

This page left blank intentionally.

C. SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF PARKING & TRAFFIC (DPT)

- C-1. The text on page 4.3-2, fifth paragraph of the Draft EIR has been revised to reflect this comment (see **Section 12.0, Revisions to the Draft EIR**).
- C-2. The text on page 4.3-3, second full paragraph of the Draft EIR has been revised to reflect this comment (see **Section 12.0, Revisions to the Draft EIR**).
- C-3. See the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Residential Permit Parking**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- C-4. Detroit Street, Hazelwood Avenue and Paulding Street are all included in the parking study area. They are not listed in Table 2 in the traffic impact appendix, as only those city blocks that experience full occupancy at some time between 4:00 and 8:00 PM were included in the table. The full parking survey results are shown in Appendix A of the traffic impact study.
- C-5. The text at the bottom of page 4.3-10 and continuing to p. 4.3-11 of the Draft EIR has been revised to reflect this comment (see **Section 12.0, Revisions to the Draft EIR**).
- C-6. The EIR analysis of traffic congestion was performed in accordance with the City Transportation Guidelines. The traffic volumes and congestion during the first week of a new term were not analyzed because they are temporary occurrences and not typical of conditions near the Main Campus.
- C-7. As stated on p. 3.0-19 of the Draft EIR, the draft Balboa Park Station Area Plan includes a policy calling for the redesign of Phelan Avenue to function more as an internal campus street. Under this policy, the redesigned street would include one lane of traffic in each direction (reduced from two), Class I bike lanes and a landscaped median with left-turn pockets. This proposal is not part of the proposed Main Campus Master Plan; it is a City project. The redesign project is under consideration but the City has not committed to it at this time. See the topical response **Transportation, Improvements to Phelan Avenue**, for additional discussion (**Section 10.0, Topical Responses**)

The November 2003 draft Main Campus Master Plan (used as the basis for the Draft EIR analysis) did not include a new driveway into the Balboa Reservoir. CCSF has since proposed relocating the reservoir driveway as a mitigation measure for campus access impacts (Impact **Traffic-9**, p. 4.3-33 of the Draft EIR). With this mitigation measure, there would be one entrance to the reservoir (as there is now), but it would be near the location where the center reservoir berm is now. The driveway is currently being designed; as a preliminary concept, it would provide for two lanes of access and two lanes of egress (as opposed to the current one-lane-in, one-lane-out configuration). CCSF would install a traffic signal and a pedestrian crosswalk at the driveway.

Mitigation Measure **Traffic-9h**, p. 4.3-34 of the Draft EIR, has been revised to include the proposed driveway relocation (see **Section 12.0, Revisions to the Draft EIR**). The revised mitigation measure notes that the relocated driveway would be designed to operate acceptably with expected future traffic volumes (so as to avoid exceeding any traffic thresholds identified in the EIR).

C-8. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Analysis of Lee Avenue Entrance**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.

C-9. Comment noted. The intersection numbers on Figures 8 and 9 in the Traffic Report should have been included. These figures were not included in the Draft EIR, and therefore, this change does not affect the Draft EIR. As a result, the Draft EIR has not been revised. Revised Figures 8 and 9 are included in **Appendix B** of this document.

C-10. This intersection was analyzed as two intersections to allow for consideration of all traffic movements and the queuing that occurs between the two intersections. The differences in the intersection LOS between the Master Plan and the Draft EIR are attributable to updated traffic counts and signal timing at several intersections.

C-11. The intersection should have been analyzed as a completely unsignalized intersection. (Howth intersects Geneva as two one-way streets in opposite directions; a driver can turn onto Howth from Geneva but cannot turn onto Geneva from Howth.) The analysis of levels of service at the intersection has been revised to reflect the correct configuration. The results for each of the scenarios studied are as follows (LOS/average delay in seconds):

- Existing conditions: LOS B/2.4
- 2006 Project Conditions: LOS B/2.3
- 2015 Project Conditions: LOS B/2.3
- 2015 Cumulative Condition: LOS B/2.6
- 2015 Cumulative plus Project Condition: LOS B/2.5

These results are substantially improved over the results presented in the Draft EIR. **Section 4.3** of the Draft EIR (Table 4.3-4) has been revised to reflect this information (see **Section 12.0, Revisions to the Draft EIR**).

C-12. Pedestrian counts were taken at the same time as intersection counts (between 4:00 and 8:00 PM). Full pedestrian counts are shown in Appendix D of the traffic report. There were some surges in the number of pedestrians at the intersections during the survey period. As noted on p. 4.3-29 of

- the Draft EIR, Master Plan buildout would not result in a significant impact on pedestrians at the study intersections.
- C-13. Please see the topical response **Recommended v. Proposed Improvements in Section 10.0, Topical Responses**. The Draft EIR traffic analysis reflects the proposed improvements.
- C-14. Please see the topical response **Recommended v. Proposed Improvements in Section 10.0, Topical Responses**. The Draft EIR traffic analysis reflects the proposed improvements.
- C-15. Please see the topical response **Recommended v. Proposed Improvements in Section 10.0, Topical Responses**. The Draft EIR correctly analyzed the intersection of Phelan and Judson Avenues as an unsignalized intersection.
- C-16. The Draft EIR includes all significant impacts identified during the traffic analysis.
- C-17. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Analysis of Lee Avenue Entrance, in Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- C-18. The text on p. 54 of the traffic report is not complete. The completed sentence reads, "In addition, the proposed bicycle network changes to Phelan Ave would also result in a safer pedestrian environment since there would be one less travel lane along Phelan Ave in the southbound direction." This correction is included in **Appendix B** of this document.
- C-19. It is agreed that the other intersections along Ocean Ave (to the west of the campus) might also need to have their cycle lengths adjusted to maintain signal coordination. The EIR preparers coordinated with DPT staff when developing the mitigation for this intersection. Mitigation Measure **Traffic-11a** has been revised to include coordination by CCSF with the City and County of San Francisco regarding signal coordination issues (see **Section 12.0, Revisions to the Draft EIR**).
- C-20. Left turn storage capacity would not be changed as a result of Mitigation Measures **Traffic-11b** and **Traffic-11c**. Geneva Avenue already has four lanes, and the two existing left-turn/through lanes would be changed to left-turn only. The Draft EIR states (p. 4.3-40) that the measures are within the purview of the City and Caltrans.
- C-21. The handwritten notes in the traffic report are a table indicating the traffic volumes along the major and the minor streets. This information is reflected in the traffic analysis in the EIR.
- C-22. See the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Campus Access Impacts and Mitigation, in Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- C-23. See the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Residential Permit Parking, in Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.

This page left blank intentionally.