

1 [Affirming the Categorical Exemption Determination - SFMTA Hairball Intersection
Improvement Project]

2

3 **Motion affirming the determination by the Planning Department that the proposed San**
4 **Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Hairball Intersection Improvement Project**
5 **is categorically exempt from further environmental review.**

6

7 WHEREAS, On May 16, 2017, the Planning Department determined that the proposed
8 San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Hairball Intersection Improvement Project
9 (“Project”) is exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality
10 Act ("CEQA"), the CEQA Guidelines, and San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 31;
11 and

12 WHEREAS, The proposed Project involves paint-only modifications to the existing
13 roadway on Bayshore Boulevard (between Jerrold Avenue and Marin Street) and Jerrold
14 Avenue (between Bayshore Boulevard and Barneveld Avenue), including modifications to
15 existing travel lanes to create a new bicycle lane on Jerrold Avenue, installation of new high
16 visibility crosswalks at the intersection of Marin Street/Bayshore Boulevard and Jerrold
17 Avenue/Bayshore Boulevard, the removal of 10 parking spaces and two loading zones along
18 westbound Jerrold Avenue and establishment of parking restrictions; and

19 WHEREAS, On May 26, 2017, the Planning Department determined that the Project is
20 exempt from environmental review under Class 1 of the CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Reg.
21 Section 15301), which provides an exemption for minor alterations to existing facilities; and

22 WHEREAS, On September 19, 2017, the SFMTA Board of Directors (the “SFMTA
23 Board”) conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting and
24 approved the Project by SFMTA Board Resolution No. 1170919-119; and

25

1 WHEREAS, On October 19, 2017, Mary Miles, Attorney for the Coalition for Adequate
2 Review (“Appellant”) filed an appeal of the categorical exemption determination; and

3 WHEREAS, The Planning Department’s Acting Environmental Review Officer, by
4 memorandum to the Clerk of the Board dated October 24, 2017, determined that the appeal
5 was timely filed; and

6 WHEREAS, On November 28, 2017, this Board held a duly noticed public hearing to
7 consider the appeal of the exemption determination filed by Appellant and, following the public
8 hearing, affirmed the exemption determination; and

9 WHEREAS, In reviewing the appeal of the exemption determination, this Board
10 reviewed and considered the exemption determination, the appeal letter, the responses to the
11 appeal documents that the Planning Department prepared, the other written records before
12 the Board of Supervisors and all of the public testimony made in support of and opposed to
13 the exemption determination appeal; and

14 WHEREAS, Following the conclusion of the public hearing, the Board of Supervisors
15 affirmed the exemption determination for the Project based on the written record before the
16 Board of Supervisors as well as all of the testimony at the public hearing in support of and
17 opposed to the appeal; and

18 WHEREAS, The written record and oral testimony in support of and opposed to the
19 appeal and deliberation of the oral and written testimony at the public hearing before the
20 Board of Supervisors by all parties and the public in support of and opposed to the appeal of
21 the exemption determination is in the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors File No.171147, and is
22 incorporated in this motion as though set forth in its entirety; now, therefore, be it

23 MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors hereby adopts as its own and incorporates by
24 reference in this motion, as though fully set forth, the exemption determination; and, be it
25

1 FURTHER MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors finds that based on the whole
2 record before it there are no substantial project changes, no substantial changes in project
3 circumstances, and no new information of substantial importance that would change the
4 conclusions set forth in the exemption determination by the Planning Department that the
5 proposed Project is exempt from environmental review; and, be it

6 FURTHER MOVED, That after carefully considering the appeal of the exemption
7 determination, including the written information submitted to the Board of Supervisors and the
8 public testimony presented to the Board of Supervisors at the hearing on the exemption
9 determination, this Board concludes that the Project qualifies for an exemption determination
10 under CEQA.

11
12
13 n:\land\as2017\0400241\01235494.docx
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25