

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING ~~DEPARTMENT~~COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

Regular Meeting)
)
)
_____)

ITEM 12: BALBOA RESERVOIR PROJECT
DRAFT SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
2018-007883ENV
PUBLIC COMMENT

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ~~COMMISSION~~ CHAMBERS, ROOM ~~400~~250

CITY HALL, 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2019
4:21 P.M.

Reported by:

Bridgette Rast

APPEARANCES

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

Joel Koppel, Vice President

Frank Fung, Commissioner

Rich Hillis, Commissioner

Milicent Johnson, Commissioner

Kathrin Moore, Commissioner

Jonas P. Ionin, Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Jeanie Poling, Senior Environmental Planner

PUBLIC COMMENT

Lisa Anderson, Resident, Monterey Heights

Alvin Jaw, Resident

Steve Zeltzer, United Public Workers for Action

Andrew Currier, PhD, Archbishop Riordan High School

Christopher Peterson, Resident, Ingleside

Benjamin Snyder, Resident, Ingleside

Sam Moss, Executive Director, Mission Housing Development

Laura Foote, NB Action (phonetic)

Brad, CCSF Student

Jess Wynn, CCSF Student

Michael Adams, CCSF Student

Vicky, CCSF Student

Sophie Sapphire, CCSF Student

~~Wendy~~ Kaufman, CCSF Faculty

Monica Collins, Resident, Sunnyside
PUBLIC COMMENT

Theodore Randolph, Resident, Excelsior

Jean Barish, former CCSF Faculty Member

Amy O'Hare, Sunnyside Representative, Balboa Reservoir
Community Advisory Committee, Board Member, Sunnyside
Neighborhood Association

Gary Barringer, Resident

Jennifer Heggie, Resident Sunnyside, Balboa Reservoir
Community Advisory Committee Representative

Christine Hanson, Resident

Marcie Rhine, Resident

Hedda Tima, Resident

Michael Ahrens, President, Westwood Park Homeowners
Association

Ken Kowalski, Member, Westwood Park Homeowners
Association

Laura Fry, Resident, Westwood Park

Anita Theoharis, Board Member, Westwood ~~park-Park~~
Association

Harry Bernstein, CCSF Faculty Member

Nicholas Nagle, San Francisco Housing Action Coalition

Jon Winston, Chair, Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory
Committee

Rita Evans, Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

P R O C E E D I N G S

4:21 P.M.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA,

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2019

SECRETARY IONIN: Okay, the court

reporter is ready.

Commissioners, we left off on Item 12,

for Case No. 2018-007883ENV, for the Balboa

Reservoir Project. This is the draft

Environmental Impact Report.

Please note that written comments will be

accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00

p.m., on September 23, 2019.

And I would like to just stress and

remind members of the public your testimony

should be on the accuracy and adequacy of the

final Environmental Impact Report, not your

opinion of the project itself.

MS. POLING: Good afternoon Vice

President Koppel and members of the Commission.

I'm Jeanie Poling, Planning Department staff and

Environmental Coordinator for the Balboa

Reservoir Project.

1 Can I have the screen? Thank you. The
2 item before you is the review and comment on the
3 Balboa Reservoir Project draft Subsequent
4 Environmental Impact Report, or EIR. The purpose
5 of today's hearing is to take public comments on
6 the adequacy, accuracy and completeness of the
7 draft Subsequent EIR pursuant to the California
8 Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA, and San
9 Francisco's local procedures for implementing
10 CEQA. No approval action on this document is
11 requested at this time.

12 The public review period for the
13 project's draft Subsequent EIR began on August 8
14 and will continue until 5:00 p.m., on September
15 23.

16 I'll briefly explain why we're preparing
17 a Subsequent EIR and then summarize the project
18 description and analysis before opening up the
19 meeting to public comment.

20 The 17-acre project site is the western
21 portion of the Balboa Reservoir, which is within
22 the Balboa Park Station Plan Area. The
23 programmatic EIR for the area plan was certified
24 in 2008 and it assumed 500 dwelling units would
25 be developed at the reservoir project site.

1 A Subsequent EIR is a whole new EIR that
2 focuses on the conditions that need new analysis.
3 The current project proposes more density than
4 was assumed in the Area Plan EIR, so it's a
5 revision to the project and it identifies new,
6 significant environmental impacts, and
7 substantially more severe impacts than those
8 identified in the 2008 Area Plan EIR.

9 Thus, the CEQA document we are preparing
10 is a Subsequent EIR and it uses as a base the
11 analysis that was done for the 2008 Area Plan
12 EIR.

13 The draft Subsequent EIR analyzes two
14 different sets of options for the site's
15 residential density to capture a range of
16 possible development on the project site. The
17 developer's proposed option is proposed by
18 Reservoir Community Partners and the additional
19 housing option has been developed by the City to
20 maximize affordable housing.

21 Development under each of the two options
22 would entail the same land uses, street
23 configurations, and site plans. The additional
24 housing option adds one story to each of the
25 buildings and includes smaller units to increase

1 the number of residences.

2 The developer's proposed option includes
3 1,100 dwelling units and a public parking garage.
4 The additional housing option includes 1,550
5 units and no public parking garage.

6 The draft Subsequent EIR also analyzes
7 four project variants. These variants are
8 located at the same project site and they all
9 relate to the parking garage location and
10 transportation access.

11 Before I discuss the findings, I'd like
12 to point out that in February 2019 the Planning
13 Department updated its Transportation Impact
14 Analysis guidelines. These guidelines provide
15 methodologies and criteria for undertaking
16 transportation review in San Francisco. They
17 include updated travel demand rates that account
18 for vehicles operating as Transportation Network
19 Companies, or TNCs.

20 The Balboa Reservoir Project's
21 transportation analysis is based on these rates
22 and, therefore, analyzes the impacts of TNCs.

23 I'll now summarize the draft Subsequent
24 EIR's significant and unavoidable impact
25 findings. The draft Subsequent EIR identifies

1 three significant and unavoidable impacts during
2 project construction. These involve construction
3 noise, regional air quality during the three-year
4 construction schedule, and localized air quality
5 during the three-year construction schedule.

6 All three of these impacts would be
7 significant under both project options and all
8 project areas.

9 The draft Subsequent EIR identifies two
10 transportation-related impacts during project
11 operation. One involves potential conflicts
12 related to loading along the Lee Avenue
13 extension, which is currently a dead end, but
14 would become a through street when the project
15 becomes operational.

16 The other impact involves transit delay
17 under cumulative conditions due to growth at the
18 project site combined with growth at City
19 College.

20 Both of these impacts would be
21 significant under both project options and all
22 project variants.

23 The draft Subsequent EIR identifies four
24 project alternatives. A no-project alternative,
25 which is required by CEQA law, a reduced density

1 alternative, an alternative that allows passenger
2 vehicle access from Westwood Park via San Ramon
3 Way, and a six-year construction alternative.

4 The only build alternative that would
5 reduce significant and unavoidable impacts is the
6 six-year construction schedule, which would
7 reduce the two significant construction air
8 quality impacts to less than significant with
9 mitigation.

10 Significant transportation impacts during
11 project operation would occur under both options
12 and all variants.

13 While the San Ramon Way vehicle access
14 alternative and the reduced density alternative
15 would reduce transportation-related impacts, they
16 wouldn't reduce them to less--than--significant
17 levels.

18 Today, the Planning Department is seeking
19 comments on the adequacy and accuracy of the
20 information contained in the draft Subsequent
21 EIR. For members of the public who wish to
22 speak, please fill out a speaker card and state
23 your name for the record. Please speak slowly
24 and clearly so that the court reporter can make
25 an accurate transcript of today's proceedings.

1 Staff is not here to respond to comments
2 today. Instead, we will transcribe all verbal
3 and written comments received today, and during
4 the public comment period, and we will respond to
5 these comments that raise significant
6 environmental issues in a responses to comment
7 document.

8 SECRETARY IONIN: I'm sorry, there are no
9 speaker cards.

10 MS. POLING: Sorry. Okay, no speaker
11 cards, but you can line up. Correct? Okay,
12 sorry about that.

13 So, we will respond to written and oral
14 comments in a responses to comments document,
15 which we anticipate publishing in the spring of
16 2020.

17 Those who are interested in submitting
18 written comments on the draft Subsequent EIR may
19 do so by email or by hardcopy. All comments must
20 be received by 5:00 p.m., on Monday, September
21 23.

22 Unless the Commissioners have procedural
23 questions, I respectfully suggest that the public
24 hearing on this item be opened. Thank you.

25 SECRETARY IONIN: Okay, members of the

1 public, please line up on our left, your right
2 side of the room, and come on up.

3 MS. ANDERSON: Hello, my name is Lisa
4 Anderson. I'm here on behalf of myself, my
5 husband, and my son. We live in Monterey Heights
6 and we're supporters of this project. Looking at
7 the Environmental Impact Report, we don't see any
8 reason that this project should not go through.

9 Housing is such an issue in San Francisco
10 and this project has already been reduced in
11 scope, so we would urge you to support this.

12 As a former high school administrator, it
13 broke my heart to see all of the students who
14 could not afford to live here. And I've just had
15 to say goodbye to my son's best friend, who grew
16 up on Wildwood, just blocks from this project.

17 So, please, approve this project.

18 SECRETARY IONIN: Thank you. Next
19 speaker please.

20 MR. JAW: My name's Alvin Jaw. I've
21 already submitted quite a number of written
22 comments to you. Hopefully, you've been able to
23 read some of them. And I have pointed out a
24 whole lot of inadequacies in the SEIR.

25 I'm wearing this shirt that says "No War

1 on Iraq". That's because I don't have a shirt
2 that says no invasion of luxury housing onto the
3 Balboa Reservoir. And I am in favor of
4 affordable housing, but not luxury housing.

5 Yeah, I'll just talk about two
6 inadequacies out of all the things that I've
7 written so far, and there will be more written
8 comments forthcoming. But I'll talk about two.

9 This is a weapon of mass destruction in
10 terms of what the Balboa Reservoir project is
11 doing. You know, similar to the Iraq war where
12 they were looking for weapons of mass
13 destruction, we have one right here with the
14 reservoir project.

15 And how do I mean? During the Iraq war,
16 the British Intelligence Agency, M16, wrote what
17 was called the Downing Street Memo. And what the
18 Downing Street memo said that the facts -- excuse
19 me. The evidence and the facts or the
20 intelligence and the facts were fixed around the
21 policy.

22 And that's what we have right here. You
23 have the Planning Department that has set this
24 whole -- which is sponsoring the reservoir
25 project. And the policy and the SEIR is being

1 fixed around that policy.

2 Okay, so I'll go to two specifics. One
3 is the environmental setting. Okay, that's
4 critical for CEQA, setting up the environmental
5 baseline setting. The description that's given
6 in the SEIR basically just talks about the plot
7 itself. But CEQA, in terms of the Code of
8 California Regulations, says you have to talk
9 about the vicinity, not just the plot, itself.
10 So, that, already, right there is in violation of
11 CCR 15125. You can look it up, okay.

12 The second one is regarding transit
13 delay. Okay, transit delay is defined in this
14 SEIR with a threshold of significance. And it's
15 an invented threshold of significance. And what
16 does the SEIR say: The threshold of significance
17 is four minutes. What does that mean in terms of
18 the reservoir? It means that, oh, the reservoir
19 project can contribute four minutes of delay on
20 MUNI without it being considered to be
21 significant. So, it's BS. Okay, read it
22 carefully before you certify it.

23 SECRETARY IONIN: Thank you, sir. Next
24 speaker please.

25 MR. ZELTZER: Steve Zeltzer, United

1 Public Workers for Action. I think we see today,
2 already, the results of your disastrous Planning
3 Commission decisions. Warrior Stadium is a good
4 example of that. You approved that without
5 proper transit. A violation of your rules, but
6 you did it because you're basically a kept
7 commission, which represents the developers.
8 That's why all today you've been going along with
9 whatever the developers want. You're saying to
10 hell with the people of San Francisco, it's okay
11 to have more gridlock.

12 Now, this project, at Ocean, the Balboa
13 Reservoir, is a project that will destroy City
14 College of San Francisco. That's not in your
15 plans, although that will be the result. To have
16 construction, massive construction and 1,500
17 condos next to the college prevents the college
18 from developing. It will create chaos. But you
19 don't really give a damn about City College or
20 the people of San Francisco because you represent
21 the developers.

22 That's what I think more and more people
23 understand who come here; they see you as shells
24 for the developers. The fact of the matter is
25 this is a corrupt operation and the City of San

1 Francisco has spent millions of dollars for
2 Avalon for these meetings, staged meetings to
3 really grease the way for this development.
4 These homes, these condos are not for the people
5 of San Francisco, working people, students,
6 professors; they're for people who have a lot of
7 money, who can afford million-dollar condos.
8 That's not the kind of construction we need. We
9 need working class construction.

10 Now, the San Francisco Labor Council has
11 said, along with the Union, AFP 21, the PUC
12 should transfer that property to City College for
13 development. That's what we support. It
14 shouldn't be privatized, as you're supporting
15 these developers to do.

16 Avalon and the developers are interested
17 in one thing, profit, profiteering off the land
18 of San Francisco. We need working class housing
19 in San Francisco, not more million-dollar condos.
20 But that's, apparently, what you are driven to do
21 by the developers who appointed you and who you
22 represent.

23 The students at San Francisco City
24 College need that parking. There's no plans for
25 parking for them. These are working class

1 students who work at jobs. Where are they going
2 to go? They're going to be driven out of City
3 College because they won't have parking. They
4 have to go to their jobs. They won't be able to.
5 They'll go to other colleges. That's part of the
6 privatization and the destruction of City
7 College, which is being pushed, really, by the
8 developers and the mayor of San Francisco. And
9 if the supervisors approve that, they're part of
10 this actual development process.

11 So, we say to the public of San
12 Francisco, stop this corrupt, rotten development,
13 the more gridlock on Ocean Avenue. There's no
14 way of getting mass transportation out there.
15 The MTA has said they can't provide the extension
16 of the Ocean Avenue, which means there will be
17 gridlock. There is gridlock now, and you want to
18 encourage more gridlock for the people of San
19 Francisco.

20 You have to be held accountable for the
21 terrible situation of the Warriors, with two
22 stadiums, now. A hospital, two hospitals, or a
23 hospital and Kaiser, and people can't go to their
24 own facilities.

25 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you, sir.

1 Next speaker please.

2 SECRETARY IONIN: I will remind members
3 of the public that the purpose of today's hearing
4 is to accept testimony on the accuracy, adequacy,
5 and completeness of the Environmental Impact
6 Report.

7 DR. CURRIER: Good afternoon. That's a
8 tough one to follow, but I've got a few concerns.
9 My name's Dr. Andrew Currier. I'm representing
10 Archbishop Riordan High School, as its President.

11 There's a multitude of concerns. But as
12 it relates to this report, we serve 680 boys, 9
13 to 12, and a quarter of them, 170 of them have
14 diagnosed learning needs. And if you see, if I
15 could pull this up, this circle RSP; that
16 represents the learning area. It's a specialized
17 designed learning area for students with
18 diagnosed learning needs that they can't -- we
19 can't move them elsewhere in the building.

20 So, we're worried that there's not enough
21 information about the noise, the dust, the
22 disruption to their learning growth, their
23 academic growth. Again, we don't have any option
24 to move them elsewhere in the building, so we
25 really want more detail on that. We want some

1 sensitivity to that. These are young men that
2 cannot be served by San Francisco public schools.
3 These are specialized programs.

4 We also have 50 students in residence at
5 Archbishop Riordan High School who, also, some of
6 them have significant learning needs. They can't
7 go elsewhere to receive this help.

8 So, we need more information about the
9 noise impact. How is this all -- how is the
10 hammering, the excavation, the drilling, all of
11 that noise, all of that disruption, the trucks
12 when they're beeping to back up, the backhoes,
13 all that noise, how is that going to impact -- is
14 that going to be two years lost on 170 students'
15 education, who are trying despite learning needs
16 and differences, to prepare themselves for
17 college.

18 They're paying, in some cases, \$60,000 a
19 year to attend Riordan for this specialized care.
20 That's all going to be disrupted for two plus
21 years? That's unacceptable to us. So, we need
22 more detail on this.

23 The other thing is we're worried that
24 fire trucks aren't going to be able to get to our
25 school in case of a fire. There's not been

1 enough detail or clarity about transportation.
2 They've delayed that meeting. That was supposed
3 to take place this week. That has not occurred.
4 It's been delayed until September 30th. I need
5 more clarity on the impact of transportation on
6 our school.

7 The other thing is there's not nearly
8 enough detail about the blockage of light into
9 our building. It was designed to have natural
10 light coming in to warm the building, to enhance
11 the culture of learning for our students in the
12 classrooms. That's all going to be blocked.

13 So, thank you for listening.

14 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
15 speaker please.

16 MR. PETERSON: Thank you very much. My
17 name is Christopher Peterson, a resident of the
18 Ingleside. I strongly support the additional
19 housing option version of this project. It is
20 environmentally superior to options and
21 alternatives that provide less transit-oriented
22 affordable housing and/or more public parking.

23 To reduce the amount of housing would
24 increase pressure on housing in areas that are
25 more automobile dependent and have more extreme

1 climate. To provide more public parking would
2 undercut efforts to address climate change by
3 reducing automobile use.

4 That said, this draft fails to evaluate
5 how the developer's proposed public parking
6 garage would undercut City College's efforts to
7 reduce automobile use. The College's 2019
8 Transportation Demand Management and Parking Plan
9 concludes that TDM measures would be sufficient
10 to address the loss of parking spaces caused by
11 this project. The only exception will be during
12 a few hours of the first week of each semester.
13 Even then, the shortfall would be less than one-
14 third of the 750 spaces proposed in the public
15 parking garage.

16 There is, therefore, no need for such a
17 large public parking garage. It would undercut
18 the City's and the College's efforts to respond
19 to the climate crisis by reducing automobile use.

20 Finally, the transit improvement
21 mitigation measures identified in the draft
22 should not be deferred until after the project is
23 shown to have an adverse impact on transit
24 service. Congestion when City College is in
25 session and congestion associated with the Whole

1 Foods Grocery Store are already impeding transit
2 service. So, the project proponents should be
3 working with MUNI, now, to implement transit
4 improvement measures up front without waiting for
5 proof of additional adverse impacts in the
6 future. Thank you very much.

7 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
8 speaker please.

9 MR. SNYDER: Hi there. My name is
10 Benjamin Snyder. I'm a resident of District 7,
11 in Ingleside Terraces, and I'm speaking on behalf
12 of myself and my parents, with whom I live as a
13 14-year-old college grad, largely because of the
14 dearth of the affordable housing options in San
15 Francisco. And, specifically, the dearth of
16 affordable, reasonably-sized housing options in
17 my own neighborhood, in the OMI, off Ocean
18 Avenue.

Commented [SY1]: Please have transcriber double check this.

19 So, I'm thrilled to see that this project
20 is making its way through the process with all of
21 these more reasonably-sized units, that are still
22 transit accessible, and in this great location.

23 And it appears to me, with my untrained
24 eye, that the Environmental Impact Report is in
25 order and it should proceed to the next rounds of

1 approval.

2 And I'd also like to say that the kind of
3 thing that isn't included in the Environmental
4 Impact Report is the number of people who will
5 live in these places in the future, without cars,
6 and who will be taking public transit in San
7 Francisco, rather than that same number of people
8 living out in Modesto and driving into San
9 Francisco every day, for an hour and a hour. So,
10 I think those are really important environmental
11 considerations to make as well.

Commented [SY2]: Should it be "and a half"?

12 I want to also reiterate what the
13 previous speaker said. That I hope that the
14 Commission approves the more housing-rich option
15 and thinks very seriously about these parking
16 garages, and increasing transit service sooner,
17 rather than later. Thank you.

18 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
19 speaker please.

20 MR. MOSS: Good evening Commissioners.
21 Thanks for having this lovely meeting. Really
22 appreciate your time.

23 My name is Sam Moss. I'm the Executive
24 Director of Mission Housing Development
25 Corporation. We're a 48-year-old nonprofit,

1 affordable housing developer that is one of three
2 affordable housing developers on this team.

3 Really want to reiterate that, that when
4 developers are being disparaged, it is
5 disparaging three nonprofits who have provided
6 over a century, and thousands upon thousands of
7 one hundred percent low-income affordable housing
8 to San Francisco.

9 And to be frank, Avalon is an incredible
10 market rate developer that knows and understands
11 the community. This project has taken everything
12 into account and then some. And, you know,
13 Mission Housing has over a thousand children that
14 live in our buildings. We take their health and
15 safety very seriously. We do occupied rehab
16 projects in their buildings all the time.

17 So, not to say that those concerns aren't
18 valid, but I am personally saying that as one of
19 the co-developers of this project that the
20 community and its safety are top of our list.

21 But I do hope that you see fit to keep
22 this going forward today and thank you for your
23 time.

24 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
25 speaker, please.

1 MS. FOOT: Hi, Laura Foot, NB Action
2 (phonetic). I have been speaking in favor of
3 Balboa Reservoir for a couple years, now. And if
4 we can't have an Environmental Impact Report tell
5 us that it's better to have dense, vibrant,
6 walkable housing instead of a giant parking lot,
7 then I don't know what to say about the future of
8 San Francisco's ability to deal with climate
9 change.

10 It's obvious that we should be turning
11 parking into housing. It is obvious that it will
12 be for the benefit of literally thousands of
13 people who will have the ability to live in this
14 50-percent affordable housing project.

15 Another great thing, planners have worked
16 really hard to do these cross-subsidized projects
17 in a world where we don't have enough funding for
18 subsidized affordable housing. We're working on
19 things like the bond. We're working on other
20 sources of stable funding. These 50-percent
21 affordable projects, where we get to cross-
22 subsidized with market rate housing in order to
23 get more low-income housing we need to be
24 celebrating those projects.

25 This is exactly the kind of thing that

1 allows the city to get a lot more units of
2 subsidized affordable housing.

3 It's tragic to be speaking for this
4 project over and over again. It's been since
5 2008 and this is the fourth time they have tried
6 to build housing here. And if San Francisco
7 cannot get its act together and turn a 17-acre
8 parking lot into walkable housing, then we are
9 not going to solve any of our other problems.
10 Thank you.

11 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
12 speaker, please.

13 BRAD: Hi. My name's Brad. I've lived
14 here. I grew up here. I was born here. But you
15 have to really think about this location. It's
16 City College. It's the main campus. So, you
17 really have to think about what this use is for
18 and the impact.

19 I'm all for, you know, affordable
20 housing. I believe in, you know, biking. But
21 you really have to think about all the people
22 that can't bike here to that location. You know,
23 it's very valuable to be able to have a parking
24 lot and so that it opens it to everybody that
25 wants to be able to park there. And it's

1 frustrating and I'm sure you guys are frustrated,
2 too, that it's dragged on so long. But there's a
3 reason why it's dragged on so long because people
4 really, you know, that believe in this. I'm glad
5 that we're really taking time to make sure that
6 this is. And also, so I'm also disabled, and so,
7 you have to think about the mobility of the, you
8 know, people that need to be able to get to
9 campus and to get to class on time.

10 Obviously, you know, parking's very
11 limited. So, thanks for your time.

12 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
13 speaker, please.

14 MS. WYNN: Hi. Sorry, I'm a little
15 nervous. This is my first time at any of these
16 meetings and watching other people speak, it's
17 incredibly -- sorry. My name is Jess Wynn~~x~~ and I
18 have been a student since January 2018 and a
19 proud recipient of free City. I'm incredibly
20 grateful for the opportunity to change my life
21 and my career. And now, you help protect the
22 access for future students.

23 I would like to echo the student
24 disability advocate, Brad, for his statements on
25 the already lack of available parking for

1 disabled students. The parking lot is not just
2 parking it's a representation of students,
3 students carpool. They work two or three jobs
4 just to go to school. Free city is their only
5 option to go and actually get to the next level.
6 They can't afford to even live -- I would -- I've
7 heard the pictures shown in the developer's plan,
8 of the lane in question, showing the CCSF parking
9 lot as being under-utilized. The photo was said
10 to be taken on a Sunday. I don't know about you,
11 but we don't offer many Sunday classes at our
12 school or on Ocean campus. The library isn't
13 even open. I don't think it's a fair
14 representation of the current service this public
15 land provides.

16 Nearby, Riordan uses the parking lot
17 during the school year for band practice. The
18 upper CCS lot is filled by 10:00 a.m. and the
19 Balboa Reserved Public Land has been essential
20 for students.

21 Students have been posting videos on
22 Twitter of the Balboa Reservoir being occupied by
23 students, at [ccsfstudentsays/ccsfbottomlaw](https://twitter.com/ccsfstudentsays) and
24 [ccsfbsaid](https://twitter.com/ccsfbsaid).

25 Students are going to experience the pain

1 and it's going to affect the success of the
2 community. Neighborhoods are flooded with cars.
3 And if students are rushing to find parking in
4 residential, surrounding areas, then you're going
5 to increase the risk of pedestrian fatalities.

6 SF is known as a premier city. During
7 the transit week, associate students surveyed
8 students on their MUNI commute to school. One
9 Tweeted result showed that a large number of
10 students take over an hour to get to school on
11 MUNI. Students commute over an hour just to come
12 here to learn. And it's not a surprise that
13 veteran students come in droves to San Francisco.
14 The education and higher rate of reimbursement
15 encourages them to come all the way from
16 Hollister, Joshua Tree, Stockton and Sacramento
17 just to go. Where will students go?

18 Pushing the responsibilities -- pushing
19 the burden on neighbors seems irresponsible.

20 Is this the absolute best use of the
21 land? The school isn't perfect. It had seven to
22 eight chancellors in the last decade. I question
23 its management of money and how the CCSF
24 Transportation Report represented students.

25 I've sat on the land. I've organized.

1 I've advocated and I've talked to students for
2 hours at a time. Seventy percent of the CCSF
3 teaching staff are now part-timers. Their
4 salaries won't even cover affordable housing that
5 Avalon claims to build.

6 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
7 speaker, please.

8 MR. ADAMS: Hello. My name is Michael
9 Adams. I come to you as a student of City
10 College, a former City Planner, a former
11 Administrator of a major university in this City,
12 and a person who lives in a walkable
13 neighborhood.

14 The access from my walkable neighborhood
15 to City College is accomplished by rapid transit.
16 Rapid transit in San Francisco is getting in a
17 car, driving twice as far and half the time as
18 you can get on MUNI and BART, and getting to your
19 destination and doing your business, and then
20 departing on your next rapid transit journey.

21 That parking lot is more than a piece of
22 asphalt. It's kind of like folks would call the
23 runways at San Francisco Airport a parking lot.
24 Without any context in terms of the cultural and
25 social and economic value of that property. It's

1 not a parking lot. It's a transit stop for
2 people's shopping and experiencing the
3 educational opportunity that City College
4 provides.

5 We've heard remarks about zoning. This
6 project's going to require a zoning change. Spot
7 zoning is the substance of federal lawsuits.
8 When a neighborhood is zoned a certain way and
9 people, developers come in and capture a spot,
10 and create a spot zone exception to the normal
11 asset value of a consistently zoned neighborhood,
12 that's lawsuit material.

13 This group, who are opposing this
14 project, I'd like you to look at the diversity of
15 the group and then compare that with the
16 diversity of this panel, and then compare that
17 with the diversity of the project sponsors, who
18 can't find a person who looks like me to support
19 the project.

20 There's something about San Francisco
21 that gets preserved when diverse populations join
22 together to try to make their point and presence
23 known.

24 Justin Herman, who I studied under as a
25 City Planner, destroyed the western addition.

1 And that legacy has continued, unfortunately, in
2 major decisions by this City, through this
3 Planning Department, through this City Board of
4 Supervisors. And it would be helpful, since
5 you're going through a transition of
6 administrators to look carefully, and not
7 repeating the ghost of Justin Herman.

8 Carlton Goodlett is a better ghost. And
9 he was a friend and neighbor of ours in Nebraska.
10 Think about it.

Commented [SY3]: Have transcriber double check this word.

11 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
12 speaker, please.

13 VICKY: Hi. My name is Vicky. I am a
14 student at City College. And I'm here because --
15 I'm here to represent a lot of those who couldn't
16 come with me. If you can imagine the 20,000
17 students who will be impacted by this, who are
18 currently enrolled at City College. Twenty
19 thousand students, yeah.

20 We already, as is, are a commuter school.
21 We know that when we did a survey in 2016, it
22 showed that over 45 percent of the students have
23 to commute to the college. Right. And so, we
24 already -- we're serving a population where more
25 than 80 percent are either employed or looking

1 for paid jobs. So, they're part-time students.
2 Or, really, they're actually maybe taking a full
3 course load and just working part-time.

4 And we know of that, there's 26 percent
5 who work 26 plus hours. That's a survey we did
6 in 2019.

7 So, if we're thinking about the
8 population that we serve at City College, how
9 they live in the intersections of being
10 marginalized, having disabilities, being of
11 color, being trans, they're probably the ones who
12 are working these jobs.

13 So, if you're taking away access,
14 physical access to education, where they have to
15 transport themselves to the college, we're
16 probably not going to have the same level of
17 enrollment. These students won't have access to
18 educations. Is that something we're ready to
19 take away from people? From a population that's
20 already marginalized?

21 And I would say, I am all for affordable
22 housing. I grew up living in Section 8s. And to
23 me this plan is not aggressive enough. I'm
24 sorry, it's public land. A hundred percent of it
25 should go to affordable housing.

1 We know that the cost of land in San
2 Francisco is incredibly high. Why would we take
3 public land and privatize it? We should be
4 asking for a more aggressive plan. If anything,
5 to expand access to education, to provide
6 affordable housing to students, to faculty.

7 I mean, unless we're addressing their
8 ability to access education, then I'm sorry, this
9 plan is just not good enough. Thank you.

10 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
11 speaker, please.

12 MS. SAPPHIRE: Hi. My name's Sophie
13 Sapphire. I was born and raised in San Francisco
14 and I've been a City College of San Francisco
15 student since 2012.

16 I recently moved near campus, so I can
17 walk to school. But for seven years I had to
18 drive, and that was living in the City. I lived
19 in the outer Richmond. And to take a bus from
20 there to City College takes an hour and a half.
21 That's the time it takes for me to walk out of my
22 house until I'm in my classroom. And that was
23 what it was like for me.

24 So, like Vicky said, over 40 percent of
25 students who go to City College commute.

1 And for those seven years that I drove to
2 school, I always had to drive straight down to
3 the lower lot, the language -- or, excuse me, the
4 location that is in question, because the upper
5 lot is always full. And as the years have
6 progressed, this has only continued to get more
7 and more severe. There is no access to parking
8 on campus and, frankly, it's a necessity for many
9 of these students who do work part and fulltime
10 jobs, like myself, to be able to attend school.

11 Furthermore, there are not going to be
12 enough units in this building for students to be
13 able to access them. It's public land and it
14 should be only 100 percent affordable. And if
15 that can't be, then the situation that we have
16 currently, with the available parking, is the
17 best situation for the students. That's all,
18 thank you.

19 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
20 speaker, please.

21 MS. KAUFFMAN: Hi. I'm Wendy Kauffman
22 and I've been a teacher at City College for 36
23 years. You know, San Francisco has always prided
24 itself on its commitment to social justice and
25 equity. To that end, the City's undertaking an

1 effort to train its decision makers to be more
2 sensitive and aware of social justice.

3 In fact, I know that on September 26th
4 you, the Planning Commission, are scheduled to
5 participate in a racial and social equity
6 training.

7 In light of this, and in light of the
8 fact that the draft Environmental Impact Report
9 states the need to develop the reservoir in a
10 manner that will best benefit the neighborhood,
11 the City, and the region as a whole.

12 In light of these things, I ask you to
13 consider the social justice aspects of the
14 proposed Balboa Reservoir Project with respect to
15 housing, education, and labor.

16 Housing. This project is not addressing
17 the real crisis in San Francisco. It's not
18 addressing the affordability crisis of housing.
19 Public land should be kept in public hands for
20 public good, and it should only be used for 100
21 percent deeply affordable housing on the Balboa
22 Reservoir. It certainly should not be given over
23 to a private developer, whose CEO makes \$7
24 million a year.

25 With regards to education, this project

1 will limit student access to higher education by
2 allowing the developer to remove their
3 transportation options before another viable one
4 -- viable ones are put into place.

5 I want to put this picture here because
6 you see so many pictures of this parking lot that
7 are completely empty. We need to have a
8 counterbalance. Now, of course, it's not always
9 this full, but it's more toward this end of the
10 spectrum than the empty lots that you see in the
11 developer's promotional materials.

12 Lastly, the social justice aspect with
13 regard to labor. In the January 9th, 2018 San
14 Francisco County Transit Authority meeting, where
15 the TBM was passed, Malia Cohen says this: I
16 believe that Avalon Bay will create a lot of
17 problems for us.

18 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you, ma'am,
19 your time -- oh, I apologize, go ahead.

20 MS. KAUFMAN: Yeah. Those of us that
21 have relationships in labor, many times they have
22 come here, our labor partners have come here
23 raising concerns that they haven't hired union
24 labor to do the job. Any project built in San
25 Francisco, and especially one on public land

1 should be mandated to use local union labor.

2 Thank you.

3 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
4 speaker, please.

5 MS. COLLINS: Hello, Monica Collins,
6 Sunnyside. This is prepared.

7 The SEIR states that transit delay
8 induced by the Balboa Reservoir Project will be
9 insignificant. But this conclusion is based on a
10 completely arbitrary, unauthorized definition of
11 delay on the part of the consultants.

12 The meaning on time performance standards
13 allows for a four-minute delay for an entire
14 route. But the 43 Masonic travels from Balboa
15 Reservoir, along Frida Kahlo Way, to Balboa Park
16 in seven minutes. Using the consultant's
17 redefinition of transit delay, additional delays
18 of up to four minutes in just three segments,
19 resulting in a travel time of 19 minutes, 171
20 percent increase. From any perspective, whether
21 legal, ethical, or engineering, this is wrong.

22 The SEIR is in error in using this
23 faulty, invalid method of determining transit
24 delay.

25 So, as for me, I am an electrician,

1 construction electrician. We build things. And
2 I'm not against development. I'm totally in the
3 bag for City College, and for diversity, and for
4 truly, deeply affordable housing.

5 Also, I'm a small-time landlord. But
6 this is luxury housing. Can we stop pretending
7 that this is L.A.? We can't cram an infinite
8 number of people into a 7-by-7 square mile city,
9 you know, at the expense of a quiet residential
10 neighborhood, and a college that's serving
11 working class and poor people, and many people.
12 And can we stop pretending that gentrification on
13 steroids is helping anyone.

14 As my friend Michael hinted, what
15 happened in the Fillmore District with a
16 bulldozer is being done, now, with
17 gentrification. Some call it ethnic cleansing.
18 Some call it bleaching. Can we stop pretending
19 that the Orwellian terms we're using are
20 accurate? That up to 50 percent affordable
21 housing is 50 percent. Macy's is having a sale
22 up to 50 percent off. Good luck finding anything
23 that's 50 percent off. Up to means less than,
24 okay.

25 Now, \$140,000 a year is affordable for a

1 single person for housing? Oh, please. \$4,000 a
2 month for an Avalon Bay one-bedroom apartment is
3 affordable? Oh, please. Transit rich is just a
4 substitute for we're not going to plan, budget,
5 or spend for MUNI.

6 I talked to Carmen Chew. Developer money
7 is rolling in and you can afford to subsidize
8 housing. Thank you.

9 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
10 speaker, please.

11 MR. RANDOLPH: Hello. I'm Theodore
12 Randolph, resident of the Excelsior. And I think
13 if there's inadequacy in the EIR it's that it
14 plans for the impacts of too few people. So, the
15 previous attempts to build housing at the Balboa
16 Reservoir were planning for like 100, or 500
17 units of housing and now the developer's option
18 is 1,100. I think that's too small.

19 When we started this process that was
20 five years ago. It looks like it's going to take
21 up to another ten years, if this goes ahead, to
22 finish all those new buildings. And in the
23 subsequent years, our needs could increase even
24 more. So, we should be open to -- Malia Cohen
25 mentioned a number, like 5,000 units in the

1 reservoir.

2 So, just because you say what would be
3 the impact of so many people doesn't mean you are
4 going to build up to that amount. So, we should
5 preserve the option of having more units.

6 And we should also use the site as a --
7 you know, goes to reduce car travel. If people
8 -- when I went to City College, I biked to school
9 every day. And if the students are having to
10 drive there that means our region is not
11 investing enough in public transit. We need to
12 be building more bus lanes. But that's not -- we
13 should have an express bus from the outer
14 Richmond to City College. But that's not part of
15 the EIR for this project. All right, thank you.

16 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
17 speaker, please.

18 MS. BARISH: Good afternoon. My name is
19 Jean Barish. Thank you very much for giving me
20 the opportunity to speak this afternoon.

21 I'm a former CCSF faculty member and have
22 also practiced law for over 20 years, including
23 working on a number of cases involving CEQA. I'm
24 here to state my opposition to the project in
25 general and to highlight some of the many flaws

1 in the draft EIR.

2 I'd like to show you a rendering of what
3 the project will look like if it has 1,550 units.
4 As you can see, this is an oversized project. It
5 would squeeze up to 1,550 units of housing,
6 mostly market rate, onto a parking lot adjoining
7 CCSF, and a quiet neighborhood of single-family
8 homes.

9 While it may be a developer's field of
10 dreams, this project is an environmental
11 nightmare to the surrounding neighborhoods and to
12 City College. It will create traffic congestion,
13 transit issues, environmental problems galore,
14 convert public land into private property for
15 profiteering developers, and it will not meet the
16 growing need in San Francisco for affordable
17 housing.

18 There are numerous flaws in the draft
19 SEIR. I'd like to highlight a few that are just
20 representative of the problem in this document.

21 In the initial study, Appendix B, of the
22 draft SEIR, these are just three examples of many
23 problems with the SEIR.

24 The study concluded that the project
25 would not create adverse shadow effects, despite

1 the fact that there would be new shadow on Unity
2 Plaza for over 25 percent of the year and there
3 would be significant shadow on Riordan High
4 School. No significant effect.

5 The initial study says there would be a
6 population increase of over 100 percent in the
7 plan area, but then concludes there would be no
8 significant cumulative population impacts because
9 this is just a tiny increase compared to the
10 total population of the City as a whole.

11 This is a flawed apples and oranges
12 comparison and should not be accepted.

13 Finally, another example, the initial
14 study, Appendix B, concludes the project would
15 not result in cumulative impacts on public
16 services, yet it did not analyze the impacts of
17 the project on City College. Again, the draft
18 SEIR review of this impact is inadequate.

19 In these and in many other areas the
20 draft SEIR offers no objective criteria to serve
21 as a basis for determining that the impacts
22 aren't less than significant.

23 Accordingly, it is a flawed document that
24 must be revised before it is submitted for final
25 review. Thank you for your consideration.

1 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
2 speaker, please.

3 MS. O'HARE: Good afternoon
4 Commissioners. My name is Amy O'Hare. I'm the
5 Sunnyside representative on the Balboa Reservoir
6 Community Advisory Committee. I'm also on the
7 Board of Sunnyside Neighborhood Association, and
8 I'm speaking for the Board today.

9 I want to address a particular aspect of
10 the environmental report and that is Alternative
11 C. That's opening San Ramon Way to vehicular
12 traffic.

13 I want to urge the Planning Department to
14 support this alternative. As currently planned,
15 there are only two openings for vehicular traffic
16 in and out of the reservoir sites. By opening
17 San Ramon Way, a third access point would be
18 provided, mitigating some of the locked in nature
19 of the site.

20 When AECOM did the initial transportation
21 analysis, in 2015, they conclude: Extending San
22 Ramon Way would reduce local traffic bottleneck
23 into the neighborhood. The extension would
24 attract a portion of the Reservoir site traffic
25 and it can be accommodated without resulting in

1 substantial negative impacts on the existing
2 neighborhood.

3 The draft SEIR states that opening San
4 Ramon Way to vehicles would redistribute traffic
5 from Ocean Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way, where it
6 would otherwise contribute to the transit delay.
7 Opening San Ramon Way would provide emergency
8 vehicles better access.

9 Further, it would reduce project-
10 generated traffic volume at Lee Avenue, which is
11 identified in the draft report as a troublesome
12 intersection with a lot of projected congestion.

13 In 1917, Westwood Park laid out several
14 stub-ended streets. It was laid out with several
15 stub-end streets, including San Ramon.

16 In 1986, Westwood Park Association
17 successfully blocked the opening of the one of
18 the east -- the west side of Westwood Park and so
19 that's just a solid wall. And on the other side
20 of that is the El Dorado development, which
21 happened in the 80s.

22 The original planners fully envisioned
23 that these stubs would be connecting up with new
24 streets as future residential development
25 happened in the surrounding neighborhoods.

1 Connecting San Ramon Way to the Balboa
2 Reservoir Project would seem like an obvious part
3 of effectively developing this site. But
4 apparently, the barrier to do so lies far in the
5 past.

6 I have a conveyance real estate, which
7 was just provided to me by the assessor today,
8 which shows that in 1955 Westwood Park acquired a
9 very tiny slice of San Ramon Way, as a lot.
10 Which a lot was just made up out of public
11 streets. And this is a barrier that's right at
12 the edge of the Balboa Reservoir Project. And I
13 urge the Commission to override this ownership
14 that costs them \$1.36.

15 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you, ma'am,
16 your time is up.

17 MS. O'HARE: Yeah, thank you.

18 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: The next speaker,
19 please.

20 MR. BARRINGER: Good afternoon. Gary
21 Barringer. I live within three blocks of this
22 proposed project area and have lived there for 40
23 years. I first found out about this project and
24 this meeting today when I was taking my dog for a
25 walk right where the project is to be built. And

1 I saw on these lamp posts, this kind of public
2 notice wrapped around. So, I tried to read it
3 and looked a little bit goofy walking around and
4 around, because it really wasn't readable to the
5 public. Finally, I was able to sense it's from
6 the Planning Commission. I got a name and an
7 email. And I wrote Ms. Poling. I told her my
8 problem with this and asked, well, can I get more
9 information?

10 So, she directed me to the website. She
11 was very helpful. And I went down to the
12 Planning Commission and I picked up this book, or
13 this tome, as I call it. And as I read through
14 it, I started calling this the Balboa Housing
15 Boondoggle Project.

16 And I cannot separate the actual project
17 from this SEIR. It's like they borrowed some
18 frumies -- some Sharpies from Donald Trump, drew
19 the lines to make their own reality, and ignored
20 the reality that the neighbors of this project
21 and the students of City College are going to be
22 facing.

23 One example. The draft SEIR fails to
24 include the City College multi-use building as a
25 sensitive receptor, which I think is a euphemism

1 for young kids, okay.

2 The multi-use building is 150 feet from
3 the construction site and is used for childcare
4 classes, for children and classes on the site.

5 The short term measurement location
6 information in the SEIR, which is on page 3,
7 section C.9, notes that, and I quote from the
8 DEIR: The college campuses are generally not
9 considered a noise-sensitive receptor.

10 The MUB has been used for childcare
11 classes, for children on site for years and will
12 continue to be used that way. Therefore, it
13 qualifies as a noise-sensitive receptor. And the
14 DEIR completely ignores that, as they ignore the
15 impact to City College, and the impact on Riordan
16 College.

17 This is public land. It should be used
18 for the public. I strongly urge you accept
19 alternative A, which is to do nothing and start
20 back at the drawing board to build affordable
21 housing for teachers and students.

22 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you, sir.

23 MR. BARRINGER: Thank you.

24 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Next speaker,
25 please.

1 MS. HEGGIE: Hello. My name's Jennifer
2 Heggie. I'm from Sunnyside and representing the
3 Balboa Reservoir Committee for the SNA.

4 First, I want to thank the Planning
5 Department for this SEIR. It identifies many of
6 our concerns that are issues that cannot be
7 mitigated, including noise, transportation, and
8 air quality. My focus today is going to be on
9 noise.

10 Noise effects on residents and childcare
11 centers in adjacent Sunnyside have been ignored,
12 although they are located within the 900-foot
13 zone of the project noise considerations. Two
14 childcare centers and preschools were identified
15 in the EIR, in this east side of the project.

16 The sensitive receptors are closer to
17 parts of the development than the studied 24-hour
18 LT.3 location in Westwood Park. And Sunnyside
19 sites lie in an area that is typically downwind
20 of the construction site.

21 Like many childcare or nursery schools in
22 the area, the Staples and Frida Kahlo Way -- I've
23 forgotten the name of the mini location. It's
24 for children. Serves as a residence, as well as
25 childcare center and preschool center. It needs

1 a 24-hour noise study.

2 Additionally, we suggest noise testing at
3 the corner of Judson and Frida Kahlo Way,
4 formerly Phelan Avenue, where a replacement City
5 College daycare center is planned for the future.

6 The first mitigation measure for noise
7 recommends selecting truck haul routes that,
8 quote: Avoid the north access road and adjacent
9 Riordan High School and residential uses along
10 Lee Avenue.

11 But there is only one alternative route,
12 Lee Avenue to Ocean Avenue, which is also
13 adjacent to a sensitive receptor, the Harmony
14 Family Childcare. A high school, nursery schools
15 and daycare centers are located at or near all of
16 the identified possible entrances and exit site
17 points.

18 The Lee Avenue alternative is already
19 identified in the Cumulative Transportation Items
20 4 and 6.B, as a route that poses significant and
21 unavoidable adverse impacts to transportation and
22 circulation, even after mitigation.

23 Mitigation measure for Noise Number 1
24 would only exacerbate another unmitigatable
25 project issue. The first mitigation of the

1 report also recommends undertaking the noisiest
2 activities during times of least disturbance to
3 surrounding residents and occupants, which are
4 identified as 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. This
5 coincides with the period when daycare centers
6 and nursery schools are in session. Riordan High
7 School holds classes and afterschool activities.
8 And the majority of City College classes,
9 including child development classes in the multi-
10 use building are in session.

11 The times of least disturbance need to be
12 redefined.

13 SECRETARY IONIN: Thank you, ma'am. Your
14 time is up.

15 MS. HEGGIE: Thank you.

16 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Next speaker,
17 please.

18 MS. HANSON: Thank you for your time. My
19 name's Christine Hanson. And I don't know if you
20 can see this, but the cars in this lot -- I don't
21 think you're showing the picture. I'll just do
22 my comment, then.

23 The administrative record and the draft
24 SEIR has little information about the pressure
25 that City agencies have exerted upon the creation

1 of City College's Facilities Master Plan. The
2 meetings, ongoing today, began during the time of
3 the state takeover of the school. City agencies
4 began meeting then with the state-imposed
5 administration. The administrative record in the
6 draft SEIR makes a very slim mention of those
7 meetings.

8 A public records search in 2017 showed
9 that by then at least 17 of these private
10 meetings had occurred, mostly at SF Planning. It
11 was news to the board of trustees, and news to
12 Trustee Davila, who sits on the Balboa Reservoir
13 CAC, representing City College.

14 Kitchell, City College's facility
15 planners, whose work is included in this SEIR,
16 answers to the question: What is the appropriate
17 place for city agencies to address the Facilities
18 Master Plan was; in public comment.

19 If you take the administrative record
20 presented in the draft SEIR at face value, you
21 would get the impression that this, indeed, has
22 been the behavior of city agencies. But this is
23 not what the collection of FMLs agendas,
24 meetings, and notes surrounding these meetings
25 show. The agendas for those meetings are mostly

1 similar, with the top item being the City College
2 Facilities Master Plan.

3 Your planner, Jeremy Shaw, even attended
4 one of the consultant job interviews on June 8th,
5 2015, with the blessing of a former state-
6 appointed facilities head at City College. The
7 Facilities Master Plan has been upgraded twice
8 and rebooted once. The intrusion of city
9 agencies into a plan that should have been
10 focused on the school's Education Master Plan and
11 focused on the needs of students has, instead,
12 been formed around a private development that has
13 literally cost the taxpayers millions in bond
14 money.

15 The collection will be forwarded to you
16 as written public comment. Thank you.

17 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. The
18 next speaker, please.

19 MS. BRIN: Hello. My name is Marcie
20 Rhine. And I just wanted to say a couple quick
21 things. I wasn't going to talk, but I was so
22 moved by what the City College students had to
23 offer that I wanted to just underscore that I
24 think there is a very critical flaw in this draft
25 EIR that it does not address City College either

1 as a part of the overall setting, or as a vital
2 public service.

3 This is a school that has been a part of
4 the life of the City for generations. It's
5 trained people for essential jobs and public
6 services, provided enrichment to countless people
7 through lifelong learning. And to not consider
8 it, consider the impact seems to me a serious
9 flaw that should be reexamined.

10 The second thing I wanted to address is
11 there's a lot of talk about affordable housing.
12 So, I just wanted to put out a couple of figures
13 for your consideration. If you look at the
14 development plan, the request is for 18 percent
15 affordable housing for people who are making 80
16 percent of the area median income, and that would
17 be \$66,500 a year.

18 Then, an additional 17 percent for
19 moderate income. That's 120 percent over the
20 AMI. We're talking \$99,500 a year. And then,
21 you get to 50 percent with an additional,
22 optional moderate income housing and that
23 additional housing is -- there's no
24 responsibility for the developer to build it and
25 there's currently no funding in the plan.

1 So, I know this **is** about the EIR and not
2 the project itself, but I just wanted you to have
3 those figures that the actual affordable housing
4 that will be gotten from giving away this public
5 land to a private developer is less than one-
6 fifth. So, and of course, the biggest cost in
7 building housing is the land. If the public land
8 were not given away, it could all be affordable.
9 So, just to think about that. Thank you very
10 much.

11 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
12 speaker.

13 MS. TIMA: Thank you for your indication.
14 My name is Etta Tima. I'm a resident for 48
15 years and at times old age helps to understand
16 something. I live on Plumas Avenue. I view the
17 parking lot every morning. It is full. And it
18 is necessary. And it should remain because
19 during at lease time, he said he wanted to put
20 another 100,000 people into the County of San
21 Francisco.

22 Now, I'm asking you, where should they
23 find education? If you reduce the parking space,
24 this at this moment presents 4 percent of the
25 student body. That is not very much.

Commented [SY4]: Check/confirm

1 In regards to the history of this lot, I
2 was really disenchanted that your SEIR was
3 showing such a lousy picture to mislead
4 everybody. That's a sales pitch. Can you
5 imagine if you have 1,200 units right at the
6 entrance of freeway 280, and that will not solve
7 apartments for San Francisco. They will all go
8 down to Silicon Valley.

9 I asked the developer, could he put
10 restrictions on it and he denied my request. He
11 said that would not be possible.

12 If you are building 1,200 units on an
13 earthquake fault, and I'm sure you know because I
14 have expressed this before, the earthquake fault
15 runs right through City College, and Riordan High
16 School, and Wildwood.

17 Then, you need emergency water in case we
18 have an earthquake to kill the fires. There is
19 no emergency water supply for the west and south
20 area of San Francisco. Would you please get busy
21 before you start building and get that done?

22 I'm against building any 1,200 units.
23 And in regards to building, the shaking of the
24 construction element way above the viability
25 demands of construction. And my house is old and

1 I do not want to have cracks in my stucco. Thank
2 you.

3 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
4 speaker, please.

5 MR. AHRENS: Good afternoon. My name is
6 Michael Ahrens. I am President of the Westwood
7 Park Association, Homeowners Association. I am
8 also a member of the Balboa Citizens Advisory
9 Committee, sometimes called the CAC. And thank
10 you for hearing our comments.

11 On behalf of the Board of Directors of
12 the Westwood Park Association, the neighborhood
13 that is most affected by this whole development,
14 I'm glad to tell you I will be brief. We will
15 put our comments on the DSEIR in writing.

16 But I will say this that the DSEIR is
17 severely flawed and we will tell you why in
18 writing.

19 I will outline, now, only a series of
20 some of the flaws, and you've heard some of the
21 hints of these things from other speakers
22 tonight. First, we will discuss the failure of
23 the DSEIR to accurately address the cumulative
24 secondary parking impacts caused by the loss of
25 existing parking, including the impacts on

1 transit, Lyft and Uber drivers.

2 Second, we will discuss the failure to
3 properly take into consideration the cumulative
4 transportation impacts of the project increase in
5 City College enrollment. There's an increase, as
6 the DSEIR correctly notes, by I think 26 to 56
7 percent over the next few years, and it fails to
8 take that into consideration.

9 Next, the DSEIR fails to mention that
10 City College has an agreement and will undertake
11 to have 500 units of student housing developed on
12 what's called the East Basin. That is not taken
13 into consideration.

14 In addition, the consideration of the
15 building of the PAC, and the steam building, is
16 going to go on simultaneously and the DSEIR does
17 not take into consideration the tremendous
18 environmental problems caused by a simultaneous
19 construction on the East Basin and the West
20 Basin, which will result in virtually no parking
21 remaining.

22 Next, there is an extreme error in the
23 DSEIR in discussing Reduced Density Alternative B
24 in stating that no financial analysis has been
25 conducted. That's false and we will show why.

1 Next, there is the improper inclusion of
2 Alternative C on San Ramon Way, on Passenger
3 Vehicle Alternative. That should be rejected and
4 we will say why. That has to do with Plymouth
5 Avenue and others.

6 And last, the rejection by the Planning
7 Department of the use of the site for City
8 College as an alternative was not appropriate.
9 Public land should not be used for anything but
10 public good.

11 Parties in the scoping process requested
12 that this alternative of using project land for
13 City College should be an alternative. The
14 Planning Department rejected that and that was
15 inappropriate under the law.

16 I only had two minutes. I tried to be
17 brief. Thank you very much. We will put the
18 rest of our comments in writing. Or, no, we will
19 put those comments in writing.

20 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
21 speaker, please.

22 MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you. Kevin
23 Kowalski, a Westwood Park Association resident.
24 I live along Plymouth Avenue with my wife 18
25 years, between San Ramon and Ocean. I can attest

1 to the situation of the violence level due to the
2 parking and driving situation.

Commented [SY5]: Check word

3 Westwood Park was built for Model T's and
4 Model A's. Cars have to pull over all the time.
5 The violence level goes on all the time, day and
6 night.

7 I leave for work at 4:00 o'clock in the
8 morning. People are going at 40 miles per hour
9 on that street and they're bypassing the stop
10 signs at San Ramon Way. They're also running the
11 red light at Ocean Avenue and Plymouth Avenue.

12 I do not believe that the EIR takes into
13 account the death that will happen to City
14 College. City College needs different types of
15 things. Some of them may be buildings. Some of
16 them may be parking. Some of them may be an on
17 ramp to the freeway. It needs a lot of different
18 things. To not leads to the college animus.

19 And, thirdly, the environmental impact to
20 the neighborhood will be overwhelming. When they
21 rebuilt Ocean Avenue, they used right behind our
22 house, which abuts to the reservoir, as a dumping
23 ground for the concrete and asphalt. There were
24 over 70 filed complaints, with payoffs for
25 damages to homes, sewer lines, et cetera, et

1 cetera, et cetera.

2 Please reject this EIR. If you want one
3 in reality and not the stylized façade this one
4 is, then have all the stakeholders participate in
5 creating one to see the truth of what's going on
6 in this neighborhood. Thank you for your time.

7 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
8 speaker, please.

9 MS. FRY: My name is Laura Fry, Westwood
10 Park. Thanks for your patience with all these
11 people.

12 Three main concerns. My first concern,
13 like a lot of people, is City College. I don't
14 think the impact on City College has been really
15 addressed in this. And I want to remind the
16 Planning Department that the timing of the
17 development, the process began at the same time
18 that the accreditation crisis began. So, City
19 College, like Chris alluded to, was out of the
20 loop and never really caught up.

21 My second issue is density. This is a
22 downtown style project, without the downtown
23 style streets. And as Hedda mentioned, the
24 firefighting infrastructure, water pipes that
25 accommodate the dense housing in the other parts

1 of the City that have dense housing, they're
2 water structure is totally different than what we
3 have in this area. And that lack of firefighting
4 infrastructure would be a hazard to the residents
5 of the development itself, but it would also be a
6 hazard to all of the surrounding neighborhoods.

7 I've gone to all the BRCAC meetings and
8 the Planning Department kept assuring us that the
9 parameters of the BRCAC would have a strong
10 bearing on the final plan. The density of this
11 project far exceeds the density that would have
12 been built if the parameters had been followed.

13 In the urban design parameters it stated
14 that the height would be 28 feet on the west and
15 then gradually go to 65 on the east. Now, it
16 starts out, I think, at 30, 35, something like
17 that, and then it jumps real quick, and then it
18 goes real high to 78 or 88 feet.

19 And then, my third concern is opening San
20 Ramon Way. It downplayed and, in fact, it even
21 said it was a positive. But on Plymouth, it's
22 basically one lane. The 1200 block of Plymouth,
23 where I live, there's always parking cars on both
24 streets, so it's single lane. So, you have to go
25 into the driveways and let people pass. And this

1 happens all day. And the driveways are small and
2 if the car is big, or the driver isn't such a
3 good driver, it can take a long time for people
4 just to move down the street. And sometimes
5 people get upset. Sometimes they get really
6 nasty. Sometimes they scream. Sometimes they
7 just sit.

8 And the EIR just sort of really
9 downplayed this, that this would slow traffic.
10 Well, as a previous speaker said, that sometimes
11 people still go very fast on Plymouth and people
12 on Plymouth regard this situation as a negative,
13 not as a positive.

14 And then, just I think the predictions of
15 the traffic through San Ramon is inaccurately low
16 because the EIR does not address that if that San
17 Ramon Way was opened you'd get other traffic than
18 just the project. Thank you.

19 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
20 speaker, please.

21 MS. THEOHARIS: Good afternoon
22 Commissioners. Anita Theoharis, Westwood Park
23 Association Board Member on behalf of Westwood
24 Park.

25 I know that comments should be narrowly

1 focused on technical issues, but I do have one
2 nontechnical observation that does have relevance
3 to one of our -- to one of the technical
4 objections to the sufficiency of the draft.

5 Our goal is to support a housing project
6 on the reservoir that includes affordable housing
7 for people of modest means. A project that
8 creates a new neighborhood with sufficient open
9 space and a welcoming environment for everyone.
10 A project with a number of units that can be
11 supported by the existing and planned
12 infrastructure. And one that does not damage a
13 crown jewel of the City, City College, or the
14 students who attend in the hopes of a better life
15 for themselves and their families.

16 It doesn't accomplish these goals.
17 However, there was a proposal, submitted by
18 Related of California, a developer, during the
19 RFP process, a process that Westwood Park was
20 frozen out of by the Balboa Citizens Advisory
21 Committee. A project that could be one we could
22 support.

23 It brings me to the relative objection.
24 The draft concludes that the financial
25 feasibility of a reduced option of 800 units

1 referred to as Plan B is unknown. That is
2 factually incorrect.

3 Related proposed a 680-unit project, with
4 parking to accommodate City College. And in
5 discussions with Related, they said they could
6 reduce the number of units even further and still
7 make a profit.

8 Yet, this document ignores that real
9 world fact and concludes that the financial
10 feasibility option of 800 units is unknown, even
11 though a well-known and respected developer
12 concluded it could make a profit with far fewer
13 units.

14 The EIR must conclude that a reduced
15 density option is financially feasible and study
16 the impacts of that option.

17 We will submit in writing as well. And
18 thank you very much for your time.

19 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
20 speaker, please.

21 MR. BERNSTEIN: My name is Harry
22 Bernstein. I'm a faculty member at City College.
23 So, I would like to provide some context to the
24 impacts indicated in the Subsequent EIR for the
25 Balboa Reservoir Project.

1 Noise, air quality and transportation
2 from the project will cause significant and
3 unavoidable adverse impact. You hear those
4 words? Significant and unavoidable adverse
5 impact. Impacts on the college students, faculty
6 and staff, students at the adjacent Riordan High
7 School, and students in the childcare program at
8 the adjacent multi-use building.

9 So, these topics, noise, air quality, and
10 transportation came up before the Planning
11 Commission at their meeting in August. And this
12 was the context I want to mention. The mayor has
13 sought to streamline development, housing
14 development in San Francisco. And so, she is
15 trying to get a -- have several factors that are
16 considered in CEQA to reduce the required
17 mitigation. So, these, besides secondary ones
18 like cultural and paleontological, they include
19 noise, air quality, and transportation.

20 So, out of this 500-page report, the
21 serious issues are the one that the City is
22 trying to -- I don't know if it's put under the
23 rug, but not have to consider. They've already
24 done that with parking.

25 Okay, so that's the way we're going, just

1 to save some months, save some dollars, but to
2 give the public and the public health less
3 opportunity, less consideration.

4 A separate topic. The description of the
5 project setting baseline existing condition is
6 inadequate. The primary use of the lower
7 reservoir, since 1946, has been parking. Today,
8 it's spillover student parking. Except for the
9 years 1946 to 1954 and that was the time that the
10 college, itself, occupied the entire Balboa
11 Reservoir site. So, the college really has not
12 -- the impacts on the college, the secondary
13 impacts from parking, not the parking itself
14 because that's an issue that's being considered
15 in other ways, but the impacts on the college,
16 and the access to education, which should have
17 some priority. Thank you.

18 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
19 speaker, please.

20 MR. NAGLE: Good afternoon Commission.
21 My name's Nicholas Nagle. I'm representing the
22 San Francisco Housing Action Coalition. We've
23 been going to these meetings for years, so I'll
24 keep it short. I assume you know our position on
25 it.

1 We've been advocating for this project
2 because of our City's housing shortage. And
3 while no one project can solve the housing
4 shortage, this is a bit step towards it.

5 In terms of the EIR, we do find it to be
6 adequate and complete. And that's all from me,
7 today. Thank you.

8 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Next
9 speaker, please.

10 MR. WINSTON: Good evening Commissioners.
11 My name's Jon Winston. I have the at large seat
12 on the Balboa Reservoir CAC and I'm also the
13 Chair.

14 I'm here this afternoon -- this evening,
15 I should say, to talk about transportation and
16 circulation. The impacts I believe will be
17 significant, but I disagree with the report that
18 they will be immitigable.

19 Developer mitigation, including the
20 Transportation Demand Management Plan, including
21 measures like giving out a Fast Pass with rental
22 packages to encourage non-car use will play a
23 part. They will pay impact fees, which I believe
24 should be applied at the point of impact in the
25 neighborhood where the impacts actually occur.

1 That's where they're needed the most.

2 But also, the City can and must do more.

3 Recent San Francisco history is full of projects,
4 like the Metreon Center, the San Francisco
5 Center, the ballpark, the Chase Center, all built
6 without parking and they were all predicted to
7 lead to traffic apocalypse.

8 But with moonshot level planning, by
9 multiple city agencies, we got great civic and
10 cultural amenities that, despite the naysayers,
11 worked.

12 This, too, is a project that needs to
13 have proactive planning on the neighborhood and
14 City level to accommodate the influx of new
15 residents in the reservoir and the projected
16 increase in CCSF students.

17 New housing and businesses, like Whole
18 Foods on Ocean Avenue, also add new car, foot and
19 bike traffic.

20 SFMTA and other agencies need to begin,
21 now, to be ready with increased transit frequency
22 and have more of the share of the roadway to
23 avoid even worse gridlock and in keeping with the
24 City's transit first policy. That's the first
25 time we've heard the words "transit first"

1 tonight.

2 In addition to my role on the CAC, I also
3 serve as the Pedestrian Safety Advisor Committee
4 for the FSUSD. From that perch, I can see Ocean,
5 Geneva, San Jose Avenue as vision zero injury or
6 high injury corridors. That means there have
7 been enough deaths and injuries, serious
8 injuries, due to the design of these streets that
9 they're due and fundable for complete redesign.

10 In short, true transit first reimagining
11 of transportation and circulation for the
12 neighborhood is needed and it has to be
13 implemented.

14 At our September 30th CAC meeting, the
15 CAC will present their plans for their SFMTA,
16 Ocean Avenue Safety Project. I hope to hear
17 about a safe, beautiful, and dignified walk to
18 BART, and better pedestrian bicycle access to
19 CCSF, the reservoir and the Ocean Avenue shopping
20 district.

21 But in future meetings, I really hope to
22 hear more about a comprehensive, proactive plan.
23 The Balboa Reservoir is really a great
24 opportunity to deal with the problems that have
25 accumulated over many, many years and now, we

1 have a chance to make the needed change to get a
2 livable, sustainable community for future
3 generations. Thank you for your time.

4 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: Thank you. Any
5 more speakers for public comment.

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I'm sorry
7 there was an oversight for my comments. You have
8 an empty lot on the cover of this SEIR. I'd like
9 to give this, copies of this for the record and
10 for the members. If there a possibility to do
11 that?

12 SECRETARY IONIN: Thank you. You can
13 just leave it right there.

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay. And
15 one of the record, please.

16 SECRETARY IONIN: Anyone else for public
17 comment come on up.

18 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Rita Evans
19 dropped this off. She had to leave.

20 SECRETARY IONIN: Thank you. Anyone
21 else? Going once, public comment. Seeing none,
22 public comment is closed.

23 VICE PRESIDENT KOPPEL: We're adjourned.

24 (The meeting concluded at 5:46 p.m.)

25

Commented [SY6]: Not sure who this is even after going through this transcript.

1

2