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G. **SUNNYSIDE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION**

G-1. The commenters make several points within this comment: (a) evening traffic is much worse later in the evening than during the PM time used for analysis in the EIR; (b) the worst traffic is in the morning, and the traffic counts should be redone for morning hours; (c) what is the basis for the I-280 exit at Monterey Boulevard operating at LOS D; and (d) the EIR should have included an analysis of people using residential streets to cut through to the campus from Monterey Boulevard.

For a discussion of the choice of the PM peak period and the hour within the PM peak period, please see the topical response *Transportation, Use of PM Peak Hour*, in Section 10.0, Topical Responses.

Intersections along Monterey Blvd. were not included in the analysis, since it was assumed that the impacts of the college would be minimal at this location. Specifically, the traffic analysis' consideration of trips associated with the Master Plan project determined that those students accessing the College from I-280 would use the Ocean Ave ramps. Intersections that were included in the analysis were chosen in consultation with the City and County of San Francisco.

G-2. The commenters make several points within this comment: (a) they would like to know how CCSF plans to persuade the City to make improvements along Havelock Street; (b) they would like more details on the funding for the garage; and (c) they offer several suggestions with regard to the garage (put it elsewhere on campus, extend Circular Drive through the tennis courts, make the garage free for students, eliminate the garage access from Havelock). For a discussion of all of these issues, see the topical responses *Transportation, Campus Access Impacts and Mitigation* and *Parking Fees*, in Section 10.0, Topical Responses.

G-3. For a discussion of these issues, see the topical response *Transportation, Campus Access Impacts and Mitigation*, in Section 10.0, Topical Responses.

G-4. See the topical response *Transportation, Improvements to Phelan Avenue*, in Section 10.0, Topical Responses.

G-5. See the topical response *Transportation, Residential Permit Parking*, in Section 10.0, Topical Responses.

G-6. As shown in Table 4.3-4, p. 4.3-24 of the Draft EIR, conditions at the intersection of Phelan Avenue would change from LOS B to LOS D with the Master Plan, and to LOS E with cumulative development. The analysis of cumulative impacts (Draft EIR, p. 4.3-39) notes that the cumulative impact would be significant. The required mitigation (which was developed in consultation with City staff) involves changing the length of the signal cycle (time) at the intersection. The City has not committed to its project to provide bike lanes on Phelan Avenue, but even if bike lanes were
provided, the configuration of the intersection (number of lanes and where cars can go) would not change.

The EIR preparers cannot say why the City does not plan capital improvements at the intersection of Phelan and Judson Avenues. CCSF is willing to coordinate with Riordan High School and the City to improve this intersection; a mitigation measure has been added to the EIR addressing such coordination (see Chapter 12.0, Revisions to the Draft EIR).

G-7. Please see the topical response Transportation and Circulation, Edna Street, in Section 10.0, Topical Responses.

G-8. It is agreed that some streets are of different widths than others in the study area. The Draft EIR traffic analysis considered the appropriate operational characteristics in the LOS analysis for each study intersection. See the topical response Transportation, Campus Access Impacts and Mitigation in Section 10.0, Topical Responses.

G-9. This comment is noted for the record.

G-10. See the topical response Construction Impacts in Section 10.0, Topical Responses.

G-11. Please see the topical response Other, Future Use of Western Balboa Reservoir, in Section 10.0, Topical Responses.