navler
OPEIU 29

Thomas O'Connor
IAFF 798

Fred Pecker
IUMU

Angad Singh
Unite Here 2

Denise Sells
SLU 11000

Susan Solomon
UCSF

Kim Taveglione
NUHW

Michael Theriault
S-ECTC

Joe Toback
Shim & Masday 510

Stephania Tully
CPA

Sergeant at Arms
Helen Kelly
CAPA

Trustees
Ron Lewis, IBEW 6
David Williams, SEIU 1021
Claire Zvanski, FORUM

Whereas, the SF Public Utilities Commission in close cooperation with the SF Planning Department and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development is proceeding with plans to build a private housing development on public land currently owned by the SF Public Utilities Commission; and

Whereas, the proposed housing development is located on the section of the Balboa Reservoir that CCSF has improved and leased from the PUC for decades; and

Whereas, we understand public land to be a sacred public trust from previous generations, whose future belongs to many generations into the future, and not a commodity to be sold; and

Whereas, the proposed housing development will eliminate parking with no corresponding improvement of transit alternatives, thereby limiting access for students who do not have other viable options; and

Whereas, San Francisco public agencies must abide by both the spirit and the letter of State Surplus Land Statute 54222, which requires that any local agency disposing of surplus land shall send, prior to disposing of that property, a written offer to sell or lease the property ... to any school district in whose jurisdiction the land is located; and

Whereas, CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) requires state and local agencies to identify the significant environmental impacts of their actions and to avoid or mitigate those impacts, if feasible; and

Whereas, the process for planning this development has been tightly controlled, in some cases secretive, and has routinely ignored community input; and

Whereas, the process for planning this development has involved pressure exerted on CCSF administration to serve the goals of other City agencies rather than the needs of City College; and

Whereas, the current private plan inadequately addresses the desperate need for truly affordable housing in San Francisco; therefore

Be it Resolved, the San Francisco Labor Council ask the SF PUC to transfer this public property to City College of San Francisco; and

Be it Further Resolved, the San Francisco Labor Council will call on other unions to pass a resolution asking the SF PUC to transfer this public property to CCSF; and

Be it Finally Resolved that the San Francisco labor Council urge the CCSF Board of Trustees and administration to advocate vigorously for the interests of the college and for the principle of public land for the public good.


Submitted by AFT 2121 and adopted by the San Francisco Labor Council on November 13, 2017.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tim Paulson", with a long horizontal line extending to the left and a flourish extending to the right.

Tim Paulson
Executive Director

OPEIU 29 AFL-CIO 11



Educate. Empower.

Executive Director

President

Secretary/Treasurer

VP for Affiliate Support

VP for Community Activities

VP for Political Activities

Executive Committee

Resolution in Support of Building the Performing Arts and Education Center at CCSF

Whereas in 2001 and in 2005 San Francisco voters approved bonds for building a Performing Arts Education Center (PAEC) on the City College Ocean Campus (on an area currently used for student, staff and faculty parking) , and

Whereas Robert Agrella unilaterally shut the project down when he became Special Trustee With Extraordinary Powers during the Accreditation crisis, even though at least 16 million dollars of foundation work including the construction of heating and cooling infrastructure had already been completed, plans developed and permits approved, and

Whereas the elected CCSF Board of Trustees has voted to re-start the PAEC, and Chancellor Mark Rocha has said he's "deeply committed" to completing the project but recommends construction be delayed until parking can be assured for students, and

Whereas the Avalon Corporation wants to use the adjacent lower reservoir, owned by the PUC, to build 1100 units of housing--too many of which, in our view, would be luxury condos and too few truly low-income units--and that proposed construction would eliminate over 1,000 parking spaces used by CCSF students, and

Whereas this sale of irreplaceable public assets would privatize the largest parcel of undeveloped land left in San Francisco, with the exception of the Shipyard, and would deprive CCSF students, faculty and staff of parking spaces they have used since 1958, and

Whereas Avalon Bay owns eight commercial developments in San Francisco that rent units for \$3,000-\$7,000 per month, and has been the object of picket lines and protests by community activists and union workers, and

Whereas if both the Avalon Bay development and the PAEC go forward simultaneously, this will create much disruption and noise in the area, impacting the quality of education at CCSF and severely damaging City College's capacity to re-grow enrollment just as the Free City initiative is taking off. There is no legitimate reason that a new corporate development project should be allowed to push ahead of a long-standing commitment made to the people of San Francisco who voted to fund the PAEC in 2001 and 2005, and

Whereas delaying construction of the PAEC until the parking issue is resolved is a bureaucratic and deceitful delay that is contrary to the interests of CCSF and the will of the voters, and

Whereas completing the PAEC would accomplish the following:
Keep CCSF's promise to SF voters by creating an accessible venue for community-based arts and showcasing the famous Diego Rivera mural, which would be visible 24 hours a day from Frida Kahlo Way and would also

- Build enrollment by signaling a new day at City College, and by bringing thousands of people to the college for events
- Replace the inadequate Diego Rivera Theater and support artistically and culturally the talented students that come to City College;
- Enable CCSF to offer training for good union jobs in theater, event-staging and technology;
- Bring in new resources. A similar center at Folsom Lake College brought in \$2.75 million in ticket sales alone during its first year; the PAEC could also be rented out for festivals and events,
- Give the SF voters confidence that bond issue commitments are being met at last, paving the way for a future City College bond issue in 2022,

Therefore Be It Resolved that the San Francisco Labor Council support the prompt construction of the Performing Arts Education Center at the CCSF Ocean Campus in accordance with the wishes of the San Francisco public and voters.

Submitted by AFT 2121 and unanimously adopted by the San Francisco Labor Council on August 13, 2018.

Respectfully,



Rudy Gonzalez
Interim Executive Director

LENNY CARLSON
Music Instructor, CCSF
Member, AFT 2121
7/10/2018

**IN SUPPORT OF THE AFT 2121 RESOLUTION
TO COMPLETE THE PERFORMING ARTS EDUCATION CENTER NOW**

The best things about SF historically have been the diversity of its population, the progressive nature of its politics and the wealth and range of its artistic expression. No institution, locally or nationally, has exemplified these qualities more than City College of San Francisco does.

CCSF was founded in 1935 as a 2-year school and is now part of a system of 115 community colleges spread throughout California.

What CCSF lacks that all others colleges in the system have is an auditorium. For that reason, CCSF is considered to be technically an *incomplete institution*. (!) Our small Drama theatre, the Diego Rivera, seats 286, woefully inadequate for a college that has roughly 2000 employees and 30,000 students at the Ocean Campus alone. We've had to hold recent college-wide meetings in the gymnasium.

The Music Department and the Theater Arts Department have never had adequate practice, rehearsal or performance space at the college. This is absurd, considering that San Francisco is a destination city known around the world for its arts organizations (SF Symphony, Opera, Ballet, SFJazz, many renowned museums, etc.) along with its tech industries and great food.

The Music Department has thousands of students that enroll in classes every year and just a handful of practice rooms. Because of this situation, there is no MUSIC MAJOR available at CCSF, although all the classes exist to fulfill such a major. There are also no spaces in which individual instrumental or vocal lessons can be given. People of all ages need music in their lives - for creative expression, therapy and quality of life. Along with the Music and Theater Arts Departments, the college and the community have suffered greatly from the lack of appropriate support.

There were SF city bonds passed in 2001 and 2005 to help fund the construction of the PAEC. The SF Community College District has the money in hand to begin the project, and about \$25 million has already been spent on the project. As of 2012, the PAEC was shovel-ready, with award-winning architecture and design teams having gotten all the approvals from the Department of State Architects. Unfortunately the building, which would be a spectacular addition to the college and community, has been a political football for many years.

There would be a profound benefit to the Labor Movement in SF to have the project proceed. There are hundreds of construction, electrical and plumbing jobs

involved in the building phase. There would be many permanent jobs involved in maintaining the building. There would also be sites for training: student certificates, internships, apprenticeships and others.

Because of the continuing tech boom and all the other growth in the Bay Area, there is much demand for trained personnel to work in the conventions, conferences, corporate meetings and the like being held at the Moscone Center, major hotels and similar venues throughout the region.

Where do IATSE and other unions go for training these days? They have to travel 100 miles NE to Folsom Lake Community College, location of the Brice Harris Three Stages Center for the Performing Arts, which opened in 2011, and features stages designed by the same theater designers that designed our PAEC auditorium and theaters.

Rentals for training and performances, along with ticket sales, brought the city of Folsom, CA about \$3.5M in the Harris Center's first year of existence, and that figure has increased annually. It's reasonable to expect that the PAEC could generate substantially more income than that.

San Francisco has numerous local arts organizations badly in need of a venue. The PAEC would serve the entire south end of the city – indeed it would be the only available major performance space between SF Civic Center and San Mateo on the Peninsula. It would not compete with Davies, the Opera, Zellerbach and other large venues that host touring performers.

It would be more for local artists, students and the community. The larger spaces could be used by any college department or for community meetings; it isn't exclusively for Music and Theatre Arts. Broadcasting, Dance, Cinema, Speech and Debate, and the Spoken Arts would all have an important footprint. The iconic Diego Rivera Mural that brings viewers from all over the world is scheduled to be permanently housed in the lobby of the main auditorium.

The Performing Arts Education Center would be a win-win for City College and the San Francisco Bay Area as a whole. It would focus deserved attention on the college as a vital and progressive cultural institution, ready to serve the future generations that live, work, study and create in this unique city. Stopping the project was illegal and directly contradicted the wishes of the voters of SF. Please support the AFT 2121 Resolution that addresses these issues.

(Thanks to Madeline Mueller for editing and fact-checking)

KRONOSQUARTET

KRONOS PERFORMING ARTS ASSOCIATION

Alex Randolph
President, Board of Trustees
City College of San Francisco
50 Frida Kahlo Way
San Francisco, CA 94112

Dear President Randolph and Members of the Board of Trustees,

On behalf of San Francisco's multiple Grammy Award-winning Kronos Quartet and the board and staff of the nonprofit Kronos Performing Arts Association, I urge you to proceed with the completion of the City College of San Francisco's Performing Arts Education Center (PAEC) in one phase, as originally proposed.


We emphatically oppose modification of the Facilities Master Plan in any way that does not culminate in construction of the entire PAEC — including all spaces designed for practice, teaching, media production and other purposes, in addition to performance. Any attempt to build the PAEC in two or more phases deviates substantially from the approved design of the project, and will impact the ability of the performing arts program at City College of San Francisco (CCSF) to engage with students.

Kronos is deeply committed to mentorship of the next generations of artists, and recognizes the vital service CCSF provides by ensuring affordable access to education for those who otherwise may be excluded from receiving it. The performing arts generate substantial economic and social benefits for the City of San Francisco and the State of California, and are therefore a valuable curricular program of CCSF which requires support in the form of fully functional spaces and modern technical resources.

In part, CCSF's mission is to provide "educational programs and services that promote student achievement and life-long learning" and states that students "will improve their critical thinking, information competency, communication skills, ethical reasoning, and cultural, social, environmental, and personal awareness and responsibility." Access to the performing arts in a professional setting enables students and other participants to achieve all of this and much more.

We hope that the Board of Trustees will fulfill its responsibility to these goals and to the community at large by maintaining the course previously set forth — construction of the complete PAEC, according to plan.

Sincerely,



Janet Cowperthwaite
Managing Director, Kronos Quartet/Kronos Performing Arts Association

1242 Ninth Avenue San Francisco, California 94122 USA
Tel: 415.731.3533 Fax: 415.664.7590 E-Mail: office@kronosarts.com
www.kronosquartet.org

John Adams

To Whom It May Concern:

I write in support of City College of San Francisco's Performing Arts & Education Center (PAEC).

The PAEC will be a major addition to San Francisco's famously varied cultural life. What to my mind makes its creation doubly important is that it will service the artistic activities and arts education not of a narrow slice of the "elite," but rather of a vast and "broadband" range of ethnic and economic demographic in the Bay Area.

While San Francisco is home to a world-famous orchestra, opera house and ballet company, those institutions are richly endowed by the city's wealthiest corporations and donors. I know this, because as a composer and conductor whose career has enjoyed decades of support from the generosity of these funders, I am fully aware that their audience, however intellectually keen and enthusiastic, is largely made up of the same demographic.

We all know that, despite the current controversies surrounding City College, it remains absolutely essential as an affordable and accessible source of learning, skill-acquisition and cultural growth. The PAEC, already twice approved by San Francisco voters, should not fall prey to hectic political machinations or cynical budget maneuvering. The center will provide an immeasurable shot in the arm to our artistic and multicultural profile. To arbitrarily cancel its creation would be to foolishly misunderstand the importance of arts education in every citizen's life.

John Adams
Composer, conductor
Pulitzer Prize in Music, 2003

5

From Geri Vahey, Flood Avenue

Ocean Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way safety and traffic : I am very concerned about unsafe conditions between the freeway offramp, the Balboa Park BART Station, and the Balboa Reservoir. The street conditions should be dealt with before construction. We will also want to address this at the September CAC meeting, where the whole focus will be transportation, and SFMTA will be present. Make the re-construction of the 280 offramp onto Ocean Avenue and the safety improvements on Ocean Avenue precede any construction on the reservoir. Study existing traffic gridlock on Frida Kahlo & Ocean Ave and find ways to mitigate before adding hundreds of new residents.

Permit Parking: Explore permit parking for the area of Sunnyside nearest the project site. If Permit Parking is introduced to help current neighborhoods, I'm sure all existing neighborhoods would like permits that are *unique* (different from the proposed new housing).

City College Parking: Push the developers and the City to construct a parking garage for City College as a precondition for any other development and consider constructing a garage on the East side of campus. This is critical, and it's shameful that it's not already in place.

BR CAC Comments by Jennifer Heggie June 10, 2019

COMMENT #1: CEQA Timing

An SFMTA plan that takes into account the development of the Balboa Reservoir should have been completed before the CEQA comment period. We request a fair amount of time for community discussion and input before the end of the Balboa Reservoir CEQA comment period. At present, the last date for completing CEQA review set by the Planning Department coincides exactly with the timing of the first public introduction of the public transportation and TDM plans, which is the evening of our next Balboa Reservoir Citizens Advisory Committee meeting in early September. This does not provide the Committee and community time to digest and explore transportation impacts, proposals and options and to offer helpful insights to improve the plan. It doesn't allow community review of whether mitigation efforts are adequate and whether there are or are likely to be resources to implement them. My understanding is that CEQA incorporates public transit, public education and VMT concerns. We would like at least a week to comment on the CEQA findings after the BRCAC transportation meeting.

◦ **COMMENT #2: Frida Kahlo Way and Ocean Avenue Transportation Improvement**

Studies, comments and recommendations have been made for several years to improve the transit, pedestrian, bicycle and driving experience along the Ocean Avenue corridor between the Balboa BART station and Frida Kahlo Way. This need, and these requests began long before any discussion of building a Balboa Reservoir development. There have been small improvements. But they've been inadequate.

During the City College semester, particularly between 9am and 2pm, Frida Kahlo Way is a crush of cars. The Balboa Reservoir will add thousands of residents who may need to do more than walk across the street for class or employment. The addition of so many new residents will cause severe stress to City College and neighborhood interests. I, and members of the SNA Balboa Reservoir Committee, would like to see plans backed up by financing to implement real improvements for the corridor prior to any approval of a new development.

◦ **COMMENT #3: Meet the Spirit of the BR CAC Principles and Parameters**

Principle #3: Help to alleviate City's undersupply of housing.

Parameters:

b. Create housing without compromising the quality of design or construction or outpacing needed transportation infrastructure.

COMMENT #4: Heavy truck impact:

Our Sunnyside neighbors would like to see heavy construction trucks avoid

Sunnyside streets. Many of our homes are almost 100 years old and shake when large trucks are in the area. Our streets are residential, narrow and are used by home-based service businesses and schools including at least nine pre-schools and two elementary schools within Sunnyside. Parents use our streets to drop off and pick up very young children. Other routes are a better fit for the movement of large construction vehicles.

•**COMMENT #5: Height Representation**

There have been multiple times that we have requested a visual representation of the stepped height changes of buildings from North to South. The developers have not yet provided this piece of information. It would be helpful to see the inclusion of City College building height plans and proposals in drawings when they are available, as well.

•**COMMENT #6: Mosquito Concerns**

We would like to ensure this development does not become a mosquito breeding center with a storm water management system doubling as greenspace in the middle of the development.

COMMENT #7: Impact to City College and Music

The construction of the Balboa Reservoir should not result in negative impacts to an important San Francisco public institution, City College. But the removal of a large area for parking that is owned by the public, the PUC, will have a serious impact on the future of the Performing Arts at City College. Because City College doesn't have the resources to add a parking garage, they are being forced to consider an alternate facilities plan which reduces their ability to perform their core function and the footprint of the planned Performing Arts Education Center. This alternate plan will allow a fraction more of the needed parking to be available for students and faculty along with inadequate music facilities. Reducing the footprint of the PAEC will have a severe and lasting impact on the music and performing arts departments and opportunities in these fields for San Franciscans who wouldn't otherwise have them. Without these classes, the San Francisco community at large will lose many fine musicians with a wide diversity of musical backgrounds who don't have the resources or time of day to study elsewhere.

We anticipate that the new Diego Rivera auditorium will be widely used and coveted by many departments on campus. In this new plan there is little space specifically set aside for music education and rehearsals and concerts by groups of musicians such as the choir, orchestra and bands. A few new music classrooms may be included in the new high-rise that would take the place of the music hall. But any music class space will share a building with the primary

BR CAC Comments by Jennifer Heggie June 10, 2019

purpose of that building: Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Math. The sounds produced may not be compatible with these other purposes, and even if there is adequate sound proofing, STEAM will be the priority.

Already there is inadequate space for musicians at City College. The choir has been squeezing into the library stairwell to perform it's quarterly recitals, anticipating that they would have a larger space soon.

I would like to see a solution that keeps the performing arts at City College whole and provides adequate parking for campus needs. If this means more of the Balboa Reservoir space for parking, then San Francisco should consider that option. 17% of the Balboa Reservoir space is expected to be fully financed by San Francisco. Could that be part of the solution?

May 29, 2019

TO: San Francisco Public Utilities Commissioners, The Balboa Reservoir

My name is Ann Clark. I am a City College Graduate.

I am asking that SFPUC help with the plans and suggestions for the Reservoir. You have the experience, expertise, planning, building and traffic experiences that are necessary and important for the college.

We need you, SFPUC, to help us and to be part of the design and planning for the reservoir. The 2006 City College report states that the Balboa Reservoir has been an open tract for the college since 2003. That track is still open now, 2019 – sixteen years after the 2003 report.

Only one building has been built in the reservoir, the Multiple Use Building (MUB). The 2003, 2004, 2006 reservoir plans, promises and bonds for the Performing Arts Center (PAC) were never completed. The PAC promise must be kept now – sixteen years later.

The reservoir is for the college – that is what it is for.

Right now, the lower Balboa Reservoir is a rectangular area surrounded by four sides.

First Side: Back yards of Plymouth Street houses that are swamped with streets of cars, trucks, bikes, motor cycles and delivery vans parked bumper to bumper on lawns and blocked drive ways that have become one-way streets for backed up traffic.

Second Side: Ocean Avenue: Three blocks of four stories high condos, apartments, shops as well the large, bumper to bumper congested day, night in and out MUNI transit systems for the college, Ocean and Ingleside residents.

Third Side: City College Multiple Use Building (MUB). There is a parking lot where the Performing Arts Center was to be completed by 2006.

Fourth Side: A narrow road in and out of the reservoir next to Riordan High School.

From: [aj](#)
To: [BRCAC \(ECN\)](#); [Amy O'Hair](#); [Michael Ahrens](#); [Brigitte Davila](#); [Robert Muehlbauer](#); [Howard Chung](#); [marktang.cac@gmail.com](#); [Christine Godinez](#); [Jon Winston](#)
Cc: [Alex Randolph](#); [Tom Temprano](#); [Brigitte Davila](#); [ivylee@ccsf.edu](#); [jrizzo@ccsf.edu](#); [Thea Selby](#); [Shanell Williams](#); [studenttrustee@mail.ccsf.edu](#); [mrocha@ccsf.edu](#); [facilities@ccsf.edu](#); [Rueben Smith](#)
Subject: 6/10/2019 Written Comment on Agenda Item 4: CCSF TDM lacks context
Date: Sunday, June 09, 2019 10:06:08 PM

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

Written Comment for Agenda Item 4 re: City College TDM, Parking Plan, FMP

The CCSF TDM fails to provide the context of it being a result of the Reservoir Project.

I comment in **red** on the Fehr & Peers "Key Questions" Summary:

1. *What level of investment does CCSF want to make in providing affordable transportation alternatives i.e., implementing the "Additional TDM" measures?*

- **The main reason the "core TDM measures", not to mention the "Additional TDM" measures, are called for is the impact of the Reservoir Project--the elimination of the existing student parking by the Reservoir Project. The CCSF TDM fails to address the overall context of the Balboa Reservoir Project's adverse impact on City College. The Reservoir Project needs to fully mitigate its adverse impact on City College instead of shifting the burden of mitigation onto City College stakeholders via TDM.**

2. *How will CCSF balance managing parking demand with sustainability goals and minimizing the impact of vehicle trips?*

- **The Fehr & Peers Plan & Analysis has as one of the TDM Goals, "Maintain just and equitable access to a CCSF Education."**
- **"Key Question" #2 does not mention this goal of "just and equitable access."**

My interpretation is that the importance of educational access has been subordinated to the needs of the Reservoir Project. CCSF Administration should not subordinate the needs of its stakeholders for the benefit of the Reservoir Project.

3. *Is meeting parking demand a financial investment priority for the College?*

- **Paying for meeting parking should not be a financial investment priority for CCSF.**

Rather, the Reservoir Project should have the obligation to pay for the

replacement parking that will be necessitated by its elimination of the existing student parking.

--aj

From: [aj](#)
To: sunnyside.balboa.reservoir@gmail.com; [Michael Ahrens](#); [Brigitte Davila](#); [Robert Muehlbauer](#); [Howard Chung](#); marktang.cac@gmail.com; [Christine Godinez](#); [Jon Winston](#); [BRCAC \(ECN\)](#)
Cc: [Shaw, Linda \(MYR\)](#); [Alex Randolph](#); [Tom Temprano](#); [Brigitte Davila](#); ivylee@ccsf.edu; jrizzo@ccsf.edu; [Thea Selby](#); [Shanell Williams](mailto:Shanell.Williams@studenttrustee@mail.ccsf.edu); studenttrustee@mail.ccsf.edu; facilities@ccsf.edu; [Rueben Smith](#); [Mark Rocha](#)
Subject: For 6/10/2019--Inequity in TDM
Date: Monday, June 10, 2019 4:39:56 AM

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

BRCAC:

You will be presented with the CCSF Fehr & Peers TDM at your 6/10/2019 meeting.

The CCSF Fehr & Peers TDM Plan & Study is but one aspect of the overall Balboa Area TDM Plan that was initiated to address the impact of the Reservoir Project.

The following is a written comment that was submitted to BRCAC and Reservoir Community Partners, LLC (Avalon/Bridge) back in July of last year. The written comment was my critique based on the actual content of:

- Nelson/Nygaard TDM Framework
- Nelson/Nygaard Balboa Area TDM Existing Conditions Report
- Reservoir Community Partners, LLC Base Plan
- AECOM Transportation Analysis
- SFCTA Prop K Grant for "Balboa Area TDM Study"
- NAIOP/Haas School of Business Golden Shovel Challenge: "Westwood Terrace in Balboa Park"
- May 2016 CCSF Facilities Planning Survey on Transportation & Parking
- Sunshine Ordinance document: 2014 email from Jeremy Shaw of Planning Dept to AECOM Transportation Analyst

--aj

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

From: aj <ajahjah@att.net>

To: BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>; Shanahan Thomas (ECN) <thomas.shanahan@sfgov.org>; balrescacchair@gmail.com

Cc: balboareservoir@gmail.com <balboareservoir@gmail.com>; Joe Kirchofer <joe_kirchofer@avalonbay.com>

Sent: Saturday, July 7, 2018, 9:35:50 AM PDT

Subject: additional comment for 7/9/2018 BRCAC Transportation meeting

BRCAC:

A few days ago I had sent you a Written Comment on Transportation that cited a UCB Haas School of Business "Westwood Terrace" study/ proposal.

The Written Comment quoted "Key Challenges" from that study proposal. I urge you to examine how the Reservoir Project has addressed those "Key Challenges" --in particular:

2. As the largest student parking area on-campus, preservation of parking capacity on the Balboa Reservoir is a focal point for both the City College and the local community.

3.

Due to limited access points and large influx of new residents, traffic impact and flow is a primary concern for the project.

The Reservoir Community Partners, LLC's (Avalon-Bridge) Base Plan shows motor vehicle access at two points: Lee Avenue (Whole Foods exit) and North Street (adjacent to Riordan High). This confirms the Haas Business School study's observation of "limited access points and large influx of new residents."

Yet the Reservoir Project's solution has been TDM and Residential Permit Parking which is totally deficient in addressing a "Key Challenge."

To refresh your memory, please consider and review the following (from an earlier submission regarding the Nelson-Nygaard TDM Framework) for your Transportation discussion:

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:

**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.

WILLFUL EXCLUSION OF COMPREHENSIVE PARKING ASSESSMENT

Sunshine Ordinance documents reveal the following:

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 [Balboa Reservoir parking lots--aj] 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.”

MANIPULATION AND BIAS IN CITY’S SURVEY OF CITY COLLEGE PARKING

The Reservoir Project's data collection was deliberately skewed to minimize apparent parking demand at City College. It did this by collecting PM data from 10 pm to 12:30 am when no classes are in session. From the Reservoir Project's Balboa Area TDM Existing Conditions Report: *"The surveys were conducted during two periods; midday, between 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM; and late evening, between 10:00 PM to 12:30 AM."*

Why would a parking survey be performed between 10pm and 12:30am when any fool could tell you that the CCSF parking lot would be empty?

DELIBERATELY OBSCURED: CONTEXT OF RESERVOIR BEING A NEW PROJECT

The TDM Study was a response to community concerns about transportation issues that would be generated by the new Reservoir Project that would impact 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.

The TDM Framework fails to acknowledge the fact that the Balboa Reservoir sub-area, as a new proposed project, is responsible for mitigation of its adverse impacts. Instead, the TDM Framework presents the Reservoir Project as a fact-on-the-ground with importance equal to--if not greater than--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

Page 18 of the TDM Framework has a section entitled "Parking availability." The section brings up Balboa Park Station and City College as mahor trip generators. The section says that concerns have been expressed about

parking during class times. **Yet this "Parking availability" section pointedly avoids any mention whatsoever of the impact of 2,200 new residents in a new residential project projected to contain about 550 parking spaces!**

On page 25, 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 car use target for new Balboa Reservoir residents to be **60%**.
 - In comparison, CCSF student car use is already down to **35%** and CCSF employee car use is already down to **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 Orwellian vacuous and 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 smarts to realize that transportation is an issue only 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.

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

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 or for the neighborhoods.

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.

From: [aj](#)
To: [BRCAC \(ECN\); bd@briggitedavila.com; rmuehlbauer@live.com; jon.winston.brcac@outlook.com; sunnyside.balboa.reservoir@gmail.com; Mikeahrens5@gmail.com; hnchung@yahoo.com; marktang.cac@gmail.com; cgodinez@lwhs.org](#)
Subject: On 17% "Additional Affordable"
Date: Friday, June 07, 2019 3:31:52 PM
Attachments: [Budget Analyst on additional 17%.docx](#)
[17% additional affordable chart.pdf](#)

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

BRCAC:

The 17% "Additional Affordable" is going to be financed by public monies.

As such, the Reservoir Project should not claim credit for the 17% "Additional Affordable" **that will be publicly-funded**. It is only by taking undeserved credit for the 17% "Additional Affordable" that the Reservoir Project can claim to be 50% affordable.

Objectively, Reservoir Community Partners, LLC project will have 60% market-rate/40% affordable split.

The following written comment, with 2 attachments, has been submitted to the Planning Commission for their consideration:

President Melgar, Vice President Koppel, Commissioners Fung, Hillis, Johnson, Moore, Richards:

Planning Dept staff will be presenting the Balboa Reservoir Project to you on June 10, 2019.

1. Deception of "50% affordable" or "up to 50% affordable"

The Balboa Reservoir Project has been promoted consistently by Planning Dept staff as providing "50% affordable" or "up to 50% affordable" housing. However this representation of "50% affordable" is deceptive and misleading.

It is deceptive because the 17% "Additional Affordable" will not be provided by Reservoir Community Partners, LLC (Avalon/Bridge). The 17% "Additional Affordability" will not be financed and built by Reservoir Community Partners. Rather, the 17% "Additional Affordable" will be coming entirely from public monies.

The fact that the 17% "Additional Affordable" will not be borne by Reservoir Community Partners, LLC is confirmed by the BOS Budget Analyst's analysis of the project's "Findings of Fiscal Responsibility and Feasibility."

Please see the attached "The 50% Affordable Deception" and Chart.

Bottom line: **The actual and objective market-rate/affordable split is 60/40; NOT the 50/50 split that has been misleadingly marketed. The misleading representation of "50% Affordable" only facilitates privatization of public assets.**

2. Impact on City College

The PUC Reservoir lot has historically been used for CCSF student parking. Student parking is the existing condition.

The Reservoir Project fundamentally dumps the adverse impact of the elimination of 1,000 spaces onto City College. Elimination of 1,000 spaces will severely impair student, faculty, and staff access to City College. Yet the Reservoir Project's primary response has been TDM, asking City College stakeholders to reduce car usage. This fundamentally shifts the burden of mitigation of the Reservoir Project's impact onto its victims.

Bottom line: **Reservoir Community Partners, LLC needs to fully mitigate the elimination of student parking by replacing the lost parking and paying for new parking on City College property.**

Submitted by:
Alvin Ja

THE 50% AFFORDABLE DECEPTION

The Balboa Reservoir Project takes credit for the 17% “Additional Affordable” that will be paid for with public monies as being part its project. This is deceptive advertising.

The 17% “Additional Affordable” is not objectively part of the Reservoir Community Partners, LLC (Avolon/Bridge) project.

Although marketed as 50% affordable, in reality, the Reservoir Community Partners project is a 60/40 split (60% market-rate/40% affordable—see yellow crosshatch on chart for 1100 units).

From BOS Budget Analyst’s Report regarding 17% Additional Affordable:

Uncertain Financing for Affordable Housing Not Financed by Reservoir Community Partners

Fourth, the development of the additional 17 percent affordable housing does not have identified financing sources. Potential sources identified in the Development Overview for the additional 17 percent affordable housing units include future voter approval of gross receipts taxes and state housing bond ballot measures, General Fund revenues generated by the project, State grants or loans. BRIDGE Housing, Mission Housing, and Habitat for Humanity would be responsible to develop the additional 17 percent affordable housing units.

Also, ownership of the land on which the additional 17 percent of affordable housing would be built has not been defined. The Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) could potentially own the land and enter into long term ground leases with affordable housing developers, which is the current practice of MOHCD. The Board of Supervisors should request MOHCD to report back to the Board of Supervisors early in the process of negotiations between the City and Reservoir Community Partners on (a) potential financing sources for the additional 17 percent affordable housing; (b) whether the City will own any land on which 100 percent affordable housing developments are constructed; and (c) conformance of the additional 17 percent affordable housing units to City policy and requirements.

