

This page left blank intentionally.

**H. PUBLIC HEARING, MARCH 1, 2004**

- H-1. Buildings on the Reservoir constructed as part of the Main Campus Master Plan would be restricted to the eastern portion of the Reservoir. The western portion would belong to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and remain undeveloped for the time being. As noted in the EIR discussion of project impact **Visual-3** (Impacts to Visual Character), the mass and scale of campus buildings to the west of Phelan Avenue could result in the visual character being perceived as less open, more built-up, and larger scale (DEIR, pg. 4.2-20). Although implementation of Measures **Visual-3a** and **-3b** would reduce the potential impact to visual character, some of the impact may be inherent in the size and general placement of the proposed structures. As a result, the potential impact to visual character would remain significant after mitigation. The commenter's concern about loss of openness is consistent with the conclusions of the EIR.
- H-2. Please see the topical response **Other, Future Use of Western Balboa Reservoir**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-3. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Residential Permit Parking**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-4. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Use of PM Peak Hour**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-5. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Campus Access Impacts and Mitigation**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-6. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Need for On-Campus Parking**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-7. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Need for On-Campus Parking**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-8. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Parking Fees**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-9. Please see the topical response **Other Issues, Mission Campus**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-10. A survey of student trip patterns was not conducted for the Master Plan or EIR; however, it is acknowledged that community college students may be combining their trips to school with trips to work or other locations. This factor was considered in the Master Plan team's estimates of the

effectiveness of a Transportation Demand Management Program and need for additional parking.

As noted on p. 4.3-8 of the Draft EIR, about 44 percent of the daily-enrolled students use transit to access the campus. The analysis of traffic impacts in the Draft EIR assumed that only 23 percent of the future trips would use transit; this assumption was conservative and based on the San Francisco Transportation Guidelines.

Please also see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Need for On-Campus Parking**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.

- H-11. It is unclear if Mr. Lesser is referring to the study Trustee Marks asked about or a study that would relate to the Mr. Lesser's subsequent comments. In either case, the comment is addressed in the response to Trustee Marks' comment or the response to Mr. Lesser's next comment.
- H-12. Please see the topical response **Other Issues, Mission Campus**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-13. This comment is about the Master Plan, not the EIR. The EIR is based on a version of the Master Plan published on November 19, 2003; this version is the project proposed by CCSF. The draft Master Plan is on file for review at CCSF and other locations. It should be noted that the draft Master Plan has been modified as appropriate as a result of comments received by the public, including comments by Mr. Weaver.

For example, in response to concerns raised by local residents, the Child Development Center, originally designed to be located on Judson Avenue east of the Environmental Horticulture and Forestry building, is now planned for the corner of Phelan and Judson Avenues. Likewise, after presenting a draft of the Master Plan to the neighborhood in the early Fall of 2003, a building planned for the hillside area of Judson Avenue close to Marston Avenue was removed in response to objections from the neighbors. In addition, the Master Plan includes recommendations that the City provide a wider sidewalk along Ocean Avenue, and that BART enhance the north end of the Balboa Park station; these recommendations were included in response to neighbor concerns. Likewise, the EIR will reflect changes to the Master Plan.

Mr. Weaver's most recent comments were submitted after the publication of the November 19, 2003 draft Master Plan; CCSF will incorporate his comments and others (as appropriate) when preparing the final version of the Master Plan. Prior to adoption of the final Master Plan, CCSF will ensure that the EIR adequately analyzes the environmental impacts of the final version of the Master Plan.

- H-14. See the response to Comment H-13.

- H-15. The Master Plan recommends a direct vehicle access to the Reservoir parking lots from Ocean Avenue, through the Phelan Loop transit turnaround site at the intersection of Ocean Avenue and Lee Avenue (DEIR, pg. 3.0-18). This improvement would involve the City and MUNI, and would be undertaken in coordination with redevelopment of the Phelan Loop area consistent with the draft *Balboa Station Area Plan*. A process has been initiated to consider a mixed-use residential and retail project at this location. The possible presence of residential and retail uses south of the reservoir is considered in this EIR but a future direct access to Ocean Avenue is still considered speculative at this time. For the EIR, therefore, it is assumed that the reservoir parking would be accessed via Phelan Avenue only.
- H-16. There are currently 2,244 off-street parking spaces at the Ocean Avenue Campus. By 2015, there would be 2,700 spaces.
- H-17. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Need for On-Campus Parking**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-18. According to the Chinatown/North Beach Campus DEIR, in 1995, there were a total of 2,043 off-street parking in the vicinity of the proposed project (pg. 75-77). At the time of publication of the DEIR (1998), a parking facility with 147 public parking spaces was planned as part of the approved St. Mary's project (pg. 83). There is no parking provided at the Downtown Campus.
- H-19. See the topical response **Transportation, Campus Access Impacts and Mitigation**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-20. See the topical response **Transportation, Campus Access Impacts and Mitigation**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-21. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Improvements to Phelan Avenue**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-22. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Residential Permit Parking**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-23. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Edna Street**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-24. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Use of PM Peak Hour**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-25. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Campus Access Impacts and Mitigation**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.

- H-26. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Campus Access Impacts and Mitigation**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-27. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Edna Street**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-28. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Use of PM Peak Hour**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-29. It appears that Mr. Wilson is referring to the informational hearing to be held by the San Francisco Planning Commission on the Institutional Master Plan. The hearing is currently planned for May 6, 2004. Section 304.5 of the San Francisco Planning Code requires that "each...post-secondary educational institution...in the City and County of San Francisco shall have on file with the Department of City Planning a current institutional master plan describing the existing and anticipated future development of that institution..." Among the required elements of the plan is a description of "the development plans of the institution, for a future period of not less than 10 years, and the physical changes in the institution projected to be needed to achieve those plans." The San Francisco Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing on the plan for the receipt of testimony only; the hearing "shall in no way constitute an approval or disapproval of the institutional master plan... by the City Planning Commission." (Section 304.5(d)) The public testimony shall become part of the institutional master plan file at the Planning Department and shall be available for public review.
- H-30. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Campus Access Impacts and Mitigation**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-31. The comment has been noted for the record.
- H-32. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Campus Access Impacts and Mitigation**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-33. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Campus Access Impacts and Mitigation**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-34. The comment has been noted for the record.
- H-35. In the EIR scoping session held on November 19, 2003, Mr. Lewis' comments were about issues associated with the Master Plan, e.g., the opportunity for minorities and women in the community to be employed as contractors and the possibility of a partnership between CCSF and merchants. His comments were not about the content or adequacy of the EIR; the purpose of this Response to Comments document is to provide CCSF the information needed to determine whether the EIR is adequate. It should be noted that CCSF is committed to including small

business enterprises (SBE) in the completion of the elements outlined in the Master Plan, although CCSF has no control over whom the SBEs hire. Mr. Lewis' comments are noted for the record and will be considered by the Board of Trustees in its deliberations on the project.

- H-36. This question concerned procedural matters and was answered by Arlyn Purcell (Impact Sciences) at the Public Hearing. [The Final EIR will be issued in early April.]
- H-37. Please see the topical response **Transportation and Circulation, Campus Access Impacts and Mitigation**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**. In addition, there are no plans to widen Havelock Street.
- H-38. At this time, it appears that the EIR will be addressed at the April regular meeting of the Board.
- H-39. Please see the topical response **Other Issues, Construction Impacts**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-40. Please see the topical response **Other Issues, Construction Impacts**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-41. The DEIR noted the presence of a number of sensitive noise receptors in the vicinity of CCSF, including two high schools (Riordan High School and Lick-Wilmerding High School). To reduce construction noise impacts (**Noise-1**, pg. 4.4-14), the DEIR calls for various mitigation measures, including **Noise -1a**: For any construction activities that involve the use of pile driving, CCSF shall notify nearby residents in advance of the construction work and shall schedule pile driving when it would cause the least disturbance to neighboring uses. For groundborne noise and vibration (**Noise-1**, pg. 4.4-17), the following mitigation measure addresses Trustee Ramos's comment: **Noise 2-a**: CCSF shall provide notification to the closest receptors, at least ten days in advance, of construction activities that could cause vibration levels above the threshold. To respond to Mr. Ramos' concerns about coordination with the area high schools, the Draft EIR has been revised to include a more general mitigation measure requiring such coordination prior to construction activity (see **Section 12.0, Revisions to the Draft EIR**).
- H-42. Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which the strength and stiffness of a soil is reduced by earthquake shaking or other rapid loading. Liquefaction can result in loss of foundation support and settlement of overlying structures as well as ground subsidence due to lateral spreading. As discussed in **Section 4.7, Geology, Seismicity, and Soils**, based on the draft results of the geotechnical investigation at the site of the proposed Community Health & Wellness Center, the liquefaction potential at the site is judged to be moderate to high (pg. 4.7-6). As outlined in Mitigation Measure **Geology-2**, CCSF shall conduct a site-specific geotechnical investigation prior to construction of the Community Health & Wellness Center, which shall consider the potential for liquefaction hazards (DEIR, pg. 4.7-13). CCSF shall implement all feasible measures

identified in the geotechnical investigation to avoid liquefaction potential or to minimize it to a less-than-significant level. As stated in the EIR, these measures could include minor shifting of the building blueprint to avoid areas of identified liquefaction hazard, the use of piles supported in the underlying bedrock, in-situ soil improvement, or overexcavation of liquefiable soils. If implemented, this measure would reduce potential impacts resulting from liquefaction to a less-than-significant level.

Impacts to cost and the construction schedule are not issues addressed in an EIR. The possibility of encountering problematic soil conditions, e.g., the potential for liquefaction, is factored into construction budgets and schedules, including contingencies with the direct aim of addressing these types of issues. The need to address liquefaction issues will ultimately add to the cost of building the Community Health & Wellness Center; the commenter is referred to the CCSF Master Plan team for more details.

- H-43. Please see the topical response **Other Issues, Noticing and Distribution**, in **Section 10.0, Topical Responses**.
- H-44. Mr. Coghlan states that he has never received any information about the meetings for the Master Plan, despite signing up to request that such information be send to him. A review of the distribution lists of the notices related to the Master Plan EIR indicates that, as a resident of District 7, Mr. Coghlan was sent a postcard notice of the EIR scoping meeting and the March 1<sup>st</sup> Draft EIR public hearing.
- H-45. Ms. O'Neill remarks that Riordan High School has never received notification of any of the meetings regarding the Master Plan. A review of distribution lists of the notices related to the Master Plan EIR indicates that Riordan High School was sent a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the EIR in October 2003. More recently, on March 22, 2004, CCSF met with representatives from Riordan High School to update school officials on the Master Plan, discuss any of the school's concerns, and establish an on-going dialogue between CCSF and Riordan High School.
- H-46. This issue was addressed in the Public Hearing by Chancellor Day, who informed the commenter that the property in question does not belong to CCSF.
- H-47. This issue is beyond the scope of the DEIR as CCSF does not have jurisdiction over the Phelan Loop. To pursue this issue further, we direct Mr. Lewis to Ken Rich at the City of San Francisco Planning Department (415-558-6345).
- H-48. This comment was addressed at the Public Hearing by Chancellor Day, who informed the commenter that CCSF has been talking to MUNI. While they are not in agreement yet, the issue of Phelan Loop will be resolved.

H-49. This comment was addressed in the Public Hearing by Chancellor Day, who stated that the Theater would be available to the community.

This page left blank intentionally.