

**City College Questions and Answers  
May 1, 2017**

The following questions were submitted by Balboa Reservoir RFP finalists on or before April 7, 2017. City College has provided the answers below.

**1. *What is the timing of construction of the Performing Arts and Education Center and garage structure?***

- CCSF does not currently have adequate funding to construct the Performing Arts Education Center (PAEC). We are seeking additional funding through grants and donations. If we are successful in securing supplemental grant funding through the California Community Colleges' Capital Outlay Program, as delineated in a [presentation provided to the CCSF Board of Trustees on April 13, 2017](#), the construction period would be mid-2020 through mid-2023. If CCSF is successful in securing alternate funding, this schedule may accelerate.
- CCSF's developing (but not yet adopted) [Facilities Master Plan \(FMP\)](#) shows two structured parking facilities – one on the west side of the Ocean Campus west of the Performing Arts Education Center, and one on the east side of the Campus east of the Stadium. These parking structures are shown on the FMP in anticipation of the Balboa Reservoir development, which will result in the loss of up to 1,004 parking spaces that CCSF has had access to for many decades. Timing of construction of the parking structures should occur ahead of the loss of the equivalent parking due to Balboa Reservoir development.

**2. *Does CCSF expect to develop the structured parking at the same time that it develops the PAEC? Will the structured parking be built in advance of the PAEC?***

- Development of the parking structure is not tied to development of the PAEC – it is tied to the loss of parking due to development of Balboa Reservoir. Timing of construction of the parking structures should occur ahead of the loss of the equivalent parking due to Balboa Reservoir development.

**3. *What funding mechanisms will be used for the Performing Arts and Education Center and parking facility?***

- CCSF has approximately \$40 million of 2005 Proposition A general obligation bond funding allocated to the PAEC. There is a funding deficit of approximately \$120 million that needs to be secured prior to award of construction and equipment contracts. See the response to question 1 for information about CCSF's pursuit of California Community College Chancellor's Office funding.
- CCSF has not identified or secured any funding for parking structures. While CCSF's developing Facilities Master Plan shows potential locations on its property for parking structures, CCSF does not believe it should bear the burden of developing the parking structures and the associated costs. CCSF has enjoyed use of the Balboa Reservoir site for 1,004 parking spaces for decades, and although CCSF utilizes the parking under a fully-revocable license from the SFPUC, many now perceive it as an extension of CCSF's campus. CCSF is only master planning potential sites for parking structures on campus land due to the potential loss of the Balboa Reservoir parking.

- On July 28, 2016 CCSF's Board of Trustees passed a [Resolution on the Development of the Balboa Reservoir Property \(Item 160728-XI-223\)](#); this Resolution offered support of the housing development, and also delineated the conditions for their continuing support – including provision of replacement parking – to avoid the loss of enrollment from students who must commute by car and loss of parking for audience members of performances at the PAEC. City College does not have any regulatory jurisdiction over the SFPUC-owned Balboa Reservoir property but is recognized by the City as an important stakeholder.

**4. Given the low parking rates offered by CCSF to the students at this time, does CCSF believe that charging a rate that is closer to a market-based rate is a feasible strategy for financing a new garage structure? Does CCSF expect that parking in the new facility will be subsidized?**

- CCSF's parking fee structures are developed in compliance with State Education Code §76360, which governs and limits the fees that a community college district may charge for parking services. CCSF takes into consideration a variety of factors when examining its parking fee structures, including enrollment management, the variety of services our students require to succeed at City College, and balancing the cost of providing parking services against current and projected future parking demand. At this time, CCSF is highly focused on growing enrollment. It is unlikely that significant parking fee increases for CCSF-owned and operated parking would be contemplated in the short term planning horizon.

**5. Is there a desire for CCSF to share structured parking with the needs of the Balboa Reservoir project?**

- There is a strong desire to explore the possibility of shared parking with the Balboa Reservoir project. CCSF believes structured parking utilization rates could be optimized through shared use, given the days and times of parking demand from the CCSF population versus the Balboa Reservoir resident population.

**6. What is CCSF's willingness to allow the overall replacement of parking spaces on the reservoir site to be located on CCSF property? Alongside PAEC or MUB? At other areas of campus?**

- In anticipation of the loss of parking at Balboa Reservoir, CCSF's developing Facilities Master Plan shows potential locations for parking structures on CCSF property. One potential structured parking site is west of the PAEC; a second potential structured parking site is east of the Stadium. CCSF's developing facilities master planning studies have preliminarily indicated that both parking structures would contain a maximum of 500 stalls each, and would be required to have 2 or 3 below-grade and 2 or 3 above-grade levels to accommodate parking stall quantities within the available footprints. The site west of CCSF's Multi-Use Building contains hundreds of geothermal wells, and cannot accommodate structured parking.

**7. What is CCSF's position on creation of a new connection between Phelan and an extended Lee Ave, just south of the MUB - for pedestrians/bikes? Or for autos?**

- In its facilities master planning work, CCSF has contemplated how rerouting vehicular traffic from Phelan Avenue to a new roadway west of the MUB and future PAEC would allow for the re-characterization of Phelan Avenue into a pedestrian-friendly connection between the developed eastern and developing western portions of CCSF's Ocean Campus; such a pedestrian-focused improvement to Phelan Avenue would benefit not only CCSF, but also other local pedestrian and bicycling populations in surrounding Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods, and the Archbishop Riordan High School community.
- Existing roadways and easements at the northern and western edges of CCSF's property have been in place since May 2012. On July 28, 2016 CCSF's Board of Trustees passed a [Resolution on the Development of the Balboa Reservoir Property \(Item 160728-XI-223\)](#); this Resolution offered support of the housing development, and also delineated that CCSF may exchange roadway accesses/easements through CCSF owned property; it further delineated that CCSF cannot grant a roadway between the MUB and the planned PAEC. A new solution to connect the southern end of the north-south roadway could be an extension of Lee Avenue and/or a new connection between Phelan Avenue and the southern end of the north-south roadway, taking into account the SFPUC utility easements and the need for safe pedestrian connections from Unity Plaza and across Phelan Avenue.

**8. What are CCSF's most pressing housing needs - Faculty? Staff? Student? At what income/AMI levels? Rental vs Ownership?**

- In late February 2017, CCSF surveyed employee interest in workforce housing; the results of that [CCSF Workforce Housing Survey](#) were presented to the [CCSF Board of Trustees at its April 2017 meeting in Item VII.C](#). The survey results indicate a high level of interest and need for CCSF employee housing at the Ocean Campus. CCSF's survey did not differentiate between certificated (faculty) and classified (staff) employees. The survey only contemplated workforce rental housing, not housing ownership; however, home ownership would not be out of alignment with the long service tenures of typical CCSF employees. A large percentage of CCSF's current workforce is at or nearing retirement age, and 75% of CCSF's workforce is stationed at the Ocean Campus; as such, local affordable housing solutions would not only facilitate recruitment and retention of a replacement workforce – it would also align with CCSF and City transportation demand management strategies.
- Faculty and staff income/AMI calculations can be informed by CCSF salary information publicly available at <http://www.ccsf.edu/en/about-city-college/administration/human-resources/ero/salary-tables.html>
- While the recent CCSF survey did not include student participation, CCSF is aware of the affordable housing challenges that its current student population faces. It is anticipated that affordable student housing in the Balboa Reservoir development would provide a housing solution and learning community that would benefit CCSF's student population.

**9. Would CCSF be willing to participate financially in the construction or operation of new housing targeted at its faculty/staff/students? Would CCSF have a desire to own this housing? Or a preference not to own it?**

- On July 28, 2016 CCSF's Board of Trustees passed a [Resolution on the Development of the Balboa Reservoir Property \(Item 160728-XI-223\)](#); this Resolution offered support of the housing development, and also delineated a desire for faculty and staff housing, and if possible student housing. CCSF would be interested in exploring the possibility of financial participation in housing solutions for faculty/staff/students. It is not feasible for CCSF to consider use of its limited annual operating or current capital funds to finance housing. Any exploration would require a financing vehicle that relies on rental revenues to fully cover operating and maintenance expenses.

**10. Does CCSF have any programmatic or design ideas/specifications for the Child Development Center that is contemplated in the RFP document?**

- On July 28, 2016 CCSF's Board of Trustees passed a [Resolution on the Development of the Balboa Reservoir Property \(Item 160728-XI-223\)](#); this Resolution offered support of the housing development, and also delineated an interest in the project providing high quality child care for residents, students, faculty, and staff.
- CCSF's existing Child Development Center is based on a very low income laboratory model. CCSF's low-income model contract with the State for our CDC is anticipated to preclude Balboa Reservoir development residents, whose incomes may be ineligible for participation.
- CCSF does not expect to participate financially in a Child Development Center associated with Balboa Reservoir. However, given the space and eligibility restrictions associated with CCSF's "lab model" CDC, it is possible that members of the CCSF community ineligible for child care through CCSF's CDC may seek child care services at a new childcare center created on the Balboa Reservoir.

**11. Does CCSF expect to participate financially in the construction or operation of the Child Development Center?**

- See response to #10 above.