
From: Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2019 12:00 AM
To: Balboa Reservoir Compliance (ECN)
Subject: FW: additional comments on the Balboa Reservoir Project, Case No. 2018-007883ENV (for SF Planning)

From: Harry Bernstein <riquerique@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2019 4:56 PM
To: CPC.BalboaReservoir <CPC.BalboaReservoir@sfgov.org>
Subject: additional comments on the Balboa Reservoir Project, Case No. 2018-007883ENV (for SF Planning)

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

Hello, Ms. Poling

From what I am reading in and about the draft SEIR, the document does not address the impact of the development on City College. Already mentioned was that

- 1) there's little acknowledgement of the effect of the development on City College as well as other nearby schools in terms of public services or
- 2) recognition of the College's long-term use of the lower Balboa Reservoir—the proposed development site—since 1946, as either part of the campus (“West Campus”) and the 60+ years that the Lower Reservoir site has been used by students as a parking lot. Other factors are impacts on air quality and more pollution during construction.
- 3) The loss of parking in the Lower Reservoir lot is likely to have a significant impact on access to education, especially for those individuals who are tightly scheduled because they are working, going to school and perhaps having additional family responsibilities besides. That is, the loss of approximately 1000 spaces from the Lower Reservoir site will make it harder for many such people to get to the school in a timely manner. Even now many faculty members mention the difficulty that their students often have early in the semester getting to class on time because of traffic backing up and fewer spaces available, and those quite often located in the most distant lots.
- 4) Also related to access is further traffic congestion. Circulation and congestion would be worse than they are today because of the impact of the approximately 2500-3000 additional people, the access to the development through only to entrances, one coinciding with the road just south of Riordan High School—unless this is reconfigured—and the other via the extension of Lee Avenue. The interference of a through Lee Street extension with the operations of Whole Foods egress could become quite a serious problem. The extra cars and people from the development will likely make traffic on Ocean Avenue considerably worse. The impact that the extra traffic would have on buses—one of the common means of reaching the College (other than BART) is expected to be serious. A local retired bus driver has explained that a bus being late on one time point by four minutes results in a serious schedule problem. But for the no. 43 bus, the only bus running on Frida Kahlo Way, the delay anticipated is more like 12 minutes, not four minutes. This would affect other lines that cross the path of the 43 bus or connect

with it. And as for Ocean Avenue, it currently has a number of lines passing within 1-2 blocks of the College—nos. 8, 29, 49 and K.

5) The question of having a shuttle provided for City College students and others needing access for that last mile from the BART station has been raised repeatedly at public meetings, such as the Balboa Reservoir CAC. The idea has consistently met with resistance. It's not considered to be a bad idea per se, but it appears to be a financial challenge. Representatives from the City and from the developer have dutifully written the suggestion on white boards but have never embraced it or advocated it. **YET THERE HAS TO BE MITIGATION FOR THE IMPACTS ON THE EXISTING CONDITION OF ESSENTIAL PARKING FOR STUDENTS AND FACULTY**—for parking which may become unavailable due to a housing development. If there is a development, there will be impacts and consequences which can't just be ignored.

Another part of the story not yet mentioned is the long promised Performing Arts Education Center (PAEC) at City College, which has been something of a political football. It was a strong component of the last two successful bond measures at the College—in 2001 and 2005—and is essential for the Music and Theatre Arts programs but also for the College as a whole. This project was shovel-ready in October, 2012, but final discussion about it was postponed and in less than a year, during a State takeover initiated in July, 2013, was abruptly canceled by the Special Trustee with Extraordinary Power. Some have doubted the legality of this takeover but the College community is still living with the consequences therefrom. That is why the future of the PAEC is still a current issue. Until about 2014, there was no doubt that the PAEC would eventually be built and that the majority of the parking for it would be in the Lower Reservoir lot. Trustees, when asked about their backup plan (in the event that the Lower Reservoir lot was sold or became otherwise unavailable) and seemed to say that they didn't know they needed such a plan. The Facilities Master Plan, which has had some interference from City agencies, has been inconsistent in pushing for the timely completion of the PAEC. After returning to power, the Board of Trustees once again advocated strongly for the PAEC's completion starting in 2016. City/City College meetings about land use, sometimes referred to as the City/City College Consortium have kept track of any progress on plans for the PAEC, and also on the Education Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan. (The former Mayor of San Francisco was in consultation with the State Chancellor of the College system at the time that the College was taken over by the State and did not oppose the maneuvers as he should have been willing to do.)

The PAEC is needed, partly because at present City College is an incomplete campus, lacking an auditorium as it does. This is an accreditation issue, but it has been so for more than 50 years. Plans for the College to complete the PAEC appear to be unclear, but the construction should begin before any housing development is approved. With or without the PAEC, it remains clear that a development of 1100 units or more is a threat to the survival of the College as presently constituted. That is one of the reasons that some have urged either to reduce the number of units of a projected Balboa Reservoir development—instead having 800 units or less, with greater emphasis on gardens and open space. The other option, even though rather peremptorily dismissed in the Draft SEIR, is to have the land transferred to the College, thereby retaining it as public land. At that point, modest plans might be made for some faculty or student housing without overwhelming the neighborhood or interfering significantly with traffic or parking—due to the smaller scope of the project. But this would have to be determined later.

Thank you.

Harry Bernstein