

**From:** [Rita M EVANS](#)  
**To:** [Poling, Jeanie \(CPC\)](#)  
**Subject:** Balboa Reservoir Project, Public Comment on Scoping  
**Date:** Sunday, November 11, 2018 4:11:53 PM  
**Attachments:** [EIR Variants Comments 11-12-2018.doc](#)

---

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

Jeanie,

Attached are my comments for the public record on the Balboa Reservoir Project environmental scoping.

Thank you for a very informative presentation at the Oct 30 meeting. You made some clear distinctions about what this process is and is not intended to do. That's really helpful to those of in the public.

Rita

--

Rita Evans

To: Jeanie Poling, Senior Environmental Planner, [jeanie.poling@sfgov.org](mailto:jeanie.poling@sfgov.org), SF Planning Department  
From: Rita Evans, 226 Judson Avenue, San Francisco, [rita.evans@berkeley.edu](mailto:rita.evans@berkeley.edu)  
Date: November 11, 2018  
Subject: Balboa Reservoir Project, Case No. 2018-007883ENV, Scope of the EIR

These written comments are in addition to the oral comments I provided at the October 30 public scoping meeting.

1) The current Developer's Proposed Option for the Balboa Reservoir site is seriously flawed in assuming no vehicular access via San Ramon Way. The proposed option must be modified to allow such access before the environmental review process proceeds.

With more than 2000 new residents in the planned development, traffic congestion on neighboring streets will increase dramatically. While increased traffic is inevitable, the burden of dealing with the project's impact must be shared by the surrounding neighborhoods. Having only two access points for vehicles, one to Ocean Avenue and the other to Frida Kahlo Way/Judson Avenue, inflicts the entire burden of increased traffic on residents of neighborhoods to the east and south while shielding those living in Westwood Park.

In not considering vehicular access via the San Ramon Way (or another street to the west) the EIR will fail to weigh the benefits and drawbacks of this access point to the west of the project. There would be a significant impact on traffic on surrounding streets if residents westbound from the BR project are forced into an indirect route via streets to the south and east. Residents of Sunnyside and those living south of Ocean Avenue will be forced to assume an additional traffic burden while Westwood Park is shielded from this impact. The Proposed Option and all Variants must assume vehicular access via San Ramon Way in the interest of fairness.

Ocean Avenue is already heavily congested with private vehicles, Muni light rail vehicles, buses and bicyclists. Many streets in Sunnyside and south of Ocean, not just those in Westwood Park, are narrow and ill-suited to carrying additional traffic.

If this project is built, neighbors in ALL surrounding neighborhoods must share in the burden of the impact of additional traffic and parking demand.

2) If the Developer's Proposed Option is not modified to allow vehicular access via San Ramon or another street to the west, I request that an additional Variant allowing such access be added to the EIR process for the reasons outlined in 1) above.

3) Variant 3, "Assumes no pedestrian or bike access from San Ramon Way," should not even be considered during the environmental review process. Pedestrian and cyclists living in both the new development and existing neighborhoods to the east will be forced into lengthy detours. Instead of promoting walking and cycling, it encourages driving.

Residents to the west may wish to protect themselves from increased parking demand, but what current best practice in planning promotes the idea of walling off one neighborhood from an adjacent one? How does this promote the idea of complete streets and better neighborhoods? Who benefits

besides a small number of Westwood Park residents? Many of us in Sunnyside have looked forward for years to a more direct and more attractive walking route to the Ocean Avenue commercial corridor, one this project must provide.

It is puzzling enough that the developer would even consider such an environmentally unfriendly option, but how can the Planning Department possibly justify allowing it to be one of the options being weighed? The Planning Department promotes “Eight Elements of a Great Neighborhood” and here is the perfect opportunity for Planning to demonstrate the department’s concrete commitment to the concepts of Walking to Shops, Getting around Easily, Special Character, and Part of the Whole. (SF Planning Department, <https://sf-planning.org/eight-elements-great-neighborhood>).

I request that this Variant be dropped from the review process. Let’s connect our neighborhoods!

4) In the interest of promoting walking and cycling, pedestrian and bicyclist access to the PUC street/walkway adjacent to the Ingleside Library on Ocean Avenue should be provided.