

From: Poling, Jeanie (CPC) <jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 8:23 AM
To: aj <ajahjah@att.net>
Cc: Susan Yogi <syogi@esassoc.com>; ECN, BalboaReservoirCompliance (ECN) <balboareservoircompliance.ecn@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: RTC Volume 2

Hello Alvin,

The USB card should be attached to the inside back cover; please check again. Also you could just download the files from [this link](#):

To reduce risks to outside service providers, we are aiming to limit distribution by mail. If you still require the USB card to be mailed to you, please let us know, and Susan will arrange to have one sent to you via regular first class mail tomorrow.

Thanks,
Jeanie

Jeanie Poling, Senior Environmental Planner
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9072 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

The Planning Department is open for business during the Shelter in Place Order. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. The Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely and [the public is encouraged to participate](#). The Board of Appeals, Board of Supervisors, and Planning Commission are [accepting appeals](#) via e-mail despite office closures. All of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended until further notice. [Click here for more information](#).

From: Susan Yogi <SYogi@esassoc.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 3, 2020 10:58:37 PM
To: Poling, Jeanie (CPC) <jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: RTC Volume 2

I checked the hard copies and they did have the usb card attached to the inside back cover ..perhaps he didn't see it or it fell out in the box (?). I'm any case we will send this via regular first class mail on Tuesday (he could also just download the files from the EP website).

Begin forwarded message:

From: aj <ajahjah@att.net>
Date: May 3, 2020 at 10:54:07 PM PDT
To: Susan Yogi <SYogi@esassoc.com>, "jeanie.poling@sfgov.org" <jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>
Subject: RTC Volume 2
Reply-To: aj <ajahjah@att.net>

Susan, Jeanie,

Thanks for shooting that colossus of an RTC to me so quickly. It works well for weight training!

The FedEx package did not contain the USB card for Volume 2. Neither was it in the plastic pocket within Volume 1.

Please send me the Volume 2 USB card to correct the oversight.

Thanks,
Alvin Ja
546 Flood Ave.
SF, CA 94112

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: aj <ajjahjah@att.net>
To: Poling, Jeanie (CPC) <jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>;
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2020, 11:03:42 AM PDT
Subject: Reservoir EIR Transit Delay Re: RTC

Thanks, Jeanie.

QUESTION: Before basically dismissing my transit delay comments, weren't your analysts interested in understanding transit delay from a MUNI Operations standpoint (vs. a Planners standpoint)?!

Did they even bother to talk to any of the Operators taking their layovers at City College Terminal? How about the Inspectors who deal with line management?

It's obvious to me that the Planners' operational knowledge is limited when they conflate "stops" with "timepoints."

Also, Planning Dept understanding of "substantial evidence" is faulty:

- I had presented an analysis of 43 delay from timepoint to timepoint based on Kittelson data. My analysis apparently was dismissed as lacking "substantial evidence." Yet because my analysis (based on your own Kittelson data and official SFMTA schedules) was unfavorable to your less-than-significant determination, the SEIR has been revised to conveniently eliminate the City College Terminal to BP Station segment from EIR analysis of the 43's 7-minute running time timepoint-to-timepoint (Monterey /Gennessee to Balboa tPark Station) segment.
- I had challenged the SEIR's misuse of the City Charter's 4-minute late standard for scheduled timepoints as your Significance Criterion for Transit Delay. The RTC refers to the Planning Dept's Transit Impact Assessment Guidelines as "substantial evidence" to justify using 4-minute delay as the threshold of significance. In a careful reading of the TIA Guidelines, the 4-minute transit delay standard is simply an assertion, containing not even a shred of evidence that would support the assertion. Using common sense, how could a 4 minute delay within a 7-minute running time route segment be objectively considered "less-than-significant"?!

An EIR is supposed to be an objective analysis. However, actually it's similar to the run-up to the Iraq War: The facts were being fixed around the policy.

Sincerely,
Alvin Ja

On Thursday, April 30, 2020, 8:25:52 AM PDT, Poling, Jeanie (CPC) <jeanie.poling@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Alvin,

You'll receive a copy by Fedex tomorrow. It was s

Thanks,

Jeanie Poling, Senior Environmental Planner

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9072 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)

The Planning Department is open for business during the Shelter in Place Order. Most of our staff are working from home and we're [available by e-mail](#). Our [Public Portal](#), where you can file new applications, and our [Property Information Map](#) are available 24/7. The Planning Commission is convening remotely and [the public is encouraged to participate](#). The Board of Appeals and Board of Supervisors are [accepting appeals](#) via e-mail despite office closures. All of our in-person services at 1650 and 1660 Mission Street are suspended until further notice. [Click here for more information](#).

From: aj <ajjah@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 4:23 PM
To: Poling, Jeanie (CPC) <jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>
Subject: RTC

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

Hi Jeanie,

Please send me a hard copy of RTC.

Thanks,

Alvin Ja

546 Flood Ave

SF, CA 94112