

**From:** Lutenski, Leigh (ECN) <leigh.lutenski@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 17, 2020 9:59 AM  
**To:** ECN, BalboaReservoirCompliance (ECN) <balboareservoircompliance.ecn@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Fw: Balboa parking and shuttle  
**Attach:** TDM presentation Chinatown.pdf; Bal res TDM presentation.pdf

---

**From:** Christine Hanson <chrissibhanson@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 17, 2020 8:32 AM  
**To:** Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>; Breed, Mayor London (MYR) <mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org>; Major, Erica (BOS) <erica.major@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Koppel, Joel (CPC) <joel.koppel@sfgov.org>; Moore, Kathrin (CPC) <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Milicent (CPC) <milicent.johnson@sfgov.org>; Imperial, Theresa (CPC) <theresa.imperial@sfgov.org>; Fung, Frank (CPC) <frank.fung@sfgov.org>; Diamond, Susan (CPC) <sue.diamond@sfgov.org>; Hood, Donna (PUC) <DHood@sfgov.org>; Linda Shaw <lshaw@ccsf.edu>; swilliams <swilliams@ccsf.edu>; Tom Temprano <ttemprano@ccsf.edu>; tselby <tselby@ccsf.edu>; John Rizzo <jrizzo@ccsf.edu>; alexrandolph <alexrandolph@ccsf.edu>; Brigitte Davila <bdavila@ccsf.edu>; Ivy Lee <ivylee@ccsf.edu>; Lutenski, Leigh (ECN) <leigh.lutenski@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Dineen, Jk <jdineen@sfgov.org>; Joe Fitzgerald <FitztheReporter@gmail.com>; Dianna Gonzales <dgonzales@ccsf.edu>; Charmaine Curtis <charmaine@curtis-development.com>; Torrance Bynum <Tbynum@ccsf.edu>; sbruckman <sbruckman@ccsf.edu>; Steven Brown <sbrown@ccsf.edu>  
**Subject:** Balboa parking and shuttle

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

Mayor Breed, Supervisors, Commissioners, Trustees, and Staff,  
(Staff members, kindly distribute this email to your groups)

There have been many TDM reports created around the lower Balboa Reservoir in the last five years. The plan providing the basis for the developer's estimate that 220 parking spaces would be sufficient to replace the existing CCSF parking was chosen from the Fehr and Peers TDM, which was presented to the Balboa Reservoir CAC in June of 2019. A month earlier, the same report was presented to the City College Board of Trustees at a meeting at their Chinatown Campus.

Though both were from the same report, the two presentations differed in content and conclusions. Both of these presentations are attached to this email.

Because it considered a scenario that included City College's plan for construction on the upper lot, the conclusion of the report in the CCSF presentation was that 980 replacement parking spots would be needed. The graphic showing this is included below. The presentation given to the CAC and echoed by the developer arrived at 220 parking spots needed from a scenario that didn't consider the impact of new buildings planned by City College, this graphic is also included here. The conclusion of the CAC presentation came though its version of the TDM was a part of a larger presentation of the City College Facilities Master Plan which clearly showed the College's plans to construct buildings on the CCSF upper lot.

One of five TDM strategies offered in the City College version of the presentation highlights a BART shuttle. That slide is included below. In the CAC presentation there was no mention of a BART shuttle, though the Community has repeatedly asked for a shuttle. This idea has also been dropped from the Developer Agreement and the project Design Standards document. A BART shuttle is a sound idea if the route runs on streets to the North of Ocean Campus—which doesn't involve further travel on Ocean Avenue—this is different than the route studied by the developer team, which picked a shuttle route up Ocean Avenue into the traffic, that would contribute more congestion.

The idea of a BART shuttle must be revisited; it is a real solution to help with the bottleneck of congestion that already

occurs on Ocean Avenue. It is one of the few mitigations that can help a scenario that the DEIR terms Unavoidable Adverse impacts to transportation. The estimated yearly parking revenue from the new development, according to their Berkson fiscal report, approved by the Board of Supervisors on April 3, 2018 is projected at \$1.9 million dollars, this certainly could fund a shuttle. A page from that report is also included.

Please, insist that a BART shuttle is cemented into the transportation plans, and please listen when the City College Community complains about issues that seem to be non-existent per information presented to you by the Balboa Reservoir Partners. There are solutions to some, though not all, of the problems posed by this development, but if the discussion is muddled by a misdirection of data everyone suffers.

Sincerely,  
Christine Hanson  
Grateful City College student

**Table 14: Scenario 3 (Baseline + PAEC + Balboa Reservoir Housing) Parking Demand and Supply**

Enrollment/ TDM Scenario	Peak Day Parking Demand (First Week of Instruction)	Non-Peak Demand (Typical Day in Semester)	Supply	Unservd Demand - Baseline Peak Day of First Week of Instruction	Unservd Demand - Baseline Typical Day in Semester
2018	2,835	2,094	1,243	1,592	851
2026 (25% growth) without TDM	3,543	2,617	1,243	2,300	1,374
2026, with core TDM	3,010	2,223	1,243	1,767	980
2026, with additional TDM	2,245	1,658	1,243	1,002	415

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2018; IDAX Data Solutions, 2018; CCSF Draft Facilities Master Plan, 2016

**Table 13: Scenario 2 (Baseline + Balboa Reservoir Housing) Parking Demand and Supply**

Enrollment/ TDM Scenario	Peak Day Parking Demand (First Week of Instruction)	Non-Peak Demand (Typical Day in Semester)	Supply	Unservd Demand - Baseline Peak Day of First Week of Instruction	Unservd Demand - Baseline Typical Day in Semester
2018	2,835	2,094	2,003	832	91
2026 (25% growth) without TDM	3,543	2,617	2,003	1,540	614
2026, with core TDM	3,010	2,223	2,003	1,007	220
2026, with additional TDM	2,245	1,658	2,003	242	0

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2018; IDAX Data Solutions, 2018; CCSF Draft Facilities Master Plan, 2016


## TDM STRATEGIES


Additional Measures

- Provide Muni pass to all full-time students
- Provide Bike Share (and/or scooter share)
- Provide shuttle to BART during peak demand periods
- Allocate car share parking spaces and subsidize memberships for employees
- Price employee parking

Percent Reduction

- Up to 10%
- 1%
- Up to 5% during peak demand periods
- Up to 1%
- 5%





**Table A-9**  
**Parking Tax**  
**Balboa Reservoir**

Item	Assumption	Total
Garage Revenue (2)		\$1,900,000
Spaces (shared garage) (1)		500
<u>Parking Revenues</u>		
Annual Total (2)	\$3,800 per year/space	\$1,900,000
<u>San Francisco Parking Tax (3)</u>	25% of revenue	<b>\$475,000</b>
Parking Tax Allocation to General Fund/Special Programs	20% of tax proceeds	\$95,000
Parking Tax Allocation to Municipal Transp. Fund	80% of tax proceeds	\$380,000

(1) Shared spaces will be a mix of residents and City College parking.

(2) Based on estimated revenue from parking garage; actual hourly and daily revenue will vary depending on occupancy rates, turnover during the day, and long-term parking rates vs. hourly rates.

(3) 80 percent is transferred to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency for public transit as mandated by Charter Section 16.110.

Source: Berkson Associates

2/9/18