

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

**DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC DURING
12/11/17 REGULAR MEETING**

AND

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

Period: 11/14/17 – 12/11/17

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

**DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC DURING
12/11/17 REGULAR MEETING**

Period: 11/14/17 – 12/11/17

[NO DOCUMENTS RECEIVED]

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

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

Period: 11/14/17 – 12/11/17

Shanahan, Thomas (ECN)

From: aj [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2017 12:29 AM
To: BRCAC (ECN); Shanahan, Thomas (ECN); Wong, Phillip (ECN)
Cc: [REDACTED] Michael Ahrens; Brigitte Davila; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: Balboa Area TDM Framework
Attachments: 2017-11-26 to BOT re--Ken Rich.docx

Hi Tom, Phillip:

Please enter the attached document into the BRCAC public record.

Thank you, and happy holidays!

--aj

BOT, Administration, Facilities Committee:

In looking at the video of the 11/9/2017 BOT meeting, Ken Rich adamantly and repeatedly stated that criticism of the City's parking survey having been conducted while class was not in session was "incorrect."

Despite his protestations of innocence, please look at the following submission to the Balboa Park Station CAC. In the submission, I quoted directly (and highlighted in yellow) from their own Nelson-Nygaard Existing Conditions report.

To reinforce the correctness of the allegation that the Mayor's representative so vehemently and combatively denied, I offer an additional direct quote from page 3-36 of the October 2016 "Balboa Area Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan: Existing Conditions":

"Because the late-evening period parking survey took place after CCSF classes finished, the low occupancy rate during this period shows the number of students or faculty who stay at the campus late or park overnight."

If you don't believe me, please refer to the document itself, which is attached. I didn't make this stuff up!

--aj

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

From: aj [REDACTED]
To: Kim Walton [REDACTED]; Aaron Goodman [REDACTED]

BPS CAC:

The Balboa Reservoir Area TDM Framework Report will be presented to you at your 11/28/2017 meeting.

The Project Manager for the Balboa Reservoir Project will probably ask for the BPS CAC's endorsement of the TDM Framework. It is important not to give the TDM Framework your support without understanding its genesis, content, and function.

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

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

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

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

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

GENESIS OF BALBOA AREA TDM FRAMEWORK STUDY

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

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

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

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

WILLFUL DISREGARD FOR HARD DATA

The City Agencies have managed the Reservoir Project in a manner similar to how the Iraq War had been promoted. Just like the Iraq War in which, according to British Intelligence's Downing Street Memo, “... the intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy”, the recommendations and conclusions of the Nelson-Nygaard study have been fixed around the pre-determined TDM policy.

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

WILLFUL EXCLUSION OF COMPREHENSIVE PARKING ASSESSMENT

Sunshine Ordinance documents reveal the following:

In 2014, the AECOM Transportation Analyst had proposed performing a comprehensive supply & demand assessment for all on-street and off-street parking in the neighboring vicinities. Jeremy Shaw of the Planning Dept put a stop to AECOM's proposal to perform this comprehensive assessment.

Instead, in a 2014 email to the AECOM Transportation Analyst, Planning Dept told AECOM to confine their study to the Reservoir parking lots alone:

*“...edits made in the attached word document reflect the current thinking in SF transportation analysis...
“Comment [JS4]: We'd recommend just looking at the [Balboa Reservoir parking lots--aj] parking lots. --
- Off-site parking analysis is nice to have. But really we want to focus the effort on what will drive the on-site design and what kind of trips that design will generate – rather than worry about off-site impacts and mitigations...”*

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

"THE CURRENT THINKING IN SF TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS"

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

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

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

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

DELIBERATELY OBSCURED: CONTEXT OF RESERVOIR BEING A NEW PROJECT

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

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

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

THROWN OVERBOARD: STUDENT INTERESTS OF ACCESS TO EDUCATION

By putting the proposed Reservoir Project on equal footing with City College and the neighborhoods, the Reservoir Project has been, with a sleight-of-hand, absolved of its CEQA responsibility to mitigate its adverse impacts on the existing setting.

Instead, mitigation has been dumped onto the Reservoir Project's victims. Instead of the Reservoir Project being held responsible for providing replacement parking for students, City College's FMP has had to respond by proposing new parking structures on SFCCD property.....but with no realistic funding sources for such structures necessitated by eviction of student parking.

INEQUITY IN BALBOA AREA TDM FRAMEWORK

Page 18 of the TDM Framework has a section entitled "Parking availability." The section brings up Balboa Park Station and City College as major trip generators. The section says that concerns have been expressed about parking during class times. **Yet this "Parking availability" section pointedly avoids any mention whatsoever of the impact of 2,200 new residents in a new residential project projected to contain about 550 parking spaces!**

On page 25, the TDM Framework has set up car-use reduction targets for the City College students and employees, and for the new Reservoir residents. It has also proposed Residential Permit Parking for the neighborhoods:

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

OVERARCHING GOALS

The TDM Framework sets up 4 overarching goals:

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

FALSE EQUIVALENCE: REDUCING CAR USE vs. STUDENT ACCESS

Conspicuously missing from the list of overarching goals is: ENSURING STUDENT ACCESS TO EDUCATION. Other than providing Orwellian vacuous and perfunctory talk about *"the importance of accessible education and striv[ing] to establish equitable transportation*

choices...” the TDM Framework proffers no realistic or effective solution to the priorities shown to be important to CCSF stakeholders in data collected in the CCSF Transportation Survey.

Hard data from the survey shows that “Reducing Travel Time” and “Arriving on Time” are overwhelmingly the most important considerations in choosing transportation mode.

CONFLATING MEANS WITH ENDS: THE OVERARCHING IMPORTANCE OF THE DESTINATION

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

It should not take a lot of smarts to realize that transportation is an issue only when there’s a destination involved. Lacking a desired destination, transportation and parking are a non-issues.

The TDM Framework fails to recognize the fact that transportation is just a way to get to a desired destination. Instead, it dogmatically asserts that parking in and of itself generates traffic.

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

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

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

BPS CAC should see through the TDM Framework scam that will facilitate the privatization of a public asset at the expense of CCSF students.

I ask that you reject the TDM Framework.

Submitted by:

Alvin Ja

City College lifelong learning student, 40+ years;

Sunnyside resident, 38 years;

Municipal Railway Operator/Dispatcher/Inspector/Instructor, 33 years (most of which was working out of MUNI Metro/Green Division at Balboa Park Station, 425 Geneva Ave)

Shanahan, Thomas (ECN)

From: aj [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, November 16, 2017 2:06 AM
To: Shanahan, Thomas (ECN); BRCAC (ECN); Wong, Phillip (ECN);
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Cc: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Subject: 11/14/2017 PUC meeting approving ENA

Tom,

Please enter the following into the BRCAC record.

Thanks,

aj

PUC met on Tuesday 11/14/2017 to approve an agreement with the developers. Here's a meeting report: Surprisingly, the meeting material even included written comments that had been sent in on the day of the meeting, most of which were against the Reservoir Project. Written comments included: --PODER letter calling for 100% affordable and meeting needs of CCSF -- Save CCSF Coalition info packet --7 comments from individuals: -2 in favor of Project -5 against Reservoir Project During general public comment for "items not on agenda", the United Public Workers for Action representative spoke vociferously against the general concept of privatization of public property For the Reservoir ENA item, PUC Deputy General Manager Michael Carlin presented the item. He talked about the transparency of the Project's process and City College's involvement for over 2 years. He said that the City would ensure that the Developer would take care of City College's needs. In attendance, but did not speak: OEWD's Ken Rich and Emily Lesk, Avalon Bay developers, SFCCD's Jeff Hamilton. The PUC chair counted 18 speaker cards for the Reservoir item, most of whom spoke against approval of the ENA. 5 speakers spoke in favor of the Reservoir Project. All the rest opposed it. In addition to the usual suspects speaking for CCSF grassroots, Westwood Park and Sunnyside, ex-City College Trustee Varni spoke up. The talking points included opposition to privatization, harm to City College, unaffordability of "affordable housing", parking and congestion, PAEC, transfer of Reservoir property to CCSF, data and facts being fixed around policy (like Downing Street Memo). Five speakers commented in favor of Project: --Jon Winston, Mayor's appointee to Reservoir CAC, who read Lisa Spinali's written comment --Corey Smith and Todd David, Community Organizer and Executive Director respectively, of SF Housing Action Coalition <https://www.sfhac.org/staff-and-board/> --Laura Clark of Yimby Action <https://yimbyaction.org/about/#board> - -SPUR (SF Planning and Urban Research Assn--reinvented from "SF Planning and Urban RENEWAL Association" <http://sfcitizen.com/blog/2015/03/27/spur-wasp-heres-your-racist-recent-history-of-sf-planning-urban-research/> Other than Jon, I believe all the other 'pro' speakers are in paid staff positions to do their lobbying and advocacy work. Look up SFHAC's, Yimby Action's, and SPUR's boards and guess what their staff funding sources are.

Note that two of the people on the Avalon-Bridge developer team are on SFHAC's Executive Committee. In addition to being on SFHAC's Executive Committee, Avalon Bay's Joe Kirchofer is also on SPUR's Housing Policy Committee. Note that one of the Reservoir developers, Sam Moss, in addition to being on SFHAC's Executive Committee, is also on Yimby Action's Board. Does this look like interlocking directorates and an echo chamber? Commissioners Vietor and Moran asked some questions of Staff regarding the State Surplus Land Statute and the "requirement " for getting market value for land as well as regarding the parking needs of the college. They got blandishments that everything was on the up and up. Staff made no mention of Administrative Code that allows property to be sold for "historic cost" for a "proper public purpose" (and later down the line, don't be surprised if the PUC Reservoir gets sold at below market value to Avalon-Bridge by using "proper public purpose" of "affordable housing" as the excuse!). None of the Commissioners addressed the fundamental issue of privatization. Disappointingly--but not totally surprising--the only outspoken Commissioner, who advocated approval of the ENA, was Vince Courtney who is on Labor Council Executive Committee (Labor Council passed a Resolution "Public Land Must Stay in Public Hands" in relation to the Balboa Reservoir the night before on 11/13/2017!)..... Have you heard the term "labor aristocracy"? Bottom-line: the Commissioners voted to approve the ENA.