



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**MEMO**

**DATE:** February 14, 2020

**TO:** Susan Yogi, ESA

**FROM:** Jeanie Poling, Environmental Planning

**RE:** Balboa Reservoir Project (2018-007883ENV) RTC-1 Submittal

1650 Mission St.  
Suite 400  
San Francisco,  
CA 94103-2479

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

Please see the attached combined comments on the RTC-1 draft that you submitted on January 9, 2020. We have no comments on any sections/documents that are not attached.

Overall, it was a very good submittal. Here are some global comments, in addition to the individual comments in the attached documents.

- For air quality, noise, and transportation sections, make sure each has a response that describes that the sensitive receptor locations, intersections, etc., and say there were selected to represent the areas most impacted by the project and representative the impacts that may occur at other locations.
- At the beginning paragraph of each response where we provide a summary of the comments, please boil down the summary and lump together issues where possible.
- For topics where we are addressing more than three issues with a comment, please provide sub-headings within the response so people can find the topics within the responses easily. Maybe start with a bullet list or table that clearly identifies upfront where comments and responses are addressed. This isn't currently consistent across the RTC. Certain comments are detailed and others are left out. The transportation section is a good example of less detail.
- Be consistent whether and when to insert this statement: This comment does not raise specific environmental issues about the adequacy or accuracy of the SEIR's coverage of physical environmental impacts that require a response in this RTC document under CEQA Guidelines section 15088. Such comments may be considered and weighed by the decision-makers prior to rendering a final decision to approve, modify, or disapprove the proposed project. This consideration is carried out independent of the environmental review process.
- Global: change 750-space parking garage to "up to 750"
- Don't correct commenters' errors, i.e., don't add 'sic.'
- Commenters sometimes reference attachments or figures they submitted. For the convenience of reviewers, at the first response in each chapter where the comment references an attachment, add a footnote that says that attachments and figures referenced by the commenters can be found with the original comments in Attachment B (Comment Letters)
- Cross references to other responses should be consistent throughout the RTC document.

- Be consistent when cross referencing another RTC response, maybe at the beginning or end of each response.
- Be consistent when referencing DSEIR sections and/or pages.
- Discuss SEIR and comments in the present tense, e.g., 'the SEIR finds' not 'the SEIR found'
- Use the word 'to' instead of a hyphen or n dash, e.g., ages 2 to 6 instead of ages 2-6.
- Use p. and pp. instead of page and pages
- Spell out hours and days below 10
- Lower case D in draft EIR
- Lower case initial caps in initial study.
- The SEIR includes the initial study, so don't say the SEIR and the initial study
- "As such" is not a substitute for "therefore." Rather, "such" must refer to an antecedent noun or noun phrase in order for "as such" to make grammatical sense (and yes, it's a matter of grammar). As a test, ask yourself "as what?"
- Instead of saying Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option, say the proposed project.
- Use non-breaking hyphens in page number references (e.g., 3.B-65) and mitigation measures
- The period comes before the closed quotation mark in American English.

Please submit the MMRP with RTC-2 (revised from the version we received with the DSEIR). We would like two hard copies of RTC-2.