
CHAPTER 2

Revisions and Clarifications to the Project Description

2.A Introduction

Since publication of the draft SEIR, the project sponsor has initiated minor revisions to the proposed project as described in draft SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description. This chapter summarizes these minor revisions, describes updates to the text in the draft SEIR (deletions are shown in ~~striketrough~~; new text is double-underlined), and describes the environmental impacts of the revisions. Draft SEIR text revisions are presented in this chapter only where they have been made specifically in SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description. Text revisions in other portions of the SEIR that are updated as a result of these changes are presented in RTC Chapter 5, Draft SEIR Revisions.

The revisions update the information in the draft SEIR. The revisions do not provide new information that would result in any new significant impacts that were not already identified in the draft SEIR, nor would these changes increase the severity of any of the project's impacts identified in the draft SEIR. Mitigation measures identified in the draft SEIR would continue to be required in order to reduce or avoid significant environmental impacts. No new measures would be required to mitigate the significant impacts identified for the proposed project in the draft SEIR.

CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5 requires recirculation of an EIR when "significant new information" is added to the EIR after publication of the draft EIR but before certification. The CEQA Guidelines states that information is "significant" if "the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project proponents have declined to implement." Section 15088.5 further defines "significant new information" that triggers a requirement for recirculation as including, but not limited to, identification of a new significant impact, of a substantial increase in the severity of an impact (unless mitigation is adopted to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level), or of a new feasible alternative or mitigation measure that would lessen the environmental impacts of the proposed project that the project sponsor is unwilling to adopt. CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5(b) states that recirculation is not required if "new information in the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR."

As described below, the revisions and clarifications to the proposed project options would not introduce new characteristics or substantially modify previously proposed characteristics that would result in any new significant impacts not already identified for the proposed project studied in the draft SEIR, nor would these changes increase the severity of any identified significant impacts.

2.B Project Description Revisions

The minor revisions to the proposed project are described below. Certain aspects of the proposed project are superseded and replaced by the minor revisions presented in this chapter; all other aspects of the project description remain unchanged, as presented in draft SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description. The environmental effects of the proposed project with the project refinements incorporated are fully covered by the analyses in this chapter together with the analyses in draft SEIR Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts.

Proposed Street Type Plan

As illustrated on Figure 2-12, Proposed Street Type Plan on draft SEIR p. 2-27, the portion of West Street that is south of South Street is proposed as a private street and the portion of Lee Avenue that is north of North Street is proposed as a neighborhood residential street. The type of street has been modified by the project sponsor such that West Street south of South Street is proposed as a neighborhood residential street, and Lee Avenue north of North Street is proposed as a private street. These revisions would only change the street ownership and would not result in changes to roadway configurations or vehicle, pedestrian, or bicycle access to and from the project site. The revised street ownership is shown in Revised Figure 2-12 in RTC Chapter 5, Draft SEIR Revisions.

Educator Housing

Under the Developer's Proposed Option, a total of up to 50 percent of the new units would be designated affordable to persons earning between 55 and 120 percent of the area median income. The project sponsor has provided information regarding the affordable housing component, which would include approximately 150 moderate-income dwelling units dedicated to educator households as part of the 50 percent affordable housing. Under the Additional Housing Option, approximately 150 moderate-income dwelling units would also be dedicated to educator housing as part of the 50 percent affordable housing. This would not change the number and mix of residential units, building footprints, or overall development program of the ~~Developer's Proposed Option~~ project.

Parking

Under the Developer's Proposed Option, public parking spaces could be provided in the up to 750-space garage located under Blocks A and B, or in dedicated public parking areas within several of the residential garages, all of which would be separate from the residential parking. This would not change the overall number of parking spaces provided at the site.

Temporary Use of the Project Site

Since publication of the draft SEIR, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has been temporarily using a portion of the project site since October 1, 2019 for SFMTA employee parking, under an agreement with the SFPUC. The agreement for this temporary use will expire September 2020, prior to the potential start of project construction activity, and therefore would neither be affected by, nor affect, the proposed project.

2.C Draft SEIR Revisions

The following figure has been revised to show the revised street ownership; the revised figure is provided in RTC Chapter 5, Draft SEIR Revisions.

- Figure 2-12 on draft SEIR p. 2-27

The last paragraph on SEIR p. 2-7 is revised as follows:

The site does not contain any permanent structures and currently contains 1,007 surface vehicular parking spaces. The lot provides overflow vehicular parking for City College students, faculty, and staff.²⁶ The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) is also temporarily using a portion of the project site for SFMTA employee parking, under an agreement with SFPUC. 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.

The paragraph under Section 2.E.1, Developer's Proposed Option, on SEIR p. 2-13 is revised as follows:

The Developer's Proposed Option would include up to 1.64 million gsf in new construction on 10 Blocks (**Figure 2-4, Developer's Proposed Option Site Plan and Height Ranges**). Construction under this option would provide 1,100 residential units totaling about 1.3 million gsf. Housing would be provided on each block. A total of up to 50 percent of the new units would be designated affordable to persons earning between 55 and 120 percent of the area median income, depending on market surveys, funding source restrictions and other stakeholder input on the affordable housing plan. Affordable housing would be distributed throughout the site. For purposes of this SEIR, the unit mix is assumed to be 40 percent studio/one bedroom units and 60 percent two-or-more-bedroom units. The project proposes to provide approximately 150 moderate-income dwelling units (as a component of the project's 50 percent affordable housing element) that would be deed-restricted to occupancy by educator households with an average income of 100 percent of the 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 City College households having first priority and San Francisco Unified School District households having second priority.

Figure 2-5, Ground Floor Use Plan for Developer's Proposed Option, presents the proposed ground floor use plan at the project site. With the exception of the townhome blocks (Blocks TH1 and TH2), the ground floor areas on all blocks could include common spaces, building lobbies, residential units, as well as utility and parking access. As shown in Figure 2-5, the ground floor of Block B would contain approximately 10,000 gsf of childcare and community space. Approximately 7,500 gsf of retail space, including a café, could be provided on the ground level of Block A, C, D, E, or F.

The first bullet under Section 2.E.6, Vehicle Parking and Loading, on SEIR p. 2-23 is revised as follows:

- **Developer's Proposed Option:** The Developer's Proposed Option would provide a total of up to 1,300 off-street vehicle parking spaces. **Figure 2-10, Developer's Proposed Option Parking Facilities and Street Parking Plan**, illustrates the proposed off-street parking locations. 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. In addition to resident parking, the Developer's Proposed Option would include a below-grade multilevel public garage of up to 750 spaces located under Blocks A and B and accessed from South Street, or in dedicated public parking areas within several of the residential garages, all of which would be separate from the residential parking. The Developer's Proposed Option would include a minimum of seven car-share parking spaces located on streets and in buildings. In addition, the Developer's Proposed Option would include approximately six on-street freight loading areas and approximately eight passenger loading areas along the internal streets.

Commented [PJ(1)]: Steve Vettel added Blocks A and B here. Would that be a project description change? Figure 2-10 has "plus 86 potential residential spaces" so I think it's a correction/clarification to the text, not a correction. If we add A and B here, we have to double underline it as a change to the DSEIR. And change it in Chapter 5 as well.

Section 2.I.2, Local Agencies on SEIR pp. 2-50 to 2-51 is revised as follows to update or correct local agency approval actions:

2.I.2 Local Agencies

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

- Adoption of CEQA findings
- Approval of general plan amendments
- Approval of planning code amendments (SUD) and associated zoning map and height map amendments
- Approval of a development agreement
- Approval of final subdivision map(s)
- Approval of dedications and easements for public improvements, and acceptance of public improvements, as necessary
- Approval of an amended easement and access agreement with ~~City College of the~~ San Francisco Community College District for roadway access and any joint development of streets, if applicable
- Approval of a resolution(s) authorizing the sale of property under SFPUC jurisdiction and various license agreements for use, construction, and open space on SFPUC property
- Approval of a resolution acknowledging City's intention to fund affordable housing in the project

San Francisco Planning Commission

- Certification of the final SEIR
- Adoption of CEQA findings
- Approval of special use district design standards and guidelines

- Initiation and recommendation to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to approve amendments to the general plan
- Initiation and recommendation to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to approve planning code amendments adopting an SUD and associated zoning map amendments
- Approval of Design Standards and Guidelines
- Recommendation to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to approve a development agreement

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission or General Manager

- Adoption of CEQA findings
- Actions and approvals related to a development agreement and purchase and sale an agreement for the sale of property under SFPUC jurisdiction, and various license agreements for use, construction, and open space on SFPUC property and other actions and approvals related to its jurisdictional authority
- Approval of an amended easement and access agreement with the San Francisco Community College District for roadway access and any joint development of streets, if applicable

San Francisco Department of Public Works

- Actions and approvals related to its jurisdictional authority

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

- Actions and approvals related to a development agreement and approval of transit improvements, public improvements and infrastructure, including certain roadway improvements, stop controls, bicycle infrastructure and loading zones, to the extent included in the project

San Francisco Fire Department

- Actions and approvals related to its jurisdictional authority

San Francisco Department of Building Inspection

- Approval and issuance of demolition, grading, and site construction permits
- Nighttime construction permit, if required

San Francisco Department of Public Health

- Actions and approvals related to its jurisdictional authority

City College of San Francisco Community College District

- Act as responsible agency under CEQA
- Approval of an amended easement and access agreement

2.D Environmental Impacts

The minor modifications described in RTC Section 2.C above would not result in any changes to the site layout, street configuration, proposed number of housing units, or construction assumptions. These modifications would result in no changes to the assumptions, analysis, or conclusions described in the draft SEIR assessment of environmental impacts of the proposed project as presented in draft SEIR Chapter 3, Environmental Setting and Impacts, and draft SEIR Appendix B with respect to any resource topics. The significant and unavoidable transportation, noise, and air quality would remain and are discussed below.

The transportation impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for several reasons as described on draft SEIR pp. 6-59 to 6-60:

- Providing approximately 150 moderate-income dwelling units dedicated to educator households may lead to slightly less vehicular travel than not providing such dedicated housing. However, the cumulative impact related to public transit delay (Impact C-TR-4, discussed on draft SEIR pp. 3.B-94 to 3.B-99) is based on the addition of vehicle and transit trips generated by the proposed project in combination with the City College facilities master plan projects and other cumulative development. Due to the uncertainty surrounding the development at City College's Ocean Campus and the uncertainty of SFMTA approval of other measures under its jurisdiction, cumulative transit delay impacts would be significant and unavoidable. The impacts to transit delay would occur irrespective of potential changes in travel demand or patterns from educator housing.
- The cumulative impact to passenger and freight loading (Impact C-TR-6b, discussed on draft SEIR pp. 3.B-101 to 3.B-102) is determined based on the impact to existing loading zones along Lee Avenue between Ocean Avenue and the project site. Under such a scenario, the Lee Avenue extension would still occur, and impacts to loading on Lee Avenue would occur irrespective of potential changes travel demand or patterns from educator or student housing. Thus, the impact conclusion would be significant and unavoidable.

An additional reason that the transportation impacts would remain significant and unavoidable are:

- The 150 educator-dedicated housing at the site would not obviate the need for travel to and from other City College centers and instructional sites and San Francisco Unified School District schools throughout San Francisco. Employees traveling to and from the Ocean Campus ~~only~~ accounts for ~~only~~ a portion of total daily travel to and from the project; other travel would still occur from these employees throughout the day. Thus, educator housing at the project site would not prevent project-related vehicle travel from using Ocean Avenue in the project vicinity.

The minor modifications described in RTC Section 2.C would not change the configuration of the site or size of the buildings. Therefore, construction assumptions and durations would remain the same. The construction-related noise and air quality impacts would remain significant and unavoidable as described in draft SEIR sections 3.C, Noise and 3.D, Air Quality.

The revisions to the proposed project would not result in any new significant impacts that were not already identified in the draft SEIR, nor would these changes substantially increase the severity of any impacts identified in the draft SEIR. The mitigation measures identified in the draft SEIR for the proposed project would continue to be required to reduce or avoid the significant environmental impacts of the revised proposed project. No new or modified measures would be required to mitigate the significant impacts identified for the proposed project in the draft SEIR. Therefore, references to the proposed project in this RTC document, including Chapter 5, Draft SEIR Revisions, shall be interpreted to include and incorporate any changes proposed by the revised proposed project, unless otherwise noted.

This page intentionally left blank