To: Commentors and Interested Parties
Enc: CCSF Chinatown / North Beach Campus Comments and Responses Errata
Date: October 1, 2007
Re: CCSF Chinatown / North Beach Campus Comments and Responses Errata
     Special Meeting- October 18, 2007

City College published the Comments and Responses document for the Chinatown / North Beach Campus Project EIR on September 17, 2007. The attached Errata contains typographical corrections or revisions to the Comments and Responses. The Errata do not change any analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR or information in the Comments and Responses.

Please note that at their September 27, 2007 regular meeting, the City College Board of Trustees continued consideration of certification of the Final EIR, and consideration of approval of a Chinatown / North Beach Campus Project, to a special meeting. The special meeting will be at 6:00 PM, October 18, 2007, at the Chinatown / North Beach Campus, 940 Filbert Street.
COMMENTS AND RESPONSES ERRATA

The following typographical corrections or revisions to the City College of San Francisco Chinatown/North Beach Campus Project EIR Comments and Responses do not change any analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR or information in the Comments and Responses. Corrected words and phrases are underlined, as are new sentences that are incorporated into existing text. Text that is deleted is denoted with strike through.

Page 13, second response paragraph, third sentence.

Chinese and Italian translation services were available as at both of these meetings.

Page 17, second response paragraph, second sentence.

A letter confirming receipt of the document is included in this Responses to Comment document.

Page 17, third response paragraph, second sentence.

The discussion in the Master Plan regarding the Chinatown/North Beach Campus is based on the 1998 EIR and 1999 Addendum; thus, the Project is slightly different than anticipated in the Master Plan.

Page 21, added to the end of the second response paragraph.

See responses to comments herein on alternatives, pp. 152 to 190.

Page 31, first response paragraph, final sentence.

Draft EIR p. III.A-17 compares the major dimensional requirements in the Planning Code to the proposed Projects. The table below lists these requirements:

Page 33, first and second full response paragraphs.

In June 2007, the Planning Commission requested that the District make an informational presentation on the Project on July 12, 2007. Due to District being in recess, and the Planning Commission recess during the second half of August, the informational presentation was held at a special meeting on September 6, 2007. The District is committed to work with the Planning Department staff regarding the future design development of the Project. At this meeting, the Planning Commission instructed the Planning Director to meet with the parties and to attempt to bring the parties together to arrive at a design solution.

Due to District being in recess, and the Planning Commission recess during the second half of August, the informational presentation was held at a special meeting on September 6, 2007. At this meeting, the Planning Commission instructed the Planning Director to meet with the parties and to attempt to bring the parties together to arrive at a design solution.
Page 36, first full response paragraph, third sentence.

The Draft EIR, p III.DA-13 notes that the Project would contrast with the smaller-scale development in Chinatown.

Page 39, last response paragraph, first sentence.

Draft EIR, p. III.D-421 states, “Kearny Street has 14-foot sidewalks and can accommodate the additional foot traffic.”

Page 41, first response paragraph, second sentence.

The committee includes architects and consultants not connected with the Project—or other District plans.

Page 41, second full response paragraph.

The Project would consist of one building on one two contiguous lots. Two new Alternative designs proposing to construct two buildings on Lots 9/10 and on Lot 5 to allow a shorter building on Lots 9 and 10 was explored in addition to those discussed in Alternatives A, B, C, and D (Draft EIR pp. V-5 to V-12). Alternatives A, B, and D would use two sites on the Project block. Alternative D uses two sites, one of which is not on the Project block. See also responses to comment herein on Alternatives, pp. 152 to 190.

Page 45, final response paragraph, third sentence.

The Draft EIR concludes that the Project would have potentially significant impacts would on the visual setting of the Colombo Building and views from Portsmouth Square because of the sensitivity of these sites, and the proximity of these sites to the Project.

Page 49, title of Figure C&R-3.

**FIGURE C&R-3: VIEW TOWARDS PROJECT SITE FROM INTERSECTION OF MONTGOMERY STREET AND WASHINGTON JACKSON STREET**

Page 50, second full response paragraph, third sentence.

Regarding the Project’s impacts on Portsmouth Square and other local parks, refer to the response under Public Services, p. 1445 and 146.

Page 54, first response paragraph.

As stated in the Draft EIR, p. III.B-14, there is no quantitative threshold for determine determining the visual quality impacts of a project, and the standards for determining such impacts are, to an extent, based on subjective judgment.
Page 63, first response paragraph, second full sentence.

Several other areas in the district would offer limited views of the Project, primarily when traveling westbound on the north sides of Washington Street, Jackson Street and Pacific Avenue and the north and south sides of Washington Street.

Page 72, second response paragraph.

The Introduction of the Draft EIR discusses the existing facilities and states that “currently the Chinatown/North Beach Campus occupies eight (8) leased sites in the Chinatown, North Beach and the Marina Neighborhoods.” The leased space at the Marina Middle School will be retained. A brief description of the sites currently leased by the District, including how the space is used by City College and other uses/occupants of the buildings is provided below:

Page 73, third bullet point.

- **888 Clay Street** - CCSF no longer leases any classroom space at this location.

Page 73, new bullet point to be added after the final bullet point.

- **940 Filbert Street** - This is the main site for the campus, leased from the San Francisco Unified School District, and includes instructional and administrative operations.

Page 76, first response paragraph.

The above comments are concerned with potential adverse affects of the Project on historic resources in the vicinity, including the Jackson Square Historic District and the proposed Chinatown Historic District especially as it relates to the stark contrast in design of the proposed building to the surrounding historic buildings. As discussed in the Draft EIR and in the responses above, the Project would not result in significant adverse affects where the defining characteristics, history, setting or physical integrity that contribute the justification of existing and potentially designated historic structures or districts, including the Colombo Building, the Jackson Square Historic District, or the proposed Chinatown Historic District would be impaired or lost. Please see the responses above to on pp. 60 and to 66 above for further details regarding the affects of the Project on the Jackson Square Historic District and the potential Chinatown Historic District.

Page 76, second response paragraph, second sentence.

The Draft EIR discusses potential visual quality impacts of the Project on the area in Section III.B on pages III.B-16 through III.B-21 and acknowledges that....

Page 77, first partial response paragraph, final sentence.

...setting or physical integrity that contribute the justification of existing and potentially designated historic structures or districts, including the Colombo Building, the Jackson Square Historic District, or the proposed Chinatown Historic District would be impaired or lost.
Page 81, second response paragraph, second sentence.

As discussed on Draft EIR p. III.D-16-13 and to ±7-18 discussed discussed the trip origin and destination data used in the Draft EIR transportation analysis; this discussion is based on the results of a survey conducted in January 2007 of employees, faculty, and students at the current Chinatown/North Beach Campus.

Page 82, first response paragraph, third sentence.

The results of the survey demonstrated that the more than 80 percent of students commute to the Chinatown/North Beach Campus from neighborhoods that are North and South of Market.

Page 84, first response paragraph, first sentence.

The Draft EIR evaluates transit, parking and pedestrian impacts on pp. III.D-19 to III.D-2± 27.

Page 85, first partial response paragraph.

...breakdown of this information in Table 7, Trip Origins by Locations on page III.D-16. See responses to comments on pp. 162 to 164 regarding other CCSF campus locations. Based on historic data, the District anticipates that the demand in the Chinatown North Beach Campus in the morning will continue to be ESL, ESL vocational classes and Citizenship classes.

Page 87, first response paragraph, second sentence.

As discussed above, the students attending AM classes are already using the same MUNI lines serving the scattered sites in the current Chinatown North Beach Campus or walk to their classes.

Page 90, first response paragraph, final sentence.

...and in the Chinatown Community Business District (Section 161 (d)) when the lot size is in excess of does not exceed 20,000 square feet (Sections 161 (d) and 810.1.22).

Page 92, first response paragraph, first sentence.

The comment states that there would not be enough space in the parking garage of located at 655 Montgomery Street during the day and that parking is limited during the evening hours.

Page 92, first response paragraph, final sentence.

The survey also found that during evening hours the area surrounding the Project site has a generally low parking occupancy rate of 32.5 percent as shown in Table 4 on p. III D-8 of the Draft EIR; thus, availability of off-street parking in the surrounding area during the evening hours would not be affected by the limited evening parking at 655 Montgomery Street.

Page 91, Figure 19.

See Figure 19, attached. The parking area reference numbers corresponding with Table 4 of the Draft EIR did not print clearly.
Page 97, second response paragraph.

The comment states that the Draft EIR does not anticipate route changes proposed by MUNI. The description of transit lines does reflect changes MUNI made in spring of 2007 after the implementation of the T-line. In addition, the number 15 line is not listed in Table 3. The North Beach, Chinatown and Financial District neighborhoods are heavily served by MUNI. Due to the high demand for public transit in the area, it is anticipated that MUNI service levels would remain at current levels or be increased. The description of transit lines does reflect changes MUNI made in spring of 2007 after the implementation of the T-line. In addition, the number 15 line is not listed in Table 3.

Page 100, first partial response paragraph, seventh complete sentence.

The Draft EIR states “that the Project would is conservatively judged to have a significant impact on transit capacity....”

Page 102, first response paragraph, second and third sentences.

This garage is a well utilized. When there are major events in Chinatown, it is not unusual that queues from form Washington Street, Walter Lum Place, Clay Street and Kearny Street.

Page 125, third full response paragraph.

At the Willy Woo Woo playground on Sacramento Street near the proposed new Chinatown YMCA building, the Recreation and Park Commission and the Planning Commission found that the new shadow of the proposed YMCA project would not to be significant because of the duration and location of the shadow and because, on balance there would be a net increase in the amount of sunlight on that park.

Page 129, first full response paragraph, first sentence.

Please refer to Response to Comment 3-2 above, on pp. 120 and 125, with regard to the City’s jurisdiction.

Page 131, first indented paragraph.

With the Project in place, conditions would change little with the average wind speed for all 21 sidewalk test locations remaining averaging at about 10.67-76, similar to the existing average of 10.7 mph.

Page 139, sentence added to the final sentence of the partial response paragraph.

...and are consistent with the measures included in the City College Master Plan EIR for construction noise mitigation and as typically required for projects in the City and County of San Francisco.

Page 140, second response paragraph, final sentence.

The Project would comply with the 2001 Fire Code regulations and the 2008 International Building Code, whereas none of the buildings currently leased by City College comply with these current Codes with building code standards currently in effect.
Page 145, fifth response paragraph, second sentence.

As described on Draft EIR p. III.D-16, most students are and would be part-time; they go directly to classes from home, then proceed to work or home, or vice versa.

Page 147, first full response paragraph, third sentence.

Project contributions were not identified, but the regulations and capacities that support the Draft EIR conclusions are analyzed on pp. III.L-5 to III.L-7.

Page 150, second bullet point.

- If dewatering is required, groundwater pumped from the site shall be retained in a holding tank to allow suspended particles to settle, if this were found to be necessary by the Bureau of Environmental Regulation and Management of the Department of Public Works to reduce the amount of sediment entering the combined sewer system.

Page 150, final response paragraph, first sentence.

The Treadwell & Rollo geotechnical report, cited on Draft EIR p. III.G-8 E-1, footnote 15, has identified that the depth to groundwater at the project site about 13 to 18 feet below ground surface.

Page 151, third response paragraph, final sentence.

Also, as noted in the response above, any groundwater encountered on the site that required disposal in the sewer system would be subject to treatment as recommended by the Department of Public Works.

Page 154, final response paragraph.

For a cost comparison of alternatives refer to p. 295 192 of this response to comments document.

Pages 155 and 156. Table C&R-1.

 Corrections are made to Table C&R-1, attached, in comparison of certain impacts, to be consistent with text.

Page 161, first response paragraph, second and third sentences.

While Alternative C would not achieve all of the Project objectives and present economic concerns. Alternative E would be feasible, but may present historic architectural resources concerns and have more severe land use, visual quality, and transportation impacts than the Project. While Alternatives A and B would not achieve all of the Project objectives. All of the Alternative B variants would meet program objectives.

Page 170, add the following bullet point at the discussion of Alternative B Variant 3.

- The tower would be setback five feet on the north and east sides above the podium level.
Page 174, final paragraph, second sentence.

The wind tunnel test used the same measurement locations as for the Project analysis, as shown in Figure 27, Draft EIR p. III.H-5 4, with an additional measurement point on the roof of the approved St. Mary's School.

Page 176, Table C&R-3.

Corrections are made to “bold” notations Table C&R-1 to clarify exceedences. The data in the table are correct. See revised Table C&R-1, attached.

Page 180, first response paragraph, third and forth complete sentences.

Variant 3 4 would eliminate the two exceedences with one new exceedence location of one hour per year at Washington Street and Kearny Street near the project, at point 12. Annual hours of exceedence would drop from 11 hours to one two hours.

Page 181, first response paragraph, fifth sentence.

The Design Review Committee has been in place and has reviewed the Project design in a public meetings held on April 11, and August 21, 2007 prior to EIR certification.

Page 190, first response paragraph.

The high cost of constructing underground parking on the project block is noted. For a cost comparison of alternatives refer to p. 490 192 of this response to comments document.

Page 191, third response paragraph, third sentence.

For each of the design schemes, Bovis was also instructed to develop costs estimates for the exterior of the building using a curtain wall system or a façade with a combination of precast panels and window system.

Page 192, first full response paragraph, final sentence.

A three-level sub-surface parking garage at the project site is estimated to cost $3-2 10 million.

Page 194, third response paragraph, second sentence.

This objective is not about reallocating a defined amount of funds, but about the idea of a using District funds to improve a permanent campus rather than pay rent for temporary sites.

Page 194, final response paragraph.

Draft EIR, p. IV-3, states that the Project would employ approximately 127 faculty and employees, and increase of nine faculty and employees over existing, and that there would be approximately 1,700 students on campus at any one time during morning periods, similar to existing conditions. This information is also cited in the Draft EIR Transportation, Public Services, and Utilities sections.
Page 195, first response paragraph, final sentence.

The updated survey results were substantially different from the January 2007 survey in that the percentage of students going from class to work is higher.

Page 198, first response paragraph, second sentence.

Draft EIR p. I-1 is correct. The total number of classrooms and laboratories, 46,42, remains the same.

Page 206, second full response paragraph.

Fiscal issues and community benefits from the Project are topics that will be considered by the Board in weighing the merits of the Project. The merit-related issues identified by all commentors will be considered as the Board members Trustees consider whether to approve the Project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Objectives and Location</th>
<th>Draft EIR Alternatives</th>
<th>Comments &amp; Responses Variants</th>
<th>Commentor-Initiated Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Objectives and Location</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would meet program objectives; would generally meet location objectives, but would be located on two sites</td>
<td>Would not meet program objectives; would generally meet location objectives, but would be located on two sites</td>
<td>Would meet program objectives; would not meet location objectives (two sites would be 3 blocks apart)</td>
<td>Would meet program objectives; would not meet location objectives (two sites would be 3 blocks apart)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Quality</td>
<td>LTS, would avoid impact on Colombo Building SU</td>
<td>PS, similar to Project SU</td>
<td>PS, similar to Project SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resources</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>PS, similar to Project</td>
<td>PS, similar to Project</td>
<td>PS, similar to Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU impact</td>
<td>SU, would avoid impact on Colombo Building</td>
<td>PS, similar to Project</td>
<td>PS, similar to Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE C&R-1
COMPARISON OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Draft EIR Alternatives</th>
<th>Comments &amp; Responses Variants</th>
<th>Commentor-Initiated Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alt B Variant 3</td>
<td>Alt B Variant 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadows</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>LTS</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
<td>LTS, similar to Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** PBS&J 2007.
### TABLE C&R-3
**WIND COMFORT ANALYSIS – VARIANTS 3 AND 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Variant 3</th>
<th>Variant 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Criterion (mph)</td>
<td>Velocity (mph)</td>
<td>% Time Above Criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Donald J. Ballanti, Certified Consulting Meteorologist.

**Note:** Exceedances are in boldface.

New Project exceedances are underlined.