

---

**From:** Poling, Jeanie (CPC)  
**Sent:** Monday, September 23, 2019 4:51 PM  
**To:** Balboa Reservoir Compliance (ECN)  
**Subject:** FW: Public Comment on draft SEIR for Balboa Reservoir development

---

**From:** Ed Osawa <sfosawa@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 22, 2019 9:53 AM  
**To:** CPC.BalboaReservoir <CPC.BalboaReservoir@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Public Comment on draft SEIR for Balboa Reservoir development

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

Dear Members of the Committee –

I am a resident of the neighborhood adjacent to the proposed Balboa Reservoir development. The following are my comments in response to the recently released draft SEIR.

The SEIR acknowledges that for all options there will be “significant and unavoidable negative impact to traffic that cannot be mitigated”. While this statement is diluted in the SEIR by other boilerplate environmental analyses, and while the CEQA guidelines have unfortunately replaced “automotive delay” with a less-meaningful “vehicular miles traveled” (VMT) metric, it is undoubtedly the greatest single impact to the environment and to the safety of the neighborhood of the proposed site.

Most critically, according to the proposal ***the only vehicular inlet into an 1100 unit housing development is a single lane northbound on Lee Avenue from Ocean Avenue. This would seem to be wholly inadequate.*** Additionally, that single lane on Lee will also be potentially occupied by truck loading activities for Whole Foods and neighboring businesses.

Ocean Avenue is already beset with heavy traffic at most hours of the day. Traffic is often down to a single lane due to Muni traffic, cars turning left, and double-parked vehicles. This will now become intolerably congested. The existence of several offset intersections (at Ocean/Geneva/Frida Kahlo, Ocean/Brighton, and Ocean/Plymouth) also contributes to poor traffic flow and to vehicular safety issues.

The analysis of an additional automotive access route (Alternative C, pages 6-29 to 6-44) focuses disproportionately on the impact on a short tab of a street that will access the project (San Ramon Way) rather than the broader impact on the narrow streets that would feed into that access. These feeder streets are two-way but *de facto* single lane roads due to parking, and even today cars routinely must leapfrog from driveway cutout to cutout as they pass in opposite directions. A somewhat comical argument is made in the Alternative C analysis that the increased congestion will result in safer driving conditions as traffic speed will be reduced; indeed, it is difficult to have an injurious accident in a gridlock situation. The analysis also fails to adequately account for the likely increase in bicycle traffic along Plymouth and other feeder streets, as San Ramon will become a useful shortcut for bicyclists to get to City College.

There will also be significant impact to freeway traffic. Even today, the off-ramp from NB280 to Geneva is frequently backed up well onto the main traffic of NB280, resulting in extremely hazardous traffic conditions. It is noted that most of the exiting cars are turning east onto Geneva away from the proposal site, as this ramp is the primary access to the Outer Mission and Cow Palace areas – with the project site added as a destination in the westbound direction from the ramp, one can expect a bad situation to grow much worse. The off-ramp from SB280 to Ocean is likewise backed up onto the freeway proper during most commute hours.

The proposed site is indeed closely situated to many public transit options. However, given the proximity to I-280, the uphill walk to BART, and the remoteness from many of the attractions of the city, it is highly optimistic to assume that there will be a mass influx of non-automotive households that would mitigate the traffic and parking burden.

I appreciate the need for more housing in San Francisco, but the current proposals are out of scale for the neighborhood and have not adequately addressed critical deficiencies in traffic flow and parking. I would urge the adoption of the lowest density alternative option for the development. By no means should the higher density option be considered.

Other suggestions and comments include the following:

- Widen the Lee Avenue access to two lanes (no parking zones, narrower sidewalk) with the construction of a truck loading zone off the street, and have dedicated turn lanes off of Ocean.
- Reconfigure the intersection of Ocean/Geneva/Frida Kahlo to remove the offset and improve traffic flow.
- The lanes in the Phelan Loop bus terminal are often vacant and underutilized and could be reconfigured to provide another vehicle access to and from the development.
- If the San Ramon access alternative must be implemented, perhaps Plymouth Ave can be configured as one way northbound from Ocean (not southbound, as the offset intersection at Ocean/Plymouth would get congested).
- There must be an increased frequency of mass transit options (Muni). Transit vehicles according to current schedules often are completely full.
- Take traffic pressure off of Ocean Avenue by improving the San Jose / Mission St off-ramp from SB280 and the Sagamore/Alemany/Brotherhood corridor to make that the primary westbound route off of 280.
- Consideration must be given to the impact of construction noise on the classrooms at Riordan High, as work will be done during school hours.

Respectfully,

Ed Osawa

40 Eastwood Drive

San Francisco, CA 94112

[sfosawa@yahoo.com](mailto:sfosawa@yahoo.com)