
From: Lutenski, Leigh (ECN)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2019 3:26 PM
To: Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); Hong, Seung Yen (CPC); Shanahan, Thomas (ECN)
Subject: FW: Materials for 3/11/2019 BRCAC meeting

Hi all – has Alvin made this request before and if so, what is our rationale for keeping our procedures as they are? I want to be prepared to answer with a little more detail.

From: aj [mailto:ajahjah@att.net]
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2019 12:53 PM
To: Wong, Phillip (ECN) <phillip.c.wong@sfgov.org>; Shanahan, Thomas (ECN) <thomas.shanahan@sfgov.org>
Cc: sunnyside.balboa.reservoir@gmail.com; Mikeahrens5@gmail.com; bd@brigittedavila.com; rmuehlbauer@live.com; hnychung@yahoo.com; marktang.cac@gmail.com; cgodinez@lwhs.org; jon.winston.brcac@outlook.com; Lutenski, Leigh (ECN) <leigh.lutenski@sfgov.org>; Hong, Seung Yen (CPC) <seungyen.hong@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Materials for 3/11/2019 BRCAC meeting

Hi Tom, Leigh, Seung Yen:

As you might know, I have been making public comments via written submissions to brcac@sfgov.org. As such, members of the CAC might never see my comments until well after the submission when you follow the practice of not posting until after the meeting.

I request that written submissions to BRCAC be distributed to the members as they are received, instead of waiting several months later before the submissions are posted on the website.

Although Planning and OEWD may not agree with my assessments, BRCAC members should not be insulated from seeing analyses that are different from the Planning/OEWD party line.

RE: "Many of the items you reference appear to relate to the EIR scoping. This is separate from the CAC."

Yes, those items were submissions sent to Jeanie Poling and relate to EIR scoping. And yes, the EIR process, in and of itself, is separate from the BRCAC process. However, the subject--the Reservoir Project-- of those two processes are identical. Scoping submissions should be directly relevant to, and be of interest to, CAC members.

Thank you for posting the record of comments on EIR Scoping today. Up until today the the Reservoir EIR scoping comments had only been accessible via multiple layers within the Planning Dept website--an undertaking that was far from simple.

Tom, the best to you on your next assignment!

--aj

On Monday, March 11, 2019, 10:20:05 AM PDT, Shanahan, Thomas (ECN) <thomas.shanahan@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Alvin,

Good morning.

As per our regular procedure, public comment is posted following each CAC meetings. Our most recent CAC meeting was on October 15th so materials since that date have not yet been posted. All public comment received between October 15th and today's meeting will be posted after today's meeting.

Many of the items you reference appear to relate to the EIR scoping. This is separate from the CAC. For convenience, this meeting and the related documents and public comment have been posted to the CAC website. The public comment is located in the meeting minutes [here](#).

Just to make you aware, I will be transitioning off the Balboa Reservoir project. Leigh Lutenski from OEWD and Seung Yen Hong from Planning, both cc'd, will be the best points of contact going forward.

Best,

Tom

--

Tom Shanahan

Office of Economic and Workforce Development

City Hall, Room 448, SF, CA, 94102-4653

Office: (415) 554-7027

Website: <http://OEWD.org/Development>

From: aj [<mailto:ajahjah@att.net>]

Sent: Saturday, March 09, 2019 5:58 PM

To: Shanahan, Thomas (ECN) <thomas.shanahan@sfgov.org>; BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>; Wong, Phillip (ECN) <phillip.c.wong@sfgov.org>

Cc: sunnyside.balboa.reservoir@gmail.com; Mikeahrens5@gmail.com; bd@brigittedavila.com; rmuehlbauer@live.com; hunchung@yahoo.com; marktang.cac@gmail.com; cgodinez@lwhs.org; jon.winston.brcac@outlook.com

Subject: Materials for 3/11/2019 BRCAC meeting

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

BRCAC Staff:

The BRCAC website for the 3/11/2019 meeting does not show any posting of "Public Comment Documents and Emails" for the period beginning 10/16/2018. Please correct this oversight.

For your information, my written submissions to Environmental Planning during the scoping period had also been sent to BRCAC@sfgov.org. These were the submissions:

1. 10/10/2018:

For Balboa Reservoir scoping--Fw: Written comment on Reservoir Open Space, (WITH TWO ATTACHMENTS)

2. 10/10/2018:

ESA Scope of Work omission, (WITH ONE ATTACHMENT)

3. 10/11/2018:

Comment on Balboa Reservoir NOP re: "Summary of Potential Environmental Issues", (WITH TWO ATTACHMENTS)

4. 10/14/2018:

CEQA SCOPING for Reservoir: Contextualization of Existing Land Use and Public Services

5. 10/21/2018:

Balboa Reservoir: Impact on Muni Railway's Public Service

6. 11/1/2018:

Impact on Public Services and Cultural Resources (MUNI, City College, schools)

7. 11/4/2018:

DEFICIENT MITIGATIONS FOR ADVERSE IMPACTS ON PUBLIC SERVICES OF SCHOOLS, TRANSIT, (WITH ONE ATTACHMENT)

8. 11/4/2018:

Balboa Reservoir: ON OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, (WITH ONE ATTACHMENT)

9. 11/6/2018:

Fw: Hypocrisy in 11/17/2016 letter from City to CCSF

10. 11/6/2018:

Evidence of Secondary Impact

Please ensure that these submissions are entered and posted into the BRCAC record, as well as having been duly distributed to the CAC members.

Thanks for taking care of this,

Alvin Ja