
From: Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2019 6:57 PM
To: Madeline Mueller
Cc: Balboa Reservoir Compliance (ECN)
Subject: RE: Balboa Reservoir Project, case # 2018 - 007883 ENV

Hello Ms. Mueller,

This is to confirm that we received your email and we will include it in the Balboa Reservoir Project SEIR Comments and Responses document.

Sincerely,
Jeanie Poling
Senior Environmental Planner
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9072 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

From: Madeline Mueller <madelinenmueller@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2019 11:25 AM
To: CPC.BalboaReservoir <CPC.BalboaReservoir@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: Balboa Reservoir Project, case # 2018 - 007883 ENV

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

Please include this with my response to the Balboa Reservoir DSEIR.
I tried to send it with my response, but it may not have remained attached. My email account returned both, but my gmail seems to be working.

Thanks,
Madeline Mueller
Music Department Chair
CCSF

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Madeline Mueller <madelinenmueller@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Nov 12, 2018, 15:31
Subject: Balboa Reservoir Project, case # 2018 - 007883 ENV
To: <jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>

Jeanie Poling
San Francisco Planning Department

Dear Ms Poling

Please enter the following into the administrative record for Balboa Reservoir.

San Francisco is listed as a city with housing more dense than Tokyo and Hong Kong. In America, San Francisco is second in density only to New York City. The proposed housing project for the lower Balboa Reservoir would have housing five times more dense than the surrounding area.

Thirty years ago a similar proposal involving a smaller number of housing units on the Reservoir site was rejected by San Francisco voters. One of the major concerns for housing at the site came from the fire department. The Chief had many reasons to not recommend housing in the Balboa Reservoir, citing conditions which have become even more dangerous over the years.

Increasing drought and the extreme winds coming through the reservoir gulch make a perfect storm for the type of fires that we now see devastating entire towns in California. The situation was dire before and now it's impossible to overstate the fire danger involving that particular basin (and all surrounding neighborhoods), a basin which is being proposed for impossibly dense housing. The lack of immediate water sources made and still makes the situation very bad. We've all seen what fires fed by strong horizontal winds, minus enough water, can do to houses and buildings.

The recent MUB building at City College and soon-to-be-built Performing Arts Education Center on the college portion of the reservoir use geothermal energy sources. Has there been research on the compatibility of the college's system with other projects?

It should be obvious that proposing an unsafe density of housing units next to one of the largest and most successful Community Colleges in the State is not appropriate. It was wrong 30 years ago and it's wrong now.

The sheer noise factor of thousands of new residents warehoused next to a college with a daily enrollment the size of a small city makes the educational environment totally compromised. Plus, traffic gridlock in an area, already at the most negative level possible, would with a large additional population pose tremendous problems (and dangers!) to both the college and all of the surrounding neighborhoods. The area is not "transit rich", it is "transit gridlocked".

Also, since over 1,000 units of affordable student parking (available via PUC leases to CCSF since 1958) will be lost under the proposed development, doesn't it become inappropriate that in order for a commuter school like City College to survive, it must ask San Francisco taxpayers to fund parking structures on the college land. This land is already the site of one of the most densely populated campuses in the State when comparing the number of students per acre (and many of these CCSF acres are vertical)?

The State Chancellor's office for Community Colleges will not fund parking structures. The cost must be borne by local residents. So in order to maintain a Community College that adult learners in San Francisco wish and need, citizens will need to pay hundreds of millions of dollars via bond measures for parking structures!

In effect the PUC is being asked to transfer public land to private profit makers while at the same time charging the public millions of dollars to do so if they wish to maintain their college -----that truly does not make sense (!)

In reading through the Appendix B, CEQA Checklist, I have noted the following areas that at the very least must be addressed during a full environmental review. This includes:

Aesthetics, section d

Air Quality, all sections

Community Resources, sections a through h

Hydrology and Water Quality,
probably all sections, especially f

Land Use and Planning, section a

Noise, sections a through d

Population and Housing, section a

Public Services , entire section (with the definition of a community college as a governmental facility)

Recreation, all sections

Transportation/Traffic, all sections
(a through g)

Utilities and Service Systems, all sections (a through g)

Mandatory Findings of Significance,
sections b and c

Please include the language of all the above sections in the scoping requirements for CEQA.

Thank you,

Madeline Mueller
Faculty member and Music Department Chair, A-44, Room: Arts 209
415 239-3641
mmueller@ccsf.edu
City College of San Francisco
Freda Kahlo Way 94112