

From: Hong, Seung Yen (CPC) <seungyen.hong@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, May 22, 2020 5:50 PM
To: Jennifer Heggie <jdheggie@gmail.com>
Cc: ECN, BalboaReservoirCompliance (ECN) <balboareservoircompliance.ecn@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: APEZ designation

Correct, the Balboa Reservoir project does not amend the SF Administrative Code Chapter 31.
I am here to answer any questions. Let me know when you'd like to schedule a call.

And here's our Environmental Planning team's response to the APEZ question:

1. Would you let us know why a significant section of Sunnyside and City College were recently added to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District APEZ maps?
 - a. The APEZ maps are maintained and updated by SF Planning and the Department of Public Health (not the Bay Area Air Quality Management District) as part of Article 38 of the San Francisco Health Code. Article 38 requires that the APEZ map be updated every 5 years, which recently occurred. The map reflects more current data.
 - b. Health risk analyses methods evolve, generally to be more health protective. The State refined certain methods since the prior map was released in 2014. The City used those refined methods, combined with updated data on traffic and other sources of air pollution, for the 2020 mapping. This resulted in more locations being in the 2020 map than the 2014 map. Air pollution at City College or Sunnyside hasn't dramatically changed between 2014 and 2020; it's more the methods and data were updated. For more information, the Department of Public Health website describes how the modeling was done:
https://www.sfdph.org/dph/files/EHSdocs/AirQuality/Air_Pollutant_Exposure_Zone_Technical_Documentation_2020.pdf
 - c. City college was actually in the prior 2014 map because of its proximity to I-280. However, the parcel was excluded from the 2014 published mapping because of its parcel size. The parcel size point is related to how we interpreted the modeling, but the underlying data was collected in a similar fashion to how it was for the 2014.
 - d. The APEZ has thresholds for particulate matter/cancer risk, where a parcel is either in if it exceed the thresholds or out if it's below. Those areas were very likely close to but below the threshold before, and were bumped into the APEZ because of a combination of #b and #c above and also there was likely an increase in traffic in those areas as well that pushed them over the threshold.
2. Does this mean the risk of air quality deterioration is higher than first expected?
 - a. No, the air quality impacts from the project itself have not changed. What changed was that the background conditions (those without the project) have updated data about air quality. The RTC addresses this in detail on in Response AQ-1 starting on page 4.E-3, but in summary, the impact conclusions have not changed as a result.

I hope this helps.
Have a good weekend!
Seung-Yen

From: Jennifer Heggie <jdheggie@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 22, 2020 2:10 PM
To: Hong, Seung Yen (CPC) <seungyen.hong@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: APEZ designation

Thank you. I would like to take you up on your offer, but would like to read the SUD first.
Is SF Administrative Code chapter 31 still protected?
Jennifer

On Fri, May 22, 2020 at 12:31 PM Hong, Seung Yen (CPC) <seungyen.hong@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Jennifer,
For the SUD, the short answer is all the regulations written in the BRSUD override Planning Code; if it's silent in the BRSUD, the latest Planning Code automatically applies. For example, the height limits, setbacks, land use, and parking requirements in the BRSUD override existing Planning Code. If you'd like, I am happy to schedule a call to walk through the BRSUD.

I will send along our response to your first question later today.

Best,
Seung-Yen

From: Jennifer Heggie <jdheggie@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2020 12:12 PM
To: Hong, Seung Yen (CPC) <seungyen.hong@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: APEZ designation

Thank you for your response.
Then I guess the real question is What Planning Codes are being overridden by the SUD?
Regards,
Jennifer Heggie

On Wed, May 20, 2020 at 3:58 PM Hong, Seung Yen (CPC) <seungyen.hong@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Jennifer,

Thanks for the email. I will check with other experts to find an answer to your first question.

I understand the Commission packet documents are lengthy and hard to navigate. Feel free to send along more questions about the documents. As to the DBI and the SFPD, the short answer is that their role and responsibility will be the same as any other building construction projects. I want to note that the BRSUD cannot override the Building Code or other Code that are not Planning Code.

When the project sponsor submit their construction/building permit applications, the DBI will review against the latest Building Code. If you can articulate a bit more about the DBI's role in question, I can provide a better answer.

The SFPD will continue to have authority over noise control.

I hope this helps. I will follow up with an answer to your first question later.

Best,
Seung Yen

Seung-Yen Hong, LEED Green Associate
Urban Designer/Planner, City Design Group
Direct (Office): 415-575-9026 | Fax: 415-558-6409
SF Planning Department

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: Jennifer Heggie <jdheggie@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2020 2:14 PM
To: Hong, Seung Yen (CPC) <seungyen.hong@sfgov.org>
Subject: APEZ designation

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

Hello Seungyen,
Would you let us know why a significant section of Sunnyside and City College were recently added to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District APEZ maps?
Does this mean the risk of air quality deterioration is higher than first expected?

Also, what exactly is the role of the Department of Building Inspection in the Balboa Reservoir construction? Does the Police

Department continue to have authority over noise control?

The literature is voluminous and in some cases difficult to interpret, and this information is important for the community to understand.

Thank you,

Jennifer Heggie

Acting Chair

SNA Balboa Reservoir Committee