

---

**From:** Poling, Jeanie (CPC)  
**Sent:** Monday, September 23, 2019 5:42 PM  
**To:** Balboa Reservoir Compliance (ECN)  
**Subject:** FW: feedback on the draft EIR

---

**From:** Laura Lee Frey <enzybio@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 22, 2019 8:34 PM  
**To:** CPC.BalboaReservoir <CPC.BalboaReservoir@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** feedback on the draft EIR

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

Dear Ms. Poling and Commissioners,

I was at the meeting Sept. 12, but I'm sending this email to clarify, hopefully, my spoken points.  
I have 3 main concerns:

First is City College. This is public land. I have heard from City College people, as well as long-time SF residents that the reservoir area had been set aside for City College use, if it were to be developed. This draft EIR does not sufficiently examine the long-term impact of this project on City College. Also the timing of the development should be remembered. The process for this proposed development began at the same time as City College's accreditation crisis began--this probably kept City College from having the time and resources to properly consider the impact of this development on its future at the very beginning... and it has probably been "behind" ever since.

Second issue is density. This is a very high density project--without the large streets or the fire-fighting infrastructure/water pipes to accommodate dense housing. (The fire-fighting infrastructure in dense parts of the City is different than in this area.) The lack of a sufficient fire-fighting infrastructure would be a hazard for the residents of any new dense housing project at Balboa Reservoir and for the residents in the surrounding areas. I have gone to all of the BRCAC meetings, and the Planning Department often assured us that the parameters developed at the BRCAC meetings would have a strong bearing on the final plan. This plan far exceeds the density that would be built if the BRCAC parameters were followed. In the URBAN DESIGN parameters, it is stated that the height would be 28' to the west and GRADUALLY increasing to 65' to the east. In the current proposed plan the height quickly jumps to 48'-58' on the west and goes up to 78'-88' on the east.

Thirdly, a very big concern is allowing vehicle traffic on San Ramon Way (alt. C). We live on the 1200 block of Plymouth between Ocean and San Ramon. Plymouth is the only north/south road between Monterey and Ocean, and we have cars on Plymouth all day. All parking spaces on either side of the 1200 block of Plymouth are usually filled. As stated in the Draft EIR drivers continually have to yield to each other because it is a single lane of traffic between parked cars. Usually the pullout space (the driveway) is small, and if the car is not small or the driver not great this can take awhile. Often people get impatient, sometimes they get nasty. Commute times and weekends are especially congested and nasty. It is a continual problem. The Draft EIR dismisses this problem as helping with speed, but drivers sometimes still go fast on Plymouth, which exacerbates the ONE LANE traffic problem. Getting in-and-out of driveways is difficult because of space and traffic, and side-swiping is a problem. Opening San Ramon to vehicles would increase traffic, so it would increase the problems we already have. And, I believe the predictions of traffic are inaccurately low in the Draft EIR--perhaps, resident traffic will be greater than the prediction, but the Draft EIR does not even address the traffic from non-resident cars--i.e. "cutting through" the development.

Thank-you for taking public comments,

Sincerely, Laura Frey