

5. Comments and Responses

This chapter includes a reproduction of, and responses to, each letter received during the public review period. Comments are presented in their original format in Appendix H, along with annotations that identify each comment number.

Responses to those individual comments are provided in this chapter alongside the text of each corresponding comment. Letters follow the same order as listed in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR and are categorized by:

- State and Local Agencies
- Private Individuals

Letters are arranged by category and by date received. Each comment is labeled with a reference number in the margin.

During the review period for the Draft EIR, a member of the public submitted several comments that related to the details of the proposed Project itself, convey the commenter's opinion of the proposed Project, or address the relative consequences or benefits of the proposed Project (referred to here as "merits of the proposed Project"), rather than the adequacy of the Draft EIR or the environmental issues, impacts, and mitigation measures addressed in the Draft EIR. It is important for a Lead Agency in its decision-making process to consider both the adequacy of the Draft EIR and the merits of the proposed Project. However, a Lead Agency is only required by CEQA to respond in its Final EIR to comments related to pertinent environmental issues and the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines provides direction for parties reviewing and providing comment on a Draft EIR, as follows:

In reviewing draft EIRs, persons and public agencies should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated.

Section 15204 continues in relation to the role of the Lead Agency in responding to comments:

When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR.

Although comments related to merits of the proposed Project do not require responses in the Final EIR, they do provide important input to the decision-making process. Therefore, merit- and opinion-based comment letters are included in the Final EIR to be available to the decision-makers when considering whether to adopt the proposed Project.

Responses to individual comments are presented in Table 5-1. Individual comments are reproduced from the original versions in Appendix H, along with the comment numbers shown in the appendix, followed by the response.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

TABLE 5-1 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Number	Comment	Response
A. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES		
A01	Caltrans	
A01-01	<p>Serramonte Shopping Center Expansion- Draft Environmental Impact Report. Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above project. Caltrans' new mission, vision, and goals signal a modernization of our approach to California's transportation system; provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability. The Local Development-Intergovernmental Review Program reviews land use projects and plans to ensure consistency with our mission and state planning priorities of infill, conservation, and efficient development. We provide these comments consistent with the State's smart mobility goals that support a vibrant economy, and build communities, not sprawl. The following comments are based on the Draft Environmental Impact Report.</p>	This comment provides an introduction to the comment letter, and does not question the adequacy of the analysis included in the EIR. No response is required.
A01-02	<p>Multi-Modal Facilities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix F, page 52, Design and Compatible Use Hazards: Many streets and intersections are located within the Caltrans right-of-way (ROW). There are some new Class I bicycle paths, Class II bicycle lanes, and Class III bicycle roads, sidewalks, and curb ramps involved in this project. All new facilities such as those mentioned above located within the Caltrans ROW must follow the Caltrans standards. Please modify this paragraph to reflect the change. 	Page 52 of Appendix F in the DEIR will be revised to reflect the use of Caltrans standards within Caltrans ROW, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.
A01-03	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The City of Daly City's (City) Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan includes a planned Class III bicycle route along Serramonte Boulevard between Gellert Boulevard and Junipero Serra Boulevard, we strongly encourage the City to provide a more separated facility for bicyclists given the vehicle volumes and speeds. We also recommend that the bike facility extend to the intersection directly to the .west of the Serramonte Boulevard/Gellert Boulevard intersection so that it connects to the existing bike lane. 	This comment pertains to the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and is beyond the purview of the EIR and CEQA. However, the Project would not interfere with a change to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan if it were to be altered to have a Class II bicycle lane between Serramonte Center South access point and the intersection of Junipero Serra Boulevard and Serramonte Boulevard. No further response is required.
A01-04	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Please confirm that the intersections of Callan Boulevard and Serramonte Center West and Callan Boulevard and Clarinada Avenue will have crosswalks and directional curb ramps on all four legs of the intersection. We recommend that you install stop bars ahead of the crosswalks to reduce a multiple threat situation where one vehicle blocks the view for another motorist of pedestrians crossing in the 	Crosswalks are intended on all legs of the intersection of Callan Boulevard & Clarinada Avenue. However, the crosswalks at Callan Boulevard and Serramonte Center West are only intended for the south and east legs of the intersection. A crosswalk across the north leg (crossing Callan Boulevard) is not intended due to the southbound left turn lane which would not allow for a pedestrian refuge in the median. Directional curb ramps are not required by the ADA. However, text will be

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

TABLE 5-1 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Number	Comment	Response
	crosswalk.	modified to recommend both directional curb ramps and stop bars to reduce a multiple threat situation. The Draft EIR will be revised on pages 4.13-34, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.
A01-05	4. To encourage use of the nearby SamTrans bus stops the proposed parking ratio should be lowered. A Transportation Demand Management program (Transportation Demand Management) should be established that builds off of the proposed employee trip commute reduction program (CTR) with goals to reduce all vehicle trips and a monitoring program. As in the CTR, future employees should be provided with transit subsidies as one of the amenities covered in the TDM program and bicycle parking facilities which can include bicycle lockers or secure indoor parking for all-day storage and bicycle racks for short-term parking.	Based on table 4.13-14 in the Draft EIR, the planned parking ratio for only the retail portion of the project (1,154,000 square feet) is approximately 3.71 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet. This is substantially less than the average 5.5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet that was observed in a study of 27 regional shopping centers as part of the Institute of Transportation Engineers Parking Generation Manual (4 th Edition). This low parking ratio compared to similar regional shopping centers will likely already result in increased transit ridership. A TDM plan was not considered because the Project was found to not cause significant transportation impacts that could not be mitigated when analyzing the full trip generation of the Project. Should a TDM plan be implemented by the applicant, it would only serve to lessen the impacts already identified in the Draft EIR. Therefore, the analysis included in this EIR can be considered conservative without the inclusion of a TDM plan.
A01-06	Transportation Permit Project work that requires movement of oversized or excessive load vehicles on state roadways, such as I-280 requires a transportation permit that is issued by Caltrans. To apply, a completed transportation permit application with the determined specific route(s) for the shipper to follow from origin to destination must be submitted to the following address: Transportation Permits Office, 1823 -14 th Street, Sacramento, CA 95811-7119. See the following website link for more information: http://www/hq/traffops/permits/ .	This comment provides a general description of Caltrans' Transportation Permit but does not question the adequacy of the analysis included in the EIR. No response is required.
A01-07	Transportation Management Plan If it is determined that traffic restrictions and detours are needed on or affecting the state highway system, a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) or construction TIS may be required and approved by Caltrans prior to construction. TMPs must be prepared in accordance with <i>California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices</i> (CAMMUTCD). Further information is available for download at the following web address: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/mutcdsupp/pdf/camuted2012/Part6.pdf	This comment provides a general description of the requirements that must be met if Project traffic requires restrictions and detours that affect the state highway system, but does not question the adequacy of the analysis included in the EIR. No response is required.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

TABLE 5-1 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Number	Comment	Response
	Please ensure that such plans are also prepared in accordance with the transportation management plan requirements of the corresponding jurisdictions. For further TMP assistance, please contact the Office Traffic Management Plans at (510) 286-4579.	
A01-08	Encroachment Permit Work that encroaches onto the state ROW requires an encroachment permit that is issued by Caltrans. To apply, a completed encroachment permit application, environmental documentation, and five (5) sets of plans clearly indicating the state ROW must be submitted to: Mr. David Sallady, Office of Permits, California Department of Transportation, District 4, .P.O. 23660, Oakland, CA 94623-0660. Traffic-related mitigation measures should be incorporated into the construction plans during the encroachment permit process. See the website link below for more information, http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/developserv/permits .	This comment provides a general description of Caltrans' Encroachment Permit but does not question the adequacy of the analysis included in the EIR. No response is required.
A01-09	Please feel free to call or email Sandra Finegan at (510) 622-1644 or sandra.finegan@dot.ca.gov with any questions regarding this letter. Sincerely, PATRICIA MAURICE Acting District Branch Chief Local Development - Intergovernmental Review	This comment provides a closing to the comment letter and does not question the adequacy of the analysis included in the EIR. No response is required.
A02	TOWN OF COLMA	
A02-01	Dear Michael: Thank you for meeting with us on Friday April 17, 2015 to discuss the Town of Colma's concerns with the traffic section of the Serramonte Mall EIR. As a follow up to this meeting, the Town requests the City of Daly City address or comment on in the following concerns in the Final EIR:	This comment provides an introduction to the comment letter, and does not question the adequacy of the analysis included in the EIR. No response is required.
A02-02	Executive Summary: <i>Pg. 1-5: Under section 1.5, the text notes that three alternatives were analyzed, but only two are listed.</i>	Page 1-5 of the Executive Summary has been modified to acknowledge that two alternatives were analyzed, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.
A02-03	Traffic Comments: <i>General Comment:</i> Summary mitigation table in Executive Summary (Table 1-1) should be updated to include the name of the intersection related to the mitigation measure.	Mitigation Measures shown in Table 1-1 of the Executive Summary have been updated to include the intersection name in addition to the mitigation measure. Also the Mitigation Measures shown in Chapter 4.13 have updated accordingly.
A02-04	<i>General Comment:</i> EIR does not include any meaningful traffic diagrams which illustrate existing and post-mitigation conditions.	While a graphic may provide additional illustration of the proposed mitigation measure, the text description presented in the mitigation is sufficient for purposes of

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

TABLE 5-1 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Number	Comment	Response
A02-05	<i>General Comment:</i> We discussed the need to include a full mitigation monitoring plan that will detail the required mitigation and the responsible parties. As indicated in the meeting, Colma will work with the applicant and the City of Daly City to mitigate intersection impacts in Colma. Since this information was not provided in the Draft EIR, the Town would like to review and comment on this document when it is completed. The Town wants to assure that there are mechanisms in place that will require the developer to meet its fair share obligation to contribute to traffic improvement solutions that can be implemented.	the EIR. No further response is required. This comment pertains to Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) document that will be included as Appendix I to this Final EIR. The Town of Colma is welcome comment on the MMRP. No further response is required.
A02-06	<i>General Comment:</i> Portions of Colma and Daly City in the vicinity of the proposed project experience near gridlock conditions during the holiday shopping season in late November through December, particularly aggravating evening and weekend peak traffic. The EIR should include a discussion of this condition and how it may affect any of the intersections studied. While it may not be feasible or required to mitigate for this short-term condition, any practical and feasible adjustments that can be made as part of mitigation implementation should be considered.	As noted in the comment, mitigation for a short-term condition is not practical and would generally be infeasible due to the overwhelming demand experienced by a regional shopping center during the holiday season. Additionally, no data were available to quantify impacts such that mitigation measures could be identified.
A02-07	<i>General Comment:</i> The project is estimated to generate 991 new jobs, which is in addition to the significant number of employees who already work at the mall and in the vicinity of the mall. Discussion in the EIR should include the feasibility of a mall funded (or shared funded) employee shuttle to the Colma BART station and/or other Transportation Demand measures. An employee shuttle has the potential to significantly reduce vehicle trips. A shuttle could greatly benefit employees and patrons of the mall. In addition, mall management should take initiative in providing staff and resources to provide promotions and incentives to mall employees to utilize alternative transportation (in addition to required employer incentives).	Mitigation measure AIR-1B calls for the implementation of a commute reduction program (CTR) which could potentially include the suggested shuttle or other trip reduction measures. The traffic analysis in the EIR did not assume a trip reduction resulting from a TDM plan. Therefore, the analysis can be considered conservative and any CTR measure implemented would only serve to lessen the Project's impact. Additionally, the Project is already served by four SamTrans bus routes that also serve the Colma BART station (Routes 112, 120, 121, and 122).
A02-08	<i>General Comment:</i> The Traffic Impact Study relies on the Daly City traffic model to forecast future cumulative traffic. Discussion in the EIR should include a description of what is included in this forecast.	The most updated travel demand model for Daly City as of August 2014 was used to develop the growth and changes to the surrounding community by 2035. This includes all of the approved or reasonably foreseeable projects that were known in August of 2014. Page 43 of Appendix F, Transportation Impact Analysis, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.
A02-09	<i>Tables 7 and 8, Traffic Appendix:</i> Table 8 of the Traffic Impact Study in the Appendix unilaterally reduces trip generation estimates for the project as a	The exact trip reductions for this Project were discussed, reviewed, and approved by the City of Daly City prior to the beginning of analysis work. The trip reductions

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

TABLE 5-1 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Number	Comment	Response
	<p>whole by over 40% for the pm peak periods. This reduction is for linked and pass-by trips. The linked trips, as defined by the study, may be deducted. However, the pass-by trips should be distinguished from diverted trips. Trips diverted from El Camino, Junipero Serra Boulevard and from the State Highway will pass through and affect Colma intersections. It appears from Table 7 that approximately 30% of a reduction in overall traffic has been devoted to these pass-by trips. Table 7 presents the adjustment proposed for each of the uses of the project. However, there is no indication given as to how the overall adjustment factors have been derived. This could mean is that the new trips added to the three study intersections are low on the order of 30%. The Traffic Consultant should document these calculations and make appropriate adjustments to the traffic counts if necessary. The current approach to trip generation calculation does not appear to follow standard transportation engineering methodology. This has a moderate effect on the calculations for Colma intersections but has a more substantial effect on the intersection entrances to the project in Daly City.</p>	<p>generally include a 10% reduction to account for non-auto trips, up to a 30% reduction to account for linked trips which are trips within Serramonte Center (e.g. a retail shopper also eats at a Serramonte Center restaurant), and a reduction for pass-by trips of up to 30%. All reductions are applied specifically by land use and are taken one at a time rather than as a summation.</p> <p>For example, the supermarket in the southeast quadrant of the Project in the PM will generate 332 total trips according to trip generation estimates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual. After taking a 10% reduction for non-auto trips, then a 20% reduction for linked trips, and then a 30% pass-by reduction, the resulting actual trip generation in the PM peak hour was 167 trips or roughly 50% of the ITE estimate. It should also be noted that no diverted trips were assumed in the analysis, only pass-by trips which were all assumed to be passing by on Serramonte Boulevard.</p>
A02-10	<p><i>Pg. 4-3: Table 4-1, Current and Future Developments in the City of Daly City:</i> We discussed the reason not to consider the development at the SamTrans Park and Ride lot by the BART station in the cumulative analysis. SamTrans issued an RFP for development of the site, and developers were selected. A Pre-application Review Application was submitted to the City of Daly City for a transit oriented development with 500 residential units and 15,000-20,000 square feet of retail. The Daly City City Council held a study session on this project on August 13, 2014 and voiced no objections to the proposal. Council members also suggested that the retail component of this project be on Junipero Serra Boulevard to attract more visibility and business. Even though a full application has not been submitted to the City of Daly City, CEQA requires consideration of other “reasonably foreseeable plans and projects causing related impacts.” Given the discussions of this project and the application submitted, development of the transit site with high density development is a strong possibility. Because of the close proximity of the Serramonte Mall and the transit site, a discussion in the EIR is required. It is our understanding that the Daly City traffic model only uses the current BART Specific Plan low intensity development as the site development option, which would significantly understate the potential trips generated by the proposed development.</p>	<p>The release of the NOP for Serramonte Center occurred in May 2014, which was three months prior to the City Council study session for the TOD project (August 2014). At the time of the Serramonte Center NOP, the project study area, including potentially impacted intersections, and the approach for analyzing the future conditions was defined in consultation with the Daly City staff. The Serramonte Center analysis includes reasonably foreseeable plans and projects, including growth in the area of the Colma BART station based on the BART specific plan, as described by the future growth assumptions in the Daly City traffic model. Without a full formal application describing the proposed TOD development, Daly City did not consider the TOD project to be a “reasonably foreseeable” project and it was therefore, not included in Table 4-1, nor considered as part of the impact analysis.</p>
A02-11	<p><i>Figure 4.13-5:</i> This figure shows a 5(3)% trip distribution down Collins Avenue.</p>	<p>As noted in the comment, this is a graphical error and does not affect the analysis</p>

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

TABLE 5-1 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Number	Comment	Response
	Project trips will come from Serramonte Boulevard, north of Collins Avenue (arrow and percentage should be moved north on the diagram adjacent to Serramonte Boulevard – support information in the EIR is correct).	which used the correct roadway. The graphic has been revised, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR, to move the arrow to the correct location.
A02-12	<i>Pg. 4.13-32 Impact Trans-4E:</i> This mitigation measure states that feasible mitigation is not available. While Caltrans controls the intersection, the right-of-way of Junipero Serra Boulevard is under the control and jurisdiction of the Town of Colma, and mitigation is feasible. As discussed at our meeting, a diagram was provided showing that ample right-of-way is available on Junipero Serra Boulevard south of Serramonte Boulevard. The project engineer should provide a diagram suggesting a possible design option to mitigate the impact and identify the steps to implement the improvement. The analysis should identify the mall expansion fair share percentage contribution to a future improvement by mall improvement phase.	In reviewing the analysis of this intersection during the Saturday Cumulative + Project conditions, it was determined that the impact could be eliminated through modifications to the signal timing. This would eliminate the increase in queue length for the northbound right approach. Therefore, Mitigation Measure TRANS-4E is revised, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.
A02-13	<i>General Comment:</i> Consistent with Daly City General Plan Circulation Element Task CE-1.6, mitigation measures shall include construction of or financial contribution toward traffic improvements that can effectively mitigate the impact within a ten-year timeframe from the project approval date. The EIR should discuss how this guarantee will be secured by Daly City for off-site improvements required by the developer for this time frame.	The exact agreement between the applicant and the City of Daly City will be discussed in the conditions of approval document and, therefore, this comment is outside of the purview of the EIR and CEQA. No further response is required.
A02-14	<i>Pg. 4.13-42 Impact Trans-8B:</i> The Town of Colma supports the implementation of Mitigation Measure Trans-8B, the optimization of the traffic signal green time at the intersection of Serramonte Boulevard and Junipero Serra Boulevard. This improvement should be implemented by the project proponent, with coordination with CalTrans, Colma and the City of Daly City. The Town of Colma will assist the project proponent and City of Daly City in any way required to assure the Implementation of this mitigation measure during the first phase of the project. The proper functioning of this intersection is vital to the Daly City and Colma retail areas.	This comment express support for Mitigation Measure TRANS-8b, and does not question the adequacy of the analysis included in the EIR. No response is required.
A02-15	<i>Pg. 4.13-42 Impact Trans-8C:</i> The Town of Colma supports the optimization of signal timing at the Serramonte and El Camino Real intersection. Since the project contributes impacts under the cumulative analysis, the mall developer should be involved in mitigation. The Town of Colma will assist Caltrans, the City of Daly City and the developer in the implementation of this measure.	This comment express support for Mitigation Measure TRANS-8c, and does not question the adequacy of the analysis included in the EIR. No response is required.
A02-16	Alternatives: <i>Pg. 6-2, Section 6.2.</i> The discussion of the No Project Alternative mentions the expiration of a lease by Sears, who is not a tenant of this mall.	Page 6-2 of the Draft EIR has been modified to remove reference of lease expiration, as shown in Chapter 3, of this Final EIR.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

TABLE 5-1 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Number	Comment	Response
A02-17	<p>Thank you in advance for your consideration of these items. We look forward to working with you and the developer in implementing mitigation measures in the Town of Colma. Please contact me at (650) 757-8896 if you would like to discuss any items in this letter.</p> <p>Sincerely, Michael P. Laughlin AICP City Planner</p>	This comment provides a closing to the comment letter and does not question the adequacy of the analysis included in the EIR. No response is required.
B. PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS		
B01	Zachary Moore	
B01-01	<p>Dear Mr. Steve Flint,</p> <p>I am writing in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Serramonte Shopping Center Expansion Project. I live less than a mile from the Serramonte Shopping Center and I have many problems with this project.</p>	This comment provides an introduction to the comment letter and does not question the adequacy of the analysis included in this EIR. No response is required.
B01-02	<p>This project will lead to a substantial increase in traffic not just in my neighborhood, but in the entire area surrounding the Serramonte Shopping Center. It used to take me five minutes to pass through the area surrounding the Serramonte Shopping Center, but now I fear it will take me fifteen to twenty minutes.</p>	As discussed beginning on page 4.13-17, the Project would result in 11,916 vehicular trips and as a result, significant impacts would occur to the intersections of Serramonte Boulevard and Gellert Boulevard, State Route 1 Southbound ramps and Clarinada Avenue, and Callan Boulevard and Serramonte Boulevard. For each intersection, mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures TRANS-1A, TRANS-1B and TRANS-1C) are proposed to reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels.
B01-03	<p>If this project moves forward, there will need to be a traffic signal placed at the Intersection of Serramonte Blvd. and Callan Blvd., at the Intersection of Southgate Blvd. and Callan Blvd., and at the Intersection of Southgate Blvd. and Serramonte Center North.</p>	Based on the traffic analysis included in the Draft EIR, and discussed on page 4.13-24, only the intersection of Serramonte Boulevard and Callan Boulevard would require the installation of a traffic signal. All other intersections are projected to operate within acceptable standards.
B01-04	<p>I also have concerns with the Interstate 280 exit at Serramonte Blvd. If no improvements occur at this exit, there will be severe traffic backups, with people trying to enter Interstate 280 from State Highway 1, and people trying to exit Interstate 280 at Serramonte Blvd.</p> <p>Accidents will be a regular occurrence.</p>	As discussed in the Draft EIR beginning on page 4.13-29, the traffic analysis included a queuing analysis that evaluated the I-280 southbound off-ramp at Serramonte Boulevard. However, based on the analysis, the Project was not found to result in hazardous conditions at the I-280 off-ramp at Serramonte Boulevard.
B01-05	<p>I believe the key to good economics is an equal balance of land use and an equal variety of business establishments. I believe we have not been successful at this. The plan for a medical building along Callan Blvd. is not a good idea because we already have medical buildings at Seton Hospital, along Southgate Ave., and along Hickey Blvd. The plan for a movie theater is also not a good idea because we have a movie theater up at the Daly City B.A.R.T. Station, as well as down at the Tanforan Mall in the City of San Bruno. The</p>	This comment questions the merits of the Project and states the opinion that the land uses proposed by the Project are ill-suited for the Project site. This comment does not question the adequacy of the analysis included in the EIR, and therefore no response is required.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

TABLE 5-1 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Number	Comment	Response
B01-06	<p>plan to demolish Daiso and replace it with a Supermarket is also not a good idea because we already have enough Supermarkets in the surrounding area.</p> <p>The plan to tear down Denny's is a horrible idea because we have a severe shortage of traditional full service American restaurants in this area. If they must close down Denny's, they should replace it with another traditional full service American restaurant such as Applebee's, Black Bear Diner, Claim Jumper, Home Town Buffet, Johnny Rockets, or Mountain Mike's, or they should bring back the Marie Callender's that they also closed down four years ago. If we lose Denny's, then that is another place that I can't have dinner with my family at.</p>	<p>This comment questions the merits of the Project and states the opinion that the land uses proposed by the Project are ill-suited for the Project site. This comment does not question the adequacy of the analysis included in the EIR, and therefore no response is required.</p>
B01-07	<p>Thank you for listening to my concerns about this project. Sincerely, A Concerned Daly City Resident</p>	<p>This comment provides a closing to the comment letter and does not question the adequacy of the analysis included in the EIR. No response is required.</p>

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

This page intentionally blank