

4.B Project Description

The comments and corresponding responses in this section cover topics in Draft SEIR Chapter II, Project Description. These include topics related to:

- Comment PD-1: Construction Schedule
- Comment PD-2: Project Description

Comment PD-1: Construction Schedule

This response addresses comments from the commenter listed below; each comment on this topic is quoted in full below this list:

I-HEGGIE2-11

"9. In the Notes section at the bottom of Table 2-2 on p. 2-38, "Phases 1 and 2 could occur simultaneously for a duration of two years following Phase 0." But above, in the same table, Phase 1 and Phase 2 are each estimated to have a duration of 2.5 years. Please explain how the condensed schedule would take two years rather than 2.5 years for Phases 1 and 2."

(Jennifer Heggie, Email, September 23, 2019 [I-HEGGIE2-11])

Response PD-1: Construction Schedule

The comment requests clarification regarding the compressed construction schedule and why Phases 1 and 2 would be 2.5 years under the six-year scenario, but two years under the compressed schedule.

The construction durations for both scenarios described on SEIR pp. 2-38 and 2-39 are correct and were provided by the project sponsor team. Under the compressed schedule, the vertical construction phases (Phases 1 and 2) would occur over a shorter period of two years. As acknowledged on SEIR p. 2-39, "a relatively larger amount of construction would take place during a relatively shorter period of time of three years, thereby increasing the typical daily construction activity."

Comment PD-2: Project Description

This response addresses comments from the commenter listed below; each comment on this topic is quoted in full below this list:

I-BARISH3-19
I-GOMEZ-1

I-PEDERSON2-6
I-PEDERSON2-7

I-PEDERSON2-8
O-WPA3-14

Commented [JP1]: Add to chapter 2: description of the educator housing, per S Vettel 2/6/20: The project proposes to provide approximately 150 moderate-income dwelling units (as a component of the project's 50% affordable housing element) that would be deed-restricted to occupancy by educator households with an average income of 100% of area median income. Households with at least one full-time employee of the City College of San Francisco or San Francisco Unified School District would have preferential priority for all educator dwelling units, with CCSF households having first priority and SFUSD households having second priority.

Add as a staff-initiated text change and say that it doesn't affect the analysis.

Commented [WW(2): Add this sentence on page 2-7:
...The lot provides overflow vehicular parking for City College students, faculty, and staff. The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency is also temporarily using a portion of the project site for SFMTA employee parking.²⁷

27. The SFMTA started temporarily using on October 1, 2019 an approximate 29,100 square foot area of the project site. This temporary use will expire September 2020.

Commented [JP3]: Revise as discussed 2/13.

I-OSAWA-2

“Figures in DSEIR Figures 2-1 through 2-8; Figures 2-9 through 2-12; Figure 2-16; Figures 2-18 through 2-21; Figure 3.B-4; Figures 5-1 through 5-4; Figure 6-1; and Figure 6-2 are inadequate and incorrect. They do not show the alterations to the Upper Lot, where the CCSF Multi Use Building is located, that are included in the Facilities Master Plan, approved by the CCSF Board of Trustees in March, 2018, and the subsequent Plan that was presented to the Board of Trustees for consideration of a San Francisco Bond Measure. Table 3.A-2 describes the New Facilities planned for this area. (P. 3,A-13). Accordingly, these Figures are all misleading and do not accurately represent buildings on the land adjoining the proposed project. The FSEIR must use accurate, updated Figures.”

(Jean B. Barish, Letter, September 23, 2019 [I-BARISH3-19])

“1) I noticed the impact report mentions the decrease in parking needs after the first week of a semester, and the proposal of a new parking lot that accommodates 750 vehicles. How many spaces would be reserved for students as opposed to residents who would live in the new development?”

(Wilson Oswaldo Gomez, Email, August 28, 2019 [I-GOMEZ-1])

“Most critically, according to the proposal the only vehicular inlet into an 1100 unit housing development is a single lane northbound on Lee Avenue from Ocean Avenue. **This would seem to be wholly inadequate.**”

(Ed Osawa, Email, September 22, 2019 [I-OSAWA-2])

“The Draft is also silent about how the public parking garage will be financed. If the developer will fund the garage with proceeds from the residential development, that raises the question about why those proceeds couldn’t instead be used to fund more below-market rate housing. If the public parking garage will be paid for with public funds (either the City’s or City College’s), that should be disclosed as well. The Draft should address how any subsidy (whether public or private) for the garage would reduce the parking fees and thereby generate additional parking demand, VMT, and GHG emissions.

If the public parking garage will be financed entirely by parking fees paid by users of the garage, the Draft should address whether the garage will be financially viable. Those who currently commute to City College either park for free or pay nominal fees. It is unlikely that they would be willing to pay the kind of substantial fees that would be necessary to pay for construction of a 750-space garage.”

(Christopher Pederson, Email, September 23, 2019 [I-PEDERSON2-6])

“If the users of the parking garage are instead anticipated to be the residents of the Balboa Reservoir project, that would be an end run around the City’s and the developer’s agreement that the overall parking ratio for the residential component of the project would be 0.5 parking spaces per residence. Using the public parking garage as residential parking would also mean that the project would exceed the zoning code’s maximum 1:1 parking ratio for the site.”

Commented [JP4]: Clarify in response.

(Christopher Pederson, Email, September 23, 2019 [I-PEDERSON2-7])

“Finally, the Draft is entirely silent about how the parking rates for the garage would be structured. For example, would the daily rate be lower than 8 hours of the hourly rate? Would weekly, monthly, semester, or annual rates be allowed? If rates for periods longer than one day would be allowed, the Draft should address whether such rates would reduce incentives for commuters to take transit, walk, or bike on days during those periods when the commuter doesn’t need to drive. Finally, would the rates and any leasing arrangements be structured so that any employer who pays for spaces within the garage on behalf of its employees would be subject to California’s parking cash-out statute? (See Cal. Health & Safety Code, section 43845.) The Draft should address how the fee structure and the applicability of the parking cash-out statute would affect VMT and GHG emissions.”

(Christopher Pederson, Email, September 23, 2019 [I-PEDERSON2-8])

“A representative of the developer has informed the Chair of the BRCAC that the developer will not develop the 1,550 unit Additional Housing Option. The Planning Department should verify the accuracy of this representation to the BRCAC. If correct, the 1,550 Unit Project option should be added to the list of alternatives considered but rejected by the Planning Department since its development will not be undertaken by the developer.”

(Michael Ahrens, President, Westwood Park Association, Letter, September 22, 2019 [O-WPA3-14])

Response PD-2: Project Description Comments and Questions

This group of comments are regarding the project description or require clarification of the proposed project. One comment states that the site plan figures in SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description, Chapter 5, Variants, and Chapter 6, Alternatives, are inadequate and incorrect because they do not depict the City College facilities master plan projects for the east basin. One comment requests clarification regarding how many spaces in the 750-space parking garage would be reserved for students, while another asserts-states that the use of the public parking as residential parking would exceed the zoning code’s 1:1 parking ration for the site. One comment asserts-states that the project would have one vehicular inlet point via a single northbound lane on Lee Avenue from Ocean Avenue, which would be “wholly inadequate.” One comment states

that the developer indicated to the CAC that they would not develop the Additional Housing Option.

Figures 2-1 through 2-12, Figure 2-16, Figures 2-18 through 2-21, Figure 3.B-4, Figures 5-1 through 5-4, and Figures 6-1 through 6-2 depict the plan-view diagrams of the proposed project. As described in Response CEQA-2, Existing Setting and Baseline, on RTC p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**, per CEQA Guidelines section 15125(a)(1), the physical conditions existing when the notice of preparation is published was used to establish the baseline for the project-level analysis in the SEIR and initial study. The figures in the SEIR reflect the existing conditions and the proposed project. The commenter's ~~assertion-statement~~ that the facilities master plan projects should be shown is incorrect, as the City College projects are considered under cumulative future conditions and do not represent existing or near-term baseline conditions.

The 1,550 Additional Housing Option was developed by the City to fulfill the objectives of the general plan to maximize affordable housing and housing in transit-rich neighborhoods (SEIR p. 2-1). The SEIR analyzes the environmental impacts of the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option as proposed.

The assertion that the project would have one vehicular inlet point is incorrect. The proposed circulation of the project site is described in SEIR Section 2.E.8, Transportation and Circulation Plana (SEIR pp. 2-26 to 2-30). As described in SEIR Section 2.E.8 and as shown in Figure 2-12, Proposed Street Type Plan (SEIR p. 2-27), there would be two access points to the project site. Lee Avenue would provide a vehicle travel lane in each direction from Ocean Avenue, and North Street would provide a vehicle travel lane in each direction from Frida Kahlo Way.

The assertion that the use of the public parking as residential parking would exceed the zoning code's 1:1 parking ratio is incorrect. Vehicle parking is described on SEIR p. 2-23 and all residential parking would be unbundled with the exception of the townhomes. As stated on SEIR p. 2-23, "up to 550 off-street parking spaces for project residents may be located in parking garages below grade at Blocks C, D, F, and G and in the townhomes." The proposed up to 750-space parking garage would be located under Blocks A and B, which is separate from the residential parking. The public parking garage spaces would not be for the residents and would be available to the public (including students).

Two comments ask about financing of, and parking rates that would be charged at the public parking garage that could be developed as part of the proposed project. Project financing, including financing of any potential parking garage, is not directly related to any potential physical effects of the project and, therefore, financing of the project, including its components, is not a subject of CEQA analysis. ~~To the extent that funding for the construction of on-site parking could instead be devoted to additional housing development, this is a policy matter that could be considered by the decision makers in their deliberations on the proposed project.~~

Commented [WW(5)]: Revise as discussed 2/13