

12.0 REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

A. INTRODUCTION

The following corrections and clarifications have been made to the EIR text. These changes include revisions resulting from specific responses to comments, and staff-initiated text changes to update information presented in the Draft EIR. The text revisions are organized by chapter, section, and page number, as they appear in the Draft EIR. Text in this section indicates text that has been deleted from the EIR. Text that has been added to the EIR is presented as underlined. For corrections initiated by a comment on the Draft EIR, references in parentheses refer to the comment letter and comment number. The text changes presented herein do not constitute “significant new information” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, and therefore, the changes do not trigger recirculation of the Draft EIR.

B. TEXT REVISIONS

Section 2.0 Executive Summary

Page 2.0-5, Mitigation Measure **Land Use-1b** (Comment SFDPT C-3, C-23; Sunnyside G-5; Hearing H-3, H-22; OMICAO J-1):

Land Use-1b: CCSF shall assist residents of the area north and northeast of the Main Campus to petition the City and County of San Francisco to extend the permit parking area. This assistance could include holding an educational meeting, providing information on the petition process, and arranging for a meeting between a representative of the San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic and campus neighbors. CCSF shall also formally request that the City ~~institute and enforce~~ residential permit parking requirements in ~~the all applicable areas north and northeast of~~ near the campus.

Page 2.0-5, mitigation for Impact **Land Use-1** (Comment SF Planning E-10)

Land Use-1e: As individual Master Plan buildings are designed, the designers shall adopt a set of building design guidelines that ensure that new buildings are respectful of existing neighborhood scale and character.

Page 2.0-7, Mitigation Measure **Visual-2c** (Staff-Initiated):

CCSF shall replace mature trees that cannot be saved (as the result of Measures a or b above) with new trees of the same species at a ratio of at least 1 to 1 (or higher if recommended by the arborist). A different species may be planted if the arborist believes it would serve a more valuable aesthetic and/or biological function. The sizes of replacement trees shall be determined by a qualified arborist. The locations of the replacement trees shall be selected by the College landscape architect to be

consistent with the landscape plan, but the visibility and scenic benefits of the existing trees shall be considered. All replacement trees shall be monitored for at least five years to ensure the success of the new tree plantings. If a tree dies during this period, the tree shall be replaced and the replacement tree shall be monitored for an additional five years.

Page 2.0-8, Mitigation Measure **Visual-2d**, first paragraph (Staff-Initiated):

CCSF shall implement measures to minimize impacts to trees adjacent to or near project construction. The measures shall be developed by a qualified arborist, and shall consider the value of the trees to be preserved and their relationship to the functions of the individual Master Plan projects. The measures ~~but~~ may include:

Page 2.0-9, Mitigation Measure **Visual-3b** (Comment SF Planning E-11, Staff-Initiated):

CCSF shall establish a Design Review Committee, to consist of ~~members of the CCSF Board of Trustees~~ an outside architect, an outside planner, an architect from staff, and staff and faculty representing the project being reviewed, to review the design of all major structures on the Main Campus. The review shall consider compliance of the design with the Master Plan principles and design guidelines and the mitigation in this EIR. The review shall be open to the public.

Page 2.0-9, Mitigation Measure **Noise-1c** (Staff-Initiated):

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.~~

Page 2.0-10, Mitigation Measure **Noise-1d** (Staff-Initiated):

If feasible based on the soils present and other considerations, CCSF shall require the use of predrilled holes for pile driving, to minimize the noise and vibration from pile driving.

Page 2.0-10, Mitigation Measure **Noise-1e** (Staff-Initiated):

In the event that construction activities would occur for an extended period of time adjacent to classrooms, or that construction noise could not be attenuated to an acceptable level inside classrooms, CCSF shall consider the temporary relocation of classes to a different location on campus.

Page 2.0-10, new measure added after Mitigation Measure **Noise-1e** (Comment Hearing H-41):

Noise-1f: CCSF shall coordinate with Riordan High School and Lick-Wilmerding High School prior to starting all construction and prior to construction on any major Master Plan project. CCSF shall work with representatives of the high schools to implement measures to minimize potential noise

impacts to teachers and students (including, but not limited to, the other noise measures identified herein).

Page 2.0-10, new measure added after new Mitigation Measure **Noise-1f** (Staff-Initiated Change)

Noise-1g: CCSF shall designate suitable routes for truck access to and from the campus. To the extent possible, these routes shall include major streets (such as Ocean Avenue) and shall avoid residential streets (such as Marston Avenue).

Page 2.0-10, new measure added after new Mitigation Measure **Noise-1g** (Comment Marks A-67):

Noise-1h: CCSF shall incorporate building deconstruction and recycling techniques where and when feasible.

Page 2.0-10, Mitigation Measure **Noise-2a** (Staff-Initiated):

CCSF shall provide notification to the closest receptors, at least ~~ten days~~ two days in advance, of construction activities that could cause vibration levels above the threshold (i.e., 0.1 inches per second RMS).

Page 2.0-10, Mitigation Measure **Noise-2b** (Staff-Initiated):

~~CCSF shall require construction contractors to conduct demolition, earthmoving, and ground impacting operations so as not to occur in the same time period. [deleted: determined to be infeasible]~~

Page 2.0-10, Mitigation Measure **Noise-2f** (Staff-Initiated):

The construction contractor shall implement feasible methods to reduce vibration, including, but not limited to, sound attenuation barriers, cut-off trenches and the use of smaller hammers.

Page 2.0-14, Mitigation Measure **Air Quality-2a** (Comment Marks A-48, A-50, A-69; SF Environment D-5; SF Planning E-6)

CCSF shall commit to implementation of the TDM program outlined in the Master Plan (to the extent feasible and in compliance with State law) in order to reduce operational emissions related to vehicles traveling to and from the Ocean Avenue Campus. The goal of the TDM program shall be to reduce the number of auto trips to and from the campus by at least 15 percent from the number currently observed. The components of the TDM program are outlined below.

Page 2.0-14, Mitigation Measure **Air Quality-2a**, third bullet (Comment Marks A-48):

~~Investigate subsidized or reduced cost~~ Implement free transit passes (e.g., MUNI/BAR T Class Pass) to full-time faculty, staff and students provided agreements can be reached with the transit providers and to the extent financially feasible;

Page 2.0-17, mitigation for Impact **Service-3** (Comment Marks A-77):

The needed mitigation for the impact (upgrading of the undersized sewers around the Main Campus) is the responsibility of the SFDPW; as noted above, SFDPW does not currently have adequate funds to upgrade the system. Therefore, the mitigation is under the jurisdiction of another agency. The following measure is intended to minimize the potential increase in combined wastewater/stormwater flows from the Main Campus.

Service-3: Individual Master Plan projects shall incorporate features to minimize the generation of wastewater and stormwater runoff. Measures to minimize wastewater generation include waterless urinals, low-flow toilets and showers and use of motion sensors for toilets and sinks. Measures to minimize stormwater runoff include the use of drought-tolerant landscaping and the use of pervious pavements (such as in plazas).

Page 2.0-17, mitigation for Impact **Service-8** (Comment Marks A-77):

See Mitigation Measure **Service-1** for the impact to fire services. See Mitigation Measure **Service-3** for the impact to wastewater and stormwater runoff. The needed mitigation for the impact to the wastewater/stormwater system (upgrading of the undersized sewers around the Main Campus) is the responsibility of the SFDPW; as noted above, SFDPW does not currently have adequate funds to upgrade the system. Therefore, the mitigation is under the jurisdiction of another agency.

Page 2.0-18, Mitigation Measure **Traffic-9a** (Staff-Initiated):

CCSF shall work with the City to improve conditions along Havelock Street. Possible improvements include the installation of a sidewalk or path. Consideration shall be given to the extent of public right-of-way, land ownership and use, location of utilities, and presence of physical opportunities or obstacles. There is room to create pedestrian facilities along the southern edge of the street, which is under the City's jurisdiction.

Page 2.0-18, Mitigation Measure **Traffic-9c** (Comment Marks A-48, A-50, A-69; SF Environment D-5; SF Planning E-6)

CCSF shall commit to implementation of the TDM program outlined in the Master Plan (to the extent feasible and in compliance with State law) in order to reduce the number of vehicles traveling to and from the Ocean Avenue Campus. The goal of the TDM program shall be to reduce the number of auto trips to and from the campus by at least 15 percent from the number currently observed. The components of the TDM program are outlined below.

Page 2.0-18, Mitigation Measure **Traffic-9c**, first bullet (Comment SFDPT C-3, C-23; Sunnyside G-5; Hearing H-3, H-22):

Assist residents of the area north and northeast of the Main Campus to petition the City and County of San Francisco to extend the permit parking area. This assistance could include holding an educational meeting, providing information on the petition process, and arranging for a meeting between a representative of the San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic and campus neighbors. Encourage the City and County of San Francisco to ~~impose and~~ enforce parking restrictions and permits in the adjacent neighborhood;

Page 2.0-18, Mitigation Measure **Traffic-9c**, third bullet (Comment Marks A-48):

~~Investigate subsidized or reduced cost~~ Implement free transit passes (e.g., MUNI/BAR T Class Pass) to full-time faculty, staff and students provided agreements can be reached with the transit providers and to the extent financially feasible;

Page 2.0-20, Mitigation Measure **Traffic-9g**, (Staff-Initiated):

CCSF shall work with the City to extend Lee Avenue from Ocean Avenue to the Balboa Reservoir along the western edge of the reservoir development. This extension would ~~allow access to the proposed garages at two locations on the west side~~ provide a second exit onto Ocean Avenue.

Page 2.0-20, Mitigation Measure **Traffic-9h**, (Comment SFDPT C-7):

~~CCSF shall provide a second~~ has pr oposed to r elocate the _entrance/exit for the garage on _to the reservoir parking from Phelan Avenue to help minimize traffic congestion on Phelan Avenue and reduce potential conflicts with traffic using Cloud Circle. The relocated driveway, which would be located approximately halfway between Riordan High School and Ocean Avenue, is currently being designed, but the preliminary concept includes two lanes of ingress and two lanes of egress, a traffic signal, and a pedestrian crosswalk. The driveway would be designed in such a way as to accommodate expected future traffic and operate acceptably (so as to avoid exceeding any traffic thresholds identified in the EIR).

Page 2.0-20, new Mitigation Measure **Traffic-9j** (Comments SFDPT C-22; Sunnyside G-2, G-3; Hearing H-19, H-20, H-25, H-26, H-30, H-32, H-33, H-37):

Traffic-9j: CCSF shall commit to a process to address existing and potential future congestion issues on the neighborhood roads adjacent to the campus. The process would include working with stakeholders (including, but not limited to, College neighbors and the City), development of a list of proposed improvements to present to the City for implementation, and CCSF contribution of its fair share of the cost of those improvements. This process shall be initiated and major alternatives identified prior to construction of the eastern parking garage or the eastern internal campus road.

Page 2.0-20, new Mitigation Measure **Traffic-9k** (Comment Sunnyside G-6):

Traffic-9k: CCSF shall work with Rior dan High School and the City of San Francisco regarding improvements to the intersection of Phelan and Judson Avenues. These improvements could include but would not be limited to installation of a signal at the intersection.

Page 2.0-20, Significant Impact **Traffic-11** (Staff-Initiated Change):

Under cumulative-plus-project conditions, three intersections in the area would experience degradation of LOS levels and increases in average delay times.

Page 2.0-20, Mitigation Measure **Traffic-11a** (Comment SFDPT C-19):

CCSF shall request that the City and County of San Francisco increase the cycle length at the intersection of Phelan Avenue and Ocean Avenue. This measure would be within the purview of the City and County of San Francisco. The intersection currently operates with a cycle length of 70 seconds.¹ If the cycle length were increased to 80 seconds (similar to the other time periods) the intersection would operate at LOS D with an average delay of 44.7 seconds. CCSF shall coordinate with the City and County of San Francisco regarding signal coordination issues.

Section 3.0 Project Description

Page 3.0-19, second paragraph (Comment SF Planning E-13, E-19; Sunnyside G-4; Hearing H-21):

The draft *Balboa Park Station Area Plan* includes a policy (2.4) calling for the redesign of Phelan Avenue to function more as an internal campus street. The redesigned street will include one lane of traffic in each direction (reduced from two), Class II bike lanes and a landscaped median with left-turn pockets. This proposal is ~~a funded City project under consideration by the City~~ for implementation ~~in the near future and is reflected in the traffic analysis in this EIR~~ but the City has not committed to it. The final configuration of the roadway does not affect the results of the intersection analysis done for this EIR.

Page 3.0-23, last paragraph, first sentence (Comment SF Planning E-14):

The Master Plan also includes improvements at two additional campuses that have already been approved by CCSF and subject to environmental review by CCSF.

Page 3.0-26, last section and paragraph (Comment SF Planning E-2)

Reservoir Reconfiguration and Other Projects

The following are the Master Plan project components requiring discretionary actions of the City of San Francisco known at this time. These components would include curb cuts (e.g., the location of the curb cut into the Community Health & Wellness Center, the curb cut from Phelan Avenue into the

reservoir parking) and connections to City rights-of-way (e.g., access from the reservoir to Lee Avenue, connections to the proposed eastern campus roadway). The property exchange agreement for the reconfiguration of the Balboa Reservoir would be subject to the approval of the SFPUC, Board of Supervisors, and Mayor. CCSF is working on an MOU with the Planning Department relating to the proposed vacation of IIs Lane as part of the Chinatown/North Beach campus. Other discretionary approvals related to the Chinatown/North Beach campus include Board of Supervisors approval for appropriation of Measure A bond proceeds for acquisition of Lots 4, 5, and 12 of Block 195 by the San Francisco Community College District.

Section 4.1 Land Use and Planning

Page 4.1-13, second full paragraph (Comments SF Planning E-1, E-13, E-16):

Accountable Planning Initiative

On November 4, 1986, the voters of San Francisco approved Proposition M, the Accountable Planning Initiative, which is codified as Section 101.1 (b) of the Planning Code.¹⁰ These policies call for: (1) preservation and enhancement of neighborhood retail uses; (2) protection of neighborhood character; (3) preservation and enhancement of affordable housing; (4) discouragement of commuter automobiles; (5) protection of industrial and service land uses from commercial office development and enhancement of residential employment and business ownership; (6) earthquake preparedness; (7) landmark historic building preservation; and (8) preservation of open space. Prior to issuing a permit for any project, or adopting any legislation that requires an Initial Study under CEQA, or adopting any zoning ordinance or development agreement, and before taking any action that requires a finding of consistency with the *General Plan*, the City is required to find that the project is consistent with the Priority Policies established by Proposition M.

The Main Campus Master Plan would be ~~exempt subject from to~~ Proposition M, ~~because no approval by the City is required~~ if the priority policies are considered a zoning ordinance (though CCSF could choose to exempt individual classroom projects). In addition, the City would have to make findings regarding compliance with the priority policies as part of any discretionary approvals required for Master Plan implementation. For example, the proposed reconfiguration and land exchange within the Balboa Reservoir would require that the City make Proposition M findings. Therefore, an analysis of potential conformance with the priority policies is included in this EIR.

Page 4.1-17, Mitigation Measure **Land Use-1b** (Comment SFDPT C-3, C-23; Sunnyside G-5; Hearing H-3, H-22; OMICAO J-1):

Land Use-1b: CCSF shall assist residents of the area north and northeast of the Main Campus to petition the City and County of San Francisco to extend the permit parking area. This assistance could include holding an educational meeting, providing information on the petition process, and

arranging for a meeting between a representative of the San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic and campus neighbors. CCSF shall also formally request that the City institute and enforce residential permit parking requirements in the all applicable areas north and northeast of near the campus.

Page 4.1-17, mitigation for Impact **Land Use-1** (Comment SF Planning E-10)

Land Use-1e: As individual Master Plan buildings are designed, the designers shall adopt and implement a set of building design guidelines that ensure that new buildings are respectful of existing neighborhood scale and character.

Page 4.1-21, new paragraph after second paragraph (Comments SF Planning E-1, E-13, E-16):

Priority Policies. The proposed Main Campus Master Plan would occur within the existing campus, and thus would not remove or interfere with neighborhood retail uses (Priority Policy 1). Similarly, Master Plan implementation would not displace housing or directly extend into campus neighborhoods. Impacts to the visual character of existing development have been identified as significant in the absence of specific design information (see **Section 4.2**); however, the issue relates to the interface between the proposed development on the reservoir and uses to the west. Mitigation has been included in the EIR to reduce the potential visual conflicts. Therefore, the Master Plan overall could raise issues with respect to Priority Policy 2 (protection of neighborhood character). The Master Plan is not a housing project and would not result in the displacement of any housing (Policy 3). The Master Plan and this EIR include implementation of a Transportation Demand Management Program; the EIR identifies potential impacts related to increased traffic in the campus neighborhood, but also includes mitigation measures to help reduce the impacts (Policy 4). The Master Plan does not involve commercial office development, and would provide additional employment opportunities for area residents (Policy 5). The building demolition and renovation included in the Master Plan and being implemented on an ongoing basis are intended in part to improve seismic safety (Policy 6). As documented in **Section 4.9, Cultural Resources**, the CCSF Main Campus does not contain any landmark buildings (Policy 7). The Main Campus is already in fully urbanized area; therefore, preservation of open space does not apply (Policy 8). The potential physical impacts related to the Priority Policies have already been analyzed in the impact sections of the EIR (for example, in **Section 4.2, Visual Quality and Shadow**).

Page 4.1-23, Section heading (Staff-Initiated Change)

Land Use-34 *Cumulative Impacts*

Section 4.2 Visual Quality and Shadow

Page 4.2-17, Mitigation Measure **Visual-2c** (Staff-Initiated):

CCSF shall replace mature trees that cannot be saved (as the result of Measures a or b above) with new trees of the same species at a ratio of at least 1 to 1 (or higher if recommended by the arborist). A different species may be planted if the arborist believes it would serve a more valuable aesthetic and/or biological function. The sizes of replacement trees shall be determined by a qualified arborist. The locations of the replacement trees shall be selected by the College landscape architect to be consistent with the landscape plan, but the visibility and scenic benefits of the existing trees shall be considered. All replacement trees shall be monitored for at least five years to ensure the success of the new tree plantings. If a tree dies during this period, the tree shall be replaced and the replacement tree shall be monitored for an additional five years.

Page 4.2-18, Mitigation Measure **Visual-2d**, first paragraph (Staff-Initiated):

CCSF shall implement measures to minimize impacts to trees adjacent to or near project construction. The measures shall be developed by a qualified arborist, and shall consider the value of the trees to be preserved and their relationship to the functions of the individual Master Plan projects. The measures but may include:

Page 4.2-22, Mitigation Measure **Visual-3b** (Comment SF Planning E-11, Staff-Initiated):

CCSF shall establish a Design Review Committee, to consist of an outside architect, an outside planner, an architect from staff, and staff and faculty representing the project being reviewed ~~members of the CCSF Board of Trustees~~, to review the design of all major structures on the Main Campus. The review shall consider compliance of the design with the Master Plan principles and design guidelines and the mitigation in this EIR. The review shall be open to the public.

Section 4.3 Transportation and Circulation

Page 4.3-2, fifth paragraph (Comment SFDPT C-1):

In the first block East of I-280, Ocean Avenue has two lanes in each direction, with dedicated MUNI light rail along the street. Parking is only provided on the Balboa Park side of the street. East of San Jose Avenue, Ocean Avenue has one lane in each direction and parking on both sides of the street. West of I-280, Ocean Avenue has two lanes in each direction with the dedicated transit line in the middle of the street.

Page 4.3-3, second full paragraph (Comment SFDPT C-2):

Phelan Avenue runs north-south between Flood Avenue and Ocean Avenue. Alongside the campus this street has two traffic lanes with ~~no parking~~ on both sides of the street ~~provisions~~. This street provides the main western access to both the campus and the reservoir parking. North of the campus this street has one traffic lane in each direction with parking on both sides of the street.

Page 4.3-6, Table 4.3-1, Intersection Level of Service Analysis, Existing Conditions (Comment SFDPT C-11):

| | | |
|---|----|--------|
| 10. Howth Street and Geneva Avenue ^d | DB | 26.924 |
|---|----|--------|

Page 4.3-6, first paragraph (Comment SFDPT C-11):

Field observations confirm these LOS calculations. At the intersection of Phelan Avenue and Judson Avenue, the field observations confirmed that there are many vehicles accessing the campus by traveling south on Phelan Avenue and turning into the “dogleg” to continue southbound. At the intersection of Howth Street and Geneva Avenue, the westbound left turn (Geneva onto Howth) conflicts with the eastbound through movement on Geneva (though the average delay for the intersection is low). ~~This unsignalized intersection has stop signs in the east-west direction.~~

Page 4.3-10, new paragraph just before Subsection C6, Pedestrian Conditions (Comment SFDPT C-3):

According to the most recent map of permit parking areas, most of the area directly north of the Main Campus does not have residential permit parking. The southwestern part of Permit Area D includes Havelock Street (between the Main Campus and I-280), Marston Avenue (between the Main Campus and I-280, and Edna Street (from Havelock Street to a point north of Marston Avenue). Based on the results of the parking inventory, the available parking on these streets is completely full. Based on anecdotal reports from campus neighbors, the permit parking program is not effective in discouraging parking on these streets, although it most likely limits the duration of parking. Most of the area directly south of the Main Campus has residential permit parking (as part of Permit Area V). Several blocks of the Westwood Park neighborhood directly west of the Balboa Reservoir are also part of Permit Area V.

Page 4.3-10, last line and extending to p. 4.3-11 (Comment SFDPT C-5):

Many of the pedestrians use the unsignalized crosswalk just north of the Phelan Avenue and Ocean Avenue intersection. There were ~~2316~~ recorded accidents involving pedestrians along Phelan Avenue between Ocean Ave and Judson Ave at this location from April 1998-1995 through 1999-March 2003. Of these, 12 accidents were during the AM period (7:00 AM to 12:00 noon), seven between 12:00 Noon and 8:00 PM and four after 8:00 PM.¹⁴

Page 4.3-10, footnote 14 (Comment SFDPT C-5):

¹⁴ Source: Opportunities and Constraints Analysis, City College of San Francisco, Institutional Master Plan, Fehr & Peers Associates, October 2002. San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic, “Traffic Collision History Report, Midblock Collisions,” 3/25/04.

Page 4.3-11, last sentence (Comment Marks A-64):

As a commuter college, CCSF has a student population that resides throughout the City and adjacent cities ~~and is not concentrated within bicycling distance of campus.~~

Page 4.3-12, second full paragraph (Comment SF Planning E-13, E-19; Sunnyside G-4; Hearing H-21):

~~In the near future, t~~The City and County of San Francisco is considering a pr oject plans to install Class II bicycle facilities along Phelan Avenue. (Class II facilities are bicycle facilities that allow bicyclists to drive alongside traffic in dedicated lanes marked by striping.) There ~~will~~would be two northbound travel lanes with one of these containing dedicated turning bays for the reservoir parking. There ~~will~~would be one southbound travel lane.

Page 4.3-22, second paragraph (Comment SFDPT C-11):

Table 4.3-4, Level of Service Summary, illustrates the level of service for each of the study intersections for the existing plus 2015 project conditions scenario. Traffic signal warrants (tests for considering whether signals are needed) for the two unsignalized intersections are in the DKS Associates technical report (available for review at CCSF, as noted at the beginning of this section). ~~Thirteen~~Fourteen of the 15 intersections would operate at LOS D or better at Master Plan buildout.

Page 4.3-23, first paragraph (Comment SFDPT C-11):

~~The unsignalized intersection of Howth Str eet and Geneva Avenue currently operates at LOS D with an average delay of 26.9 seconds. In 2015, the intersection would degrade to LOS E with an average delay of 41.9 seconds (the V/C ratio would be 1.2). The westbound approach is the only appr oach at this intersection that would operate at LOS F. In addition, this intersection would not meet the Caltrans peak hour traffic signal warrant. Therefore, the project impact at this intersection would be less than significant.~~

Page 4.3-24, Table 4.3-4, Level of Service Summary (Comment SFDPT C-11):

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------|-----------|------------------------|-----------|------------------------|-----------|--|-----------|--|
| 10 | Howth St and Geneva Ave ³ | <u>DB</u> | <u>26.9</u> <u>2.4</u> | <u>DB</u> | <u>32.1</u> <u>2.3</u> | <u>EB</u> | 41.9 (1.0) ⁴ <u>2.3</u> | <u>FB</u> | 69.1 (1.2) ⁴ <u>2.5</u> |
|----|--------------------------------------|-----------|------------------------|-----------|------------------------|-----------|--|-----------|--|

Page 4.3-33, third paragraph (Comments SFDPT C-22; Sunnyside G-2, G-3, G-8; Hearing H-5, H-19, H-20, H-25, H-26, H-30, H-32, H-33, H-37):

Havelock Street, along the northern edge of the campus, is a narrow street with limited pedestrian facilities. Other streets in the area, including Edna Street and Marston Avenue, are narrow and heavily used by students. The draft Master Plan indicates that about 2,300 vehicles travel on

Havelock Street each day. The project includes construction of a parking garage in the eastern part of the campus, just south of Havelock Street. Although most vehicles would access the garage via the signalized Ocean Avenue entrance at Howth Street, some vehicles could use Havelock Street to access the parking garage, and others could use Havelock as an alternate entry into the campus (by existing I-280 at Monterey Boulevard). An increase in traffic on this road and nearby roads could create localized congestion and annoyance to campus neighbors (as discussed in **Section 4.1, Land Use and Planning**), and could lead to hazardous conditions for vehicles and pedestrians. The Master Plan states that its intent “is to maintain this secondary access to the lower campus without increasing the volume of traffic” and recommends that pedestrian connections be improved, but in the absence of more specific design information (or a commitment to provide sidewalks), the impact would be significant.

Page 4.3-34, Mitigation Measure **Traffic-9a** (Staff-Initiated):

CCSF shall work with the City to improve conditions along Havelock Street. Possible improvements include the installation of a sidewalk or path. Consideration shall be given to the extent of public right-of-way, land ownership and use, location of utilities, and presence of physical opportunities or obstacles. ~~There is room to create pedestrian facilities along the southern edge of the street, which is under the City's jurisdiction.~~

Page 4.3-34, Mitigation Measure **Traffic-9c** (Comment Marks A-48, A-50, A-69; SF Environment D-5; SF Planning E-6):

CCSF shall commit to implementation of the TDM program outlined in the Master Plan (to the extent feasible and in compliance with State law) in order to reduce the number of vehicles traveling to and from the Ocean Avenue Campus. The goal of the TDM program shall be to reduce the number of auto trips to and from the campus by at least 15 percent from the number currently observed. The components of the TDM program are outlined below.

Page 4.3-34, Mitigation Measure **Traffic-9c**, first bullet (Comment SFDPT C-3, C-23; Sunnyside G-5; Hearing H-3, H-22):

Assist residents of the area north and northeast of the Main Campus to petition the City and County of San Francisco to extend the permit parking area. This assistance could include holding an educational meeting, providing information on the petition process, and arranging for a meeting between a representative of the San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic and campus neighbors. Encourage the City and County of San Francisco to ~~impose and~~ enforce parking restrictions and permits in the adjacent neighborhood;

Page 4.3-34, Mitigation Measure **Traffic-9c**, third bullet (Comment Marks A-48):

~~Investigate subsidized or reduced cost~~ Implement free transit passes (e.g., MUNI/BAR T Class Pass) to full-time faculty, staff and students provided agreements can be reached with the transit providers and to the extent financially feasible:

Page 4.3-35, Mitigation Measure **Traffic-9g**, (Staff-Initiated):

CCSF shall work with the City to extend Lee Avenue from Ocean Avenue to the Balboa Reservoir along the western edge of the reservoir development. This extension would provide a second exit onto Ocean Avenue ~~allow access to the proposed garages at two locations on the west side.~~

Page 4.3-35, Mitigation Measure **Traffic-9h**, (Comment SFDPT C-7):

CCSF ~~shall provide a second~~ has proposed to relocate the entrance/exit ~~for the garage on~~ to the reservoir parking from Phelan Avenue to help minimize traffic congestion on Phelan Avenue and reduce potential conflicts with traffic using Cloud Circle. The relocated driveway, which would be located approximately halfway between Riordan High School and Ocean Avenue, is currently being designed, but the preliminary concept includes two lanes of ingress and two lanes of egress, a traffic signal, and a pedestrian crosswalk. The driveway would be designed in such a way as to accommodate expected future traffic and operate acceptably (so as to avoid exceeding any traffic thresholds identified in the EIR).

Page 4.3-36, new Mitigation Measure **Traffic-9j** (Comments SFDPT C-22; Sunnyside G-2, G-3; Hearing H-19, H-20, H-25, H-26, H-30, H-32, H-33, H-37):

Traffic-9j: CCSF shall commit to a process to address existing and potential future congestion issues on the neighborhood roads adjacent to the campus. The process would include working with stakeholders (including, but not limited to, College neighbors and the City), development of a list of proposed improvements to present to the City for implementation, and CCSF contribution of its fair share of the cost of those improvements. This process shall be initiated and major alternatives identified prior to construction of the eastern parking garage or the eastern internal campus road.

Page 4.3-36, new Mitigation Measure **Traffic-9k** (Comment Sunnyside G-6):

Traffic-9k: CCSF shall work with Riordan High School and the City of San Francisco regarding improvements to the intersection of Phelan and Judson Avenues. These improvements could include but would not be limited to installation of a signal at the intersection.

Page 4.3-39, third full paragraph (Comment SFDPT C-11):

~~The unsignalized intersection of Howth Street and Geneva Avenue currently operates at LOS D with an average delay of 26.9 seconds. Under the 2015 Cumulative plus Project scenario, the intersection would degrade to LOS F with an average delay of 108.4 seconds (the V/C ratio would be 1.2). For the~~

~~purposes of this EIR, the operational impact at an unsignalized intersection would be significant if one or more approaches operates at LOS E or F and the Caltrans peak-hour signal warrant is met. The westbound approach is the only approach at this intersection that would operate at LOS F. However, this intersection does not satisfy criteria for a Caltrans peak-hour traffic signal warrant. Therefore, the impact at this intersection would be less than significant.~~

Page 4.3-40, Mitigation Measure **Traffic-11a** (Comment SFDPT C-19):

CCSF shall request that the City and County of San Francisco increase the cycle length at the intersection of Phelan Avenue and Ocean Avenue. This measure would be within the purview of the City and County of San Francisco. The intersection currently operates with a cycle length of 70 seconds.³ If the cycle length were increased to 80 seconds (similar to the other time periods) the intersection would operate at LOS D with an average delay of 44.7 seconds. CCSF shall coordinate with the City and County of San Francisco regarding signal coordination issues.

Section 4.4 Noise

Page 4.4-17, Mitigation Measure **Noise-1c** (Staff-Initiated):

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.~~

Page 4.4-17, Mitigation Measure **Noise-1d** (Staff-Initiated):

If feasible based on the soils present and other considerations, CCSF shall require the use of predrilled holes for pile driving, to minimize the noise and vibration from pile driving.

Page 4.4-17, Mitigation Measure **Noise-1e** (Staff-Initiated):

In the event that construction activities would occur for an extended period of time adjacent to classrooms, or that construction noise could not be attenuated to an acceptable level inside classrooms, CCSF shall consider the temporary relocation of classes to a different location on campus.

Page 4.4-17, new measure added after Mitigation Measure **Noise-1e** (Comment Hearing H-41):

Noise-1f: CCSF shall coordinate with Riordan High School and Lick-Wilmerding High School prior to starting all construction and prior to construction on any major Master Plan project. CCSF shall work with representatives of the high schools to implement measures to minimize potential noise impacts to teachers and students (including, but not limited to, the other noise measures identified herein).

Page 4.4-17, new measure added after new Mitigation Measure **Noise-1f** (Staff-Initiated Change):

Noise-1g: CCSF shall designate suitable routes for truck access to and from the campus. To the extent possible, these routes shall include major streets (such as Ocean Avenue) and shall avoid residential streets (such as Marston Avenue).

Page 4.4-17, new measure added after new Mitigation Measure **Noise-1g** (Comment Marks A-67):

Noise-1h: CCSF shall incorporate building deconstruction and recycling techniques where and when feasible.

Page 4.4-18, Mitigation Measure **Noise-2a** (Staff-Initiated):

CCSF shall provide notification to the closest receptors, at least ~~ten days~~ two days in advance, of construction activities that could cause vibration levels above the threshold (i.e., 0.1 inches per second RMS).

Page 4.4-18, Mitigation Measure **Noise-2b** (Staff-Initiated):

~~CCSF shall require construction contractors to conduct demolition, earthmoving, and ground-impacting operations so as not to occur in the same time period. [deleted: determined to be infeasible]~~

Page 4.4-18, Mitigation Measure **Noise-2f** (Staff-Initiated):

The construction contractor shall implement feasible methods to reduce vibration, including, but not limited to, sound attenuation barriers, cut-off trenches and the use of smaller hammers.

Section 4.5 Air Quality

Page 4.5-20, Mitigation Measure **Air Quality-2a** (Comment Marks A-48, A-50, A-69; SF Environment D-5; SF Planning E-6):

CCSF shall commit to implementation of the TDM program outlined in the Master Plan (to the extent feasible and in compliance with State law) in order to reduce operational emissions related to vehicles traveling to and from the Ocean Avenue Campus. The goal of the TDM program shall be to reduce the number of auto trips to and from the campus by at least 15 percent from the number currently observed. The components of the TDM program are outlined below.

Page 4.5-20, Mitigation Measure **Air Quality-2a**, third bullet (Comment Marks A-48):

~~Investigate subsidized or reduced cost~~ Implement free transit passes (e.g., MUNI/BART Class Pass) to full-time faculty, staff and students provided agreements can be reached with the transit providers and to the extent financially feasible;

Table 4.5-4, starting on p. 4.5-23 (Comment Marks A-74):

1. Design Streets for People

Objective 4: Emphasize the street grid as the primary pattern that provides the foundation for the neighborhood's character, orientation and sense of scale.

Policy 4.1: Extend the grid.

4. Build with a Sense of Place

Objective 4: Ensure a rich and active pedestrian realm, especially along neighborhood commercial streets.

Section 4.6 Public Services and Utilities

Page 4.6-1, third paragraph (Comment Marks A-77):

CCSF is served by the San Francisco Department of Public Works (SFPDW) sewer system, which handles both sewage and storm water runoff in the same network of pipes. According to SFPDW, the wastewater treatment and pumping facilities are of adequate capacity to handle any additional flow from the campus area. At the same time, SFPDW has indicated that the existing sewer/stormwater lines located around the Main campus are adequate to accommodate the additional sanitary flow expected from Master Plan buildout, but are, and would continue to be, undersized to handle the wet weather flow generated by the 5-year storm event. The wastewater flows added by the Master Plan would worsen this condition and would cause a significant impact with respect to stormwater system capacity. The needed mitigation (upgrade of the system) is under the purview of the SFPDW, which has indicated that adequate funding is not available. Without this mitigation, the impact to the wastewater/stormwater system would remain significant. This EIR includes mitigation that can be implemented by CCSF to minimize the potential increase in combined wastewater/stormwater flows from the Main Campus.

Page 4.6-15, first and second paragraphs (Comment Marks A-77):

Mitigation

The needed mitigation for the impact (upgrading of the undersized sewers around the Main Campus) is the responsibility of the SFPDW; as noted above, SFPDW does not currently have adequate funds to upgrade the system. Therefore, the mitigation is under the jurisdiction of another agency. The following measure is intended to minimize the potential increase in combined wastewater/stormwater flows from the Main Campus.

Service-3: Individual Master Plan projects shall incorporate features to minimize the generation of wastewater and stormwater runoff. Measures to minimize wastewater generation include waterless

urinals, low-flow toilets and showers and use of motion sensors for toilets and sinks. Measures to minimize stormwater runoff include the use of drought-tolerant landscaping and the use of pervious pavements (such as in plazas).

Significance After Mitigation

Implementation of wastewater/stormwater reduction measures would help to minimize the potential increase in wastewater/stormwater flows. However, any increase in flows would exacerbate the existing lack of pipe capacity. The mitigation required to reduce this impact to an insignificant level is under the jurisdiction of another agency and not likely to be implemented in the near future. For that reason, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Page 4.6-21, Mitigation for Impact **Service-8**, first, second and third paragraphs (Comment Marks A-77):

Mitigation

See Mitigation Measure **Service-1** for the impact to fire services. See Mitigation Measure Service-3 for the impact to wastewater and stormwater runoff. The needed mitigation for the impact to the wastewater/stormwater system (upgrading of the undersized sewers around the Main Campus) is the responsibility of the SFDPW; as noted above, SFDPW does not currently have adequate funds to upgrade the system. Therefore, the mitigation is under the jurisdiction of another agency.

Significance After Mitigation

The appropriate contribution of funding by CCSF would address the impacts of the increased demand for fire services resulting from Master Plan buildout. Construction of a new station is within the authority of the SFFD, however, and cannot be assumed at this time. For that reason, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Implementation of wastewater/stormwater reduction measures would help to minimize the potential increase in wastewater/stormwater flows. However, any increase in flows would exacerbate the existing lack of pipe capacity. The mitigation required to reduce the impact to the wastewater/stormwater system to an insignificant level is under the jurisdiction of another agency and not likely to be implemented in the near future. For that reason, the impact to the wastewater/stormwater system remains significant and unavoidable.

Section 4.7 Geology, Seismicity, and Soils

Page 4.7-8, last section and paragraph (Comment Marks A-11 and Staff-Initiated Change):

State Requirements for Colleges

As ~~part of the California Community Colleges system a State facility and a public college~~, CCSF is subject to certain State of California requirements, including requirements relating to structural engineering and seismic safety. Structures on the Main Campus must meet the requirements of the California Building Code (Title 24, Part 1 and Part 2). The California Building Code is similar to the 1997 Uniform Building Code, but incorporates California amendments. In addition, the State has more stringent safety standards for public school buildings (e.g., the Field Act).⁴ Individual projects processed as part of the Main Campus Master Plan would be subject to review by the California Division of Mines and Geology and the Division of the State Architect.

Section 4.9 Cultural Resources

Page 4.9-29, third paragraph under Impact **Cultural-3** (Comment SF Planning E-21):

The 1998 Mission Campus EIR and 2003 EIR Addendum noted that there are no known archaeological resources in the immediate project area, but that there is potential for unknown prehistoric artifacts to be discovered. In addition, completion of the Mission Campus project would require following the guidelines for treatment of historic properties to avoid creating substantial adverse changes in the remodeling of the former Samuel Gompers Trade School building.¹¹ This building may be individually eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. With implementation of these guidelines, construction related to the Mission Campus would not result in significant impacts to cultural resources. ~~Mitigation measures were proposed and adopted as part of the Mission Campus project. Thus, the EIR Addendum concluded that the project would not result in any significant impacts to historic architectural resources.~~

Section 5.0 Other CEQA Considerations

Page 5.0-7, sentence added to end of first paragraph (Comment Marks A-77):

This EIR includes mitigation that can be implemented by CCSF to minimize the potential increase in combined wastewater/stormwater flows from the Main Campus.

Section 6.0 Alternatives to the Project

Page 6.0-10, sentence added to end of first paragraph (Comment Marks A-77):

Mitigation that can be implemented by CCSF to minimize the potential increase in combined wastewater/stormwater flows from the Main Campus (see **Section 4.6**) would help to address the impact, as it would for the proposed project.

¹¹ These guidelines are described in Weeks and Grimmer, 1995, Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties.

Page 6.0-15, sentence added to end of third paragraph (Comment Marks A-77):

Mitigation that can be implemented by CCSF to minimize the potential increase in combined wastewater/stormwater flows from the Main Campus (see Section 4.6) would help to address the impact, as it would for the proposed project.

C. GRAPHICS AND TABLES

This section includes a revised version of **Table 2.0-1, Summary of Significant Project Impacts**, reflecting all of the changes noted earlier in this chapter. In addition, the environmental topics in the table have been re-ordered to match the order of the topics presented in **Chapter 4.0** of the Draft EIR.

This section includes revised versions of **Figure 4.3-1, Study Area**, **Figure 4.3-2, Study Intersections**, and **Figure 4.3-3, Existing Public Transportation Network in the Campus Vicinity**. The revised figures show Edna Street in response to Comments Sunnyside G-7 and Hearing H-23 and H-27.

This page left blank intentionally.