

4.I General Comments

The comments and corresponding responses in this section cover General Comments (GC) on topics throughout the draft SEIR. These include topics related to:

- Comment GC-1: General Environmental Comments
- Comment GC-2: Noticing
- Comment GC-3: Opinions Related to the Project
- Comment GC-4: Scope of Project
- Comment GC-5: Market-Rate Units

Comment GC-1: General Environmental Comments

This response addresses comments from the commenter listed below; each comment on this topic is quoted in full below this list:

A-CALTRANS-3	I-BARISH3-28	I-HEGGIE1-1
A-CALTRANS-4	I-BARISH3-42	I-HONG-5
O-ARHS-1	I-BERNSTEIN1-1	I-KAUFMYN-1
I-BARISH1-2	I-BIERINGER1-2	I-KOPP-3
I-BARISH1-6	I-BIERINGER4-2	I-KOWALSKI-3
I-BARISH2-2	I-BURGGRAF-1	I-MARTINEZ-1
I-BARISH2-8	I-BURGGRAF-2	I-MUELLER2-1
I-BARISH3-1	I-E.HANSON-1	I-MUHLHEIM-1
		I-PEDERSON2-2

“Coordination

As the project progress, please keep Caltrans informed of any updates with the project, including but not limited to alternative selection and scope changes.”

(Wahida Rashid, Acting District Branch Chief, Caltrans, Letter, September 10, 2019 [A-CALTRANS-3])

“Lead Agency

As the Lead Agency, the City of San Francisco is responsible for all project mitigation, including any needed improvements to the State Transportation Network. The project's fair share contribution, financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures.”

(Wahida Rashid, Acting District Branch Chief, Caltrans, Letter, September 10, 2019 [A-CALTRANS-4])

“Good afternoon. That’s a tough one to follow, but I’ve got a few concerns. My name’s Dr. Andrew Currier. I’m representing Archbishop Riordan High School, as its President.

There’s a multitude of concerns. But as it relates to this report, we serve 680 boys, 9 to 12, and a quarter of them, 170 of them, have diagnosed learning needs. And if you see, if I could pull this up, this circle RSP; that represents the learning area. It’s a specialized designed learning area for students with diagnosed learning needs that they can’t – we can’t move them elsewhere in the building.

So, we’re worried that there’s not enough information about the noise, the dust, the disruption to their learning growth, their academic growth. Again, we don’t have any option to move them elsewhere in the building, so we really want more detail on that. We want some sensitivity to that. These are young men that cannot be served by San Francisco public schools. These are specialized programs.

We also have 50 students in residence at Archbishop Riordan High School who, also, some of them have significant learning needs. They can’t go elsewhere to receive this help.”

(Andrew Currier, President, Archbishop Riordan High School, CPC Hearing, September 12, 2019 [O-ARHS-1])

“I’m here to state my opposition to the project in general and to highlight some of the many flaws in the draft EIR. I’d like to show you a rendering of what the project will look like if it has 1,550 units. As you can see, this is an oversized project. It would squeeze up to 1,550 units of housing, mostly market rate, onto a parking lot adjoining CCSF, and a quiet neighborhood of single-family homes.

While it may be a developer’s field of dreams, this project is an environmental nightmare to the surrounding neighborhoods and to City College. It will create traffic congestion, transit issues, environmental problems galore, convert public land into private property for profiteering developers, and it will not meet the growing need in San Francisco for affordable housing.”

(Jean Barish, CPC Hearing, September 12, 2019 [I-BARISH1-2])¹

“In these and in many other areas the draft SEIR offers no objective criteria to serve as a basis for determining that the impacts aren’t less than significant.

Accordingly, it is a flawed document that must be revised before it is submitted for final review. Thank you for your consideration.”

(Jean Barish, CPC Hearing, September 12, 2019 [I-BARISH1-6])

¹ The figure referenced by the commenter can be found with the original comment letter in RTC Attachment 2, Comment Letters and Emails on the Draft SEIR.

"I am here ... to highlight some of the flaws in the Draft Subsequent EIR. (Att 1)

This oversized project could squeeze up to 1,550 units of housing, mostly market rate, onto a parking lot adjoining CCSF and a quiet neighborhood of single-family homes. (Att 1)

While it may be a developer's Field of Dreams, the project is a nightmare to the surrounding neighborhoods and to City College.

It will create congestion, transit problems, lack of access to CCSF, and many other environmental problems. It will also convert public land, currently owned by the SF PUC and used by CCSF for decades, into private property for profiteering developers. And it will not meet the growing need in San Francisco for affordable housing."

(Jean Barish, Letter, September 12, 2019 [I-BARISH2-2])

"In these and many other areas, the DSEIR offers no objective criteria to serve as a basis for determining that the impacts are not significant. Accordingly, the it is a flawed document that must be revised before it is submitted for final review."

(Jean Barish, Letter, September 12, 2019 [I-BARISH2-8])

"After reviewing the DSEIR it is clear there will be many significant environmental impacts to that cannot be mitigated if this project is approved. Additionally, the DSEIR is flawed because it fails to consider numerous environmental impacts that should have been considered.

Following are my questions and comments regarding this DSEIR.

Definitions

"Substantial Evidence," as used in this letter, shall mean: "enough relevant information and reasonable inferences from this information that a fair argument can be made to support a conclusion, even though other conclusions might also be reached." (14 Cal Code Regs Sec. 15384(a)) "Substantial evidence includes facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, and expert opinion supported by facts." (14 Cal Code Regs Sec. 15384 (b)) " Argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative, or evidence that is clearly inaccurate or erroneous, or evidence that is not credible, shall not constitute substantial evidence." (14 Cal Code Regs. Sec 15064(f)(5))

"Feasible Alternatives", as used in this letter, shall mean: "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (Public Resources Code section 21061.1; 14 CCR section 15364)"

(Jean Barish, Letter, September 23, 2019 [I-BARISH3-1])

“NOVEMBER 12, 2018 SCOPING LETTER

Included in this letter as Attachment 1 is the November 12, 2018 Scoping Letter submitted for this Project. Many of these issues were not addressed in the DSEIR. These comments should all be addressed during the preparation of the FSEIR.”

(Jean Barish, Letter, September 23, 2019 [I-BARISH3-28])²

“The Balboa Reservoir Project will significantly impact City College of San Francisco and the surrounding neighborhoods. Your preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Report should assure that any project on this land will both benefit the community as well as not harm the environment or community.”

(Jean Barish, Letter, September 23, 2019 [I-BARISH3-42])

“My name is Harry Bernstein. I’m a faculty member at City College. So, I would like to provide some context to the impacts indicated in the Subsequent EIR for the Balboa Reservoir Project.

Noise, air quality and transportation from the project will cause significant and unavoidable adverse impact. You hear those words? Significant and unavoidable adverse impact. Impacts on the college students, faculty and staff, students at the adjacent Riordan High School, and students in the childcare program at the adjacent multi-use building.

So, these topics, noise, air quality, and transportation came up before the Planning Commission at their meeting in August. And this was the context I want to mention. The mayor has sought to streamline development, housing development in San Francisco. And so, she is trying to get a -- have several factors that are considered in CEQA to reduce the required mitigation. So, these, besides secondary ones like cultural and paleontological, they include noise, air quality, and transportation.

So, out of this 500-page report, the serious issues are the one that the City is trying to -- I don’t know if it’s put under the rug, but not have to consider. They’ve already done that with parking.

Okay, so that’s the way we’re going, just to save some months, save some dollars, but to give the public and the public health less opportunity, less consideration.”

(Harry Bernstein, CPC Hearing, September 12, 2019 [I-BERNSTEIN1-1])

² The attachment referenced by the commenter can be found with the original comment letter in RTC Attachment 2, Comment Letters and Emails on the Draft SEIR.

“And I went down to the Planning Commission and I picked up this book, or this tome, as I call it. And as I read through it, I started calling this the Balboa Housing Boondoggle Project.

And I cannot separate the actual project from this SEIR. It’s like they borrowed some frumies -- some Sharpies from Donald Trump, drew the lines to make their own reality, and ignored the reality that the neighbors of this project and the students of City College are going to be facing.”

(Garry Bieringer, CPC Hearing, September 12, 2019 [I-BIERINGER1-2])

“When I finally picked up a copy of the SDEIR and read through it, I was appalled at how this document minimized all the problems this would cause the community and the 2 large educational institutions closest to this proposed housing: CCSF and Riordan High School. The routes laid out for the trucks (several estimated to be 20 trucks/hr), via the north access road (right off Frieda Kecko way (formerly Phelan Ave.) would cause years of disruption to of us that must drive, walk, or use MUNI down this street and will provide massive noise pollution along with air pollution. Using Lee Avenue would totally block traffic on Ocean Ave., and there is a very large children’s climbing structure about 50 yards from the proposed Lee Ave. Route. There is no way we can have children climbing on that structure with all the trucks whizzing by so closely.”

(Garry Bieringer, Email, September 23, 2019 [I-BIERINGER4-2])

“You have received a written comment via Email from Michael Ahrens and the Board of the Westwood Park Association in parallel. I am a resident of Westwood Park as well (in the 1300 Plymouth block) and I wholeheartedly agree and concur with all the comments made by the WPA board, especially with the comments made by other residents (Exhibit 5 and 6 respectively attached to the WPA comments).”

(Alex Burggraf, Email, September 23, 2019 [I-BURGGRAF-1])

“In general, I think that a lot of the infrastructural impact (parking, traffic, noise during construction) on the neighborhood of the project - especially Westwood Park - is either not adequately addressed or drastically underestimated in the DEIR.”

(Alex Burggraf, Email, September 23, 2019 [I-BURGGRAF-2])

“I also want to express the concern that the aesthetic effects of the proposed development, including height of buildings compared to surrounding areas, is gravely underestimated and downplayed, especially considering that Westwood Park has been declared a "Residential Character District" by the Board of Supervisors.”

(Alex Burggraf, Email, September 23, 2019 [I-BURGGRAF-4])

“The DSEIR is not only inadequate, it stands as evidence to a planning process that runs contrary to the principles of good planning, fair input and democracy.

From the onset the project has been biased and selective in the way facts have been presented to the public for input. The SEIR clearly downplays and minimizes the potential impacts of the project on City College of San Francisco, and the surrounding educational institutions”

(Edward Hanson, PhD, Email, September 23, 2019 [I-E.HANSON-1])

“My name’s Jennifer Heggie. I’m from Sunnyside and representing the Balboa Reservoir Committee for the SNA.

First, I want to thank the Planning Department for this SEIR. It identifies many of our concerns that are issues that cannot be mitigated, including noise, transportation, and air quality.”

(Jennifer Heggie, CPC Hearing, September 12, 2019 [I-HEGGIE1-1])

“4. During the construction period, this massive project will need a lot of daily communication from the sponsor to the community. All too often this process fails.”

(Dennis Hong, Email, September 11, 2019 [I-HONG-5])

“Hi. I’m Wynd Kaufmyn and I’ve been a teacher at City College for 36 years. You know, San Francisco has always prided itself on its commitment to social justice and equity. To that end, the City’s undertaking an effort to train its decision makers to be more sensitive and aware of social justice.

In fact, I know that on September 26th you, the Planning Commission, are scheduled to participate in a racial and social equity training.

In light of this, and in light of the fact that the draft Environmental Impact Report states the need to develop the reservoir in a manner that will best benefit the neighborhood, the City, and the region as a whole. In light of these things, I ask you to consider the social justice aspects of the proposed Balboa Reservoir Project with respect to housing, education, and labor.”

(Wynd Kaufmyn, CPC Hearing, September 12, 2019 [I-KAUFMYN1-1])

“And, thirdly, the environmental impact to the neighborhood will be overwhelming. When they rebuilt Ocean Avenue, they used right behind our house, which abuts to the reservoir, as a

dumping ground for the concrete and asphalt. There were over 70 filed complaints, with payoffs for damages to homes, sewer lines, et cetera, et cetera.”

(Kevin Kowalski, CPC Hearing, September 12, 2019 [I-KOWALSKI-3])

“Has the Planning Department truly assessed the environmental impact, more cars and more pollution, on the neighbors around the Balboa Reservoir?”

(Anita Martinez, Email, September 23, 2019 [I-MARTINEZ-1])

“The email below was sent during last year's CEQA process preceding the current Balboa Reservoir DSEIR. In it, I noted areas which should have been reviewed in this environmental impact report. Many were not; only a few were cherry-picked to be addressed. I do not believe that this is fully legal.”

(Madeline Mueller, Email, September 23, 2019 [I-MUELLER2-1])

“<!--[if !supportLists]>1. <!--[endif]> This is not a complete report. It does not re-study many areas of the original Balboa Station Area Plan that included a much smaller housing project. Much larger project = larger impact.”

(Fred Muhlheim, Email, September 23, 2019 [I-MUHLHEIM-1])

“it fails to adequately evaluate the environmental impacts of the 750-space public parking garage included in the developer’s proposed option”

(Christopher Pederson, Email, September 23, 2019 [I-PEDERSON2-2])

Response GC-1: General Environmental Comments

The comments include general statements about the City’s responsibility for project mitigation and monitoring. A number of comments express general dissatisfaction with respect to the adequacy of the draft SEIR analysis of noise, air quality, and traffic. In some cases, the comment serves as an introductory paragraph for a more specific and detailed list of issues that follows (which are bracketed as separate comments and responded to elsewhere in this document under each specific topic). Specific comments on which these conclusions may be based are responded to elsewhere in this RTC document, under the relevant environmental topics. The general environmental comments here, and where these issues are addressed in the draft SEIR and this RTC document, include the following:

Environmental Impact Report Topics

- Congestion, transit, pedestrian, and other transportation impacts [draft SEIR Section 3.B; RTC Section 4.C]
- Noise impacts [draft SEIR Section 3.C; RTC Section 4.D]
- Air quality impacts [draft SEIR Section 3.D; RTC Section 4.E]

Initial Study Topics

- Effects on City College of San Francisco [SEIR Appendix B Section E.14; RTC Section 4.H]

Also refer to Response CEQA-1, Type of EIR, Tiering, and Focusing Second-Tier Review, on RTC p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.** for further discussion of the concept of tiering from the prior EIR.

One commenter states that project construction would require communication between the project development team and the community. The comment is acknowledged, and it is noted that Mitigation Measure M-NO-1, Construction Noise Control Measures on draft SEIR pp. 3.C-30 to 3.C-31, requires the preparation of a construction noise control plan that is to be reviewed and approved by the planning department. Such a plan, to be prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant, typically requires the posting of contact information at the project site to allow nearby residents and others to lodge complaints regarding noise generated during construction. The project sponsor would be required to file weekly noise monitoring log reports with the planning department that would include listing of noise complaints and how they were resolved.

A commenter makes specific reference to a “children’s climbing structure about 50 yards from the proposed Lee Ave. Route” and alleges that the project would result in a safety hazard to children using the climbing structure. This comment apparently concerns the play structure at the northern end of Unity Plaza. While the play structure is, indeed, about 50 yards east of the proposed Lee Avenue extension, the play structure is considerably closer than 50 yards (i.e., about 20 yards) to the existing Muni City College Loop. The play structure is also immediately adjacent to the paved area off of Lee Avenue that is currently used as an informal truck loading zone for the Whole Foods grocery and other retail stores. Neither of these proximate bus and truck uses has resulted in reported safety issues with respect to the play structure or Unity Plaza. Moreover, under conditions with the proposed project, with the Lee Avenue extension completed, the Unity Plaza play structure would be no closer to an active street than are many other play structures and children’s playgrounds in the City. For example, in the greater project vicinity, Minnie & Lovie Ward Recreation Center has a children’s playground with play structures that is 30 yards or less from Capitol Avenue. The commenter raises no specific reason why the Unity Plaza play structure should be subject to greater traffic-related effects than any other comparable recreational facilities. It is further noted that the primary haul route for construction truck traffic would be via Frida Kahlo Way and North Access Road. ~~During cConstruction, haul trucks would not use the Lee Avenue extension during construction of the proposed project,~~ but may be used ~~in very limited instances~~ by non-haul trucks for material delivery. The truck routes would be subject to review and approval by San Francisco Public Works and SFMTA, and the project sponsor would be required to meet the blue book requirements related to safety measures, sidewalk, and lane closures.

Commented [PJ(1): Define this, if it’s not commonly known.

One commenter states that aesthetic effects of the project should be considered because the adjacent Westwood Park neighborhood is a “residential character district.” This designation, contained in San Francisco Planning Code section 244.1, requires that new construction and alterations within the Westwood Park Residential Character District “be consistent with the design policies and guidelines of the General Plan and with the previously adopted ‘Residential Design Guidelines’ as amended by portions of ‘The Westwood Park Association Residential Design Guidelines.’” These planning code provisions are not applicable to the proposed project.

More generally with respect to potential aesthetics impacts of the proposed project, as stated in the SEIR, the proposed project is located in an urban infill zone and transit priority area (see draft SEIR Appendix B, p. B-16; draft SEIR p. 3.A-3). As described therein, pursuant to CEQA section 21099, aesthetics impacts of a qualifying mixed-use or employment center project on an infill site located within a transit priority area are not, as a matter of law, considered significant impacts on the environment; and consequently potential aesthetics effects on existing character, scenic vistas, or views are not part of the CEQA analysis. However, aesthetics effects of the proposed project or project variant would still be considered by decision-makers as part of the design review approvals.

Some commenters raise a concern with respect to parking. As with aesthetics, parking effects are not, as a matter of law, considered significant impacts on the environment; and consequently are not part of the CEQA analysis.

CEQA Guidelines section 15151 contains the standards used to determine whether an EIR is adequate:

An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.

The draft SEIR complies with the standards set in CEQA Guidelines section 15151. Further, inadequacy of an EIR can be shown only when there has been a prejudicial abuse of discretion by the lead agency, either because the agency has not proceeded in the manner required by law or because the conclusions in the EIR are not supported by substantial evidence (CEQA section 21168.5). None of the comments on the draft SEIR shows failure to follow the law or demonstrate that the draft SEIR’s conclusions are not based upon substantial evidence.

Finally, one commenter states that the draft SEIR does not re-evaluate some topics analyzed in the Balboa Station Area Plan PEIR. This is incorrect. Environmental topics from the Balboa Station Area Plan PEIR are included in the draft SEIR, either in chapter 3, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, or in draft SEIR Appendix B.

Comment GC-2: Noticing

This response addresses comments from the commenter listed below; each comment on this topic is quoted in full below this list:

I-BIERINGER1-1
I-BIERINGER4-1

“Good afternoon. Garry Bieringer. I live within three blocks of this proposed project area and have lived there for 40 years. I first found out about this project and this meeting today when I was taking my dog for a walk right where the project is to be built. And I saw on these lamp posts, this kind of public notice wrapped around. So, I tried to read it and looked a little bit goofy walking around and around, because it really wasn’t readable to the public. Finally, I was able to sense it’s from the Planning Commission. I got a name and an email. And I wrote Ms. Poling. I told her my problem with this and asked, well, can I get more information?

So, she directed me to the website. She was very helpful.”

(Garry Bieringer, CPC Hearing, September 12, 2019 [I-BIERINGER1-1])

“I first found out about this project while walking my dog in the proposed housing area, and saw a planning notice wrapped around a light pole. I tried to read the notice but had to keep walking around and around the pole and kept losing my place. I finally got a name and phone number from the planning dept. and I called to complain about this placement. The notice was clearly intended to make it very challenging, if not impossible, for anyone to read and showed extreme insensitivity towards the community most impacted by this proposed housing development. This was a harbinger of things to come!”

(Garry Bieringer, Email, September 23, 2019 [I-BIERINGER4-1])

Response GC-2: Noticing

The commenter alleges inadequacy in the public notices posted concerning the availability of the draft SEIR. Public notice was given as required under both CEQA and the San Francisco Administrative Code. CEQA Guidelines section 15087(a) requires that public notice of the publication of a draft EIR be given to any person or organization who has requested such notice and shall also be given by at least one of the following: publication in a newspaper of general circulation; posting on and off the project site; or direct mailing to owners and occupants of contiguous properties. A notice must also be posted in the offices of the county clerk and notification must also be given to the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research CEQA clearinghouse. San Francisco Administrative Code section 31.14(a) requires that all of the above forms of notice be provided with respect to both availability of the draft EIR and of the impending public hearing at which comments on the draft EIR may be made before the planning commission.

In addition, notice of availability of the draft EIR and public hearing is posted at the planning department.

All of the above noticing was completed in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and the San Francisco Administrative Code and following the planning department guidelines for posting of the project site and vicinity. These planning department guidelines require the posting of one or more larger poster-size (approximately 24 inches by 36 inches) notice and at least several smaller (11-by-17-inch) notices. In the case of the proposed project, because of the relatively large size of the project site, three (3) poster-size notices were installed—one near the eastern boundary of the site, within the upper City College parking lot (west of the Multi-Use Building); one at the end of San Ramon Way, adjacent to the western boundary of the project site; and one at the end of Lee Avenue, adjacent to the project site's southeast corner. In addition to the three large posters, 19 11-by-17-inch notices were posted. These small notices were placed—generally on light standards and utility poles—within both the west and east basin parking lots; on Frida Kahlo Way, Ocean Avenue, and Plymouth Avenue; adjacent to the Ingleside Branch Public Library outdoor courtyard; and in Unity Plaza. All of the posted notices were weather-protected. As required by planning department guidelines, the notices were inspected during the draft SEIR public comment period to ensure that they were still in place and remained legible. Replacement notices were installed on at least four locations during follow up inspections.

Comment GC-3: Opinions Related to the Project

This response addresses comments from the commenter listed below; each comment on this topic is quoted in full below this list:

I-ADAMS-1	I-COLLINS3-2	I-HONG-6
I-ADAMS-3	I-COLLINS3-6	I-HONG-8
I-BARISH3-17	I-CUTTEN-1	I-KAUFMYN1-4
I-BURGGRAF-4	I-EVANS1-1	

“MR. ADAMS: Hello. My name is Michael Adams. I come to you as a student of City College, a former City Planner, a former Administrator of a major university in this City, and a person who lives in a walkable neighborhood.

The access from my walkable neighborhood to City College is accomplished by rapid transit. Rapid transit in San Francisco is getting in a car, driving twice as far in half the time as you can get on MUNI or BART, and getting to your destination and doing your business, and then departing on your next rapid transit journey.

That parking lot is more than a piece of asphalt. It's kind of like folks would call the runways at San Francisco Airport a parking lot. Without any context in terms of the cultural and social and economic value of that property. It's not a parking lot. It's a transit stop for people's shopping and experiencing the educational opportunity that City College provides.”

(Michael Adams, CPC Hearing, September 12, 2019 [I-ADAMS-1])

“This group, who are opposing this project, I’d like you to look at the diversity of the group and then compare that with the diversity of this panel, and then compare that with the diversity of the project sponsors, who can’t find a person who looks like me to support the project.

There’s something about San Francisco that gets preserved when diverse populations join together to try to make their point and presence known.

Justin Herman, who I studied under as a City Planner, destroyed the Western Addition. And that legacy has continued, unfortunately, in major decisions by this City, through this Planning Department, through this City Board of Supervisors. And it would be helpful, since you’re going through a transition of administrators, to look carefully, and not repeating the ghost of Justin Herman.

Carlton Goodlett is a better ghost. And he was a friend and neighbor of ours in Omaha, Nebraska. Think about it.”

(Michael Adams, CPC Hearing, September 12, 2019 [I-ADAMS-3])

“The proposed ‘solutions’ to circulation, parking, and congestion problems be simply based on wishful thinking and ‘creative solutions.’ Conjecture and hope is not a solution for student access to education.”

(Jean Barish, Letter, September 23, 2019 [I-BARISH3-17])

“2. No one is allowed to do whatever they want with their property. It’s a society and we are strictly governed for the benefit of the commonweal. The benefit of neighbors, and visitors as well. We are a tourist city.

3. Tourist cities that depend heavily on revenue from visitors shouldn’t be encouraging dense residential clusters or towers that detract enormously from the beauty of the city and create traffic nightmares. This is why Paris France keeps the beauty in the city- they rely on tourism-and keep dense housing developments just outside city limits. Not saying it’s all for the best necessarily, but it’s the reason why.”

(Monica Collins, Email, September 22, 2019 [I-COLLINS3-2])

“12. I’m a 3rd generation construction worker who’s pro housing. But not all housing at any cost. Our tiny city isn’t Los Angeles Dallas or Atlanta and can’t spread at will. We can no more allow all comers physically, than the aforementioned city of Paris, and an infinite number of people would live here as they would there. These are fantasy or dream cities to so many. We’re more like

Manhattan. EVERYONE in NYC knows why New York has suburbs and five boroughs, which are mostly for residential purposes. How sensible is that!

13. SF has lost working classes, families, elders, poor and people of color due to gentrification and to eminent domain. This last in the 1960's notoriously, in the now Western Addition, then the Fillmore, working class lively neighborhood heavily populated by proud African American property owners who lost their homes, their cities, their community. DON'T DO TO OMI by gentrification, what was done to the Fillmore by the bulldozer.

14. City College management is not REMOTELY the City College community. The Diego Rivera mural on campus is now threatened with being taken elsewhere permanently. Please listen not to well paid, elite college leadership, but to the actual CCSF community: neighbors, graduates, students, faculty, supporters.

15. CCSF is beloved by all San Franciscans. Please don't let rich corporate developers from elsewhere threaten or destroy it just to generate some revenue for now. This is an answer only insofar as a fix of drugs is an answer to a drug addict. Please look at the long game and the wonderful investment that is public education."

(Monica Collins, Email, September 22, 2019 [I-COLLINS3-6])

"This proposal has nothing to do with providing benefits to anybody. It's all about the money and basically is a done deal. Most all of the objections are valid. I can't wait for the day when most of what is going on in SF implodes on the residents. Good luck!"

(Merritt Cutten, Email, September 16, 2019 [I-CUTTEN-1])

"Lastly, the social justice aspect with regard to labor. In the January 9th, 2018 San Francisco County Transit Authority meeting, where the TDM was passed, Malia Cohen says this: I believe that Avalon Bay will create a lot of problems for us.

Yeah. Those of us that have relationships in labor, many times they have come here, our labor partners have come here raising concerns that they haven't hired union labor to do the job. Any project built in San Francisco, and especially one on public land, should be mandated to use local union labor. Thank you."

(Wynd Kaufmyn, CPC Hearing, September 12, 2019 [I-KAUFMYN1-4])

Response GC-3: Opinions Related to the Project

These comments generally represent the opinions of the commenters regarding various aspects of the proposed project. None of the comments raise significant environmental points or identify issues related to the adequacy or accuracy of the SEIR. The opinions of the commenters will be

provided to the decision-makers for their consideration prior to taking an approval action on the project.

Comment GC-4: Scope of Project

This response addresses comments from the commenter listed below; each comment on this topic is quoted in full below this list:

I-EVANS2-2	I-HEGGIE2-21	I-PEDERSON2-10
I-FREY1-3	I-OSAWA-10	I-T.RANDOLPH-2
I-FREY2-3	I-PEDERSON2-6	I-WEIBEL-1
I-GOODMAN-3	I-PEDERSON2-8	

“SHUTTLE—WHERE IS THE SHUTTLE???”

Members of the public participating in the public input process for the Balboa Reservoir development have consistently, repeatedly, and loudly requested that a developer-funded shuttle be part of the solution to the traffic and transportation problems created by the project. The shuttle would run between the Balboa Reservoir site and the Balboa Park Station and would also serve students, faculty and staff at City College of San Francisco.

We believe that a free shuttle with frequent service is an absolutely necessity if the residents of the BR project are actually expected to use public transit. Since this expectation of public transit use is an essential component of a successful project, every reasonable measure to promote the use of transit must be used. In a city saturated with shuttle buses, this a logical part of the solution. The shuttle idea has been brought in public meetings, in meetings with the developer, in meetings with city representatives, and at neighborhood association meetings.

Despite this consistent, loud call for a shuttle, there is no mention of any shuttle in the SEIR. It does not appear to have even been discussed as part of the effort to manage transportation demand. This is a huge deficiency that must be corrected before the SEIR is approved.”

(Rita Evans, Letter, September 23, 2019 [I-EVANS2-2])

“I’ve gone to all the BRCAC meetings and the Planning Department kept assuring us that the parameters of the BRCAC would have a strong bearing on the final plan. The density of this project far exceeds the density that would have been built if the parameters had been followed.

In the urban design parameters it stated that the height would be 28 feet on the west and then gradually go to 65 on the east. Now, it starts out, I think, at 30, 35, something like that, and then it jumps real quick, and then it goes real high to 78 or 88 feet.”

(Laura Frey, CPC Hearing, September 12, 2019 [I-FREY1-3])

"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."

(Laura Frey, Email, September 22, 2019 [I-FREY2-3])

"The prior proposals for the Balboa Park Station included concepts for platforming over the freeway. My interest is in indicating the direct linkage that can occur from a more robust transit/parking and pedestrian "green-way" linkage from Frida Kahlo Way corner of Ocean down towards the BART station, on or along the southern edge of CCSF with a more gradual walkway that crosses the freeway and brings people directly into an intermodal station at Balboa Park that would treat the station as an intermodal hub that links the T-Geneva Harney, M-Line and J and K lines with significant bus and other systems in the district.

The increase in housing over near Alemany, and at the opposite end of Ocean Ave at the El-Ray theater, means that more congestion will be impacting an already heavily trafficked and gridlocked area."

(Aaron Goodman, Letter, September 12, 2019 [I-GOODMAN-3])

"18. Use of Natural Gas:

Per the EIR, efforts will be made to move away from fossil fuels toward renewable energy sources in accordance with the 2017 Clean Air Plan. As of 2017, electricity supplied to San Franciscans was 82% emissions-free, with 64% of electricity generated from renewable sources that include wind, solar and existing large hydropower. (DOE's Focus 2030: A Pathway to Net Zero Emissions report of July 2019, p. 7.) "Should the city fail to meet its renewable electricity goal by 2030, and continues to use natural gas and other fossil fuels, San Francisco could see up to five times more cumulative emissions by 2050." (Focus 2030 report, page 8.)

It is in the interest of San Francisco that all new buildings are powered by electricity and not natural gas. In the interest of meeting San Francisco's Net Zero Emissions plan, please identify only electrical infrastructure and appliances in all structures built on the Balboa Reservoir."

(Jennifer Heggie, Email, September 23, 2019 [I-HEGGIE2-21])

"And we should also use the site as a -- you know, goes to reduce car travel. If people -- when I went to City College, I biked to school every day. And if the students are having to drive there that means our region is not investing enough in public transit. We need to be building more bus lanes.

But that's not -- we should have an express bus from the outer Richmond to City College. But that's not part of the EIR for this project. All right, thank you."

(Theodore Randolph, CPC Hearing, September 12, 2019 [I-T.RANDOLPH-2])

I saw in the Balboa Reservoir Project Draft Environmental Impact Report that natural gas will be installed in the development for space heating, cooking, and gas fireplaces.

In light of the climate crisis, I would like to request that no natural gas be installed in the development.

Supervisor Yee, I was impressed by Berkeley's ordinance that bans natural gas in new developments, and I hope you will lead a similar resolution here in San Francisco -- not just for city buildings, as Supervisors Brown and Mandelman have proposed, but for all new construction and major renovation. What a show of leadership it would be to have an 1100+ unit development on all renewable resources, and what a step in the right direction it would be."

(Christine Weibel, Email, September 19, 2019 [I-WEIBEL-1])

Response GC-4: Scope of the Project

The comments request that the scope of the project should include additional features such as a shuttle service, taller buildings than endorsed by the Balboa Reservoir Citizens Advisory Committee, a pedestrian "green-way" linking Frida Kahlo Way with Balboa Park Station, and no natural gas in the project buildings.

Commented [w2]: I thought this comment was moved to project merits? Does the response below still need to be here?

Neither a shuttle service nor a pedestrian "green-way" is proposed as part of the project, and the transportation analysis in SEIR Section 3.B does not identify either of these features, or comparable features, as necessary mitigation measures. Also refer to Response TR-4, Transit Impacts, on RTC p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.** regarding transit effects of the proposed project. These comments do not raise specific environmental issues with respect to the adequacy or accuracy of the SEIR's analysis of the proposed features of the project, and no further response is required.

Regarding building heights, the Proposed Development Principles & Parameters for the Balboa Reservoir³, developed by the Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee, endorsed 25- to 65-foot-tall development for the project site. As described in SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description, under the Developer's Proposed Option, building heights would range from 25 feet closest to Westwood Park to a maximum of 78 feet closest to Frida Kahlo Way. Thus, heights in the western portion of the project site, nearest Westwood Park, would be the same as set forth in the Proposed Development Principles & Parameters, while buildings to the east side of the site would be up to

³ Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee, *Balboa Reservoir Development Principles & Parameters*, March 9, 2017, <https://sfwater.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=10644>, accessed February 20, 2020.

one to two stories taller than called for in the Proposed Development Principles & Parameters. ~~Therefore, the proposed project is strongly influenced by the heights called for in the Proposed Development Principles & Parameters.~~ SEIR Appendix B, Section E.10, Wind, and Section E.11, Shadow (pp. B-41 to B-51), ~~Therefore, the draft SEIR~~ adequately analyzes ~~ed the~~ wind and shadow impacts associated with the height of proposed buildings in both options. This comment does not raise specific environmental issues with respect to the adequacy or accuracy of the draft SEIR, and no further response is necessary.

Regarding the use of natural gas as part of the project, Section E.9, Greenhouse Gas Emissions (SEIR Appendix B), evaluates project impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions and concludes that no mitigation measures are necessary. These comments do not raise specific environmental issues about the adequacy or accuracy of the draft SEIR's coverage of physical environmental impacts.

All of the foregoing comments, including recommendations for modifications to the project, may be considered and weighed by the decision-makers prior to their deliberations of the proposed project. These considerations would be carried out independent of the environmental review process.

Comment GC-5: Market-Rate Units

This response addresses comments from the commenter listed below; each comment on this topic is quoted in full below this list:

I-BARISH3-34
I-LEGION-2
I-TARQUINO-10
I-WORLEY-3

"The DSEIR must consider the impact of market-rate units in working-class neighborhoods

The Draft SEIR also does not consider or compare the potential for gentrification impacts to the residents of the Ingleside, the neighborhood located across Ocean Avenue from the proposed development. A development solely devoted to affordable housing would better blend with the residents of this working class neighborhood. The proposed development of mostly market rate units leaves these residents vulnerable to displacement due to gentrification. The adjacent neighborhood, Excelsior, is also a working class neighborhood vulnerable to displacement due to gentrification."

(Jean Barish, Letter, September 23, 2019 [I-BARISH3-34])

“The Draft SEIR does not consider the established pattern of market-rate housing driving up the cost of housing in nearby areas, and its impact on OMI and nearby Excelsior, two of the last remaining affordable neighborhoods on SF.”

(Vicki Legion, Email, September 22, 2019 [I-LEGION-2])

“* The DRAFT SEIR must consider the impact of market-rate units in working-class neighborhood”

(Eve Tarquino, Email, September 12, 2019 [I-TARQUINO-10])

“The DRAFT SEIR is inadequate because it fails to consider the impact of market-rate units in working-class neighborhoods

The Draft SEIR does not consider the impacts of the project on the nearby working-class neighborhoods of Ingleside and The Excelsior. The development of mostly market rate units puts the residents at risk of displacement due to gentrification. A development solely devoted to affordable housing would better blend with these working class neighborhoods.”

(Jennifer Worley, Email, September 23, 2019 [I-WORLEY-3])

Response GC-5: Market-Rate Units

The comments state that the SEIR should analyze the potential for the project’s market-rate housing units to result in increasing the cost of housing nearby, gentrification and potential displacement of residents in nearby neighborhoods. The comments do not identify any potential physical effects on the environment and therefore no detailed response is required.

In response to one comment that a 100 percent affordable housing project “would better blend” with the project vicinity, refer to Response AL-1, Range of Alternatives, on RTC p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.** Social and economic impacts are not the subject of CEQA analysis except insofar as a chain of cause and effect may be established between such effects and physical changes in the environment. The focus of CEQA is whether and how a proposed project could alter the physical environment in an adverse manner. CEQA Guidelines section 15360 defines “environment” as “the *physical* conditions which exist within the area which will be affected by the proposed project...” (emphasis added). As stated in CEQA Guidelines section 15131(a):

Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes.
