

---

**From:** Poling, Jeanie (CPC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 24, 2019 4:30 PM  
**To:** 'Susan Yogi'  
**Cc:** Balboa Reservoir Compliance (ECN)  
**Subject:** FW: Balboa Reservoir DEIR comments 9/23/19  
**Attachments:** FINALnoisecomments.rtf

This comment came in after 5 pm, and we don't have to respond, but FYI the previous comment that she asks to remove is this:

1. Air Quality:

Please include the sensitive receptors identified above for noise in assessments of air quality as appropriate, although air travels farther than noise. The EIR construction modeling of air quality in Appendix D assumes three years. Again, six years is the Developers Option and should be the default, not three years which is not recommended due to air quality and other impacts.

---

**From:** Jennifer Heggie <jdheggie@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 23, 2019 6:58 PM  
**To:** CPC.BalboaReservoir <CPC.BalboaReservoir@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Poling, Jeanie (CPC) <jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; sna-brc@googlegroups.com  
**Subject:** Re: Balboa Reservoir DEIR comments 9/23/19

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

Please ignore comment #17 on Air Quality or remove it from my comments.  
Because it is too late to fix the error in it, please ignore the comment.  
Thank you,  
Jennifer Heggie

On Mon, Sep 23, 2019 at 4:10 PM Jennifer Heggie <[jdheggie@gmail.com](mailto:jdheggie@gmail.com)> wrote:

Attached are my comments a second time.  
I'm not sure how the formatting of the last document became scrambled, but I've removed page numbers and saved it as an .rtf document instead.  
Regards,  
Jennifer Heggie

On Mon, Sep 23, 2019 at 3:53 PM Jennifer Heggie <[jdheggie@gmail.com](mailto:jdheggie@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Jeanie Poling and the Planning Department,

I would like to thank the Planning Department for this SEIR. It identifies and analyzes neighborhood concerns that have been brought up about noise, transportation and air quality. In the comments that are attached are questions, identification of possible oversights, and further concerns. But first, a few more general comments:

Knowing that the development will cause serious risks to our educational institutions, neighbors, students and small children, I believe it is worth taking a step back and asking what is the highest good for this area that causes the least damage to the City and the immediate surroundings. In that light, please identify what number of units could be safely constructed in the Balboa Reservoir without creating significant adverse impacts to transportation and circulation, air quality, and noise, and secondary public benefits, such as educational services.

As we are aware, City College is an engine for the service jobs of San Francisco and provides opportunity including childcare and child development for students who need them while taking classes to develop skills and a better future. There are reasons that a 100% affordable housing building which houses aged-out foster youth among others was constructed next to City College at the Balboa Reservoir. Adding to the public good is an adjacent private school which is well-known as a high school, but also for its special treatment facilities for learning disabilities. Those institutions as well as many childcare, nursery school and other educational institutions are located nearby. This education hub is important for providing services to all of San Francisco. Therefore, it would benefit the City to first identify what number of units would meet City standards before shoe-horning in a project that is known in advance to have unmitigable adverse impacts.

In addition, some of the testing reports appear to provide inconsistent testing. This makes it difficult for non-professionals to compare apples to apples, track the meaning of the data and encourages misinterpreting possibly impactful conclusions. For example, adding a note below the Balboa Reservoir truck Roadway Noise Analysis on Page 1 of 2, in Appendix D2, would provide clarification of why the numbers of road segments tested differ depending on whether the test is for the existing environment, the existing plus developer's project, the existing plus additional housing scenario, or the cumulative plus developer's project.

The focus of my specific DEIR comments that are attached is noise, though there are a few non-noise-related comments at the end. Noise and vibration were not addressed in the PEIR, and we thank the Planning Department for recognizing that the earlier Balboa area plan offered a high level view, not a project view, anticipating that they could not take into account every change to the area before a project is ready for consideration. Since the time the PEIR was developed, many new buildings; educational, service-oriented, commercial and residential; have been constructed near and adjacent to the Balboa Reservoir. At the time of the PEIR, there was an expectation that no more than 500 housing units would be constructed in the Balboa Reservoir.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. I look forward to reading your responses.

Regards,

Jennifer Heggie

Sunnyside resident