

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

**DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC DURING
11/13/17 REGULAR MEETING**

AND

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

Period: 10/3/17 – 11/13/17

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

**DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC DURING
11/13/17 REGULAR MEETING**

[NO DOCUMENTS RECEIVED]

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

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

Period: 10/3/17 – 11/13/17

Shanahan, Thomas (ECN)

From: aj [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2017 6:11 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN); Shanahan, Thomas (ECN); Wong, Phillip (ECN); Lesk, Emily (ECN); Rich, Ken (ECN); Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); Rahaim, John (CPC); Russell, Rosanna (PUC); Carlin, Michael (PUC); Steve Stamos; clerk@sfcta.org; BalResCACChair@gmail.com; Michael Ahrens; Brigitte Davila; Robert Muehlbauer; Howard Chung; Rebecca Lee; Christine Godinez; Jonathan Winston
Cc: Steve Martinpinto; Amy O'Hair; Ken Hollenbeck; Jennifer Heggie; Monica Collins; Rita Evans; Bob Byrne; Ray Kutz; Anita Theoharis; Anne Chen; MP Klier; Laura Frey; Francine Lofrano; Caryl Ito; Adrienne GO; Kishan Balgobin; Kate Favetti; Tim Emert; Harry Bernstein; Michael Adams; Christine Hanson; Steven Brown; Wendy Kaufmyn; Madeline Mueller; Muriel Parenteau; Lenny Carlson; Alan D'Souza; Vicki Legion; Yee, Norman (BOS); Low, Jen (BOS); Maybaum, Erica (BOS)
Subject: Hypocrisy in 11/17/2016 letter from City to CCSF
Attachments: 2016-11-17 CCSF BOT Letter_FMP Update_City Comments_Signed JRahaim.pdf

BRCAC, OEWD. Planning, PUC, Tom & Phillip, SFCTA:

Please enter this into the Balboa Reservoir Project and Balboa Area TDM Framework records:

Thanks.

--aj

HYPOCRISY OF BALBOA RESERVOIR PROJECT PLANNERS

In reviewing Sunshine Ordinance documents, I have come across a 11/17/2016 Planning Dept letter addressed to City College BOT signed by its Director, John Rahaim (attached for your convenience).

The 11/17/2016 letter provided the City's input on the City College draft Facilities Master Plan(FMP).

Under the heading of "Access, Parking, and Transportation Demand Management", the letter states:

*"CCSF has stated that it anticipates maintaining or increasing the number of parking spaces associated with the campus as on-and-off-campus surface parking is replaced with buildings. This level of parking provision would have **negative consequences for neighborhood congestion...**"*

Further down in the letter, under the heading "Balboa Reservoir Development Access & Interface", the letter states:

*"While the design of the Reservoir site has not yet begun, **roadway access to the Reservoir site [cutting through City College property—aj]** is a critical element that needs to be considered now as part of CCSF's master planning process..."*

ONE STANDARD FOR CITY COLLEGE.....

The City had the audacity in this letter to blame the FMP for negative consequences of proposed FMP parking. The City shows lack of self-awareness and dishonesty when the reason for needing replacement

parking is ultimately the Balboa Reservoir's own elimination of student parking—parking which constitutes the existing condition.

..... ANOTHER STANDARD FOR BALBOA RESERVOIR PROJECT

The 11/17/2016 Planning Dept letter raises the importance for SFCCD to provide roadway access for the Reservoir Project. The letter says “roadway access is a critical element that needs to be considered now...”

Since the City planners say that the parking needs of CCSF stakeholders can be resolved with TDM, the TDM solution should obviate the need for roadway access for the Reservoir Project, too, doncha think? Why would Reservoir residents need roadway access when TDM is expected to succeed in getting Reservoir residents to walk, bike, and take MUNI at the nearby Phelan Loop?

But, no. A double standard applies.

Did you notice that the City's concern for “negative consequences for neighborhood congestion” only applied to City College, but not to the Reservoir Project? FYI, throughout the “public engagement process”, the Reservoir Project staff has not shown serious concern for its own negative consequences.

Why won't the City own up to its own negative consequences for neighborhood congestion that it asks of City College?

Could it possibly be benefits of "pay-to-play" from developer forces?

--aj 10/9/2017

Shanahan, Thomas (ECN)

From: Yonathan [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 03, 2017 12:16 PM
To: balboareservoir@gmail.com; BRCAC (ECN); John Winston; Christine Godinez; Howard Chung; Robert Muehlbauer; Brigette Davilla; [REDACTED]
Subject: Additional comments on benefits of the more housing at the Reservoir

Dear Balboa Reservoir CAC and developer,

This elaborates on my comments from last night.

When I hear residents say it has always been expensive to buy a house, even 30 years ago, it's like a variation of the of the boiling frog problem. The millennials are saying it's really hot in here, but long-time homeowners say don't worry, that's normal; it's always been hot. Don't worry, that's just the way it is in San Francisco. Except that homeowners are out of the housing market so they don't even feel it anymore, yet they still cling to the memory that the market is hot but not too hot. But things really have changed. If you haven't needed to find an apartment or house recently, I encourage you to take a moment to look around. Talk to younger people to learn their experience, or look at craigslist and Redfin see what people in a similar situation as you could afford to buy today.

I think that Laura Clark and Corey Smith's request to hold a CAC meeting at a central part of the city has merit (and I respectfully disagree with Maurice Rivers). It is *not* true that the Balboa Reservoir only affects this side of the city. Development is likely to create *localized* impacts, yet provide *regional* benefits to households looking for housing. All decisionmakers should be aware that we need to strike a balance between a diffuse but extreme benefit of new housing to the region and the concentrated local impacts of development. In my opinion, the right way to think about this is to respect the legitimate fears and mitigate the local impacts that we hear about at every meeting, but also to listen to citywide stakeholders to establish the goals, scope, and scale of the project.

At the meeting, several people were concerned about the quality of life for the new residents. But all these concerns hinge on affordability and accessibility. The perfect soundproofing between units does not help if the average household has to double up and triple up within the unit. Family-sized units are only helpful if groups of single people don't rent them because of the lack of affordable studios and one-bedrooms. Livability depends on affordability and accessibility. For market-rate housing, affordability is directly related to regional quantity of housing. For BMR housing, accessibility (the probability of winning the lottery) is likewise directly related to the quantity of housing. First and foremost, we have a severe housing shortage, and the Balboa Reservoir should make a meaningful attempt at addressing this shortage and send the message to other towns in the Bay Area that all neighborhoods should make the most out of the available land to address the shortage.

Yonathan