

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

**DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC DURING
6/13/16 REGULAR MEETING**

AND

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

Period: 5/25/16 – 6/13/16

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

**DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC DURING
6/13/16 REGULAR MEETING**

**City College of San Francisco
Multi-Use Building, Room 140
55 Phelan Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112**

Monday, June 13, 2016

6:15 PM

Regular Meeting



June 13, 2016

Ref: Balboa Reservoir Mixed-Use Development Proposal

Dear Lisa Spinali and Members of the Balboa Reservoir Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC),

I'm writing on behalf of the 300 member organizations and individuals of the San Francisco Housing Action Coalition (SFHAC), a 17-year-old nonprofit that advocates for housing solutions at all levels of affordability.

The City is enduring an unprecedented housing affordability and displacement crisis whose primary cause is a lack of new housing that would relieve the enormous pressure being put on the City's growing population on an inadequate housing stock. In light of this, the long fallow Balboa Reservoir site presents an terrific opportunity that comes along very rarely. This opportunity must not be squandered.

The SFHAC has been tracking the Balboa Reservoir project for over a year and is keenly interested in this regionally important proposal moving forward. It is our belief that a well-designed project would become an enormous asset to the evolving Balboa Park Plan Area, one that promotes a desirable, livable neighborhood. It would also help improve the City's social, cultural and economic diversity, a vital priority.

The following are SFHAC's suggestions on the project's key parameters.

Height Limits

The Balboa Reservoir site is located adjacent to an important regional transit node and is a logical place to build lots of transit-oriented housing. We should therefore not be timid about heights at this location. With good project design, sculpting and setbacks along main thoroughfares, it's possible to build graceful, inviting housing that enhances the neighborhood's sense of place. We believe that at this location taller heights can be consistent with excellent open spaces, community-serving ground floor uses and activation of the sidewalks and pedestrian realm.

Reducing heights limits from 85' to 65' as was indicated by the CAC earlier, is counterproductive to maximizing housing affordability. Unless there's a public subsidy available (which does not appear to be the case here), the funding necessary to support affordable housing comes from increasing the overall amount of market-rate housing. We would note that, in areas that already allow for Type V construction, the City's building code will soon change to allow five stories of

wood frame over two stories of concrete podium, which would build 75-foot buildings. A building of 65 feet height would not even reach what the code would allow.

Density

Reducing the project's heights also reduces its density. There are proposals from some groups that only want 500 units built on this 17-acre site, or about 29 units per acre. This is unacceptable and much more in keeping with suburban land use patterns. We noted in our recent blog (*Don't Let Balboa Reservoir Be A Missed Opportunity* <http://www.sfhac.org/dont-let-balboa-reservoir-missed-opportunity/>) that several other large City projects (including Parkmerced, Schlage Lock, Mission Rock and Pier 70) have adopted densities of 75 to 85 units per acre that include elevated levels of affordability. The SFHAC believes that building 1,200 to 1,500 homes here is of vital regional interest given the access to transit.

Affordability

The SFHAC supports the *maximum amount* of subsidized housing at the Balboa Reservoir site. In order to achieve this, it is necessary to build the maximum amount of *unsubsidized* housing possible. Building a suburban-style project with only 500 units makes it impossible to achieve the high levels of affordability that many are demanding.

The Mayor's Office of Housing and other City agencies have been clear the City does *not* have the resources to subsidize permanently affordable housing at Balboa Reservoir unless they are taken from existing housing commitments made elsewhere.

In addition, about two weeks ago, Governor Jerry Brown made an important announcement that signals a potentially profound change to the state's housing policies. Its first point is that the state must begin allowing housing that incorporates increased heights and densities as a tool to achieve higher affordability. Its second point is that he does not favor using scarce state funding to subsidize affordable housing. If the City cannot fund the subsidized housing demanded, it's becoming even less likely that the state will.

Finally, it doesn't make sense to demand higher-than-mandated levels of subsidized housing without offering compensating financial incentives such as increased height and density or perhaps financial tools such as impact fee waivers. While the SFHAC would support a 100 percent affordable project at this site, as some have demanded, it's not clear to us where the funding for it would be obtained.

We suggest that any future development proposals for the site should offer various affordability scenarios for different income levels and explain how they could be achieved.

Parking

The SFHAC believes that the demand made by some groups for 1:1 car parking at a major transit node is not defensible and plainly against the principles of a transit-first City. Building

parking is incredibly expensive. Our estimates are that building costs run about \$50,000 to \$100,000 per underground space. These simple metrics indicate that 10 parking spaces are about equivalent to the cost of an affordable home. Building high amounts of parking necessarily reduces funding to subsidize affordability, open space or community serving amenities.

In cities around the world, urban planners are creating innovative tools to reduce reliance on private auto usage while ensuring the resident's mobility and reducing traffic congestion. These tools would be identified during the Transportation Demand Management studies that the City now requires on large developments as part of the environmental review. The SFHAC does not believe that requiring a traffic analysis before issuing the request for qualifications (RFQ) or even the request for proposals (RFP) is necessary.

The SFHAC would strongly support using this incredibly valuable land in ways that help address the stark challenges that confront our City, region and state. These include solving our housing affordability and displacement crises, providing more housing for middle-income, and integrating it with better solutions for transportation.

The SFHAC looks forward to working with the CAC as it moves towards issuing a RFQ or RFP.

Sincerely,



Tim Colen, Executive Director

CC: Emily Lesk, MOEWD
John Rahaim, Director of SF Planning
Supervisor Norman Yee, District 7
Supervisor John Avalos, District 11

CAC Meeting June 13, 2016

Public Testimony

Anita Theoharis

The Westwood Park Association advocates for 1 to 1 parking for the development and retention of parking for CCSF students.

Housing on the Balboa Reservoir is an issue that has been around for decades. The Balboa Station Area Plan was completed in 2009 and determined that 500 units would be worst case scenario and there would be a deficit in parking that would be problematic.

But so far we get the feeling that that the City has largely ignored us, while sending a special invitation to participate to BARF, a group financed by developers and others seeking to label us as NIMBY's.

But how can we be Nimby's when we are agreeable to a number of units that represent the maximum number as the City itself determined just a few years ago? Does advocating for the students of City College make us Nimby's? Does urging the City to address the real world we all face in terms of traffic, parking and the limitations of mass transit make us NIMBY's? Does urging open space make us Nimby's? Is advocating for a project whose quality of life for its future residents by providing open space and adequate parking and addressing their traffic issues make us Nimby's?

We have coalesced behind an approach that would be a a win-win for all stakeholders. To be clear, it is not what we would normally want, but it is one that recognizes the realities of the housing shortage, affordability issues, the needs of CCSF students and faculty. It is an approach that needs to be seriously considered by the Mayor, Planning and, most importantly, you, the individual members of the CAC.

I also submit a summary of the WPA reasonable position as to the components of the proposed development.

Thank you.

Attachment: as noted

June 13, 2016

To: Balboa Reservoir Citizens Advisory Committee

From: Anita Theoharis - Westwood Park Resident
e-mail: atheoharis@sbcglobal.net



Below is a summary of the reasonable position of the Westwood Park Association ("WPA") Board of Directors and the 311 property owners that responded to a survey asking for input on our position.

As you know, Westwood Park is, a planned unit development and the City of San Francisco's only Residential Character District.

The WPA Board previously sent all Westwood Park property owners a survey asking for their input on the proposed Balboa Reservoir project, the most significant development project on the west side since Park Merced. The response was incredible, with 311 property owners out of 685 responding.

Equally remarkable, those responses demonstrated a communitywide consensus on a reasonable solution that addresses the needs of all stakeholders impacted

Our community agrees that the project should address housing needs but insist that it must also accommodate the needs of City College students by maintaining sufficient parking, include no more units than the infrastructure can support, include a parking space for each unit, include affordability and ownership opportunities for the middle class and take into account our legal status as the only Residential Character District (RCD) in San Francisco.

Those responses were submitted to the Balboa Reservoir Citizen's Advisory Committee ("CAC") which is empowered to coordinate community input in the development process and make recommendations on all aspects of the proposed project. We also submitted them to Mayor Ed Lee, the City's Planning Department and our District 7 Supervisor, Norman Yee. We also met with Supervisor Yee.

But so far we get the feeling that that the City has largely ignored us, while sending a special invitation to participate to BARF, a group financed by developers and others seeking to label us as NIMBY's.

But how can we be Nimby's when we are agreeable to a number of units that represent the maximum number as the City itself determined just a few years ago? Does advocating for the students of City College make us Nimby's? Does urging the City to address the real world we all face in terms of traffic, parking and the limitations of mass transit make us NIMBY's? Does urging open space make us Nimby's? Is advocating for a project whose quality of life for its future

residents by providing open space and adequate parking and addressing their traffic issues make us Nimby's?

We have coalesced behind an approach that would be a a win-win for all stakeholders. To be clear, it is not what we would normally want, but it is one that recognizes the realities of the housing shortage, affordability issues, the needs of CCSF students and faculty. It is an approach that needs to be seriously considered by the Mayor, Planning and, most importantly, you, the individual members of the CAC.

To be more specific:

The project must be no larger than 500 units

Housing on the Balboa reservoir is an issue that has been around for decades. The latest city study was done in 2009, see (http://sf-planning.org/balboa-park-station-area-plan#final_docs). The City itself determined that the maximum number of units that could be accommodated by this site was 500. It also recognized Westwood Park as a Special Use District under Section 244. Over 90% of WPA respondents supported that maximum of 500.

The City now acts as if that study was never done. Numbers as high as 6000 units have been floated by pro-housing activists and Planning refuses to acknowledge our RCD status in the parameters that will govern developer bids. Planning and the Mayor's office has stated that they have no specific number in mind **and want to leave that up to the developers** (though the, Program Director from the Mayor's Office of Economic Development has said that the desire is to build "as many units as possible").

Each unit must have an assigned parking space

To mitigate the impact of the project, 1:1 parking is crucial.

At this point, it appears that Planning and the Mayor's staff do not agree. The proposed parameters state that "overall site parking ratio should be no greater than .05 parking spaces per unit". This would reduce parking to one half of whatever number of units that get built. For example, if 2000 units are built, only 1000 parking spaces will be allowed.

5 acres must be dedicated to open space and include a buffer along Plymouth Avenue

The essence of our neighborhood is the 28 foot height of our homes. Imagine the impact substantially taller structures immediately adjacent to your backyard would have on your light and sense of space. That is what our neighbors along

Plymouth and the eastern side of Westwood Park face if it's up to the politically connected pro-housing groups that continually lobby the City.

WPA has advocated for a height limit of 28 feet for structures closest to Plymouth along with 1.5 acres of open space to act as a buffer along Plymouth.

Planning has refused to recognize our RCD status in their parameters for the project and even reneged on an agreement to do so. But they have indicated the possibility to scale down the height of structures adjacent to Westwood Park.

Existing parking capacity for City College students must be preserved

We all know that the parking lots on the site are full during the school year. Planning and the Mayor's staff appear to believe that if parking is eliminated, students will use mass transit. We know better. If the number of spaces is reduced, students will still drive to class, many because they have no choice or do not trust Muni to get them to class on time.

The proposed parameters address CCSF reservoir parking as follows: "Phase the project in such a way that changes to the current parking lot can occur gradually allowing for incremental adaptations rather than the wholesale removal of all parking spaces at once". **Notice that this does not address preserving student parking capacity.** In fact, the amount of student parking has already decreased over the years with the development of the Wellness Center and will most likely further decrease when/if the Performing Arts center is built. And if CCSF enrollment increases to previous levels as anticipated and desired by CCSF, **preserving current CCSF parking capacity should be critical, necessary and non-negotiable.**

Planning has posted an online survey for CCSF students addressing parking and transit issues. But, as far as we can tell, anyone can respond without confirmation of student status. Expect a heavy response from anti-car activists.

Affordability and ownership opportunities for the middle class need to be a key component

WPA agrees with the City that 33% of the units be affordable be with 18% for middle income and 15% for low income but urges that any units over 33% be for middle income. We are also urging that a significant amount of ownership opportunities be provided.

The City would apply that allocation to all affordable units and generally agrees that there should be a mix of rental and ownership.

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

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

Period: 5/25/16 – 6/13/16

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Randy Miller [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2016 8:40 PM
To: NormanYee@sfgov.org; Lee, Mayor (MYR); johnrahaim@sfgov.org;
jeremyshaw@sfgov.org; michaelmartin@sfgov.org; BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Balboa Reservoir Project

The WPA (Westwood Park Association) board and our community agree to the following points about the Balboa Reservoir Project :

- 1) The proposed project must be no larger than 500 units
- 2) Each unit must have an assigned parking space
- 3) 5 acres must be dedicated to open space , with 2 acres being a contiguous park , and include a 28foot height limit and buffer along Plymouth Avenue
- 4) Existing parking capacity for City College students must be preserved.
- 5) Affordability and ownership opportunities for the middle class need to be a key component.
- 6) An project must take into consideration our legal status as the only Residential Character District (RCD) in San Francisco.

As a long time resident of the area concerned (30 years) my wife and I both are committed to the above points regarding the Balboa Reservoir Project . In looking forward to a favorable response to our requests , we remain , sincerely

Bruce and Conchita Miller
[REDACTED]

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Thomas Kowalski [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2016 7:05 AM
To: Randy Miller
Cc: NormanYee@sfgov.org; Lee, Mayor (MYR); johnrahaim@sfgov.org; jeremyshaw@sfgov.org; michaelmartin@sfgov.org; BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Re: Balboa Reservoir Project

I agree to these points
Tom Kowalski
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 7, 2016, at 8:40 PM, Randy Miller <randy44@gmail.com> wrote:

The WPA (Westwood Park Association) board and our community agree to the following points about the Balboa Reservoir Project :

- 1) The proposed project must be no larger than 500 units
- 2) Each unit must have an assigned parking space
- 3) 5 acres must be dedicated to open space , with 2 acres being a contiguous park , and include a 28foot height limit and buffer along Plymouth Avenue
- 4) Existing parking capacity for City College students must be preserved.
- 5) Affordability and ownership opportunities for the middle class need to be a key component.
- 6) An project must take into consideration our legal status as the only Residential Character District (RCD) in San Francisco.

As a long time resident of the area concerned (30 years) my wife and I both are committed to the above points regarding the Balboa Reservoir Project . In looking forward to a favorable response to our requests , we remain , sincerely

Bruce and Conchita Miller
[REDACTED]

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Caryl Ito [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2016 7:16 AM
To: Randy Miller
Cc: NormanYee@sfgov.org; Lee, Mayor (MYR); johnrahaim@sfgov.org; jeremyshaw@sfgov.org; michaelmartin@sfgov.org; BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Re: Balboa Reservoir Project

Thank you Randy for getting involved! Hope you can attend meeting on Monday 6/13 of the CAC
Details in the letter
Public comments critical
Caryl Ito
WPA board member

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 7, 2016, at 8:40 PM, Randy Miller <randy44@gmail.com> wrote:

The WPA (Westwood Park Association) board and our community agree to the following points about the Balboa Reservoir Project :

- 1) The proposed project must be no larger than 500 units
- 2) Each unit must have an assigned parking space
- 3) 5 acres must be dedicated to open space , with 2 acres being a contiguous park , and include a 28foot height limit and buffer along Plymouth Avenue
- 4) Existing parking capacity for City College students must be preserved.
- 5) Affordability and ownership opportunities for the middle class need to be a key component.
- 6) An project must take into consideration our legal status as the only Residential Character District (RCD) in San Francisco.

As a long time resident of the area concerned (30 years) my wife and I both are committed to the above points regarding the Balboa Reservoir Project . In looking forward to a favorable response to our requests , we remain , sincerely

Bruce and Conchita Miller
[REDACTED]

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Proposed Balboa Reservoir project

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2016 8:38 AM
To: Shaw, Jeremy (CPC)
Subject: Proposed Balboa Reservoir project

Mr. Jeremy Shaw
City Planning Department

Dear Mr. Shaw,

I am a home owner in Westwood Park and I support the following recommendations of the Westwood Park Association regarding the proposed Balboa Reservoir project:

The proposed project must be no larger than 500 units, with each unit having an assigned parking space to prevent spillover parking into Westwood Park.

5 acres must be dedicated to open space, with 2 acres being a contiguous park, and, include a 28' height limit and a buffer along Plymouth Avenue.

Existing parking capacity for City College students must be preserved, again to prevent spillover parking into our already crowded Westwood Park streets.

Affordability and ownership opportunities for the middle class need to be a key component.

Any project must take into account our legal status as the only Residential Character District (RCD) in San Francisco.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Treasure Seamster
[REDACTED]

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of John Mongan [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2016 7:32 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Balboa Reservoir development

We are writing to express our support for the Westwood Park Association position on the impending Balboa Park development.

In particular, we are concerned that:

The development is limited to a reasonable size of no more than 500 units, so it doesn't overwhelm our long-established neighborhood.

There is at least one assigned parking space for each unit and that City College parking capacity is maintained. Promoting mass transit is a laudable goal, but this is best achieved by making public transit attractive, not by making driving difficult. Limiting parking will not stop people from having cars if they need them to get to school and work; it will just create traffic, pollution, noise and safety hazards that spill into adjoining neighborhoods as people circle endlessly searching for parking.

We recognize that there is a need for new and affordable housing in San Francisco and that these must be approached in an ecologically sensitive manner. At the same time, we hope that you will keep these points in mind to maintain the character and lifestyle of our city that has made it such a successful city and desirable place to live.

Thank you,

John Mongan, MD, PhD
Ann Mongan, PhD
[REDACTED]

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Adam Geller [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2016 9:52 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: density projections for balboa project

Hi Marcia,

I'm a SF resident. Like many here, I'm feeling despondent about the housing crisis we're facing. In a situation where so many people are moving to SF, it feels like the only solution is to just build more housing. As much as we can.

Things are so bad that I've stopped screening candidates who apply for jobs if they don't already live in SF because I fear that they can't find housing. Said another way, the housing crisis is affecting the growth of my business and, as a result, the tax dollars I'm sending to the city.

I know I'm not crazy about my fears since I know people who live here (and who have great jobs) and they can't find housing that is reasonably priced for more than a few months at a time.

This is why when I heard about the proposed lower-density option at the Balboa Reservoir I realized I needed to write you and urge you to choose to build more houses on this location.

We need more housing. All kinds. It would pain me to think that we might not take advantage of the opportunity this site poses.

Thank you for choosing what's right for this city in the long run.

Adam

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Tracie Wen [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 09, 2016 7:30 AM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Balboa Reservoir Project

To: The Members of the CAC Board

I am writing as a Westwood Park homeowner to strongly urge you to consider the following proposed recommendations of the Westwood Park Association members at you next and all future meetings:

1. The present existing CCSF parking capacity be preserved for the benefit of its students and faculty.
As one who went to a community college, I can say from personal experience that dedicated school parking was a paramount consideration not only for convenience, but for personal safety as well. Having dedicated school parking was a positive security "plus" when I had to attend evening classes. As crime has drastically increased in the past year in the city, I feel that all city agencies/elected officials should be even more proactive to keep all students, faculty and supportive staff safe with the present dedicated parking capacity for CCSF. It would be grossly unfair to said population and the surrounding neighborhoods (where students/faculty would park) to remove/decrease the present CCSF parking area capacity.
2. The proposed Balboa Reservoir Project site also should NOT exceed 500 units. Each unit of the site also must have a designated parking space.
1:1 parking for the site is not only fair to its future residents but also to the residents, schools and businesses that surround the site.
3. There should be a preserved standard of a 28" height limit on any future buildings at the proposed site and a buffered area along Plymouth Avenue. This is important to preserve the character and comfort of those who live along said perimeter.
4. Any project plans must be respectful and take lawful account of the legal status of Westwood Park as a Residential Character District (RCD). It is the only one of its kind in San Francisco. All of us who presently live in San Francisco are privileged to make our homes in such a storied and historic city. Please, let's not lose what made our city great in the first place: A place of historical significance, diversity and artistry.

I implore the Board to consider all the above points in the future when voting on the parameters that will determine the Balboa Reservoir Project.

Sincerely,

Tracie Wen
Westwood Park Homeowner

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Shaw, Jeremy (CPC)
Sent: Thursday, June 09, 2016 1:47 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: FW: Westwood Park concerns

From: Pauline Jue [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 09, 2016 1:45 PM
To: Rahaim, John (CPC); Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); Martin, Michael (ECN)
Subject: Westwood Park concerns

I live on Plymouth Avenue, right behind the reservoir where housing is being proposed. I have attended many of the neighborhood meetings and agree with the Westwood Park Association board that the project should not be larger than 500 units. Each unit must have an assigned parking space or we will have further crowding on our streets.

This housing must be targeted for middle class income families. There are plenty of other housing being developed that will be for higher incomes.

There should be at least 5 acres dedicated to open space, with 2 acres being a contiguous park, as there is no nearby green area. Any development must recognize and respect Westwood Park's legal status as a Residential Character District in San Francisco.

The height of the building should be no higher than 28' and provide a buffer area along Plymouth Avenue (to my neighbors' and my backyard area).

City College students will still need access to parking, or they will park in the narrow neighborhood streets, causing further congestion.

I am a native San Franciscan who loves living in my city. I can understand the need for more housing, but have grave concerns about the crowded housing being proposed and currently being built in the Westwood Park neighborhood. The current infrastructure (transportation, services, parking) barely supports the community now. Bringing more people into the area without addressing these concerns first would not be prudent.

Respectfully, Pauline Jue

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Wes Webb [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 09, 2016 2:56 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Balboa Reservoir project

We whole heartedly stand with the Westwood Park's position on the Balboa Reservoir project and expect your support on the issue.

Wesley Webb
Billy Fite

[REDACTED]

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2016 8:44 AM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Home Owner Concerns Reference the Balboa Reservoir Project

Dear CAC Board:

I have been a Westwood Park resident for over 15 years and a San Francisco resident since 1985. I chose to live in Westwood Park because of its charming character, detached homes, low crime rate, lack of traffic congestion and lack of tall buildings. Westwood Park is a special neighborhood and I enjoy the quality of life it affords me.

The pending Balboa Reservoir project has great potential to change the very character of the Westwood Park neighborhood. The size and scope of the project, lack of provision for adequate parking, potential for an increase in crime rate, increased traffic congestion and its overall potential adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood are serious consequences.

The Westwood Park Board has actively engaged with City officials and I agree with their recommendations below:

- The proposed project must be no larger than 500 units.
- Each unit must have an assigned parking space.
- 5 acres must be dedicated to open space, with 2 acres being a contiguous park, and, include a 28' height limit and a buffer along Plymouth Avenue.
- Existing parking capacity for City College students must be preserved.
- Affordability and ownership opportunities for the middle class need to be a key component.
- Any project must take into account our legal status as the only Residential Character District (RCD) in San Francisco.

The approach is reasonable and is compatible with the 2009 Balboa Station Area Plan (sf-planning.org/balboa-park-station-area-plan).

I respectfully request that you seriously consider the recommendations above, which consider the needs of our community and also provide reasonable support to the city's need for affordable housing.

Regards,
Yvonne Simonsen

[REDACTED]

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: TheObserver [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, June 11, 2016 10:52 AM
To: board@westwoodpark.com
Cc: Rahaim, John (CPC); Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); Martin, Michael (ECN); BRCAC (ECN); Lee, Mayor (MYR); norman.yee.bos@sfgov.org
Subject: WPA view of Balboa Project and lack of support by...

GOOD AFTERNOON WPA BOARD;

THE WPA BOARD AND OUR COMMUNITY AGREE:

- THE PROPOSED PROJECT MUST BE NO LARGER THAN 500 UNITS.
- EACH UNIT MUST HAVE AN ASSIGNED PARKING SPACE.
- 5 ACRES MUST BE DEDICATED TO OPEN SPACE, WITH 2 ACRES BEING A CONTIGUOUS PARK, AND, INCLUDE A 28' HEIGHT LIMIT AND A BUFFER ALONG PLYMOUTH AVENUE.
- EXISTING PARKING CAPACITY FOR CITY COLLEGE STUDENTS MUST BE PRESERVED.
- AFFORDABILITY AND OWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS NEED TO BE A KEY COMPONENT.
- ANY PROJECT MUST TAKE INTO ACCOUNT OUR LEGAL STATUS AS THE ONLY RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER DISTRICT (RCD) IN SAN FRANCISCO.

OVER ALL THE SIX BULLETS MENTION ABOVE IS GOOD BUT THE CITY GOVERNMENT HAVE ALREADY DECIDED HOW MANY POUNDS THEY ARE GOING TO PUT INTO A ONE-POUND BAG AND IT'S NOT GOING TO BE 15 OUNCES. OTHER PROJECTS IN THE CITY (WHICH HAS JUST BEEN VOTED BY THE FIFTH LARGEST CITIES IN THE NATION (USA) THE WORST CITY TO LIVE AND WORK IN) HAVE FORCED PEOPLE OUT OF DOWNTOWN AREAS AND TRYING TO BUILD AND MOVED THEM INTO OTHER HOUSING PROJECT AS IN BALBOA RESERVOIR AREA WHICH IS ALREADY OVER POPULATED WITH MULTIPLE FAMILIES LIVING IN ONE HOUSE WITH MULTIPLE CARS TO SUPPORT MULTIPLE FAMILIES.

OLD FRIENDS I GREW UP WITH IN THE SUNNYSIDE, INGLESIDE, ST. FRANCIS WOODS AND WESTWOOD PARK HAVE PACK THEIR BAGS AND HAVE LEFT THE CITY AFTER THE FIRST REACH OUT SMOKE SCREEN MEETING BY THE ED LEE'S PLANNERS OF THE BALBOA PROJECT. THEY SAW THE WRITING ON THE WALL AND IT WASN'T GOOD. IS THIS A PLAN BY THE CITY...?

BULLET	COMMENTS
1.)	LET'S SEE 500 UNITS, HOW MANY PEOPLE LIVE IN EACH UNIT?

	<p>TWO TO SIX HUMANS. THAT'S A LARGE FAMILY OR STUDENTS GOING TO CCSF THAT'S 1000 TO 3000 HUMANS.</p> <p>WE DON'T HAVE A VERY STRONG INFO STRUCTURE (WATER, SEWAGE, ELECTRICAL) NOW FOR THE CURRENT POPULATION.</p> <p>I KNOW THAT BASED ON LOW WATER PRESSURE COMING TO MY HOME AND WHEN YOU TURN ON A LIGHT AT NIGHT IT'S NOT BRIGHT ITS DULL ILLUMINATION AND WE JUST WENT THRU A LACK OF WATER AND IT'S STILL GOING ON.</p> <p>HOW DOES THE CITY PLAN TO FIND THE RESOURCES TO SUPPORT THE NEW RENTERS OF THE CITY?</p>
2.)	<p>YOU ARE GOING TO ADD 500 TO 1000 CARS AND EVEN MORE CARS ...</p> <p>TO AN OVER CROWED NEIGHBORHOOD ALREADY, NOT COUNTING ALL THE CCSF STUDENTS THAT DON'T USE THE CCSF PARKING LOT AND USE THE SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOODS TO PARK AND SLEEP...</p> <p>WILL THE NEW 1000 TO 3000 RENTERS BE CHARGE PARKING PERMITS IF SO, WILL WE FIND THEM PARKING IN OUR OVER CROWED NEIGHBORHOODS TO AVOID PAYING THE PARKING PERMIT.</p> <p>IT'S FUNNY WHEN YOU WAKE UP IN THE MORNING AND ON YOUR WAY TO WORK YOU NOTICE A YOUNG PERSON OR TWO SLEEPING IN A CAR OR EARLY IN THE MORNING THEY CLIMB OUT THROW THEIR SLEEPING BAG IN THE BACK AND TAKE OFF DOWN THE STREET HEADING FOR CITY COLLEGE. HMMM.... AND LEAVE THEIR CAR THREE OR FOUR BLOCKS AWAY FROM THE SCHOOL. DO THEY GET A PARKING TICKET HMMM...? MONEY FOR THE CITY GENERAL FUND.</p> <p>I KNOW OF PEOPLE IN THE SF FIRE DEPT. WHO DREAD TAKING CALLS IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD. DUE TO PARKED CARS (LARGE) ON BOTH SIDES OF THE STREET WHICH RESTRICT THE VERY LARGE FIRE ENGINES OR VERY WIDE PARAMEDICS TRUCKS TO TRAVEL FREELY. COMING FACE TO FACE WITH A CAR ON A CALL AND THE CAR DOESN'T GIVE WAY TO THE FIRE TRUCK HMMM... JUST THINK IF WE HAVE ANOTHER 1906 SITUATION AGAIN IN THE NEAR FUTURE PROBLEM....</p> <p>IS THE CITY STILL GETTING FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN SUPPORT OF TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT STUDY ...?</p> <p>THINK OF THE CITY AS A HEALTH BODY AND THE RESTRICTION THE FLOW OF CARS ON THE STREETS (VEINS AND ARTERIES) CAUSES HIGH RESTRICTIVE CAR FLOW (BLOOD FLOW) AND WHAT YOU SEE NOW IS HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE AND HIGH STRESS (ROAD RAGE).</p> <p>WHAT IS IT WHEN YOU PUT AN EXTREMELY LARGE BROKEN DOWN MUNI BUS DOWN A RESTRICTIVE STREET AND THE BUS STOPS WITH TWO CARS AHEAD OF THE BUS THE STOP OFF CENTERED AND OPENS THE DOOR AND THE RIDER STEPS DOWN BUT CANNOT GET OUT WITH BAGS DUE TO NO ROOM TO GET TO THE SIDEWALK AND THE CAR IS PARK LEGALLY.</p> <p>IT'S SAD WHAT THE CITY IS DOING TO THE FREEDOM OF THE CAR. THE CAR IS NOT EVIL IS THE SFMTA EVIL HMMM...</p>

3.)	<p>I WISH THIS BULLET COULD BE, BUT 500 UNITS AND A PARKING LOT THAT NEEDS TO HOLD 1000 CARS PLUS STUDENT PARKING YOU ARE GOING TO NEED A VERY LARGE BAG TO PUT THAT TEN POUNDS INTO....</p> <p>MORE REAL STATE LET'S TAKE OUT THE FIRE STATION AND THE MUNI TURN AROUND HMMM.... OR THE HIGH SCHOOL...</p>
4.)	<p>THIS BULLET IS POINTLESS DUE TO MOST STUDENT'S PARK IN THE SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOOD. INSTEAD OF GETTING A PARKING PERMIT OR PARKING TICKETS. AGAIN SAVING MONEY TO HAVE FUN(LIVE) IN A HIGH OVERHEAD CITY.</p> <p>THE CITY COULD SAVE MONEY FROM CANCELING THIS PROJECT AND UPGRADE CITY INFO STRUCTURE AND CLEAN UP THE CITY GARBAGE PROBLEM ON THE CITY STREETS AND HUMAN WASTE OR BUILD A RETAINING WALL AROUND THE CITY TO HOLD BACK THE RAISING SEA LEVEL DUE FROM THE MELTING ICE CAPS... ALL THAT VALUABLE LAND FILLED PROPERTY DOWNTOWN</p>
5.)	<p>THIS BULLET, IS A PIPE DREAM, I HOPE IT TAKES.... BUT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT REAL STATE AND WHO OWNS THE PROPERTY THE CITY.... LANDLORD TO THE PROJECT....</p>
6.)	<p>THIS BULLET, IF YOU LOOK AT OCEAN AVE IT'S STARTING TO LOOK LIKE THE MISSION ST. AND DOWNTOWN SAN FRANCISCO.</p> <p>HOW MANY STORES ARE THOSE BUILDING? WHAT IS THE DEFINITION OF A RESIDENTIAL SUBURB...? RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER DISTRICT (RCD)!!!</p> <p>I HAVE A FRIEND WHO WORKS AT A VERY LARGE PARKING LOT DOWN ON THE PENINSULA AND SHE HELPS THE TOURIST AFTER THEY RETURN FROM THERE SF VACATION....</p> <p>SHE ASKS THEM HOW WAS THEIR STAY IN THE CITY BY THE BAY...</p> <p>THE NICEST REPLY WAS "I'M GLAD I'M LEAVING THIS UNBELIEVABLE MISTAKE"</p> <p>OTHER REPLIES WENT DOWNHILL FROM THIS MISTAKE.</p> <p>HIGH CRIME CARS BREAK-INS BROKEN WINDOWS AND MISSING PERSONAL PROPERTY.</p> <p>GREAT MEMORIES OF THE TOURIST LEAVING WITH AND TALES TO BE TOLD TO THEIR FRIENDS NOT TO VISIT THE SLUM BY THE BAY....</p> <p>BEING WAYLAID BY GOD KNOWS WHO OR BEING SUBJECT TO PUBLIC SHOWS OF PUBLIC DEFECATION OF HUMAN WASTE.</p> <p>NOT VERY HAPPY WITH OVERPRICED RESTAURANTS, HOTELS, MOTELS, SOCIAL EVENTS AND PARKING (GARAGE AND METERS).</p>



Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Chad Balch [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, June 12, 2016 12:28 AM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Cc: board@westwoodpark.com; Kathy Balch
Subject: Balboa reservoir project and Westwood Park

Dear Citizen's Advisory Council Members,

We will not be able to attend the 6/13 meeting and just wanted to send you a note to let you know how concerned we are about the proposed Balboa Reservoir project. As you know, our Westwood Park neighborhood has unique legal status as a Residential Character District here in San Francisco. This special character and our quality of life would be adversely affected by development that is not a fit for the neighborhood. For 17 years we have lived here in Westwood Park, paid taxes, and voted, and have a healthy perspective on the situation. Our neighborhood community and board are in complete agreement about the potential negative impact that inappropriate development would have.

Specifically, it is very important to limit any residential project to 500 units, to ensure adequate parking with at least 1 space per unit, to provide 5 acres of open space with 2 acres of contiguous park. It is important to respect height limits, allow for adequate buffer space, and ensure that City College can meet its parking needs without relying on our neighborhood's streets.

Please help us support the continued special qualities of our neighborhood and not allow the Balboa Reservoir project to have a detrimental impact!

Thank you,

Chad & Kathy Balch

Chad Balch
[REDACTED]

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Steve Manseau [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, June 12, 2016 3:27 PM
To: Yee, Norman (BOS); Lee, Mayor (MYR); Rahaim, John (CPC); Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); Martin, Michael (ECN); BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Westwood Park/Balboa Reservoir

Dear City Officials,

I am writing to voice my support of the Westwood Park's stance on the proposed Balboa Reservoir Housing Development plan. I have been living in Westwood Park for the past 22 years, and I grew up in Westwood Park for the first 18 years of my life, and my father continues to live in the house that I grew up in.

The WPA board and our community agree:

- **The proposed project must be no larger than 500 units.**
- **Each unit must have an assigned parking space.**
- **5 acres must be dedicated to open space, with 2 acres being a contiguous park, and, include a 28' height limit and a buffer along Plymouth Avenue.**
- **Existing parking capacity for City College students must be preserved.**
- **Affordability and ownership opportunities for the middle class need to be a key component.**
- **Any project must take into account our legal status as the only Residential Character District (RCD) in San Francisco.**

Thank you,

Steve Manseau
[REDACTED]

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Lee Rawitscher [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 9:22 AM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Balboa Reservoir

Dear CAC,

I live at the Eastern end of Westwood Park, and I am very worried about the proposed future development of the Balboa Reservoir. I understand that the city wants to have more housing units available, but that can't be the only priority. What's the point of having more housing if you give up what makes the city so special? I strongly believe that any project must take into account the legal status of Westwood Park as the only Residential Character District in San Francisco, and I firmly stand behind the recommendations of the Westwood Park Association:

1. No more than 500 units total. The traffic on Ocean Avenue is already ridiculous. Sometimes it takes 20 minutes just to exit 280 and go half a mile down Ocean to get to my house. Adding all these new units without better infrastructure is just going to make matters worse.
2. EACH unit needs to have an assigned parking space. How can you seriously consider anything less than that? Are people making the decision not familiar with parking in San Francisco?
3. FIVE acres must be dedicated to open space with TWO acres of contiguous park and include a 28' height limit along Plymouth Ave. Do we really want the city to become just a bunch of cement buildings crammed together?
4. Existing parking for City College students must be preserved, or they will overflow into the surrounding neighborhoods, making it even harder to find parking.
5. Affordability and ownership opportunities for the middle class need to be key as well.

Thank you,
Lee Rawitscher
[REDACTED]

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: john williams [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 9:35 AM
To: Yee, Norman (BOS)
Cc: Lee, Mayor (MYR); johnrahaim@sfgov.org; jeremyshaw@sfgov.org; michaelmartin@sfgov.org; BRCAC (ECN); board@westwoodpark.com
Subject: Balboa Reservoir CAC Plans

Dear Mr. Yee and CAC voting members:

As residents of Westwood Park (bordering Balboa Reservoir) my wife and I strongly request that you advocate for and support the following Westwood Park recommendations for the Balboa Reservoir project:

- 500 units or less
- One assigned parking space/unit
- 5 acres dedicated to open space, 2 being contiguous park, including a 28' height limit and buffer along Plymouth Avenue
- Existing parking capacity for City College students must be preserved
- Affordability and ownership opportunities for the middle class need to be a key component
- Any project must take into account our legal status as the only Residential Character District (RCD in San Francisco

Sincerely,

John Williams
Beverly Williams

[REDACTED]

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Frank Noto [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 9:52 AM
To: rmuehlbauer@live.com
Cc: [REDACTED]; Board@westwoodpark.com; BRCAC (ECN); [REDACTED]
Subject: Balboa Reservoir CAC

Hi Bob and BRCAC Commissioners,

Back in the day on the HCDC board, I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein to a Citizens Advisory Committee to plan for housing for Balboa Reservoir, which as you know HCDC strongly supported before it was derailed by Joe O'Donoghue and his special-interest allies.

Now 30-some years later I see that you are on the Citizens Advisory Committee to the 17-acre parking lot at Balboa Reservoir. And the little girl of mine who helped break ground on the homes at Holliday Terrace is now living with us, with her two daughters, until she can afford a place of her own.

This is a great opportunity to help address our housing affordability crisis, and it should not be squandered. This is a logical place to build lots of transit-oriented housing, combining permanently affordable, middle-class and market rate homes.

We should certainly embrace the opportunity for greater density and heights at this location. With good project design and setbacks along main thoroughfares, building graceful, inviting housing that enhances the neighborhood's livability is quite feasible. As you know, any attempt to reduce heights limits to 65 feet will only make it harder to maximize affordability. The more density = the more housing = the more funding to create additional BMR homes.

This is a great location for additional density, first because it doesn't displace any current residents. I don't need to tell you why this is a location that easily accommodates density – near BART, MUNI Metro light rail, and City College -- and where car parking can be easily minimized. And let's use the money saved by minimizing parking to build more BMR housing, and improve open space and other community amenities.

A little more height and well-designed ground-floor spaces would benefit far more people than what's being proposed today. I will be very disappointed if we cannot build at least 1,200 new homes. I hope you will not allow us to lose this opportunity.

Frank Noto

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 10:06 AM
To: BRCAC (ECN); Lisa Spinali; Kate Favetti; Maria Picar; Robert Muehlbauer; Howard Chung; Rebecca Lee; Christine Godinez; Jonathan Winston
Cc: Save CCSF Coalition; Wpa Balboa. Reservoir; SNA Brick; CCHO--fernando; PODER; Ronald Gerhard; Marian Lam; Steve Bruckman; Susan Lamb; R. Mandelman; Thea Selby; Brigitte Davila; Andrew Chandler; John Rizzo; Amy Bacharach; Bouchra Simmons; Alex Randolph; Steve Ngo; Lillian Marrujo-Duck; Dana Jae; Lisa Romano; Mandy Liang; Wendy Aragon; Jennifer Heggie; Ray Kutz; [REDACTED]; Ken Hollenbeck; Rita Evans; Bob Byrne; Monica Collins; Ellen Wall; Estelle Smith; Linda Judge; Tim Emert; Anita Theoharis; Caryl Ito; Laura Frey; Francine Lofrano; Adrienne GO; Kishan Balgobin; MP Klier; Chris Hanson; Francine Podenski; Harry Bernstein; Madeline Mueller; Allan Fisher; Vicki Legion; Leslie Simon; Karen Saginor; Muriel Parenteau; [REDACTED]; Diane Green; Marian Lam; Pam Mery; Michael Adams; Aaron Goodman; PODER; fernando@sfic-409.org; Lily Wong; Vincent Pan; Lenny Carlson
Subject: for 6/13/2016 Reservoir CAC meeting

BR CAC, CCSF and neighborhood stakeholders:

Tonight's meeting will include the topic of "Additional Public Benefits." Unfortunately the City Team fails to balance "benefits" with a discussion of drawbacks.

I wrote in an earlier submission regarding Relationship with CCSF:

" It is disingenuous to talk about public benefits without also taking into account the drawbacks and disadvantages that the BR Project would inflict on CCSF and other schools.

"It's like a robber taking your wallet/purse and keeps your valuables; and then magnanimously tosses your drivers license and CCSF student ID card back to you."

The new 6/9/2016 Transportation Memo from the Planning Dept tries to explain TDM. Although it tries to make TDM sound good, you must not be fooled. The TDM toolkit will not address replacement for the existing student parking in the Reservoir.

The 6/9/2016 Memo states: *"The Balboa Area TDM Plan will recommend measures to better manage the current and future transportation needs of commuters, families, seniors, employees, visitors, and students of all ages, means, and schedules in the neighborhood."*

The key to understanding this statement is the fact that Nelson-Nygaard was given a task to perform when it got the contract from the Planning Dept. Nelson-Nygaard is required to complete its TDM study within the parameters and scope set by the Planning Dept.

What is the TDM study's scope and parameters set by the City Team? TDM, by definition, is limited in what it addresses. TDM, is by definition, not a comprehensive transportation analysis. From the SFCTA website:

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. TDM activities range from information and education programs, incentive programs, physical changes, innovative technologies, and pricing strategies.

The scope of the TDM contract does not specify a parking needs assessment. The TDM contract does not specify an assessment of the possible consequences of 1) elimination of student parking, and 2) maximum of 0.5 spaces per residential unit. Replacement of existing student parking is not part of the TDM toolkit. Neither will Westwood Park's call for one-to-one parking be within TDM contract's scope.

The scope of the TDM contract has as a main goal, "Outreach." What "outreach" really means is PR. The purpose of "outreach" isn't so much to listen to community concerns regarding parking and traffic, as it is to convince the public that TDM measures to discourage driving and encourage walking, biking and the use public transit will be enough to dispel community concerns.

I believe my 5/22/2016 e-mail (below) is still valid. Please take these thoughts under consideration in your deliberations.

--aj

From: [REDACTED]
To: BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>; Michael Martin <michael.martin@sfgov.org>; Rich Ken (ECN) <ken.rich@sfgov.org>; Exline Sue
Sent: Sunday, May 22, 2016 5:08 PM

Subject: Minor tinkering is not enough: For 5/23 meeting on Transportation P & P

CAC members:

Although I did not attend the 4/13/2016 on TDM, I have listened to the recording.

Here are some thoughts:

- Most importantly: TDM Study is not a comprehensive and unbiased assessment of parking and circulation issues in the Reservoir vicinity; and it was never meant to be a comprehensive study. The scope/parameters of Nelson-Nygaard's study were very specific according to SFCTA documentation:

- *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.*

- **PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BENEFITS**

The Balboa Area Transportation Demand Study will develop clear strategies for reducing single-occupant vehicle trips and outline a coordinated framework for future TDM programs and policies between CCSF, the Balboa Reservoir project, and the City of San Francisco. Potential TDM activities will produce a wide-range of benefits to individuals and the transportation system as a whole, from reducing traffic congestion, vehicle emissions, and fuel consumption to supporting physical activity and enhancing safety. Additionally, TDM activities will make existing transportation investments perform better, extending the life of existing infrastructure and improving the outcomes for new transportation investments.

- *TDM Program: proposing TDM solutions unique to the area comprising CCSF Ocean campus, Balboa Reservoir and neighborhoods as consistent with emerging TDM policy.*

Bottom-line: TDM solutions, by definition and intent, exclude parking. Within TDM parameters, the issue of parking is given significance only via the TDM solution of making parking "more difficult and expensive." That's why the elimination of student parking is ignored. That's why the City Team promotes 0.5 parking spaces per residential unit.

- Fatuous TDM arguments:
 - "Parking Produces Traffic Congestion--Every parking space is a magnet for cars" and "If you build it.....they will come."
 - In earlier submissions I had written:

As I have pointed out in another e-mail, there are 3 main traffic magnets in our area: schools, freeway entrance/exits, and the BP Station transit hub. If reduction of car traffic in the area is the goal, these magnets need to be removed. Obviously, this is neither an appropriate nor realistic solution.

BP Station and freeway entrance/exits are part of transportation infrastructure. However CCSF is different. CCSF is not transportation infrastructure. People are not just passing through on the way to someplace else. CCSF is a destination in and of itself.

Rather than parking producing congestion, it's the existence of a desired destination that induces traffic. Parking is but a means to accommodate those who want to get to the desired destination.

Case-in-point: When school is not in session, there are very few cars in the Reservoir parking lot and there's very little traffic on Phelan. This demonstrates the falsehood of the "parking produces traffic congestion" premise.

Bottom line: Parking, in and of itself, does not promote congestion. Rather, congestion is the product of people trying to get to a desired destination. Student access to education, which includes driving and parking, should not be subordinate to the Balboa Reservoir Project.

- "Spillover [parking] from City College"
 - Both Sunnyside Neighborhood Assn and Westwood Park Assn have made clear that the neighborhood supports CCSF and its students. The Nelson-Nygaard Study calls for preventing "spillover from City College" by making parking for them difficult via RPP and enforcement. Rather than making parking difficult for students, the neighbors have called for the Balboa Reservoir Project to provide adequate on-site parking for student needs.

Bottom line: Instead of shifting the burden of mitigation for the elimination of student parking by the TDM solution of "reducing single-occupant trips by college staff, faculty, students, and

neighborhood residents", the Reservoir Project needs to take responsibility for replacing lost student parking.

CAC members--

I urge you to think critically and analytically about the City Team's Principles and Parameters. The essence of the CAC public engagement process has been to only allow for minor tinkering with details of the P & P. I ask that you examine big picture issues that the City Team has avoided addressing.

Please review my 4/2/2016 submission regarding Transportation P & P.

Thank you.

--Alvin Ja

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

From: [REDACTED]
To: BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>; Michael Martin <michael.martin@sfgov.org>; Rich Ken (ECN) <ken.rich@sfgov.org>; Exline Sue <susan.exline@sfgov.org>; Shaw Jeremy (CPC) <jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org>; Emily Lesk <emily.lesk@sfgov.org>; Rosanna Russell <rsrussell@sfgwater.org>
Cc: SNA Brick <brc.sna@gmail.com>; Wpa Balboa. Reservoir <wpa.balboa.reservoir@westwoodpark.com>; Saveccsf Info <info@saveccsf.org>; CCHO--fernando <fernando@sfc-409.org>; PODER <jessie@podersf.org>; Susan Lamb <slamb@ccsf.edu>; Cynthia Dewar <cdewar@ccsf.edu>; Ronald Gerhard <rgerhard@ccsf.edu>; Steve Bruckman <sbruckman@ccsf.edu>; "mlam@ccsf.edu" <mlam@ccsf.edu>; Linda Shaw <lshaw@ccsf.edu>; R. Mandelman <[REDACTED]>; Thea Selby <thea@nextstepsmarketing.com>; Lillian Marrujo-Duck <lduck@ccsf.edu>; Dana Jae <[REDACTED]>; Lisa Romano <lromano@ccsf.edu>; Mandy Liang <mliang@ccsf.edu>
Sent: Saturday, April 2, 2016 10:48 AM
Subject: CAC and City Staff: Transportation P & P

BR CAC, Mayor's Office, Planning, PUC:

In reviewing the Westwood Park survey results, it is clear from the WPA data that sufficient parking--both for new Reservoir residents and for CCSF students--is a major concern.

This data should be no surprise to either CAC members or to City Staff. The data just confirms what folks in the area surrounding the Reservoir have been telling you from Day One of "public engagement." Despite this documented concern, the revised Transportation P & P persists in responding to the community's parking and congestion concerns with the single/narrow-minded "creative solution" of TDM.

1. TDM will have no enforcement power over how many cars new Reservoir residents can own. Yet the the Transportation P & P will limit the BR Project to 250 parking spaces for possibly 1,000 adult residents living in 500 housing units. So, new Reservoir residents' cars will park in the surrounding neighborhoods instead.
2. Neither the P & P nor TDM **realistically** accounts for elimination student parking. This will adversely impact student enrollment/attendance and access to educational opportunity. CEQA requires that the

Reservoir Project address impact to the Bay Area-wide public service provided by CCSF and other schools.

Also, students will park in the surrounding neighborhoods instead.

As representatives of the community, I urge all CAC members to reject the Transportation P & P for failing to provide **realistic** solutions to traffic and congestion problems that will be created by the Balboa Reservoir Project and its residents. A wish-and-a prayer from a TDM Manager using PR techniques, with no enforcement powers, does not constitute an adequate solution.

Attached is the revised Transportation P & P PDF file containing my comments. Please take the time and effort to read the comments (please expand the the pop-up notes to see entire comments).

Here are a couple of excerpts of comments:

*"A fundamental land use/existing setting principle is missing:
Transportation design must take into account that CCSF is the central economic, educational and cultural focus of the area.*

"Efforts to discourage car usage must not have the unintended consequence of discouraging students from going to school!"

OEWD/Planning's response to my comment was to simply sidestep the issue and refer the issue to CCSF P & P. Then, in a tautology, the CCSF P & P refers back to the Transportation P & P. This circular reasoning/non-answer is unacceptable.

Essentially, both the Transportation and CCSF P & P's fail to acknowledge and account for students' need for parking.

I have been persistent in pointing out that the BR Project is not taking responsibility for its impact on the existing community setting in regards to parking.

The Staff response bears this out. Since parking is "unbundled", car storage will be "up to the individual." The real-world meaning is that they [Reservoir residents] will be parking in the surrounding neighborhoods (since CCSF parking is being eliminated) during the day while they bike or take free BART/MUNI. This constitutes dumping the parking problem on the neighborhoods.

Submitted by:
Alvin Ja, Sunnyside resident

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Jennifer Heggie [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 10:44 AM
To: ajahjah@att.net
Cc: BRCAC (ECN); Lisa Spinali; Kate Favetti; Maria Picar; Robert Muehlbauer; Howard Chung; Rebecca Lee; Christine Godinez; Jonathan Winston; Save CCSF Coalition; Wpa Balboa. Reservoir; SNA Brick; PODER; Ronald Gerhard; Steve Bruckman; Susan Lamb; R. Mandelman; Thea Selby; Brigitte Davila; Andrew Chandler; John Rizzo; Amy Bacharach; Bouchra Simmons; Alex Randolph; Steve Ngo; Lillian Marrujo-Duck; Dana Jae; Lisa Romano; Mandy Liang; Wendy Aragon; Ray Kutz; [REDACTED]; Ken Hollenbeck; Rita Evans; Bob Byrne; Monica Collins; Ellen Wall; Estelle Smith; Linda Judge; Tim Emert; Anita Theoharis; Caryl Ito; Laura Frey; Francine Lofrano; Adrienne GO; Kishan Balgobin; MP Klier; Chris Hanson; Francine Podenski; Harry Bernstein; Madeline Mueller; Allan Fisher; Vicki Legion; Leslie Simon; Karen Saginor; Muriel Parenteau; eshanson@ccsf.edu; Diane Green; Marian Lam; Pam Mery; Michael Adams; Aaron Goodman; fernando@sfic-409.org; Lily Wong; Vincent Pan; Lenny Carlson
Subject: Re: for 6/13/2016 Reservoir CAC meeting

Where is the vision of the full Board of Trustees of City College on this? Are there plans to provide any replacement parking?
I continue to reel at the apparent lack of concern by the Board of Trustees for the diversity of their students' needs. My future votes will reflect it.
Jennifer Heggie

On Mon, Jun 13, 2016 at 10:06 AM, [REDACTED] wrote:
BR CAC, CCSF and neighborhood stakeholders:

Tonight's meeting will include the topic of "Additional Public Benefits." Unfortunately the City Team fails to balance "benefits" with a discussion of drawbacks.

I wrote in an earlier submission regarding Relationship with CCSF:
" It is disingenuous to talk about public benefits without also taking into account the drawbacks and disadvantages that the BR Project would inflict on CCSF and other schools.

"It's like a robber taking your wallet/purse and keeps your valuables; and then magnanimously tosses your drivers license and CCSF student ID card back to you."

The new 6/9/2016 Transportation Memo from the Planning Dept tries to explain TDM. Although it tries to make TDM sound good, you must not be fooled. The TDM toolkit will not address replacement for the existing student parking in the Reservoir.

The 6/9/2016 Memo states: *"The Balboa Area TDM Plan will recommend measures to better manage the current and future transportation needs of commuters, families, seniors, employees, visitors, and students of all ages, means, and schedules in the neighborhood."*

The key to understanding this statement is the fact that Nelson-Nygaard was given a task to perform when it got the contract from the Planning Dept. Nelson-Nygaard is required to complete its TDM study within the parameters and scope set by the Planning Dept.

What is the TDM study's scope and parameters set by the City Team? TDM, by definition, is limited in what it addresses. TDM, is by definition, not a comprehensive transportation analysis. From the SFCTA website:

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. TDM activities range from information and education programs, incentive programs, physical changes, innovative technologies, and pricing strategies.

The scope of the TDM contract does not specify a parking needs assessment. The TDM contract does not specify an assessment of the possible consequences of 1) elimination of student parking, and 2) maximum of 0.5 spaces per residential unit. Replacement of existing student parking is not part of the TDM toolkit. Neither will Westwood Park's call for one-to-one parking be within TDM contract's scope.

The scope of the TDM contract has as a main goal, "Outreach." What "outreach" really means is PR. The purpose of "outreach" isn't so much to listen to community concerns regarding parking and traffic, as it is to convince the public that TDM measures to discourage driving and encourage walking, biking and the use public transit will be enough to dispel community concerns.

I believe my 5/22/2016 e-mail (below) is still valid. Please take these thoughts under consideration in your deliberations.

--aj

From: [REDACTED] >
To: BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>; Michael Martin <michael.martin@sfgov.org>; Rich Ken (ECN) <ken.rich@sfgov.org>; Exline Sue
Sent: Sunday, May 22, 2016 5:08 PM

Subject: Minor tinkering is not enough: For 5/23 meeting on Transportation P & P

CAC members:

Although I did not attend the 4/13/2016 on TDM, I have listened to the recording.

Here are some thoughts:

- Most importantly: TDM Study is not a comprehensive and unbiased assessment of parking and circulation issues in the Reservoir vicinity; and it was never meant to be a comprehensive study. The scope/parameters of Nelson-Nygaard's study were very specific according to SFCTA documentation:
 - *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.*

○ PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BENEFITS

The Balboa Area Transportation Demand Study will *develop clear strategies for reducing single-occupant vehicle trips* and outline a coordinated framework for future TDM programs and policies between CCSF, the Balboa Reservoir project, and the City of San Francisco. Potential TDM activities will produce a wide-range of benefits to individuals and the transportation system as a whole, from reducing traffic congestion, vehicle emissions, and fuel consumption to supporting physical activity and enhancing safety. Additionally, TDM activities will make existing transportation investments perform better, extending the life of existing infrastructure and improving the outcomes for new transportation investments.

- **TDM Program:** proposing *TDM solutions* unique to the area comprising CCSF Ocean campus, Balboa Reservoir and neighborhoods *as consistent with emerging TDM policy.*

Bottom-line: TDM solutions, by definition and intent, exclude parking. Within TDM parameters, the issue of parking is given significance only via the TDM solution of making parking "more difficult and expensive." That's why the elimination of student parking is ignored. That's why the City Team promotes 0.5 parking spaces per residential unit.

- Fatuous TDM arguments:
 - "Parking Produces Traffic Congestion--Every parking space is a magnet for cars" and "If you build it.....they will come."
 - In earlier submissions I had written:

As I have pointed out in another e-mail, there are 3 main traffic magnets in our area: schools, freeway entrance/exits, and the BP Station transit hub. If reduction of car traffic in the area is the goal, these magnets need to be removed. Obviously, this is neither an appropriate nor realistic solution.

BP Station and freeway entrance/exits are part of transportation infrastructure. However CCSF is different. CCSF is not transportation infrastructure. People are not just passing through on the way to someplace else. CCSF is a destination in and of itself.

Rather than parking producing congestion, it's the existence of a desired destination that induces traffic. Parking is but a means to accommodate those who want to get to the desired destination.

Case-in-point: When school is not in session, there are very few cars in the Reservoir parking lot and there's very little traffic on Phelan. This demonstrates the falsehood of the "parking produces traffic congestion" premise.

Bottom line: Parking, in and of itself, does not promote congestion. Rather, congestion is the product of people trying to get to a desired destination. Student access to education, which includes driving and parking, should not be subordinate to the Balboa Reservoir Project.

- "Spillover [parking] from City College"
 - Both Sunnyside Neighborhood Assn and Westwood Park Assn have made clear that the neighborhood supports CCSF and its students. The Nelson-Nygaard Study calls for

preventing "spillover from City College" by making parking for them difficult via RPP and enforcement. Rather than making parking difficult for students, the neighbors have called for the Balboa Reservoir Project to provide adequate on-site parking for student needs.

Bottom line: Instead of shifting the burden of mitigation for the elimination of student parking by the TDM solution of "reducing single-occupant trips by college staff, faculty, students, and neighborhood residents", the Reservoir Project needs to take responsibility for replacing lost student parking.

CAC members--

I urge you to think critically and analytically about the City Team's Principles and Parameters. The essence of the CAC public engagement process has been to only allow for minor tinkering with details of the P & P. I ask that you examine big picture issues that the City Team has avoided addressing.

Please review my 4/2/2016 submission regarding Transportation P & P.

Thank you.

--Alvin Ja

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

From: [REDACTED] >
To: BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>; Michael Martin <michael.martin@sfgov.org>; Rich Ken (ECN) <ken.rich@sfgov.org>; Exline Sue <susan.exline@sfgov.org>; Shaw Jeremy (CPC) <jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org>; Emily Lesk <emily.lesk@sfgov.org>; Rosanna Russell <rsrussell@sfgwater.org>
Cc: SNA Brick <brc.sna@gmail.com>; Wpa Balboa. Reservoir <wpa.balboa.reservoir@westwoodpark.com>; Saveccsf Info <info@saveccsf.org>; CCHO--fernando <fernando@sfc-409.org>; PODER <jessie@podersf.org>; Susan Lamb <slamb@ccsf.edu>; Cynthia Dewar <cdewar@ccsf.edu>; Ronald Gerhard <rgerhard@ccsf.edu>; Steve Bruckman <sbruckman@ccsf.edu>; "mlam@ccsf.edu" <mlam@ccsf.edu>; Linda Shaw <lshaw@ccsf.edu>; R. Mandelman <[REDACTED]>; Thea Selby <thea@nextstepsmarketing.com>; Lillian Marrujo-Duck <lduck@ccsf.edu>; Dana Jae [REDACTED] >; Lisa Romano <lromano@ccsf.edu>; Mandy Liang <mliang@ccsf.edu>
Sent: Saturday, April 2, 2016 10:48 AM
Subject: CAC and City Staff: Transportation P & P

BR CAC, Mayor's Office, Planning, PUC:

In reviewing the Westwood Park survey results, it is clear from the WPA data that sufficient parking--both for new Reservoir residents and for CCSF students--is a major concern.

This data should be no surprise to either CAC members or to City Staff. The data just confirms what folks in the area surrounding the Reservoir have been telling you from Day One of "public engagement." Despite this documented concern, the revised Transportation P & P persists in responding to the community's parking and congestion concerns with the single/narrow-minded "creative solution" of TDM.

1. TDM will have no enforcement power over how many cars new Reservoir residents can own. Yet the the Transportation P & P will limit the BR Project to 250 parking spaces for possibly 1,000 adult residents living in 500 housing units. So, new Reservoir residents' cars will park in the surrounding neighborhoods instead.

2. Neither the P & P nor TDM **realistically** accounts for elimination student parking. This will adversely impact student enrollment/attendance and access to educational opportunity. CEQA requires that the Reservoir Project address impact to the Bay Area-wide public service provided by CCSF and other schools.

Also, students will park in the surrounding neighborhoods instead.

As representatives of the community, I urge all CAC members to reject the Transportation P & P for failing to provide **realistic** solutions to traffic and congestion problems that will be created by the Balboa Reservoir Project and its residents. A wish-and-a prayer from a TDM Manager using PR techniques, with no enforcement powers, does not constitute an adequate solution.

Attached is the revised Transportation P & P PDF file containing my comments. Please take the time and effort to read the comments (please expand the the pop-up notes to see entire comments).

Here are a couple of excerpts of comments:

*"A fundamental land use/existing setting principle is missing:
Transportation design must take into account that CCSF is the central economic, educational and cultural focus of the area.*

"Efforts to discourage car usage must not have the unintended consequence of discouraging students from going to school!"

OEWD/Planning's response to my comment was to simply sidestep the issue and refer the issue to CCSF P & P. Then, in a tautology, the CCSF P & P refers back to the Transportation P & P. This circular reasoning/non-answer is unacceptable.

Essentially, both the Transportation and CCSF P & P's fail to acknowledge and account for students' need for parking.

I have been persistent in pointing out that the BR Project is not taking responsibility for its impact on the existing community setting in regards to parking.

The Staff response bears this out. Since parking is "unbundled", car storage will be "up to the individual." The real-world meaning is that they [Reservoir residents] will be parking in the surrounding neighborhoods (since CCSF parking is being eliminated) during the day while they bike or take free BART/MUNI. This constitutes dumping the parking problem on the neighborhoods.

Submitted by:
Alvin Ja, Sunnyside resident

--

Jennifer Heggie



Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: MP Klier [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 11:35 AM
To: Jennifer Heggie
Cc: [REDACTED] BRCAC (ECN); Lisa Spinali; Kate Favetti; Maria Picar; Robert Muehlbauer; Howard Chung; Rebecca Lee; Christine Godinez; Jonathan Winston; Save CCSF Coalition; Wpa Balboa. Reservoir; SNA Brick; PODER; Ronald Gerhard; Steve Bruckman; Susan Lamb; R. Mandelman; Thea Selby; Brigitte Davila; Andrew Chandler; John Rizzo; Amy Bacharach; Bouchra Simmons; Alex Randolph; Steve Ngo; Lillian Marrujo-Duck; Dana Jae; Lisa Romano; Mandy Liang; Wendy Aragon; Ray Kutz; [REDACTED]; Ken Hollenbeck; Rita Evans; Bob Byrne; Monica Collins; Ellen Wall; Estelle Smith; Linda Judge; Tim Emert; Anita Theoharis; Caryl Ito; Laura Frey; Francine Lofrano; Adrienne GO; Kishan Balgobin; Chris Hanson; Francine Podenski; Harry Bernstein; Madeline Mueller; Allan Fisher; Vicki Legion; Leslie Simon; Karen Saginor; Muriel Parenteau; eshanson@ccsf.edu; Diane Green; Marian Lam; Pam Mery; Michael Adams; Aaron Goodman; fernando@sfic-409.org; Lily Wong; Vincent Pan; Lenny Carlson
Subject: Re: for 6/13/2016 Reservoir CAC meeting

The San Francisco Planning Department's Balboa Station Area Plan [EIR](#) has this to say about transit in the area, with the assumption that 500 units are built in the reservoir. Please see p. 21, etc., at http://default.sfplanning.org/MEA/2004.1059E_Balboa_FEIR_Pt1.pdf [emphasis added]

(iii) Balboa Reservoir subarea Tier 2 site: • Reservoir site, where 60 percent of the site is controlled by SFPUC and 40 percent is controlled by City College. **The Area Plan calls for the development of the SFPUC's site holdings with approximately 500 residential units and a large new public open space.** This site would only be developed if the SFPUC decides to abandon the site for water storage.

TRANSPORTATION

Program Level Impacts Traffic Intersection operating conditions in the Project Area were analyzed for the weekday p.m. peak hour for two future scenarios: 2025 without the Area Plan and 2025 with the Area Plan. Seven study intersections would be expected to operate at acceptable conditions (LOS D or better) during the p.m. peak hour in 2025, with the Area Plan's traffic contribution. However, the Area Plan's traffic contribution to five intersections—Ocean Avenue/Junipero Serra Boulevard; Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Phelan Avenue; Ocean Avenue/I-280 NB On-Ramp; Ocean Avenue/San Jose Avenue; Geneva Avenue/I-280 SB and NB Ramps—would be expected to deteriorate to unacceptable levels of service (LOS F), and would result in significant adverse impacts. The Ocean Avenue/San Jose Avenue and Ocean Avenue/Junipero Serra Boulevard intersections would operate at unacceptable conditions (LOS F) in 2025 with or without the proposed Area Plan; however, the Area Plan would contribute significantly to these adverse conditions. Mitigation measures have been identified to reduce impacts at the Ocean Avenue/Junipero Serra Boulevard; Ocean Avenue/I-280 NB On-Ramp; and Ocean Avenue/San Jose Avenue intersections to acceptable levels. No feasible mitigation measures have been identified to address operating conditions at the Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Phelan Avenue intersection; and the Geneva Avenue/I-280 NB and SB Ramps. Therefore, proposed transportation changes implemented as part of the Area Plan would result in significant unavoidable cumulative impacts at these intersections.

Lee Avenue Connection to CCSF Variant: Parking Impacts

Full buildout of development under the proposed Area Plan would result in a peak parking demand for about 3,004 spaces, including 2,314 spaces for the residential uses and 690 spaces for the retail uses (524 short-term spaces and 166 long-term spaces). For the analysis of parking conditions with implementation of the Area Plan, two scenarios were considered: 1) no parking provided (as allowed under the proposed Planning Code changes with the Area Plan); and 2) II. Summary Balboa Park Station Area Plan Final EIR 24 Case No. 2004.1059E current code-required parking provided (a total of 2,027 spaces). **If no parking were to be provided as part of development proposals within the Project Area, there would be a shortfall of about 3,004 parking spaces during the weekday evening period. If the maximum parking were to be provided under the current Planning Code requirement, there would be a shortfall of about 929 parking spaces during the weekday evening period. With the new developments proposed in the Area Plan, and with either current or proposed parking requirements, parking occupancy in the Project Area would increase to over 100 percent capacity at full buildout.**

On Mon, Jun 13, 2016 at 10:44 AM, Jennifer Heggie [REDACTED] wrote:

Where is the vision of the full Board of Trustees of City College on this? Are there plans to provide any replacement parking?

I continue to reel at the apparent lack of concern by the Board of Trustees for the diversity of their students' needs. My future votes will reflect it.

Jennifer Heggie

On Mon, Jun 13, 2016 at 10:06 AM, [REDACTED] wrote:

BR CAC, CCSF and neighborhood stakeholders:

Tonight's meeting will include the topic of "Additional Public Benefits." Unfortunately the City Team fails to balance "benefits" with a discussion of drawbacks.

I wrote in an earlier submission regarding Relationship with CCSF:

"It is disingenuous to talk about public benefits without also taking into account the drawbacks and disadvantages that the BR Project would inflict on CCSF and other schools.

"It's like a robber taking your wallet/purse and keeps your valuables; and then magnanimously tosses your drivers license and CCSF student ID card back to you."

The new 6/9/2016 Transportation Memo from the Planning Dept tries to explain TDM. Although it tries to make TDM sound good, you must not be fooled. The TDM toolkit will not address replacement for the existing student parking in the Reservoir.

The 6/9/2016 Memo states: *"The Balboa Area TDM Plan will recommend measures to better manage the current and future transportation needs of commuters, families, seniors, employees, visitors, and students of all ages, means, and schedules in the neighborhood."*

The key to understanding this statement is the fact that Nelson-Nygaard was given a task to perform when it got the contract from the Planning Dept. Nelson-Nygaard is required to complete its TDM study within the parameters and scope set by the Planning Dept.

What is the TDM study's scope and parameters set by the City Team? TDM, by definition, is limited in what it addresses. TDM, is by definition, not a comprehensive transportation analysis. From the SFCTA website:

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. TDM activities range from information and education programs, incentive programs, physical changes, innovative technologies, and pricing strategies.

The scope of the TDM contract does not specify a parking needs assessment. The TDM contract does not specify an assessment of the possible consequences of 1) elimination of student parking, and 2) maximum of 0.5 spaces per residential unit. Replacement of existing student parking is not part of the TDM toolkit. Neither will Westwood Park's call for one-to-one parking be within TDM contract's scope.

The scope of the TDM contract has as a main goal, "Outreach." What "outreach" really means is PR. The purpose of "outreach" isn't so much to listen to community concerns regarding parking and traffic, as it is to convince the public that TDM measures to discourage driving and encourage walking, biking and the use public transit will be enough to dispel community concerns.

I believe my 5/22/2016 e-mail (below) is still valid. Please take these thoughts under consideration in your deliberations.

--aj

From: [REDACTED]
To: BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>; Michael Martin <michael.martin@sfgov.org>; Rich Ken (ECN) <ken.rich@sfgov.org>; Exline Sue
Sent: Sunday, May 22, 2016 5:08 PM

Subject: Minor tinkering is not enough: For 5/23 meeting on Transportation P & P

CAC members:

Although I did not attend the 4/13/2016 on TDM, I have listened to the recording.

Here are some thoughts:

- Most importantly: TDM Study is not a comprehensive and unbiased assessment of parking and circulation issues in the Reservoir vicinity; and it was never meant to be a comprehensive study. The scope/parameters of Nelson-Nygaard's study were very specific according to SFCTA documentation:
 - *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.*

o PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BENEFITS

The Balboa Area Transportation Demand Study will *develop clear strategies for reducing single-occupant vehicle trips* and outline a coordinated framework for future TDM programs and policies between CCSF, the Balboa Reservoir project, and the City of San Francisco. Potential TDM activities will produce a wide-range of benefits to individuals and the transportation system as a whole, from reducing traffic congestion, vehicle emissions, and fuel consumption to supporting physical activity and enhancing safety. Additionally, TDM activities will make existing transportation investments perform better, extending the life of existing infrastructure and improving the outcomes for new transportation investments.

- o **TDM Program:** proposing *TDM solutions* unique to the area comprising CCSF Ocean campus, Balboa Reservoir and neighborhoods *as consistent with emerging TDM policy.*

Bottom-line: TDM solutions, by definition and intent, exclude parking. Within TDM parameters, the issue of parking is given significance only via the TDM solution of making parking "more difficult and expensive." That's why the elimination of student parking is ignored. That's why the City Team promotes 0.5 parking spaces per residential unit.

- Fatuous TDM arguments:
 - o "Parking Produces Traffic Congestion--Every parking space is a magnet for cars" and "If you build it.....they will come."
 - In earlier submissions I had written:

As I have pointed out in another e-mail, there are 3 main traffic magnets in our area: schools, freeway entrance/exits, and the BP Station transit hub. If reduction of car traffic in the area is the goal, these magnets need to be removed. Obviously, this is neither an appropriate nor realistic solution.

BP Station and freeway entrance/exits are part of transportation infrastructure. However CCSF is different. CCSF is not transportation infrastructure. People are not just passing through on the way to someplace else. CCSF is a destination in and of itself.

Rather than parking producing congestion, it's the existence of a desired destination that induces traffic. Parking is but a means to accommodate those who want to get to the desired destination.

Case-in-point: When school is not in session, there are very few cars in the Reservoir parking lot and there's very little traffic on Phelan. This demonstrates the falsehood of the "parking produces traffic congestion" premise.

Bottom line: Parking, in and of itself, does not promote congestion. Rather, congestion is the product of people trying to get to a desired destination. Student access to education, which includes driving and parking, should not be subordinate to the Balboa Reservoir Project.

- "Spillover [parking] from City College"
 - o Both Sunnyside Neighborhood Assn and Westwood Park Assn have made clear that the neighborhood supports CCSF and its students. The Nelson-Nygaard Study calls for

preventing "spillover from City College" by making parking for them difficult via RPP and enforcement. Rather than making parking difficult for students, the neighbors have called for the Balboa Reservoir Project to provide adequate on-site parking for student needs.

Bottom line: Instead of shifting the burden of mitigation for the elimination of student parking by the TDM solution of "reducing single-occupant trips by college staff, faculty, students, and neighborhood residents", the Reservoir Project needs to take responsibility for replacing lost student parking.

CAC members--

I urge you to think critically and analytically about the City Team's Principles and Parameters. The essence of the CAC public engagement process has been to only allow for minor tinkering with details of the P & P. I ask that you examine big picture issues that the City Team has avoided addressing.

Please review my 4/2/2016 submission regarding Transportation P & P.

Thank you.

--Alvin Ja

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

From: [REDACTED]
To: BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>; Michael Martin <michael.martin@sfgov.org>; Rich Ken (ECN) <ken.rich@sfgov.org>; Exline Sue <susan.exline@sfgov.org>; Shaw Jeremy (CPC) <jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org>; Emily Lesk <emily.lesk@sfgov.org>; Rosanna Russell <rsrussell@sfgov.org>
Cc: SNA Brick <brc.sna@gmail.com>; Wpa Balboa. Reservoir <wpa.balboa.reservoir@westwoodpark.com>; Saveccsf Info <info@saveccsf.org>; CCHO--fernando <fernando@sfc-409.org>; PODER <jessie@podersf.org>; Susan Lamb <slamb@ccsf.edu>; Cynthia Dewar <cdewar@ccsf.edu>; Ronald Gerhard <rgerhard@ccsf.edu>; Steve Bruckman <sbruckman@ccsf.edu>; "mlam@ccsf.edu" <mlam@ccsf.edu>; Linda Shaw <lshaw@ccsf.edu>; R. Mandelman <rdmandelman@ccsf.edu>; Thea Selby <theselby@ccsf.edu>; Lillian Marrujo-Duck <lmarrujo@ccsf.edu>; Dana Jae <djae@ccsf.edu>; Lisa Romano <lromano@ccsf.edu>; Mandy Liang <mliang@ccsf.edu>
Sent: Saturday, April 2, 2016 10:48 AM
Subject: CAC and City Staff: Transportation P & P

BR CAC, Mayor's Office, Planning, PUC:

In reviewing the Westwood Park survey results, it is clear from the WPA data that sufficient parking--both for new Reservoir residents and for CCSF students--is a major concern.

This data should be no surprise to either CAC members or to City Staff. The data just confirms what folks in the area surrounding the Reservoir have been telling you from Day One of "public engagement." Despite this documented concern, the revised Transportation P & P persists in

responding to the community's parking and congestion concerns with the single/narrow-minded "creative solution" of TDM.

1. TDM will have no enforcement power over how many cars new Reservoir residents can own. Yet the the Transportation P & P will limit the BR Project to 250 parking spaces for possibly 1,000 adult residents living in 500 housing units. So, new Reservoir residents' cars will park in the surrounding neighborhoods instead.

2. Neither the P & P nor TDM **realistically** accounts for elimination student parking. This will adversely impact student enrollment/attendance and access to educational opportunity. CEQA requires that the Reservoir Project address impact to the Bay Area-wide public service provided by CCSF and other schools.

Also, students will park in the surrounding neighborhoods instead.

As representatives of the community, I urge all CAC members to reject the Transportation P & P for failing to provide **realistic** solutions to traffic and congestion problems that will be created by the Balboa Reservoir Project and its residents. A wish-and-a prayer from a TDM Manager using PR techniques, with no enforcement powers, does not constitute an adequate solution.

Attached is the revised Transportation P & P PDF file containing my comments. Please take the time and effort to read the comments (please expand the the pop-up notes to see entire comments).

Here are a couple of excerpts of comments:

"A fundamental land use/existing setting principle is missing: Transportation design must take into account that CCSF is the central economic, educational and cultural focus of the area.

"Efforts to discourage car usage must not have the unintended consequence of discouraging students from going to school!"

OEWD/Planning's response to my comment was to simply sidestep the issue and refer the issue to CCSF P & P. Then, in a tautology, the CCSF P & P refers back to the Transportation P & P. This circular reasoning/non-answer is unacceptable.

Essentially, both the Transportation and CCSF P & P's fail to acknowledge and account for students' need for parking.

I have been persistent in pointing out that the BR Project is not taking responsibility for its impact on the existing community setting in regards to parking.

The Staff response bears this out. Since parking is "unbundled", car storage will be "up to the individual." The real-world meaning is that they [Reservoir residents] will be parking in the surrounding neighborhoods (since CCSF parking is being eliminated) during the day while they bike or take free BART/MUNI. This constitutes dumping the parking problem on the neighborhoods.

Submitted by:
Alvin Ja, Sunnyside resident

--

Jennifer Heggie



Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Phil Crone [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 1:50 PM
To: sunnyside.president@gmail.com; Board@westwoodpark.com; BRCAC (ECN);
[REDACTED]
Subject: Balboa Reservoir Density & Parking

Dear members of the Balboa Reservoir Citizens Advisory Committee,

I am an Ingleside resident with a strong interest in Balboa Reservoir. I am unable to attend tonight's CAC meeting, but I wanted to share my views about the project, particularly my views regarding density and parking.

Balboa Reservoir presents a great opportunity to help combat the critical housing shortage faced by the Bay Area. Recently approved projects in San Francisco of similar sizes, such as Mission Rock, Schlage Lock, and Pier 70, have included 75-85 housing units per acre while also allowing for many acres of open space. If Balboa Reservoir met this density, it would include between 1,275 and 1,445 new housing units. Creating housing units in these numbers would play a significant role in helping to relieve the housing shortage faced by our region and, in turn, make housing more affordable throughout the Bay Area. I am concerned with alternative proposals calling for less than 1,000 new housing units at Balboa Reservoir. Moving forward with less than 1,000 new housing units would represent a huge missed opportunity to combat the Bay Area's housing crisis.

One of the great virtues of Balboa Reservoir is its transit-rich location. Because of this, I believe a 0.5:1 parking ratio is appropriate. I am skeptical of the need for a high parking ratio, such as 1:1, particularly given the costs associated with additional parking. Not only are there additional construction costs involved in building additional parking facilities, but additional facilities would incentivize automobile use over public transportation and would therefore have additional, detrimental environmental and traffic consequences.

Thank you for taking the time to reading and considering my comments. Although I will not be in attendance at the CAC meeting tonight, I do hope to attend CAC meetings in the future.

Best,
Phil

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Marge Casey [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 4:30 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Balboa Reservoir Project

To the Committee members:

As long time homeowners in Westwood Park, we want you to know that we agree with and support the position of the WPA Board and our community in regard to any development in Balboa Reservoir.

The Westwood Park Homeowners Association - WPA - board and our community agree:

- **The proposed project must be no larger than 500 units.**
- **Each unit must have an assigned parking space.**
- **5 acres must be dedicated to open space, with 2 acres being a contiguous park, and, include a 28' height limit and a buffer along Plymouth Avenue.**
- **Existing parking capacity for City College students must be preserved.**
- **Affordability and ownership opportunities for the middle class need to be a key component.**
- **Any project must take into account our legal status as the only Residential Character District (RCD) in San Francisco.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Daniel and Margaret Casey

[REDACTED]

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Corey Smith <corey@sfhac.org>
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 4:51 PM
To: sunnyside.president@gmail.com; Board@westwoodpark.com; BRCAC (ECN);
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Cc: Tim Colen
Subject: SFHAC on Balboa Reservoir CAC
Attachments: SFHAC Statement 6.13.pdf

Good afternoon members of the Balboa Reservoir CAC,

I've attached the San Francisco Housing Action Coalition's official statement on the Balboa Reservoir Mixed-Use Development Proposal. I will also bring printed copies for each of you tonight, please don't bother printing and wasting the paper.

Thanks,
Corey Smith
Community Organizer, SFHAC

--

Corey Smith
Community Organizer | San Francisco Housing Action Coalition
95 Brady Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
Office [\(415\) 541-9001](tel:4155419001) [REDACTED]
Email: corey@sfhac.org | Web: sfhac.org



The San Francisco Housing Action Coalition advocates for the creation of well-designed, well-located housing, at all levels of affordability, to meet the needs of San Franciscans, present and future.

June 13, 2016

Ref: Balboa Reservoir Mixed-Use Development Proposal

Dear Lisa Spinali and Members of the Balboa Reservoir Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC),

I'm writing on behalf of the 300 member organizations and individuals of the San Francisco Housing Action Coalition (SFHAC), a 17-year-old nonprofit that advocates for housing solutions at all levels of affordability.

The City is enduring an unprecedented housing affordability and displacement crisis whose primary cause is a lack of new housing that would relieve the enormous pressure being put on the City's growing population on an inadequate housing stock. In light of this, the long fallow Balboa Reservoir site presents an terrific opportunity that comes along very rarely. This opportunity must not be squandered.

The SFHAC has been tracking the Balboa Reservoir project for over a year and is keenly interested in this regionally important proposal moving forward. It is our belief that a well-designed project would become an enormous asset to the evolving Balboa Park Plan Area, one that promotes a desirable, livable neighborhood. It would also help improve the City's social, cultural and economic diversity, a vital priority.

The following are SFHAC's suggestions on the project's key parameters.

Height Limits

The Balboa Reservoir site is located adjacent to an important regional transit node and is a logical place to build lots of transit-oriented housing. We should therefore not be timid about heights at this location. With good project design, sculpting and setbacks along main thoroughfares, it's possible to build graceful, inviting housing that enhances the neighborhood's sense of place. We believe that at this location taller heights can be consistent with excellent open spaces, community-serving ground floor uses and activation of the sidewalks and pedestrian realm.

Reducing heights limits from 85' to 65' as was indicated by the CAC earlier, is counterproductive to maximizing housing affordability. Unless there's a public subsidy available (which does not appear to be the case here), the funding necessary to support affordable housing comes from increasing the overall amount of market-rate housing. We would note that, in areas that already allow for Type V construction, the City's building code will soon change to allow five stories of wood frame over two stories of concrete podium, which would build

75-foot buildings. A building of 65 feet height would not even reach what the code would allow.

Density

Reducing the project's heights also reduces its density. There are proposals from some groups that only want 500 units built on this 17-acre site, or about 29 units per acre. This is unacceptable and much more in keeping with suburban land use patterns. We noted in our recent blog (*Don't Let Balboa Reservoir Be A Missed Opportunity* <http://www.sfhac.org/dont-let-balboa-reservoir-missed-opportunity/>) that several other large City projects (including Parkmerced, Schlage Lock, Mission Rock and Pier 70) have adopted densities of 75 to 85 units per acre that include elevated levels of affordability. The SFHAC believes that building 1,200 to 1,500 homes here is of vital regional interest given the access to transit.

Affordability

The SFHAC supports the *maximum amount* of subsidized housing at the Balboa Reservoir site. In order to achieve this, it is necessary to build the maximum amount of *unsubsidized* housing possible. Building a suburban-style project with only 500 units makes it impossible to achieve the high levels of affordability that many are demanding.

The Mayor's Office of Housing and other City agencies have been clear the City does *not* have the resources to subsidize permanently affordable housing at Balboa Reservoir unless they are taken from existing housing commitments made elsewhere.

In addition, about two weeks ago, Governor Jerry Brown made an important announcement that signals a potentially profound change to the state's housing policies. Its first point is that the state must begin allowing housing that incorporates increased heights and densities as a tool to achieve higher affordability. Its second point is that he does not favor using scarce state funding to subsidize affordable housing. If the City cannot fund the subsidized housing demanded, it's becoming even less likely that the state will.

Finally, it doesn't make sense to demand higher-than-mandated levels of subsidized housing without offering compensating financial incentives such as increased height and density or perhaps financial tools such as impact fee waivers. While the SFHAC would support a 100 percent affordable project at this site, as some have demanded, it's not clear to us where the funding for it would be obtained.

We suggest that any future development proposals for the site should offer various affordability scenarios for different income levels and explain how they could be achieved.

Parking

The SFHAC believes that the demand made by some groups for 1:1 car parking at a major transit node is not defensible and plainly against the principles of a transit-first City. Building parking is incredibly expensive. Our estimates are that building costs run about \$50,000 to \$100,000 per underground space. These simple metrics indicate that 10 parking spaces are about equivalent to the cost of an affordable home. Building high amounts of parking necessarily reduces funding to subsidize affordability, open space or community serving amenities.

In cities around the world, urban planners are creating innovative tools to reduce reliance on private auto usage while ensuring the resident's mobility and reducing traffic congestion. These tools would be identified during the Transportation Demand Management studies that the City now requires on large developments as part of the environmental review. The SFHAC does not believe that requiring a traffic analysis before issuing the request for qualifications (RFQ) or even the request for proposals (RFP) is necessary.

The SFHAC would strongly support using this incredibly valuable land in ways that help address the stark challenges that confront our City, region and state. These include solving our housing affordability and displacement crises, providing more housing for middle-income, and integrating it with better solutions for transportation.

The SFHAC looks forward to working with the CAC as it moves towards issuing a RFQ or RFP.

Sincerely,

Tim Colen, Executive Director

CC: Emily Lesk, MOEWD
John Rahaim, Director of SF Planning
Supervisor Norman Yee, District 7
Supervisor John Avalos, District 11

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Aaron Goodman [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 9:27 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Re: for 6/13/2016 Reservoir CAC meeting

Balboa Reservoir CAC -

Sorry could not make the discussion tonight due to ongoing conflicts with meetings scheduled. I did want to submit comments, and noted the below discussion with public members who have voice concerns on the issues. I would add to their points;

*a) "if the SFPUC decides to abandon the site for water storage." (*sustainability in a world of increased global changes requires increased water storage for population growth) Not to mention the loss of large-scale public swimming pools like Fleishacker and the Sutro Baths... The Balboa Pool was noted as "too-small" a renovation and should include an "expansion phase" for population growth. This was again ignored by the public agencies, in similar fashion to the Ocean Ave bond library project which is still too small for the density proposed adjacent.*

b) "No feasible mitigation measures have been identified to address operating conditions at the Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Phelan Avenue intersection; and the Geneva Avenue/I-280 NB and SB Ramps. Therefore, proposed transportation changes implemented as part of the Area Plan would result in significant unavoidable cumulative impacts at these intersections." - a mitigation measure is one which reduces or eliminates the problem which is increased parking and traffic impacts. A solution is more direct connectivity across the CCSF campus both in terms of pedestrian and bike connection, and improved direct off-ramp design to parking from the freeway to reduce or eliminate car traffic coming up ocean to CCSF. A plan must be developed in coordination with CCSF that should be a SIGNIFICANT mitigation measure that solves the problems created.

c) Sustainability has not been discussed as a mitigation measure specifically dealing with growth and density, and the concern of overall carrying "capacity" in terms of citywide and neighborhood growth, without equitable development of infrastructure and investment in surrounding systems, (ex: Libraries, Public Pools, Public Parks, Schools, and Transportation systems) You cannot just pump consistently more density without a reaction and codified increased improvement in sub-systems. Square footage of people to open space is not in the urban general plan, and neighborhoods must require additional open-space when planning density. The amount shown and indicated is far below what should be provided at this location for the amount of density proposed...

d) Sustainability of the Housing types being built (mainly market rate per prior city reports) and proposed as a "# of units have still erred on the market rate, with little balance for years of imbalance in housing constructed. Teacher's and working class families still cannot find flexibility in the rental market, and many of the units in the adjacent Avalon housing and do not meet the housing needs currently in SF. Proposing density in SF needs to look at tempered dispersal in neighborhoods, so that one area is not adversely and singularly affected. The real estate boundaries of site, and plot lines, needs to be re-thought in terms of location of terminals, air-right development along transit and infrastructure, and the preservation of systems that look towards integrating housing within infrastructure such as water-basins, and open-park-like settings with thin-taller structures that allow for open-ness of land and sunlight. The prior "typologies" and "precedent" I sent was an indicator of what should be pursued in possible typology for whatever design or imagery is decided. Be open to solutions, and

look for a more competitive and open design concept strategy with the housing created for maximal park and recreational use with improved design dialogue with CCSF and neighborhood organizations.

A.Goodman (D11)

On Monday, June 13, 2016 11:35 AM, MP Klier > wrote:

The San Francisco Planning Department's Balboa Station Area Plan [EIR](#) has this to say about transit in the area, with the assumption that 500 units are built in the reservoir. Please see p. 21, etc., at http://default.sfplanning.org/MEA/2004.1059E_Balboa_FEIR_Pt1.pdf [emphasis added]

(iii) Balboa Reservoir subarea Tier 2 site: • Reservoir site, where 60 percent of the site is controlled by SFPUC and 40 percent is controlled by City College. **The Area Plan calls for the development of the SFPUC's site holdings with approximately 500 residential units and a large new public open space.** This site would only be developed *if the SFPUC decides to abandon the site for water storage.*

TRANSPORTATION

Program Level Impacts Traffic Intersection operating conditions in the Project Area were analyzed for the weekday p.m. peak hour for two future scenarios: 2025 without the Area Plan and 2025 with the Area Plan. Seven study intersections would be expected to operate at acceptable conditions (LOS D or better) during the p.m. peak hour in 2025, with the Area Plan's traffic contribution. However, the Area Plan's traffic contribution to five intersections—Ocean Avenue/Junipero Serra Boulevard; Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Phelan Avenue; Ocean Avenue/I-280 NB On-Ramp; Ocean Avenue/San Jose Avenue; Geneva Avenue/I-280 SB and NB Ramps—would be expected to deteriorate to unacceptable levels of service (LOS F), and would result in significant adverse impacts. The Ocean Avenue/San Jose Avenue and Ocean Avenue/Junipero Serra Boulevard intersections would operate at unacceptable conditions (LOS F) in 2025 with or without the proposed Area Plan; however, the Area Plan would contribute significantly to these adverse conditions. Mitigation measures have been identified to reduce impacts at the Ocean Avenue/Junipero Serra Boulevard; Ocean Avenue/I-280 NB On-Ramp; and Ocean Avenue/San Jose Avenue intersections to acceptable levels. No feasible mitigation measures have been identified to address operating conditions at the Ocean Avenue/Geneva Avenue/Phelan Avenue intersection; and the Geneva Avenue/I-280 NB and SB Ramps. Therefore, proposed transportation changes implemented as part of the Area Plan would result in significant unavoidable cumulative impacts at these intersections.

Lee Avenue Connection to CCSF Variant: Parking Impacts

Full buildout of development under the proposed Area Plan would result in a peak parking demand for about 3,004 spaces, including 2,314 spaces for the residential uses and 690 spaces for the retail uses (524 short-term spaces and 166 long-term spaces). For the analysis of parking conditions with implementation of the Area Plan, two scenarios were considered: 1) no parking provided (as allowed under the proposed Planning Code changes with the Area Plan); and 2) II. Summary Balboa Park Station Area Plan Final EIR 24 Case No. 2004.1059E current code-required parking provided (a total of 2,027 spaces). If no parking were to be provided as part of development proposals within the Project Area, there would be a shortfall of about 3,004 parking spaces during the weekday evening period. If the maximum parking were to be provided under the current Planning Code requirement, there would be a shortfall of about 929 parking spaces during the weekday evening period. With the new developments proposed in the Area Plan, and with either current or proposed parking requirements, parking occupancy in the Project Area would increase to over 100 percent capacity at full buildout.

On Mon, Jun 13, 2016 at 10:44 AM, Jennifer Heggie [REDACTED] wrote:

Where is the vision of the full Board of Trustees of City College on this? Are there plans to provide any replacement parking?

I continue to reel at the apparent lack of concern by the Board of Trustees for the diversity of their students' needs. My future votes will reflect it.

Jennifer Heggie

On Mon, Jun 13, 2016 at 10:06 AM, [REDACTED] wrote:

BR CAC, CCSF and neighborhood stakeholders:

Tonight's meeting will include the topic of "Additional Public Benefits." Unfortunately the City Team fails to balance "benefits" with a discussion of drawbacks.

I wrote in an earlier submission regarding Relationship with CCSF:

"It is disingenuous to talk about public benefits without also taking into account the drawbacks and disadvantages that the BR Project would inflict on CCSF and other schools.

"It's like a robber taking your wallet/purse and keeps your valuables; and then magnanimously tosses your drivers license and CCSF student ID card back to you."

The new 6/9/2016 Transportation Memo from the Planning Dept tries to explain TDM. Although it tries to make TDM sound good, you must not be fooled. The TDM toolkit will not address replacement for the existing student parking in the Reservoir.

The 6/9/2016 Memo states: *"The Balboa Area TDM Plan will recommend measures to better manage the current and future transportation needs of commuters, families, seniors, employees, visitors, and students of all ages, means, and schedules in the neighborhood."*

The key to understanding this statement is the fact that Nelson-Nygaard was given a task to perform when it got the contract from the Planning Dept. Nelson-Nygaard is required to complete its TDM study within the parameters and scope set by the Planning Dept.

What is the TDM study's scope and parameters set by the City Team? TDM, by definition, is limited in what it addresses. TDM, is by definition, not a comprehensive transportation analysis. From the SFCTA website:

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. TDM activities range from information and education programs, incentive programs, physical changes, innovative technologies, and pricing strategies.

The scope of the TDM contract does not specify a parking needs assessment. The TDM contract does not specify an assessment of the possible consequences of 1) elimination of student parking, and 2) maximum of 0.5 spaces per residential unit. Replacement of existing student parking is not part of the TDM toolkit. Neither will Westwood Park's call for one-to-one parking be within TDM contract's scope.

The scope of the TDM contract has as a main goal, "Outreach." What "outreach" really means is PR. The purpose of "outreach" isn't so much to listen to community concerns regarding parking and traffic, as it is to convince the public that TDM measures to discourage driving and encourage walking, biking and the use public transit will be enough to dispel community concerns.

I believe my 5/22/2016 e-mail (below) is still valid. Please take these thoughts under consideration in your deliberations.

--aj

From: [REDACTED]
To: BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>; Michael Martin <michael.martin@sfgov.org>; Rich Ken (ECN) <ken.rich@sfgov.org>; Exline Sue
Sent: Sunday, May 22, 2016 5:08 PM

Subject: Minor tinkering is not enough: For 5/23 meeting on Transportation P & P

CAC members:

Although I did not attend the 4/13/2016 on TDM, I have listened to the recording.

Here are some thoughts:

- Most importantly: TDM Study is not a comprehensive and unbiased assessment of parking and circulation issues in the Reservoir vicinity; and it was never meant to be a comprehensive study. The scope/parameters of Nelson-Nygaard's study were very specific according to SFCTA documentation:

- *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.*

◦ PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BENEFITS

The Balboa Area Transportation Demand Study will develop clear strategies for reducing single-occupant vehicle trips and outline a coordinated framework for future TDM programs and policies between CCSF, the Balboa Reservoir project, and the City of San Francisco. Potential TDM activities will produce a wide-range of benefits to individuals and the transportation system as a whole, from reducing traffic congestion, vehicle emissions, and fuel consumption to supporting physical activity and enhancing safety. Additionally, TDM activities will make existing transportation investments perform better, extending the life of existing infrastructure and improving the outcomes for new transportation investments.

- *TDM Program: proposing TDM solutions unique to the area comprising CCSF Ocean campus, Balboa Reservoir and neighborhoods as consistent with emerging TDM policy.*

Bottom-line: TDM solutions, by definition and intent, exclude parking. Within TDM parameters, the issue of parking is given significance only via the TDM solution of making parking "more difficult and expensive." That's why the elimination of student

parking is ignored. That's why the City Team promotes 0.5 parking spaces per residential unit.

- Fatuous TDM arguments:
 - "Parking Produces Traffic Congestion--Every parking space is a magnet for cars" and "If you build it.....they will come."
 - In earlier submissions I had written:

As I have pointed out in another e-mail, there are 3 main traffic magnets in our area: schools, freeway entrance/exits, and the BP Station transit hub. If reduction of car traffic in the area is the goal, these magnets need to be removed. Obviously, this is neither an appropriate nor realistic solution.

BP Station and freeway entrance/exits are part of transportation infrastructure. However CCSF is different. CCSF is not transportation infrastructure. People are not just passing through on the way to someplace else. CCSF is a destination in and of itself.

Rather than parking producing congestion, it's the existence of a desired destination that induces traffic. Parking is but a means to accommodate those who want to get to the desired destination.

Case-in-point: When school is not in session, there are very few cars in the Reservoir parking lot and there's very little traffic on Phelan. This demonstrates the falsehood of the "parking produces traffic congestion" premise.

Bottom line: Parking, in and of itself, does not promote congestion. Rather, congestion is the product of people trying to get to a desired destination. Student access to education, which includes driving and parking, should not be subordinate to the Balboa Reservoir Project.

- "Spillover [parking] from City College"
 - Both Sunnyside Neighborhood Assn and Westwood Park Assn have made clear that the neighborhood supports CCSF and its students. The Nelson-Nygaard Study calls for preventing "spillover from City College" by making parking for them difficult via RPP and enforcement. Rather than making parking difficult for students, the neighbors have called for the Balboa Reservoir Project to provide adequate on-site parking for student needs.

Bottom line: Instead of shifting the burden of mitigation for the elimination of student parking by the TDM solution of "reducing single-occupant trips by college staff, faculty, students, and neighborhood residents", the Reservoir Project needs to take responsibility for replacing lost student parking.

CAC members--

I urge you to think critically and analytically about the City Team's Principles and Parameters. The essence of the CAC public engagement process has been to only allow for minor tinkering with details of the P & P. I ask that you examine big picture issues that the City Team has avoided addressing.

Please review my 4/2/2016 submission regarding Transportation P & P.

Thank you.

--Alvin Ja

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

From: [REDACTED] >
To: BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>; Michael Martin <michael.martin@sfgov.org>; Rich Ken (ECN) <ken.rich@sfgov.org>; Exline Sue <susan.exline@sfgov.org>; Shaw Jeremy (CPC) <jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org>; Emily Lesk <emily.lesk@sfgov.org>; Rosanna Russell <rsrussell@sfgwater.org>
Cc: SNA Brick <brc.sna@gmail.com>; Wpa Balboa. Reservoir <wpa.balboa.reservoir@westwoodpark.com>; Saveccsf Info <info@saveccsf.org>; CCHO--fernando <fernando@sfc-409.org>; PODER <jessie@podersf.org>; Susan Lamb <slamb@ccsf.edu>; Cynthia Dewar <cdewar@ccsf.edu>; Ronald Gerhard <rgerhard@ccsf.edu>; Steve Bruckman <sbruckman@ccsf.edu>; "mlam@ccsf.edu" <mlam@ccsf.edu>; Linda Shaw <lshaw@ccsf.edu>; R. Mandelman <[REDACTED]>; Thea Selby <[REDACTED]>; Lillian Marrujo-Duck <lduck@ccsf.edu>; Dana Jae <[REDACTED]>; Lisa Romano <romano@ccsf.edu>; Mandy Liang <mliang@ccsf.edu>
Sent: Saturday, April 2, 2016 10:48 AM
Subject: CAC and City Staff: Transportation P & P

BR CAC, Mayor's Office, Planning, PUC:

In reviewing the Westwood Park survey results, it is clear from the WPA data that sufficient parking--both for new Reservoir residents and for CCSF students--is a major concern.

This data should be no surprise to either CAC members or to City Staff. The data just confirms what folks in the area surrounding the Reservoir have been telling you from Day One of "public engagement." Despite this documented concern, the revised Transportation P & P persists in responding to the community's parking and congestion concerns with the single/narrow-minded "creative solution" of TDM.

1. TDM will have no enforcement power over how many cars new Reservoir residents can own. Yet the the Transportation P & P will limit the BR Project to 250 parking spaces for possibly 1,000 adult residents living in 500 housing units. So, new Reservoir residents' cars will park in the surrounding neighborhoods instead.

2. Neither the P & P nor TDM realistically accounts for elimination student parking. This will adversely impact student enrollment/attendance and access to educational opportunity. CEQA requires that the Reservoir Project address impact to the Bay Area-wide public service provided by CCSF and other schools.

Also, students will park in the surrounding neighborhoods instead.

As representatives of the community, I urge all CAC members to reject the Transportation P & P for failing to provide **realistic** solutions to traffic and congestion problems that will be created by the Balboa Reservoir Project and its residents. A wish-and-a prayer from a TDM Manager using PR techniques, with no enforcement powers, does not constitute an adequate solution.

Attached is the revised Transportation P & P PDF file containing my comments. Please take the time and effort to read the comments (please expand the the pop-up notes to see entire comments).

Here are a couple of excerpts of comments:

*"A fundamental land use/existing setting principle is missing:
Transportation design must take into account that CCSF is the central economic, educational and cultural focus of the area.*

"Efforts to discourage car usage must not have the unintended consequence of discouraging students from going to school!"

OEWD/Planning's response to my comment was to simply sidestep the issue and refer the issue to CCSF P & P. Then, in a tautology, the CCSF P & P refers back to the Transportation P & P. This circular reasoning/non-answer is unacceptable.

Essentially, both the Transportation and CCSF P & P's fail to acknowledge and account for students' need for parking.

I have been persistent in pointing out that the BR Project is not taking responsibility for its impact on the existing community setting in regards to parking.

The Staff response bears this out. Since parking is "unbundled", car storage will be "up to the individual." The real-world meaning is that they [Reservoir residents] will be parking in the surrounding neighborhoods (since CCSF parking is being eliminated) during the day while they bike or take free BART/MUNI. This constitutes dumping the parking problem on the neighborhoods.

Submitted by:
Alvin Ja, Sunnyside resident

--
Jennifer Heggie
