
From: Susan Yogi <SYogi@esassoc.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 1:51 PM
To: Wietgreffe, Wade (CPC); Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Cc: Susan Yogi
Subject: RE: Balboa Reservoir ESA Revised Scope of Work
Attachments: 2018-06-13_ESA SOW_final.pdf; 2018-06-13_ESA SOW_final.docx

Hi Wade,

Here's the clean pdf and word versions for your files. I will distribute the pdf version to the larger team this afternoon. Have a great vacation!

From: Wietgreffe, Wade (CPC) [mailto:wade.wietgreffe@sfgov.org]
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 1:20 PM
To: Susan Yogi <SYogi@esassoc.com>; Poling, Jeanie (CPC) <jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Balboa Reservoir ESA Revised Scope of Work

Hello Susan,
Thank you. Please send final version for our files and distribute to larger team.

Wade Wietgreffe, AICP, Principal Planner
Direct: 415.575.9050

From: Susan Yogi [mailto:SYogi@esassoc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 12:53 PM
To: Wietgreffe, Wade (CPC); Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Subject: RE: Balboa Reservoir ESA Revised Scope of Work

Hi Wade,

See below and attached. If the changes look good, I'll send over a clean and final version for your files.

From: Wietgreffe, Wade (CPC) [mailto:wade.wietgreffe@sfgov.org]
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 10:08 AM
To: Poling, Jeanie (CPC) <jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>; Susan Yogi <SYogi@esassoc.com>
Subject: RE: Balboa Reservoir ESA Revised Scope of Work

Hello Jeanie and Susan,

In my quick review, please respond to the following three comments:

- Should archeology be in task 3 as a technical study? Allison sent Joel a list of 3 arche consultants on June 7. I moved some text into Task 3 for the ASA. Please see attached.
- I am not comfortable with the assumption that we will not require a detailed transit delay/operational assessment under transportation. I want to figure this out through transportation scoping ok. I will pass on to Kittelson and I've struck that assumption from the scope.
- Nothing to add to the scope to this end, but please start working with Jeanie on outlines/templates for how various things will look (e.g., NOP, Initial Study, etc.). Definitely. I've been giving it some thought this week and will develop outlines for the NOP+PD, Initial Study, and detailed PD (for the EIR). My thought is that a draft of these may be good to have for the kick-off meeting.

Thank you,

Wade Wietgreffe, AICP, Principal Planner

Direct: 415.575.9050

From: Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2018 5:42 PM
To: Wietgreffe, Wade (CPC)
Cc: Susan Yogi
Subject: FW: Balboa Reservoir ESA Revised Scope of Work

Hi Wade,

I reviewed ESA's revised scope and don't have any additional comments. Please review this and let Susan know if you do have any comments. According to the latest schedule, ESA's SOW is to be finalized by tomorrow.

Thanks,
Jeanie

From: Susan Yogi [<mailto:SYogi@esassoc.com>]
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2018 10:24 AM
To: Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Subject: Revised Scope of Work

Hi Jeanie,

Attached are clean and tracked versions of the scope of work. Responses to EP comments are within the comment bubbles in the tracked version and highlighted in blue. I'm around today except between 3:15-4:30.

Let me know if you have any questions!

From: Poling, Jeanie (CPC) [<mailto:jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>]
Sent: Friday, June 8, 2018 2:53 PM
To: Susan Yogi <SYogi@esassoc.com>
Subject: RE: Preliminary schedule - for internal review

Yes, I'm here Monday.

From: Susan Yogi [<mailto:SYogi@esassoc.com>]
Sent: Friday, June 08, 2018 12:55 PM
To: Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Subject: RE: Preliminary schedule - for internal review

Thanks Jeanie, will do!

I don't have any questions on the scope so far. Are you around Monday morning for any questions if I need to check anything before submitting? I'll get this reviewed internally today and plan to send the revised scope on Monday.

From: Poling, Jeanie (CPC) [<mailto:jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>]
Sent: Friday, June 8, 2018 12:31 PM

To: Susan Yogi <SYogi@esassoc.com>
Subject: FW: Preliminary schedule - for internal review

Hi Susan,

The City is fine with this schedule. Please pass it on to the project sponsor.

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](#)

From: Susan Yogi [<mailto:SYogi@esassoc.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 30, 2018 4:56 PM
To: Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Subject: RE: Preliminary schedule - for internal review

Sorry this took a while to revise. I had to re-check the dependencies, and update the Notes/Assumptions (page 4).

A few notes re: the revised schedule:

- MS Project counts the start duration based on the tasks below the summary row. To get the start date to 6/1, I moved EP/ESA to finalize scope of work above the overall project schedule (now Row 3). I moved EP review of EE application to get the start date to 6/1 (now Row 6).
- I moved up the technical scope preparation to begin at or just after project kickoff (vs after NOP/PD #1 is submitted). This saves about 2-3 weeks.
- Line 10 - I moved up a couple days, as we can get started on that a bit earlier.
- I'm not a fan of partial submittals either, so I kept the sequencing the same. If we end up integrating the AQTR/HRA with the EIR section, that could possibly help. Have any recent projects gone with the integrated AQTR/HRA EIR section approach? I would like to include our air quality specialist in the conversation if we do go that route. For now, I think the tasks can be left as is.

I'm around until 5:45 if you have any questions. I'm in all day tomorrow and Friday.

From: Poling, Jeanie (CPC) [<mailto:jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 30, 2018 2:58 PM
To: Susan Yogi <SYogi@esassoc.com>
Subject: RE: Preliminary schedule - for internal review

And never mind my comment about preservation....just got an email that they are preparing a response to the SOW inquiry.

From: Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Sent: Wednesday, May 30, 2018 2:57 PM
To: 'Susan Yogi'
Subject: RE: Preliminary schedule - for internal review

One other minor correction:

Line 4 – Wade’s vacation ends 9/28, no5 9/18.

From: Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Sent: Wednesday, May 30, 2018 2:56 PM
To: 'Susan Yogi'
Subject: RE: Preliminary schedule - for internal review

Hi Susan,

As we discussed (and some other items):

- Move up lines 11 and 12 start to 6/1/18
- Line 28 – 3 weeks, not 4 weeks
- Line 29 – 3 weeks, not 4 weeks
- Line 32 0 2 weeks, not 4 weeks, given the relatively non-complex land uses of this project, and the AQ and noise analysis may depend on this information

The above changes will get us to ADEIR1 sooner. We are open to having AQTR/HRA submitted with DEIR2, though I’d prefer other ways to shorten the schedule instead. I’d prefer to aim for the AQ with DEIR1, though we have the option to change it later.

- Submit the SOWs a few weeks sooner and allow another round of review, as we can approve some scopes (e.g., traffic counts) sooner than others (e.g., traffic demand).

Let me know next week if you haven’t heard from our preservation staff regarding direction for their scope of work.

Please do submit another draft schedule to me.

Thanks,
Jeanie

From: Susan Yogi [<mailto:SYogi@esassoc.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2018 5:11 PM
To: Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Cc: Susan Yogi
Subject: RE: Preliminary schedule - for internal review

Hi Jeanie,

Attached is the revised schedule and ESA’s scope of work for your review.

The critical path items in the schedule are shown in red font. A couple things:

- Holidays are now built into the schedule.
- EP vacations are listed. This will be for the internal team version only.
- With the revisions to some task durations, the schedule is now longer. I believe there are ways to streamline a couple things and we can chat about that.
- For the simplified schedule, I recommend collapsing the following rows: 1-7, 27-35, 37-48, 50-52, 54-57, 59-67

I’m available most of tomorrow to make any further adjustments. Thanks!

-Susan

From: Poling, Jeanie (CPC) [<mailto:jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>]
Sent: Friday, May 25, 2018 2:52 PM
To: Susan Yogi <SYogi@esassoc.com>
Subject: Re: Preliminary schedule - for internal review

OK. Talk to you Tuesday and have a great weekend!

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Susan Yogi <SYogi@esassoc.com>
Sent: Friday, May 25, 2018 12:47:57 PM
To: Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Subject: RE: Preliminary schedule - for internal review

Thanks Jeanie. I was just preparing an update to let you know that I've requested a task breakdown/input from Tim and Mike at Kittelson. How about I check in with you on Tuesday and we can continue coordinating? I hope you have a nice holiday weekend!

-----Original Message-----

From: Poling, Jeanie (CPC) [<mailto:jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>]
Sent: Friday, May 25, 2018 12:20 PM
To: Susan Yogi <SYogi@esassoc.com>
Subject: RE: Preliminary schedule - for internal review

Particularly because you need to coordinate with Kittelson, we won't expect the next version of the preliminary schedule til next week.

Thanks,
Jeanie

-----Original Message-----

From: Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Sent: Friday, May 25, 2018 10:26 AM
To: 'Susan Yogi'
Subject: RE: Preliminary schedule - for internal review

Hi Susan,

For the most part, the review timelines for planning staff look good. Please address the following comments, we will review one more time, and then you can share the schedule with the larger group.

-Please flag critical path items. We will want you to update the critical path items as time progresses.

-EE application - existing line 2. We will try to be as proactive as possible in reviewing this application and making sure the sponsor is aware of additional information needed, if applicable. We are somewhat concerned that this schedule assumes you will have everything you need at the end of this 30-day period for you to submit draft #1 of the NOP/PD. You do not need to make changes per se, but please make note of this.

-Project Description - Please change existing line 11 to 3 weeks. We need this time to coordinate with numerous parties.

-Given the above, and given vacations from both Wade and me, we may need to push scoping meeting to post October 1. However, it is preferable that we could make the scoping meeting occur September 10 (right before Wade's vacation).

-Project Description in relation to the technical studies: We are somewhat concerned with starting scoping for air quality,

noise, transportation, and water supply assessment prior to ESA incorporating EP comments on Draft #1 of the NOP/PD. Again, no change needed per se, but please make note of this.

-Historic: Pilar has confirmed that the analysis does not need to be in a stand-alone HRE (and she will assign a planner to discuss scope with Joanna soon). However, keep in mind that there may be additional topics to address after the public scoping period because the public may bring up additional considerations that we need to address. That being said, the sooner we can get this started, the better.

-Noise: please add the subtask to your schedule. We would like to allow time to review a scope of work, but we won't require a stand-alone study.

-Air Quality: we're undecided whether we require a stand-alone AQTR/HRA as opposed to integrated within the EIR section itself. For now, please assume it will be stand-alone. Please make the following changes: existing line 22 to 3 weeks; add a new line of ESA submits draft 2 scope; add a new line 24 to EP provides comments on draft scope 2 to 3 weeks; modify existing line 25 to 3 weeks; add a new line of ESA submits AQTR-2 to EP; add a new line of EP review of AQTR-2 of 2 weeks; remove existing lines 28 and 29.

-Water Supply Assessment: The approximately five months is fine but we will need to coordinate early on with the PUC to schedule a Commission hearing. It does need to be a stand-alone WSA.

-Transportation: This item appears to be the critical path one for technical studies. We do not want a stand-alone transportation study. In other words, we want Kittelson to write the transportation section, with ESA oversight on EIR consistency. Please include Kittelson and your estimates of this schedule in the next draft.

-Schools: please note Supervisor Fewer has raised issues concerning school capacity and this may need to be an issue in the EIR, although it likely won't require a technical study (we should be able to rely on Potrero Power Plant for guidance).

-Initial Study: we like the staggered approach for the Initial Study-1 and then ADEIR-1/IS-2.

-RTC: Change existing lines 71 and 73 to 6 weeks and 4 weeks, respectively.

-Add known vacations over the next six months: Wade: June 14-19; July 5-6; September 12 - 28. Jeanie: June 13-18; July 11-13; Sept 19-28.

-Also please make sure you are assuming holidays in your schedule (e.g., we are not going to review documents on Christmas or New Year's Day).

-ESA preparation times - we defer to your ability to meet these timelines.

Please send me the revised version and I'll let you know whether it's good and ready to collapse to send to OEWD. If we don't get it done today, that's fine. I'll just let OEWD know it's coming next week. So no one has to work late!

Thank you,
Jeanie

-----Original Message-----

From: Susan Yogi [<mailto:SYogi@esassoc.com>]
Sent: Thursday, May 24, 2018 11:48 AM
To: Poling, Jeanie (CPC)
Subject: Preliminary schedule - for internal review

Jeanie,

Here's the draft first cut of the schedule with a 'for internal discussion' watermark added. It looks like a lot but I can roll up all the rounds of review for a higher level schedule that you can send out. This level of detail is more appropriate for the core team and we can use it at the kickoff.

Take a look and let me know your thoughts. I think the important thing to convey is that this is preliminary and we'll be fine tuning it over the next couple weeks. I will be away from my desk between 1:45-3:15 or so, but otherwise available.

Thanks!
Susan