
From: Christine Hanson <chrissibhanson@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 12, 2018 4:28 PM
To: Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Subject: Balboa Reservoir Project 2018-007883ENV
Attachments: sent parking comment.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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

Christine Hanson
74 Cotter St.
San Francisco, CA 94112

November 5, 2018

Jeanie Poling
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite400
San Francisco, California 94103

Re: Balboa Reservoir Project
Case No: 2018-007883ENV

Dear Jeanie Poling:
Below is public comment for scoping for this project. A PDF is also attached.

The proposed development at Balboa Reservoir will change the existing use of public land utilized for decades by City College of San Francisco. City College of San Francisco provides an important public service. This change to the area, brought by the development on the lower Balboa Reservoir will result in substantial adverse physical impacts to the school by endangering enrollment, creating hardships for the City College employees, and costing tens of millions of dollars to either the school in the form of capital improvements expenses or to the San Francisco taxpayers in the form of expensive bond spending for the school to offer the same access to education it has offered to students since 1958. In particular this will affect students who must drive in order to arrive at school in a timely fashion. **For this reason the Project must include the replacement of the existing public resource of 1,007 parking spaces available since 1958 for the use of City College students and staff.** Without this mitigation the school will suffer more financial hardship at the same time as it works to survive the recent accreditation crisis.

Although Public Resources Code section 21099 subdivision (d)(1) exempts project-parking impacts from CEQA review, **City College in particular will suffer numerous significant secondary impacts to its operations due to the loss of the existing lower reservoir parking to the proposed development.**

City College's Ocean Campus is the only campus in the San Francisco Community College District located adjacent to a freeway. The majority of City College students are working adults with little time between work and school. According to the State Chancellor's Datamart, an online clearinghouse for statewide community college statistics, the percentage of City College students aged 25 and older for both 2016 and 2017 Spring semesters were over 66%. The current quality of San Francisco's muni system is not adequate for the schedules of many of these students to utilize for timely travel between work and school and they must drive in order to go to college. **City College has been, and continues to be a commuter school of working adults.** For a comparison in the average age of its students, compare City College' statistics to those of Santa Monica College where the number of students aged 25 and above in 2016 was 65%. The same statistics for Santa Monica shows that 28% of those young people were even younger: 19 years of age or less. It is logical to assume that the majority of the youngest students are still under the financial guardianship of their parents and thus more likely to have free time for complicated transportation systems such as those that exist currently in San Francisco.

Even the City team, when discussing issues that will be facing the new residents of the development at the Balboa Reservoir CAC had this to say:

Community question: "In the projects that are unbundled, do the market-rate owners end up owning most of the parking?"

Answer from SF-Planning and City Agencies: "Not necessarily. **Low-income households, particularly single mothers have some of the most complicated lives of all San Franciscans and place an extremely high value on their time;** they are often the people that want to drive the most because that means being able to spend more time with their families."

In the case of City College students this would mean that those mothers might be able to squeeze in an important evening class, IF they can find parking.

To make things more difficult for City College's working students, they are trying to fit a college education into a life that includes keeping up with the hurdles of living in one of the most expensive areas in the nation if not the world.

For some students ability to access a free College education is only possible if they can travel between work and school in a timely manner. A survey conducted for a City College statistics class in Spring 2016 asked 100 randomly chosen students parked in the City College parking lot the question: "How much time do you have to travel between work and school?" Of the respondents, 62 cited a commute time between work and school of 30 minutes or less. **This student survey is the only one that has been taken in all of the planning thus far for this project which has asked the simple question: how much time do you have between work and school?**

An abrupt change such as the loss of parking described in the NOP will force some students to quit college because they will not be able to travel between work and school in a timely manner. If enough students stop attending then enrollment, which is how City College is funded, will drop and the school's revenue will go down. In planning terms the school, which has been drilled for the last five years repeatedly by the State to live within its means, refers to this scenario as "going over the fiscal cliff".

A simple web search for "Leno bill CCSF" or "fiscal cliff CCSF" will turn up a quantity of articles that pertain to the loss of funding to the school that occurred during the accreditation crisis. In its first year alone the Leno bill provided \$26 million in state stabilization funding to City College. According to the KQED article: "City College of San Francisco Enrollment Plunges After Threatened Accreditation Loss" enrollment was "down 14.9 percent compared to the same time last year".

The graph below, from City College's 2016-17 Budget, shows the enrollment crisis drop over these years. This enrollment drop has been a disaster for City College and has resulted in the loss of at least 550 jobs, 439 of those jobs belonging to teachers.

(graphic included in attached PDF)

Thanks to "Free City" the school is coming back to life but another hit such as barring access to a portion of the working students by removing the facility currently in use for parking could once again send the school into crisis.

There has been no reckoning in any of the planning for the secondary effect of lowered enrollment at City College and the damages that would occur to the school in any of the planning thus far.

During one of the Balboa Reservoir CAC earlier a member of the public asked: "Overall we are concerned about parking for CCSF. How much, where, and who pays for it?"

The response from SF-Planning and City Agencies was:

"At an estimated cost of \$80,000 per parking space provided, it is in everyone's interest to reduce the need for providing parking while ensuring that parking is available to those who need it."

At a more recent Balboa Reservoir CAC meeting Joe Kirchoer of Avalon Bay, when asked about building replacement parking said it would run between 25 and as much as fifty thousand dollars. But the Berkson report which detailed the fiscal \$13.83 million to build 500 parking spaces, put the estimate given to and approved by the Board of Supervisors for the cost of one parking spot at approximately: \$27. This then should be considered the cost to replace one parking spot.

In the NOP the parking estimate by the developer was much higher with a total of new parking spaces proposed at 1,300. Unfortunately none of this parking is dedicated to City College and because the price of parking in the proposed 750 public parking spots is likely to be a 3 to 6 times increase in cost to students, and will include a mandatory 25% tax that must be paid to the City of San Francisco from public parking, the proposed public parking will be of little use to the students and will not alleviate the secondary impacts that losing the 1,007 space dedicated to City College that currently exists in the lower parking lot.

The dorm building and shared parking lot that may possibly be built on the City College side of the Reservoir being discussed privately meetings between the developer and City College Administrative staff and the College's consultant representatives will remove another 300 parking spots. Those existing spots are also currently modestly priced and replacing them with parking that will cost \$12 to \$20 a day again will either create a hardship for students or in the case of students on financial aid will create an ongoing economic expense to City College. The same survey of students conducted by students in a City College statistics class quoted earlier found that of the 100 randomly chosen students parking in the City College parking lot, 38% of those students surveyed and using school issued parking permits were also on financial aid. Thus when the Berkson report says that the City of San Francisco will receive parking revenue from the new project of at least \$1.9 million it is referring to a quantity of money that will be coming directly from City College.

Parking prices on the City College lots have been kept low not only because the permit between SFPUC and the school for the permission to park demanded no profit be made by the school on their land but also because the school pledged not to increase the hardship on low income students who must use a car to access their education. This can be seen in a quote from the current City College Facility Master Plan:

*Parking is relatively inexpensive at the Ocean Avenue Campus **in order to ensure access** by CCSF's diverse community. Student parking passes are available for \$2 per day or \$30 per semester (\$15 per semester for students receiving financial aid). Faculty and staff parking passes are free. These rates are substantially below the market price for parking in San Francisco.*

Other additional secondary impacts to the school that will occur either from the loss of parking or direct impacts due to increased congestion when 1100 or 1500 new residents are added to an already impacted area include:

- During the construction of the Performing Arts Education Center at City College there will be no place for the "staging", the gathering of supplies and equipment necessary for construction as the school must continue to function. This is true for all of the buildings being considered for construction at City College including any new parking structures added to the campus.

- City College’s Gough St. location employees will soon be relocated to the Ocean Campus. One of the reasons those employees were not transferred to the newly built and spacious Chinatown Campus was **a lack of parking**.
- The motorcycle-training course will lose its location.
- There has been no consideration of how an increase in rideshare traffic will affect the congestion in the area.
- There has been no consideration of how much delivery traffic will likely be passing through the entrance to the development along Frida Kahlo Way and how that will affect the students trying to get to class and the bus lines as they try to get through.
- The development will increase the population in the area substantially without increasing the infrastructure and availability of commodities such as supermarkets.
- The area is already at the peak of transportation congestion and the addition of this many more new households will further increase this congestion.

Michael Carlin, General Manager of SFPUC stated at the recent SFPUC CAC meeting “The most significant issue is about transportation and parking. We won’t work that out until post CEQA”. That strategy will not be sufficient enough to avoid the secondary impacts that this development will inflict upon City College. The parking must be “worked out” before the project is approved under the California Environmental Quality Act and the effect upon the students and staff identified now within the EIR process. **The only sure way to mitigate those impacts without placing a burden upon the school is to replace the parking.**

Sincerely,

Christine Hanson