
From: Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2018 9:32 AM
To: Monica Collins
Subject: RE: Oct 30, 2018 Scoping Meeting Comment

Hello Ms. Collins,

Thank you for your comments.

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: Monica Collins <lizzy2k@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 27, 2018 12:16 PM
To: Poling, Jeanie (CPC) <jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>; fightbacksaveccsf13@googlegroups.com
Subject: Oct 30, 2018 Scoping Meeting Comment

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

Dear Ms Poling, Board Members and all concerned,

I'm a long term resident of the Sunnysde, as well as a former staffer at City College for almost a quarter of a century. I worked in Student Services on Ocean campus for about 14 of those years and became well acquainted with the concerns and needs of CCSF's students.

Replacing all or most of the Balboa Reservoir parking lot is in my opinion a short sighted, feel-good reaction to traffic and parking concerns. No one I know can quite explain how the term "transit rich" applies, when BART and Muni are calamitously overcrowded, vehicles not always stopping for rush hour riders. It is sophistry to pretend that most of our students who live outside of SF have ready access to transit. BART serves relatively few communities, and for nearly all of those commuters, either a bus or a car is necessary to access the stations. BART was never designed to serve most towns, of course, being a train, not a bus. BART is also quite expensive for the typical student, and a great number of CCSF students are low income.

Other than that, many of our students have had very challenged lives. Many are in recovery, some have been abused, a number homeless, and we serve refugees and immigrants by the thousands. There are lots of single or low income parents, many with more than one job, having to pay rent. Some with kids in two schools. It's ridiculous to assume that transit makes sense in their situation, for the most part.

CCSF is not a junior college, and does not serve mostly 17 to 19 year olds, by any measure. They are a lifeline for the mature student, late twenties, thirties, even in their fifties and older. These folks are looking for a vocation, a trade, ESL classes, as well as academic classes for university. Many recall what happened a couple of years ago when the Alemany /Civic Center Campus was closed with no notice. No one is quite sure what happened to those many students, many Tenderloin residents and ESL learners, struggling to get by. So many dropped out.

It's understandable that many will say that we should consider other situations besides those of these students. I do care about them, deeply, myself. Other than that, we can choose not only to improve exponentially the lives of second

chance, even last chance learners. Their success redounds to not only their families, not only CCSF, but to San Francisco and the Bay Area, as they become happy and successful taxpayers. I cannot count the number of former students I've encountered now working in their field, their profession, or studying in university. Many go from welfare to being proud workers with newfound self esteem.

As for that parking lot, yes, we all understand that parking lots are suddenly very unfashionable. They certainly are not good looking. We get that cars are not good, and that the idea of people zooming around in cars, is undesirable and not something our city leaders want anymore.

That said, what do we do for these people to get them out of cars, to find satisfactory alternatives to driving? Car shaming is Puritan at best. We know how Prohibition of alcohol worked out. The mindset that gave us Prohibition, is giving us car shaming. Those of us who do not now depend on vehicles to get around for work and school, can easily criticize those who have no choice. For over two generations, the "destroy transit and build freeways" trope has governed our cities. Yes, we look back in horror at this misguided idea, brought to us by firms who wanted to build the cars, the tires for the cars, the freeways themselves. We know better.

But social engineering with no plan, no timeline, and NO BUDGET, is a joke, at best, and a huge calamity at worst. I don't want to waste your time addressing the horrid mess on a one lane road, Frida Kahlo/ Phelan, where the school and the proposed residential towers are to be located, nor the parking mess, blocked driveways, traffic jams from Monterey Bl to Ocean to Freeway 280, that are likely to result when thousands of desperate drivers search for parking on our little streets, often blocking driveways. I think neighbors will bring it up in their comments.

Insofar as infrastructure provided for thousands of new residents, that's on us, the residents, not the developer.

Electrical grid will be challenged. Access to water. EMS/ Fire Dept trying to make their way to the apartments. There will be no good place for the thousands of new residents to shop for groceries. Whole Foods is busy all the time, frequently out of groceries and produce, and mostly quite expensive. The nearest Safeway on Monterey is thumbnail sized, usually crowded, is not that well run (last time I was there, the express counters were closed, there were long lines, and one cash register would not accept credit cards, just cash.) Being tiny, they don't carry a lot. Families needing groceries will-surprise! Jump into cars and drive to a real grocery store.

Others may point out that ride sharing services such as Lyft and Uber, which solve a lot of problems, also create other problems. Residents will be using these in great numbers. The drivers often block Muni and restricted zones, creating headaches for not only drivers but transit riders. The drivers also block traffic lanes.

The situation on Ocean Bl now is pretty calamitous. Left turners block the left lane, Whole Foods shoppers block the right lane. Double parkers are rife. Prepare for much worse if the huge residential towers are built. One does not "punish" drivers with deliberate traffic jams. One punishes transit riders, businesses, and the whole neighborhood. The proposed residential towers are not only dense and harmful to the life and character of the neighborhoods adjoining, and to CCSF itself, but the units for rent are very expensive. First of all "UP TO" fifty percent affordable housing is a sham in itself and is a promise of nothing. We've all seen stores that have "UP TO" fifty percent discounts. Meaning what, 25%, maybe?

I don't know anyone who thinks \$4,000 for a one bedroom apartment (which will only go up, these are today's rents with AvalonBay apartments on Ocean nearby) is "market rate" for working or middle classes. This is Exhibit A, why SF is losing our precious families. It's becoming a city for the rich, some elders who bought back then (and who are facing open hostility and tremendous criticism from YIMBY and the 'build it to the skies' crowd), and the unfortunate homeless. Is this either desirable or sustainable? We are losing diversity as well and seeing more professional whites and Asians buying property or being able to afford these rents, but we will lose African Americans and Latinos, for the most part. Maybe it's not nice to call this 'bleaching'. What about ethnic cleansing? I am sure no one intends this; I am also sure someone is inadvertently causing it!

It is short sighted and very harmful to our whole city to continue with this 'build it big no matter what' trend. How arrogant to pretend the neighbors do not have a say, that we are the ones who are short sighted and need to be told what's going to be imposed on us, against our wills!

If you've ever been to Paris, you may admire the beauty of the 20 Arrondissements or districts of the city. And if you've been beyond the city limits, you may have noticed the residential towers, town after town, shaded, ugly, windswept plazas and the vertical 'ice cube trays' housing those not well off enough to live in the glamorous city proper.

Who comes to SF to enjoy our traffic jams? Our enormous towers all over the city? Our expensive parking? The homeless living on the street near Civic Center? The expensive hotels? (hint: NO ONE.) Our beauty is why they visit, and spend big bucks vacationing & attending conventions here. This is revenue and a huge local industry. There is a reason

the Paris city parents restrict ugly dense towers, though they represent short term revenue for the city. And yet that is exactly what we do here. Like a drug addict, we are addicted to revenue from the builders. We are selling our birthright for a mess of pottage, to use a Biblical term.

At this time we are starting to experience dipping home prices, slower property sales, softer rents, which in my opinion, is all to the good. The price of labor, materials, and running jobs like this (I was an electrician for some years and am NOT anti development, one bit) can only continue to rise. Many apartments are going vacant and unrented, even as empty storefronts can be written off by property owners, which is causing blight. The always-growing (used to be 500 units, then 1100, then 1300, now 1550, or ???) project on Balboa Reservoir is not only ill advised, it's also ill timed.

Thank you for reading all of this!

Respectfully submitted, Monica Collins