
From: aj <ajahjah@att.net>
Sent: Sunday, June 09, 2019 9:59 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN); Amy O'Hair; Michael Ahrens; Brigitte Davila; Robert Muehlbauer; Howard Chung; marktang.cac@gmail.com; Christine Godinez; Jon Winston
Cc: Alex Randolph; Tom Temprano; Brigitte Davila; ivylee@ccsf.edu; jrizzo@ccsf.edu; Thea Selby; Shanell Williams; studenttrustee@mail.ccsf.edu; mrocha@ccsf.edu; facilities@ccsf.edu; Rueben Smith
Subject: 6/10/2019 Written Comment on Agenda Item 4: CCSF TDM lacks context

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

Written Comment for Agenda Item 4 re: City College TDM, Parking Plan, FMP

The CCSF TDM fails to provide the context of it being a result of the Reservoir Project.

I comment in **red** on the Fehr & Peers "Key Questions" Summary:

1. What level of investment does CCSF want to make in providing affordable transportation alternatives i.e., implementing the "Additional TDM" measures?

- **The main reason the "core TDM measures", not to mention the "Additional TDM" measures, are called for is the impact of the Reservoir Project--the elimination of the existing student parking by the Reservoir Project. The CCSF TDM fails to address the overall context of the Balboa Reservoir Project's adverse impact on City College. The Reservoir Project needs to fully mitigate its adverse impact on City College instead of shifting the burden of mitigation onto City College stakeholders via TDM.**

2. How will CCSF balance managing parking demand with sustainability goals and minimizing the impact of vehicle trips?

- **The Fehr & Peers Plan & Analysis has as one of the TDM Goals, "Maintain just and equitable access to a CCSF Education."**
- **"Key Question" #2 does not mention this goal of "just and equitable access."**

My interpretation is that the importance of educational access has been subordinated to the needs of the Reservoir Project. CCSF Administration should not subordinate the needs of its stakeholders for the benefit of the Reservoir Project.

3. Is meeting parking demand a financial investment priority for the College?

- **Paying for meeting parking should not be a financial investment priority for CCSF.**

Rather, the Reservoir Project should have the obligation to pay for the replacement parking that will be necessitated by its elimination of the existing student parking.

--aj