



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Resolution No. 20226

HEARING DATE JUNE 28, 2018

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Project Name: **General Plan Amendments: The Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan** Fax: **415.558.6409**

Case Number: 2015-001821GPA [Board File No. TBD]

Initiated by: Planning Commission

Staff Contact: Robin Abad Ocubillo, Citywide Long Range Planning & Policy
Robin.Abad@sfgov.org, 415-575-9123

Reviewed by: Aaron D Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs
aaron.starr@sfgov.org, 415-558-6362
Neil Hrushowy, Manager of City Design Group
Neil.hrushowy@sfgov.org, 415- 558-6471

Planning Information: **415.558.6377**

ADOPTING A RESOLUTION OF INTENTION TO INITIATE AMENDMENTS TO VARIOUS ELEMENTS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL PLAN AND THE CENTRAL WATERFRONT AREA PLAN WITHIN THE GENERAL PLAN TO ADDRESS AND INCORPORATE THE CENTRAL WATERFRONT – DOGPATCH PUBLIC REALM.

WHEREAS, Section 4.105 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco mandates that the Planning Department shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors for approval or rejection proposed amendments to the General Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Central Waterfront Area Plan, adopted in 2008, sets forth objectives and policies that address policy level issues pertaining to land use, transportation, urban design, built form, streets and open space, housing, historic resources, community facilities and economic development; and

WHEREAS, The Central Waterfront Area plan provides a legal framework to further study and address public infrastructure needs within the Plan Area but does not specify an implementation roadmap that guides and prioritizes the investment of complete streets, parks and open spaces. Under the Central Waterfront Area Plan, the Dogpatch neighborhood has continued to grow, accommodating both new housing and neighborhood commercial services, but investment in the public realm has not kept up with the growth of the neighborhood. In order to keep up with the rapid change the neighborhood is undergoing, a clear guiding framework is needed to implement these objectives and policies, in particular for the public rights-of-way and open spaces where multiple jurisdictions overlap; and

WHEREAS, Recognizing the need for an implementation roadmap, in 2015 an interagency team made up of the Planning Department, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, Public Works, SF Port, and Recreation and Park Department, was formed to kick off the Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan process;

WHEREAS, The Planning Department and the interagency team led a robust public process from September 2015 to November 2017 engaging numerous community stakeholders to solicit input to develop the Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan, including five public workshops, over 20 focus group meetings, and distributed four distinct online surveys; and,

WHEREAS, The Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan is intended to serve as the guiding framework for the investment of complete streets, parks and open spaces within the Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan Area. Future public and private projects would follow the guidance and prioritization framework set forth in the Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan, which would help ensure that public realm improvements be performed in a holistic manner and with respect to the local context; and,

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Planning Department is seeking to adopt Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan by reference and to amend the Central Waterfront Area Plan within the General Plan to incorporate the Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan. The vision and implementation strategies in the Public Realm Plan are consistent with the existing General Plan. However, a number of amendments to various elements of the General Plan are required to further achieve the vision and goals of the Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan. Proposed amendments to the General Plan are attached as Exhibit E. The City Attorney’s Office has reviewed the draft ordinance and approved it as to form; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider initiation of the proposed Ordinance on **June 28, 2018**; and,

WHEREAS, on May 2, 2018 the Planning Department determined that no supplemental environmental review is required for the proposed Ordinance. The environmental effects of this plan have been adequately analyzed pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) in the Final Environmental Impact Report (“FEIR”) previously prepared for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans project. The Planning Department reviewed the proposed plan in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164. The Planning Department found that implementation of the proposed plan would not cause new significant impacts not identified in the FEIR or result in a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce significant impacts. No changes have occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the original project that would cause significant environmental impacts to which the modified project would contribute considerably, and no new information has been put forward which shows that the modified project would cause significant environmental impacts. Based on the foregoing and in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 and San Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.19(c)(1), the Planning Department documented the reasons that no subsequent environmental review is required for the Dogpatch Public Realm Plan and issued an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report, attached as Exhibit B to this case report for reference. The Planning Commission finds the Addendum to the EIR, under Case No. 2015-001821ENV, is adequate, accurate and objective, reflects the independent analysis and judgment of the Planning Department and the Planning Commission, and concurs with said determination.

WHEREAS, the Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of Department staff and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the custodian of records, at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has reviewed the proposed Ordinance; and

MOVED, that pursuant to Planning Code Section 302(b), the Commission adopts a Resolution to initiate amendments to the General Plan;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to Planning Code Section 306.3, the Commission authorizes the Department to provide appropriate notice for a public hearing to consider the above referenced General Plan amendments contained in the draft ordinance, approved as to form by the City Attorney in Exhibit E, to be considered at a publicly noticed hearing on or after **August 23, 2018**.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on **June 28, 2018**.



Jonas P. Ioni
Commission Secretary

AYES: Fong, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

NOES: None

ABSENT: Hillis

ADOPTED: June 28, 2018

1 [General Plan Amendment - Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan]

2
3 **Ordinance amending various elements of the General Plan and amending the Central**
4 **Waterfront Area Plan within the General Plan to address and incorporate the Central**
5 **Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan, affirming the Planning Commission’s**
6 **findings under the Environmental Quality Act, making findings of consistency with the**
7 **General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and**
8 **making the public necessity findings of Planning Code, Section 340.**

9 NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
10 **Additions to Codes** are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
11 **Deletions to Codes** are in ~~*strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*~~.
12 **Board amendment additions** are in double-underlined Arial font.
13 **Board amendment deletions** are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.
14 **Asterisks (* * * *)** indicate the omission of unchanged Code
15 subsections or parts of tables.

16 Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

17 Section 1. General Findings.

18 (a) The Board of Supervisors, in Ordinance No. 297-08, adopted the Central
19 Waterfront Area Plan (“Area Plan”) in December 2008. A copy of said ordinance is on file with
20 the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 081152 and is incorporated herein by
21 reference.

22 (b) The Area Plan was adopted with various other area plans comprising the Eastern
23 Neighborhoods, comprehensively rezoning those neighborhoods to: 1) ensure a stable future
24 for Production, Distribution and Repair (“PDR”) businesses in the city, mainly by reserving a
25 certain amount of land for this purpose and 2) to provide a significant amount of new housing

1 affordable to low, moderate and middle income families and individuals, along with “complete
2 neighborhoods” that provide appropriate amenities for these new residents.

3 (c) The Area Plan established Key Principles, calling for future plans for transportation,
4 open space, community facilities, and other critical elements of complete neighborhoods.

5 (d) The Area Plan called for further study to more specifically identify public realm
6 needs and potential projects within the Area Plan.

7 (e) The public realm is comprised of complete streets, open spaces, and parks.

8 (f) The Planning Department launched the Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public
9 Realm Plan (“Public Realm Plan”) in September 2015 in partnership with San Francisco
10 Public Works, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port of San Francisco,
11 and the Recreation and Parks Department.

12 (g) The Planning Department and other agency partners led a robust public process
13 from September 2015 to November 2017 engaging numerous community stakeholders to
14 develop the Public Realm Plan.

15 (h) The Public Realm Plan presents specific recommendations for implementing Built
16 Form, Transportation, Streets and Open Space Objectives, and Policies of the Central
17 Waterfront Area Plan.

18
19 **Section 2. Environmental Findings.**

20 (a) On August 7, 2008, after a duly noticed public meeting, the Planning Commission
21 in Motion No. 17659 certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the
22 Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans, including the Central Waterfront Plan Area and various
23 General Plan, Planning Code, and Zoning Map amendments (the "Project") in accordance
24 with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (California Public Resources Code
25 Sections 21000 et seq.), the CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. Sections 15000 et seq.),

1 and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. Copies of the Planning
2 Commission Motion and Final EIR are on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 081152
3 and are incorporated herein by reference.

4 (b) At the same hearing during which the Planning Commission certified the Final EIR,
5 the Planning Commission in Motion No. 17661 adopted CEQA Findings with respect to the
6 approval of the proposed Project and other actions. The CEQA Findings adopted by the
7 Planning Commission with respect to the approval of the Project, including the rejection of
8 alternatives, a statement of overriding considerations, and a mitigation monitoring and
9 reporting program among other administrative record documents are on file with the Clerk of
10 the Board in File No. 081152. The Board of Supervisors in Ordinance No. 297-08 adopted
11 these environmental findings as its own. These and any and all other documents referenced
12 in Ordinance No. 297-08 were made available to the Board of Supervisors and may be found
13 in either the files of the Planning Department, as its custodian of records, at 1650 Mission
14 Street in San Francisco, or in File No. 081152 with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors at 1
15 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, and are incorporated herein by reference.

16 (c) On May 2, 2018, the Planning Department issued an addendum to the Final EIR
17 that analyzed the Public Realm Plan (the "Public Realm Plan Addendum"), a copy of which is
18 on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. _____ and is incorporated herein by
19 reference.

20 (d) Based on the Public Realm Plan Addendum, the Planning Commission in
21 Resolution No. _____ found that no substantial changes have occurred in the
22 Project proposed for approval under this ordinance that will require revisions in the Final EIR
23 due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the
24 severity of previously identified significant effects, no substantial changes have occurred with
25 respect to the circumstances under which the Project proposed for approval under this

1 ordinance are undertaken which will require major revisions to the Final EIR due to the
2 involvement of new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of effects
3 identified in the Final EIR, and no new information of substantial importance to the Project as
4 proposed for approval in this ordinance has become available which indicates that (1) the
5 Project will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR, (2) significant
6 environmental effects will be substantially more severe, (3) mitigation measure or alternatives
7 found not feasible which would reduce one or more significant effects have become feasible
8 or (4) mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those in the
9 Final EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment.
10 Consequently, the Board of Supervisors relies on the CEQA findings it adopted in Ordinance
11 No. 297-08, the Public Realm Plan Addendum and the environmental findings of the Planning
12 Commission in Resolution No. _____ for purposes of the actions in this ordinance
13 and adopts these findings as its own. A copy of Planning Commission Resolution No.
14 _____ is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No.
15 _____ and is incorporated herein by reference.

16
17 Section 3. General Plan and Planning Code Section 340 Findings.

18 (a) Section 4.105 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides that
19 the Planning Commission shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors, for
20 approval or rejection, proposed amendments to the General Plan.

21 (b) San Francisco Planning Code Section 340 provides that the Planning Commission
22 may initiate an amendment to the General Plan by a resolution of intention, which refers to,
23 and incorporates by reference, the proposed General Plan amendments. Section 340 further
24 provides that Planning Commission shall adopt the proposed General Plan amendments after
25 a public hearing if it finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience, and

1 general welfare require the proposed amendment or any part thereof. If adopted by the
2 Commission in whole or in part, the proposed amendments shall be presented to the Board of
3 Supervisors, which may approve or reject the amendments by a majority vote.

4 (c) After a duly noticed public hearing on _____, 2018 in Motion No.
5 _____, the Planning Commission initiated amendments to the General Plan. Said
6 Motion is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. _____ and
7 incorporated herein by reference.

8 (d) On _____, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. _____,
9 adopted findings the City's General Plan, eight priority policies of Planning Code Section
10 101.1, and Planning Code Section 340. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of
11 the Board of Supervisors in File No. _____ and is incorporated herein by reference.

12 (e) On _____, the Board of Supervisors received from the Planning
13 Department the proposed General Plan amendments related to the Public Realm Plan (the
14 "Plan Amendments"). These Plan Amendments, including maps, diagrams, and text changes
15 are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. _____ and are
16 incorporated herein by reference.

17 (f) Section 4.105 of the City Charter further provides that if the Board of Supervisors
18 fails to Act within 90 days of receipt of the proposed Plan Amendments, then the proposed
19 amendments shall be deemed approved.

20 (g) The Board of Supervisors finds, pursuant to Planning Code Section 340, that the
21 Plan Amendments set forth in this ordinance and in documents on file with the Clerk of the
22 Board in File No. _____ will serve the public necessity, convenience and general
23 welfare for the reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. _____.
24 The Board hereby adopts these Planning Commission findings as its own.

1 (h) The Board of Supervisors finds that the Plan Amendments are, on balance, in
2 conformity with the General Plan, as it is amended by this ordinance, and the eight priority
3 policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 for the reasons set forth in Planning Commission
4 Resolution No. _____. The Board hereby adopts these Planning Commission
5 findings as its own.
6

7 Section 4. Central Waterfront Plan Amendments and General Plan Amendments.

8 (a) The Board of Supervisors hereby approves the Central Waterfront Plan and the
9 General Plan amendments, both as recommended to the Board of Supervisors by the
10 Planning Commission in Resolution No. _____, and directs the Planning
11 Department to update the General Plan's Land Use Index to reflect these amendments.

12 (b) The Central Waterfront Area Plan Amendments.

13 (1) Add a Section 9 to the Central Waterfront Area Plan titled "Public Realm
14 Implementation":

15 **PUBLIC REALM IMPLEMENTATION.**

16 The Planning Department, in partnership with San Francisco Public Works, the San Francisco
17 Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port of San Francisco, and the Recreation and Parks
18 Department, led a robust public process from September 2015 to November 2017 engaging numerous
19 community stakeholders to develop the Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan. The Public
20 Realm Plan developed specific recommendations for implementing Built Form, Transportation, Streets,
21 and Open Space Objectives and Policies of the Central Waterfront Area Plan. The 2018 Central
22 Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan serves as the guiding framework for the investment of
23 complete streets, parks and open spaces within the Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan
24 Area. This Public Realm Plan, which may be amended from time to time at the discretion of the
25 Planning Commission, is incorporated herein by reference.

1 **Objective 9.1 DESIGN AND IMPLEMENT COMPLETE STREETS AND OPEN SPACE**
2 **IMPROVEMENTS CONSISTENT WITH THE CENTRAL WATERFRONT – DOGPATCH**
3 **PUBLIC REALM PLAN.**

4 Policy 9.1.1 Encourage new development in the Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm
5 Plan area to implement complete streets improvements recommended in the 2018 Central Waterfront –
6 Dogpatch Public Realm Plan, pending necessary review and approvals of the pertinent City agencies.

7 Policy 9.1.2 The City shall seek to implement the 2018 Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public
8 Realm Plan to the maximum extent feasible, both through its oversight and permitting of privately
9 sponsored street improvements as well as City-sponsored improvements.

10 (2) Update Map 4, Pedestrian/Bicycle/Traffic Calming Improvements, with a boundary
11 around the Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan area with a line that directs the
12 reader to a reference that states: CENTRAL WATERFRONT -DOGPATCH PUBLIC REALM
13 PLAN: The 2018 Public Realm Plan developed concept designs for Complete Streets and Open Spaces
14 in this Public Realm Plan Area. Please refer to that Public Realm Plan for more specific
15 recommendations for implementation.

16 (3) Update Map 5, Streets and Open Space Concept, with a boundary around the
17 Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan area with a line that directs the reader to a
18 reference that states: CENTRAL WATERFRONT -DOGPATCH PUBLIC REALM PLAN: The 2018
19 Public Realm Plan developed concept designs for Complete Streets and Open Spaces in this Public
20 Realm Plan Area. Please refer to that Public Realm Plan for more specific recommendations for
21 implementation.

22 (c) General Plan Amendments.

23 (1) Recreation and Open Space Element.

24 (i) Amend “Southeastern Waterfront” section of Policy 2.4 as follows:
25

1 The ~~recent~~continued development of Mission Bay, the passage of the Eastern
2 Neighborhoods plans (Mission, East SoMa, ~~and~~Showplace Square/Potrero Hill, and Central
3 Waterfront Area Plans), ~~and the India Basin Shoreline Plan,~~ and the proposed Candlestick Point
4 and Hunters Point Shipyard developments will bring growth, which will require increased
5 access and open spaces throughout the Southeast. Most of these plans are accompanied by
6 preliminary open space strategies for parkland along the waterfront, where active water-
7 oriented uses such as shoreline fishing, swimming, and boating should be promoted. The
8 2018 Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan includes additional, more specific
9 recommendations for the Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan area.

10 (ii) Amend “Blue Greenway: Warm Water Cove” section of Policy 2.4 as follows:

11 This isolated park has the opportunity to be improved and expanded by up to three
12 acres to provide access to the City's eastern shoreline and to provide recreational
13 opportunities to the growing population. The 2018 Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm
14 Plan includes concept designs for this site to guide future expansion and enhancements.

15 (iii) Update Map 1 Existing Open Space and Map 3 Existing and Proposed
16 Open Space with a footnote stating the following: The map is to be used for reference purposes
17 only. For parcel specific details, please refer to adopted area plans. The 2018 Central Waterfront –
18 Dogpatch Public Realm Plan conducted an updated inventory of parks and open spaces within a
19 quarter mile of the Central Waterfront Plan Area.

20 (2) Urban Design Element.

21 (i) Update Map 2, the Plan for Street Landscaping and Lighting map, with the
22 following: Add a boundary around the Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan area
23 with a line that leads to a reference that states: CENTRAL WATERFRONT -DOGPATCH PUBLIC
24 REALM PLAN: The 2018 Public Realm Plan developed concept designs for Complete Streets and
25

1 Open Spaces in this Public Realm Plan area. Please refer to that Public Realm Plan for more specific
2 recommendations for implementation.

3 (3) Transportation Element.

4 (i) Update Map 11, Citywide Pedestrian Network, with the following: Add a
5 boundary around the Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan area with a line that
6 leads to a reference that states: CENTRAL WATERFRONT -DOGPATCH PUBLIC REALM PLAN:
7 The 2018 Public Realm Plan developed concept designs for Complete Streets and Open Spaces in this
8 Public Realm Plan area. Please refer to that Public Realm Plan for more specific recommendations for
9 implementation.

10 (ii) Update Map 12, Neighborhood Pedestrian Streets, with the following: Add a
11 boundary around the Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan area with a line that
12 leads to a reference that states: CENTRAL WATERFRONT -DOGPATCH PUBLIC REALM PLAN:
13 The 2018 Public Realm Plan developed concept designs for Complete Streets and Open Spaces in this
14 Public Realm Plan area. Please refer to that Public Realm Plan for more specific recommendations for
15 implementation.

16 (iii) Update Map 13, Recommended Near-Term and Long-Term Improvements
17 to the Bicycle Route Network, with the following: Add a boundary around the Central
18 Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan area with a line that leads to a reference that
19 states: CENTRAL WATERFRONT -DOGPATCH PUBLIC REALM PLAN: The 2018 Public Realm
20 Plan developed concept designs for Complete Streets and Open Spaces in this Public Realm Plan area.
21 Please refer to that Public Realm Plan for more specific recommendations for implementation.

22
23 Section 5. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
24 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

Section 6. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the "Note" that appears under the official title of the ordinance.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

By: 

JOHN D. MALAMUT
Deputy City Attorney

n:\legals\as2018\1800607\01272313.docx



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Addendum #3 to Environmental Impact Report

Addendum Date: May 2, 2018
Case No.: 2015-001821ENV
Project Title: Dogpatch Public Realm Plan
EIR: Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final EIR
SCL No. 1984061912, certified August 7, 2008
Block/Lots: Various
Lot Size: Various
Project Sponsor: San Francisco Planning Department
Sponsor Contact: Robin Abad, Citywide Planning, 415-575-9123
Lead Agency: San Francisco Planning Department
Staff Contact: Alesia Hsiao – 415-575-9044
alesia.hsiao@sfgov.org

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

The purpose of this addendum to the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final EIR is to substantiate the Planning Department's determination that no supplemental environmental review is required for the proposed Dogpatch Public Realm Plan (DPRP) ("proposed project") because the environmental effects of the DPRP have been adequately analyzed pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") in a Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") previously prepared for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans. This addendum describes the proposed project's relationship to the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans FEIR and the Central Waterfront Area Plan, analyzes the proposed project in the context of the previous environmental review, and summarizes the potential environmental effects that may occur as a result of implementing the DPRP.

BACKGROUND

The Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Project was adopted in December 2008. The project was adopted in part to support housing development in some areas previously zoned for industrial uses, while preserving an adequate supply of space for existing and future production, distribution, and repair ("PDR" or generally light industrial) employment and businesses. The project established new zoning districts that permit PDR uses exclusively; in combination with commercial uses; in districts mixing residential and commercial uses and residential and PDR uses; as well as new residential-only districts. The zoning districts replaced existing industrial, commercial, residential single-use, and mixed-use districts. The project also resulted in amendments to height and bulk districts in some areas to accommodate anticipated residential and commercial growth.

In conjunction with the Planning Code amendments, the Planning Department developed area plans for the East South of Market Area ("East SoMa"), the Mission, Showplace Square/Potrero Hill, and the Central Waterfront for inclusion in the General Plan. These area plans address policy-level issues pertaining to land use, transportation, urban design (including building heights and urban form), open space, housing, historic resources, community facilities and economic development. The overarching objective of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans is to address key policy objectives that both ensure a stable future for PDR businesses in the city, mainly by reserving a certain amount of land for PDR use and also provide a substantial amount of new housing, particularly affordable housing, in appropriate

areas that create “complete neighborhoods” by providing appropriate amenities and services for area residents and workers.

During the Eastern Neighborhoods adoption phase, the Planning Commission held public hearings to consider the various aspects of the proposed area plans, and Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments. On August 7, 2008, the Planning Commission certified the Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR by Motion 176592 and adopted the Preferred Project for final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The mayor signed the final legislation on December 19, 2008.

Final Environmental Impact Report

The Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR is a comprehensive, programmatic document that analyzes the environmental effects of implementing the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, as well as the environmental impacts under several alternative zoning scenarios. The Draft EIR evaluated three rezoning alternatives (“Options A, B and C”), two community-proposed alternatives that focused largely on the Mission District, and a “No Project” alternative. The alternatives varied in the amount of potential area-wide land supply that would be zoned for PDR, mixed-use or residential use compared to existing conditions at the time. Option A retained the greatest amount of land supply for PDR use within the 2,300-acre plan area; Option C the least, and designated comparatively more expansive areas of residential and mixed-use zoning throughout the Eastern Neighborhoods and a lesser amount of land area exclusively for PDR use. Option B sought to balance the disposition of land uses between Options A and C. The alternative selected, or the “Preferred Project”, was analyzed in the EIR’s Response to Comments document and represented a combination of Options B and C. The Planning Commission adopted the Preferred Project after fully considering its environmental effects and the various alternatives discussed in the FEIR.

The Final EIR included analyses of environmental issues associated with amended use and height districts and new General Plan policies including: land use; visual quality and urban design; population, housing, business activity, and employment (growth inducement); transportation; noise; air quality; parks, recreation and open space; shadow; archeological resources; historic architectural resources; hazards; and other issues not addressed in the previously issued initial study for the Eastern Neighborhoods project. No specific development projects were analyzed as part of the FEIR.

On September 12th, 2012, Addendum #1 to the FEIR was published (“Art & Design Educational Special Use District”) that examined environmental impacts of the creation of an Art and Design Special Use District (SUD) and its application to five contiguous lots near 1111 8th Street in the Showplace Square/Potrero Hill Area Plan area. The SUD was intended to facilitate the continued operation of the California College and the Arts and provide a regulatory scheme for a potential future expansion. Addendum #1 concluded that implementation of the SUD would not cause new significant impacts not identified in the FEIR, or result in a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

On March 1, 2017, Addendum #2 to the FEIR was published (“UMU Heights Amendment”), which proposed an ordinance that would amend the San Francisco Planning Code and Zoning Map to prohibit gym and massage uses in the PDR zoning districts, eliminate the Transit-Oriented Retail Special Use District which includes all parcels in PDR districts along 16th Street from Mission Street to Potrero Avenue, and raise the allowable heights of certain parcels within the Urban Mixed Use (UMU) Zoning District. The former two items were not defined as projects under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2) because they do not result in a physical change in the environment. Therefore, Addendum #2 examined only the potential environmental impacts of the UMU Height Amendments. Addendum #2

concluded that implementation of the proposed UMU Height Amendments would not cause new significant impacts not identified in the FEIR, or result in a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce significant impacts.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project sponsor, the Planning Department in coordination with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, San Francisco Public Works, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, and the Port of San Francisco is proposing to implement the DPRP, as an interagency effort to guide public investment in open space infrastructure and streetscape improvements within the Central Waterfront Plan Area. The DPRP builds on the Central Waterfront Area Plan policies and the Blue Greenway Planning and Design Guidelines by addressing several improvement measures to enhance pedestrian safety and support upgrades to existing park and recreation facilities. Specifically, the Central Waterfront Area Plan, adopted in December 2008 includes numerous policies and objectives that call for open space and street improvements to promote the safety, connectivity, and sustainability of the Dogpatch neighborhood. The DPRP was developed as an implementation tool for policies related to open spaces and streetscape improvements in the area. The DPRP area generally encompasses the project area south of Mariposa Street, east of Pennsylvania Street, north of Islais Creek Channel, and west of the San Francisco Bay, excluding the Port's Pier 80 cargo facilities.

This addendum reviews the proposed DPRP in the context of the analysis conducted as part of the FEIR, particularly as captured within the FEIR's land use (zoning) and height district alternatives. Any future projects that could entail new development, changes of use or new uses, or alterations to existing structures and streetscapes that adoption of the DPRP would facilitate are unknown at this time because no specific development projects are proposed and being analyzed at this time. Therefore, future streetscape and open space improvement projects under the DPRP would be subject to project-specific environmental review. Each of the project components is further discussed below. In general, the intent of the proposed improvements is to reinvest in facilities and amenities to make parks and open spaces more resilient, sustainable, and serviceable and to improve the appearance, circulation, access, and pedestrian and bicycle experience along the streets and sidewalks within the Dogpatch neighborhood.

Although project-specific construction details (e.g., construction equipment, duration, amount of excavation, etc.) associated with future streetscape and open space improvements under the DPRP are not known at this time, they are expected to be well within the construction intensity and durations described and evaluated in the FEIR. This is because construction of streetscape improvements and open spaces would generally be less intensive and typically shorter in duration than construction of development projects (e.g., buildings). Moreover, as discussed throughout this Addendum, FEIR mitigation measures that would be applicable to development projects would likewise be applicable to the proposed streetscape and open space improvements under the DPRP.

In general, it is not expected that the proposed streetscape and open space improvement would incentivize new building development throughout the Central Waterfront/Dogpatch area or induce population growth within the Central Waterfront/Dogpatch area beyond what was already considered in the FEIR. Therefore, only direct construction and operational impacts of the DPRP are considered in this Addendum.

Open Space Improvements

The DPRP proposes open space improvements within Esprit Park, Tunnel Top Park, Warm Water Cove Park, Minnesota Grove, Woods Yard Park, and Progress Park, as shown in Figure 1, Proposed Open Space Improvements by the Dogpatch Public Realm Plan, p. 28.

Esprit Park

Esprit Park is a 1.83-acre park located between Minnesota Street and Indiana Street and between 19th Street and 20th Street, owned by San Francisco Recreation and Park Department. Esprit Park is a well-groomed field, bordered with benches, redwood trees, and picnic areas in the southwest and southeast corners. The site elevations vary from 44 feet San Francisco Datum at the northern park boundary to 48 feet San Francisco Datum at the southern park boundary.

The proposed layout of Esprit Park would expand the existing two meadow areas (North and South Meadows) from 31,500 sf, up to 5,000 sf, divided by a universal play area within the central portion of the park. North and South Meadows would be surrounded by trees, forest groves, picnic and seating areas, and parcourse and active equipment areas. The improvements at Esprit Park consist of five key elements including: the restoration of original planting design and tree rehabilitation; addition and replacement of signs, watering stations, trash receptacles, parcourse and active exercise equipment; improvements to paths, hardscapes, sidewalks and streets; providing additional lighting along pedestrian paths; and installation of sub-grade drainage and site engineering services. Hardscape and sidewalk improvements include primary and secondary circulation paths consisting of natural stone paved hardscapes and permeable surfaces, a midblock path entrance on Indiana Street and Minnesota Street, sidewalk, paving, and street planting along the perimeter of Minnesota Street. Streetscape improvements include curb bulb-outs along the north and south corners of Minnesota Street and designing one of the entrances to Esprit Park to accommodate Recreation and Park vehicles.

Tunnel Top Park

Tunnel Top Park is a 0.7-acre park located at 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue on the southwest corner of 25th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, atop the CalTrain tunnel. Tunnel Top Park is owned by CalTrain. The existing site has a flat area and open space for community gathering and recreation. The site elevations vary from 70 feet San Francisco Datum at the northern park boundary to 55 feet San Francisco Datum at the southern park boundary.

The proposed layout of Tunnel Top Park would include an arc like multi-use plaza with performance stage, a dog play area, a universal play area and wooden seating within the central portion of the park. The proposed improvements at Tunnel Top Park consist of internal circulation paths to ensure American with Disabilities Act (ADA) access to park facilities, fencing or similar structures to delineate functional use areas, a solar powered nighttime lighting program, and the development of a planting plan using native and well-adapted species. The improvements at Tunnel Top Park consist of two main elements including the addition of furnishings and equipment and improvements to paths and hardscapes. The addition of furnishings could include concrete seatwalls, wooden seating, overlook areas, a small performance stage, and steel vine structures. Equipment such as a dog play area and a universal play area with play slides could be added. Paths and hardscapes improvements could include site walls along the arc shaped plaza, and internal circulation paths consisting of decomposed granite paving line the park from the western side of the park to the eastern portion of the plaza. A corner bulbout at Pennsylvania and 25th Street and a mid-block bulbout along Pennsylvania Avenue would also be

proposed to help define park entry points and create a gateway aspect. There would be no substantial grading as the park is located atop the Caltrain tunnel.

Warm Water Cove Park

Warm Water Cove Park is a 1.5-acre park located at the end of 24th Street and east of Michigan Street, and owned by the Port of San Francisco. The existing site is within the Blue Greenway¹ offering scenic vistas of the waterfront with narrow walking paths, drought tolerant landscaping, and benches. No lighting currently exists at the park. The site elevations vary from 17 feet San Francisco Datum at the northern park boundary to 10 feet San Francisco Datum at the southeastern park boundary.

The proposed project under the DPRP is to expand the park by approximately 2.5 acres (for a total of approximately 4 acres) to the south including new vegetation, lighting, site furnishings, public art and enhanced safety features, as envisioned in the San Francisco Port's *Blue Green Design Guidelines*. The improvements at Warm Water Cove Park are comprised of six key elements, including planting and landscaping design focused on restoring and preserving coastal grasslands, and coast live oak woodlands; the construction of the landscape stormwater treatment swales and native landscaping to treat stormwater runoff from associated planned adjacent Port Pier 80 (Western Pacific Site) land improvements; the addition of furnishings and equipment utilizing a flex space with outdoor seating areas for community gathering and passive recreation space created with lawn, terraced seating, and drumlin landscape mounds; the addition and improvements to circulation, paths, and hardscapes; the addition of public art features including pier posts, art pavilion, sculpture gardens, steel pergolas, hammock gardens, boulder fields, and gabion walls; and the addition of nighttime lighting designed and located away from sensitive habitat areas. Circulation, paths and hardscapes improvements could include an entry plaza created at 24th Street and 25th Street, which would connect to the Bay Trail. Secondary circulation pathways could be raised with permeable material options including patterned concrete paving, wood, and metal. In addition, a boardwalk located over the landscape swales could be provided for continuous pedestrian circulation, where feasible.

Minnesota Grove

Minnesota Grove is a 0.4-acre area located on Minnesota Street between 24th and 25th Street, and owned by San Francisco Public Works. The existing site is along Minnesota Street, a neighborhood street that has one northbound travel lane and one southbound travel lane. The eastern portion of the site is lined with a retaining wall filled with trees, shrubs, and vegetation. The site elevations vary from 17 feet to 29 feet San Francisco Datum.

Under the DRPR, the proposed layout of Minnesota Grove would be expanded to the south and a continuous pedestrian path with a landscaped buffer would be provided to the intersection of Minnesota and 25th Street. The proposed improvements at Minnesota Grove would reconfigure and regrade the existing path to provide ADA accessibility, provide seating, redesign the existing retaining wall to improve visibility for drivers, and ensure the design and landscape of the expansion carries over the existing theme and surroundings of the area.

¹ The Blue Greenway is a City project to improve a 13-mile-long portion of the 500-mile-long, nine-county, region-wide Bay Trail as well as the newly established San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail and associated waterfront open space system. (Port of San Francisco, *Blue Greenway – Planning and Design Guidelines*. July, 2012. Available: <http://sfport.com/blue-greenway-project>. Accessed April 10, 2018).

Woods Yard Park

Woods Yard Park is a 0.3-acre park located on the southeast corner of 22nd Street and Indiana Street, and owned by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA). Woods Yard Park is a block-long open space with two grassy areas, a few shade trees, and a large sand pit for children. The site elevation is 38 feet San Francisco Datum.

Under the DPRP, the proposed improvements at Woods Yard Park include demolishing existing concrete areas to provide more planted areas, potentially relocating or replacing existing children's play area, addition of more vegetation and trees, installation of solar-powered nighttime lighting, installation of adult fitness equipment, and installation of more seating and benches.

Progress Park

Progress Park is a 0.5-acre open space area located between Indiana and Iowa Streets, north of 25th Street, owned by California Department of Transportation. The park site consists of planted areas and some lightly hardscaped areas with adult exercise equipment. The site elevations vary from 23 feet San Francisco Datum along the northern park boundary to 17 feet San Francisco Datum along the southern park boundary.

The proposed project would expand the park's footprint up to 419,500 square feet into other California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) owned parcels to the north, west, and south. Under the DPRP, the proposed improvements to Progress Park would include additional planted areas, expanded dog play facilities (dog run or dog play area), and active recreation facilities such as sports courts or fields. New nighttime lighting is also proposed.

While the FEIR project description included some open spaces as part of the project description, improvements at Progress Park and Minnesota Grove, specifically, were not anticipated at that time. However, construction characteristics associated with these two parks, as well as their operational uses, would be largely the same as other parks that were considered in the FEIR. Therefore, impacts associated with these two open spaces would not cause new significant impacts not identified in the FEIR, or result in a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce significant impacts at these two open spaces, specifically.

Streetscape Improvements

Plan Area Streetscape Improvements

The DPRP also proposes streetscape improvements, which would include designated and safe pedestrian paths of travel along PDR frontages that do not conflict with PDR operations and loading needs, construction of sidewalks that are currently legislated but unbuilt curb bulb outs, where they don't impede access required of PDR and maritime cargo operations marked crosswalks, raised midblock crossings, and a bike route, as shown in Figure 2, Proposed Street Improvements by the Dogpatch Public Realm Plan, p. 29. Other proposed improvements include the 24th Street Green Connection, improvements along Minnesota Street, providing trees and sidewalk plantings, and a pedestrian-scaled lighting program. Typical improvements that would be made to streets and sidewalks throughout the project area are shown in Figure 3, Types of Streetscape Improvements Recommended for Dogpatch, p. 30, and described in Table 1, Proposed Plan Area Streetscape Improvements.

Table 1: Proposed Plan Area Streetscape Improvements

Proposed Type of Streetscape Improvement	Streetscape Segment / Intersection
1 Sidewalks/Paths of Travel Improvements (including shared streets, textured asphalt, raised crosswalks, etc.) ¹	East and west sides of Michigan between 24 th Street and 25 th Street (New)
	East and west sides of Maryland Street, north of Cesar Chavez Street (New) or a multi-purpose trail if the street is not fully improved
	Various sections along the east and west sides of Tennessee Street between 22 nd Street to Tulare Street (New)
	Various sections along the east and west sides of Minnesota Street between 19 th Street and Cesar Chavez Street (New and/or widening up to 15 feet)
	Various sections along the east and west sides of Pennsylvania Street between 22 nd Street and Cesar Chavez Street (New)
	South side of 19 th Street between Indiana Street and Minnesota Street (Improvements to internal path as part of Esprit Park renovation for ADA compliance)
	North side of 20 th Street between Indiana Street and Tennessee Street (Improvements to internal path as part of Esprit Park renovation for ADA compliance)
	South side of Tubbs Street between Indiana Street and Tennessee Street (New)
	North side of 23 rd Street between Indiana Street and Tennessee Street (Improvements)
	North side of 24 th Street between Illinois Street to Warm Water Cove Park (Widening up to 10 feet)
	South side of 24 th Street between Michigan Street to Warm Water Cove Park (Widening up to an additional 10 feet)
	South side of 25 th Street between Indiana Street and Tennessee Street (New)
	Various sections along the north and south sides of 26 th Street between Indiana Street and 3 rd Street (New)
	Various sections along the north and south sides of Cesar Chavez east of Michigan Street (New or improvements)
	2 Corner Curb Bulb outs
Various sections along Indiana Street from 22 nd Street to Islais Creek (Widening) ²	
Illinois Street and 23 rd Street (northeast, northwest, and southwest corners)	
Illinois Street and 24 th Street (northwest and southwest corners)	
Tennessee Street and Mariposa Street (southwest corner)	
Tennessee Street and 18 th Street (northeast, northwest, and southwest corners)	
Tennessee Street and 23 rd Street (northwest corner) ²	
Tennessee Street and 24 th Street (all four corners)	
Minnesota Street and Mariposa Street (southeast and southwest corners)	
Minnesota Street and 18 th Street (all four corners)	
Minnesota Street and 19 th Street (all four corners)	
Minnesota Street and 20 th Street (northeast, northwest, and southeast corners)	
Minnesota Street and 24 th Street (northeast and northwest corners)	
Minnesota Street and 25 th Street (northeast and southeast corners)	
Indiana Street and Mariposa Street (southeast and southwest corners)	
Indiana Street and 19 th Street (northeast and southeast corners)	
Indiana Street and 20 th Street (northeast and northwest corners)	
Indiana Street and Tubbs Street (northeast and southeast corners) ²	
Indiana Street and 25 th Street (northeast and southeast corners) ²	
Indiana Street and Cesar Chavez Street (all four corners) ²	
Indiana Street and Marin Street (northeast and southeast corners) ²	
Pennsylvania Street and 25 th Street (southwest corner)	
3 Marked Crosswalks	Illinois Street at 23 rd Street, 24 th Street, Cesar Chavez Street (3 intersections)
	3 rd Street at Cesar Chavez Street (1 intersection)
	Tennessee Street at 18 th Street, Tubbs Street, 23 rd Street, 24 th Street, 25 th Street, 26 th Street, Cesar Chavez Street (7 intersections)

Table 1: Proposed Plan Area Streetscape Improvements (continued)

Proposed Type of Streetscape Improvement		Streetscape Segment / Intersection
3	Marked Crosswalks	Minnesota Street at 23 rd Street, 24 th Street, 25 th Street, 26 th Street, Cesar Chavez Street (5 intersections)
		Indiana Street at 18 th Street, 20 th Street, Tubbs Street, 23 rd Street, 25 th Street (5 intersections)
		Pennsylvania Street at 22 nd Street, 25 th Street (2 intersections)
		19 th Street at Indiana Street (1 intersection)
		Michigan Street (1 intersection)
4	Raised Mid-block Crossings	Tennessee Street between 20 th Street and 22 nd Street
		Minnesota Street between 20 th Street and 22 nd Street
5	Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities (including sidewalk planting and trees, street furnishing and lighting, bicycle lanes, bicycle parking, bicycle share stations, etc.)	Class III Bike facilities on 24 th Street between Illinois Street to Warm Water Cove Park and on 19 th Street between Indiana Street and Minnesota Street, and Class II bicycle facilities with sharrows on Minnesota Street between 19 th Street and Mariposa Street
		Boardwalk located over the wetlands within Warm Water Cove Park
Notes:		
1. New sidewalks could be up to legislated sidewalk widths or per Better Streets Plan recommendations. Improvements are unknown at this time.		
2. Sidewalk widening and new corner bulbouts are a part of San Francisco Public Works capital plan priority projects.		
Source: Citywide Planning, San Francisco Planning Department, <i>Central Waterfront Public Realm Plan Public Review Draft</i> , January 30, 2018.		

24th Street Green Connection

The proposed street improvements for the 24th Street Green Connection are generally located between Minnesota Street and Warm Water Cove Park. The current condition of 24th Street varies from block to block with minimal planting such as street trees and landscaping, and missing and discontinuous sidewalks. No bicycle facilities are available along 24th Street. Under the DPRP, the proposed improvements along 24th Street would include the establishment of a dedicated *class III* bicycle routes, completing the sidewalk network, installing corner curb bulb-outs (as defined in Table 1 above) and intersection cross walks, and providing landscape planter areas and street trees. In addition, a reduction in the street width for a portion of the section east of Michigan Street is proposed. Certain curb bulb-outs improvements would need to be considered in the context of the maritime and industrial needs of those streets that serve the Port’s maritime operations and other nearby industrial users.

Minnesota Street Improvements

The proposed street improvements along Minnesota Street would include two segments of the street, between Cesar Chavez Street and Tubbs Street, and Tubbs Street and Mariposa Street. Current conditions of Minnesota Street varies by block with minimal tree planting and sidewalk planting, north of 19th Street and south of 23rd Street, as well as discontinuous sidewalks south of 23rd Street. Under DPRP, the proposed improvements along Minnesota Street would include designated and safe pedestrian paths of travel along PDR frontages that do not conflict with PDR operations and loading needs, installation of corner bulbouts and marked crosswalks, planting of trees and other vegetation along sidewalks, and a pedestrian-scaled lighting program. Additional street improvements include raised, midblock crossings between 20th Street and 22nd Street along Minnesota Street.

Regulatory Setting

Planning Code

The open space improvements sites are located in the Public (P), Urban Mixed Use (UMU), Light Industrial (M-1), Heavy Industrial (M-2), Production, Distribution and Repair–1–General (PDR-1-G) Use Districts. As stated in Planning Code Section 211, the P District is applied to “land that is owned by a governmental agency and in some form of public use, including open space. Within the P District, allowed uses include public structures and uses of City and County of San Francisco and of other governmental agencies, accessory nonpublic uses, neighborhood agriculture, city plazas, temporary uses, and publicly-owned and operated wireless telecommunications services facilities.” The UMU District is intended to promote a vibrant mix of uses while maintaining the characteristics of this formerly industrially-zoned area. Within the UMU District, allowed uses include PDR uses such light manufacturing, home and business services, arts activities, warehouse, and wholesaling. Additional permitted uses include retail, educational facilities, nighttime entertainment, outdoor activity areas and open space. As stated in Planning Code Section 210.4, the M-1 District is “more suitable for smaller industries dependent upon truck transportation, while the M-2 District are more suitable for larger industries served by rail and water transportation and by large utility lines. In M-1 Districts, most industries are permitted, but some with particularly noxious characteristics are excluded. The permitted industries in the M-1 District have certain requirements as to enclosure, screening, and minimum distance from Residential Districts. The M-2 District is the least restricted as to use and are located at the eastern edge of the City, separated from residential and commercial areas. The heavier industries are permitted, with fewer requirements as to screening and enclosure than in M-1 District, but many of these uses are permitted only as conditional uses or at a considerable distance from Residential Districts.” As stated in Planning Code Section 210.3, the intention of the PDR-1-G District is to “retain and encourage existing production, distribution, and repair activities and promote new business formation. Thus, the PDR-1-G District prohibits residential and office uses, and limits retail and institutional uses. Additionally, this district allows for more intensive PDR activities than PDR-1-B and PDR-1-D but less intensive than PDR-2. Generally, all other uses are permitted.” The goals of the proposed project aim to build on the Central Waterfront Area Plan policies and the Blue Greenway Planning and Design Guidelines by addressing improvement measures to improve pedestrian circulation and safety and to support upgrades to existing park and recreation facilities.

The open space improvements sites are located in the Open Space (OS), 40-X, 58-X, 65-J, Height and Bulk Districts. Article 2.5 of the Planning Code regulates the height and bulk of structures consistent with the Urban Design element and other elements of the General Plan. Height and Bulk Districts have been established for all parcels in the city for a variety of purposes, including relating the height of new buildings to important attributes of the City pattern and existing development, avoiding an overwhelming or dominating appearance in new construction, preserving and improving the integrity of open spaces and public areas, promoting harmony in the visual relationships between old and new buildings and protecting important city resources and the neighborhood environment. The proposed project is intended to address improvement measures to enhance pedestrian safety and support maintenance upgrades park and recreation facilities in Central Waterfront Area Plan consistent with these purposes.

Changes in the Regulatory Environment

Since the certification of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR in 2008, several new policies, regulations, statutes, and funding measures have been adopted, passed, or are underway that affect the physical

environment and/or environmental review methodology for projects in the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas. As discussed in each topic area referenced below, these policies, regulations, statutes, and funding measures have implemented or will implement mitigation measures or further reduce less-than-significant impacts identified in the FEIR. These include:

- State legislation amending CEQA to eliminate consideration of aesthetics and parking impacts for infill projects in transit priority areas, effective January 2014.
- State legislation amending CEQA and San Francisco Planning Commission resolution replacing level of service (LOS) analysis of automobile delay with vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis, effective March 2016 (see “CEQA Section 21099” heading below).
- The adoption of interim controls requiring additional design standards for large project authorizations within the Showplace Square/Potrero Hill and Central Waterfront plan areas of the Eastern Neighborhoods effective February 2016 through August 2017.
- The adoption of 2016 interim controls in the Mission District requiring additional information and analysis regarding housing affordability, displacement, loss of PDR and other analyses, effective January 14, 2016 through January 14, 2018.
- San Francisco Bicycle Plan update adoption in June 2009, Better Streets Plan adoption in 2010, Transit Effectiveness Project (aka “Muni Forward”) adoption in March 2014, Vision Zero adoption by various City agencies in 2014, Proposition A and B passage in November 2014, and the Transportation Sustainability Program (see addendum Transportation section).
- San Francisco ordinance establishing Noise Regulations Related to Residential Uses near Places of Entertainment effective June 2015 (see addendum Noise section).
- San Francisco ordinances establishing Construction Dust Control, effective July 2008, and Enhanced Ventilation Required for Urban Infill Sensitive Use Developments, amended December 2014 (see addendum Air Quality section).
- San Francisco Clean and Safe Parks Bond passage in November 2012 and San Francisco Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan adoption in April 2014 (see addendum Recreation section).
- Urban Water Management Plan adoption in 2011 and Sewer System Improvement Program process (see addendum Utilities and Service Systems section).
- Article 22A of the Health Code amendments effective August 2013 (see addendum Hazardous Materials section).

Aesthetics and Parking

In accordance with CEQA section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for Transit Oriented Projects – aesthetics and parking shall not be considered in determining if a project has the potential to result in significant environmental effects, provided the project meets all of the following three criteria:

- a) The project is in a transit priority area²
- b) The project is on an infill site³

² According to SB 743, a “transit priority is defined as an area within one-half mile of an existing or planned major transit stop. A “major transit stop” is defined in Section 21064.3 of the California Public Resources Code as a rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.”

³ According to SB 743 an “infill site means a lot located within an urban area that has been previously developed, or on a vacant site where at least 75 percent of the perimeter of the site adjoins, or is separated only by an improved public right-of-way from, parcels that are developed with qualified urban uses.”

c) The project is residential, mixed-use residential, or an employment center⁴

The proposed project does not meet all of the above criteria. The DPRP would guide public investment of open space infrastructure and streetscape projects within the Central Waterfront Plan Area and would not meet criterion c) since the proposed DPRP would not involve projects that are residential, mixed-use residential, or an employment center. Thus, for the purposes of a conservative analysis, the addendum considers aesthetics and parking in determining the significance of the proposed project impacts under CEQA for all components of the proposed project. The Aesthetics section, p. 12, evaluates whether the project would result in a significant CEQA impact on aesthetics. The Transportation and Circulation section evaluates whether the project would result in a significant CEQA impact on parking.

REMARKS

The Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final EIR identified less-than significant environmental impacts in the following environmental topic areas: Visual Quality and Urban Design; Population, Housing, Business Activity and Employment (Growth Inducement); Parks, Recreation and Open Space; Mineral and Agricultural Resources; Wind; Utilities and Public Services; Biology; Geology/Topography; Water; and Energy and Natural Resources. The Final EIR found the following effects that can be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level with mitigation measures incorporated in the following areas: Archeological Resources; Noise; and Air Quality.

The FEIR found the following significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the adoption of the Eastern Neighborhoods zoning and area plans: Land Use; Transportation, including traffic and transit; Historic Architectural Resources; and Shadow.

As described under “Project Description” on p. 3 of this addendum, the proposed project would not amend the open space improvement sites’ existing height and bulk districts. Because the proposed project would rely on base zoning within the Central Waterfront Plan Area, the land use characteristics of the proposed DPRP fall within the range of alternatives included in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans FEIR.

ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

San Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.19(c)(1) states that a modified project must be reevaluated and that “If, on the basis of such reevaluation, the Environmental Review Officer determines, based on the requirements of CEQA, that no additional environmental review is necessary, this determination and the reasons therefore shall be noted in writing in the case record, and no further evaluation shall be required by this Chapter.”

CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 provides for the use of an addendum to document the basis of a lead agency’s decision not to require a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR for a project that is already adequately covered in an existing certified EIR. The lead agency’s decision to use an addendum must be supported by substantial evidence that the conditions that would trigger the preparation of a Subsequent EIR, as provided in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, are not present.

Since certification of the EIR, no changes have occurred in the circumstances under which the original project (e.g., zoning and map amendments and adoption of area plans) as currently proposed would be implemented, that would change the severity of the physical impacts of implementing the Central

⁴ According to SB 743, an “employment center project means a project located on property zoned for commercial uses with a floor area ratio of no less than 0.75 and that is located within a transit priority area.”

Waterfront Area Plan as explained herein, and no new information has emerged that would materially change the analyses or conclusions set forth in the FEIR.

Further, the proposed DPRP, as demonstrated below, would not result in any new significant environmental impacts, substantial increases in the significance of previously identified effects, or necessitate implementation of additional or considerably different mitigation measures than those identified in the FEIR. The effects associated with the legislative amendment would be substantially the same as those reported for the project in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans FEIR. Moreover, any individual streetscape or open space improvements undertaken under the DPRP would be subject to review by the Planning Department to determine if the project would result in potential impacts to the environment.

Land Use and Land Use Planning

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR evaluates land use effects based on three adopted criteria: whether a project would physically divide an existing community; conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or, have a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity.

The FEIR determined that implementation of the area plans would not create any new physical barriers in the Eastern Neighborhoods because the rezoning and area plans do not provide for any new major roadways, such as freeways that would disrupt or divide the plan area or individual neighborhoods or subareas. The proposed project provides a plan for future open space and streetscape improvements within the DPRP. Implementation of the proposed project would allow for future open space and streetscape improvements on certain parcels within the Central Waterfront/Dogpatch neighborhood and would not include any land use changes. These open space and streetscape improvements, including maintenance upgrades to park and recreation facilities and better connections and enhanced pedestrian safety between the open spaces and surrounding streets, would be consistent with the density and intensity of the existing urban environment and would not cause substantial adverse impact on the existing character of these land use districts.

In terms of land use compatibility, adoption of the DPRP would support the types of uses that already exist in the project areas. The DPRP was developed as an implementation tool for policies related to open spaces and streets within the Central Waterfront Area Plan. The DPRP provides a plan for future streetscape and open space improvements to enhance pedestrian safety and to support upgrades to existing park and recreation facilities. Thus, the DPRP is not anticipated to result in any land use impacts of greater severity than those reported in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. As the proposed project would not amend the open space improvement sites' existing height and bulk districts and would rely on the existing zoning within the area, adoption of the DPRP would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

In the cumulative context, the FEIR found that adoption of the preferred Eastern Neighborhoods use districts and zoning controls would result in a significant, adverse impact in the cumulative supply of land for PDR uses and would not be mitigable without substantial change in use controls on land under

Port of San Francisco jurisdiction. The finding was based on supply, demand and land use projections prepared for the Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR.⁵

The FEIR found that industrially-zoned land and PDR building space is expected to decrease over the foreseeable future. The use districts and zoning controls adopted as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans are expected to accommodate housing and primarily management, information, and professional service land uses within the area over time. The proposed project would involve improvements to existing open space and streetscape areas and expand into Caltrans-owned parcels within the DPRP area. Other than expanding into Caltrans-owned parcels, no other development parcels would be affected. Based on the above, the proposed project would not result in any new significant land use impacts, substantial increases in the significance of previously identified traffic effects, or necessitate implementation of additional or considerably different mitigation measures than those identified in the FEIR.

Aesthetics

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR noted that natural boundaries in the Central Waterfront area include the San Francisco Bay, which defines the eastern edge of the plan area and Islais Creek, which defines the southern edge of the plan area. Built elements such as the I-280 freeway define the western edge of the plan area and create a border between Central Waterfront and Potrero Hill. The FEIR concluded that with implementation of the design policies proposed as part of the area plans, future development would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the area, have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, substantially damage scenic resources that contribute to a scenic public setting, or create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or which would substantially impact other people or properties. The FEIR found that no direct change in visual quality would occur and all of the indirect visual effects of development that could occur would occur over a lengthy period of time. Given that aesthetic impacts are inherently subjective and given the changes would occur within a highly developed urban environment and would be guided by the urban design principles contained within the area plans, the FEIR could not conclude that there was a significant adverse effect on visual quality and urban design.

The proposed project would alter some public views as well as visual character of the open spaces, streets, and its immediate surroundings, similar to those identified in the FEIR. The proposed project would result in visual changes to the existing open spaces associated with replacing trees and landscaping, adding furnishings and equipment, refining circulation paths, adding lighting and public art and visual changes to the existing streets associated with the construction and widening of sidewalks, addition of corner bulbouts, marked crosswalks, raised midblock crossings, a bike route, sharrows, and a boardwalk. The addition of these physical elements would not adversely affect the aesthetics of the open spaces and streetscapes and would contribute to a greater sense of overall visual quality and organization associated with specific functions for pedestrians and bicyclists than currently exists. For example, the addition of trees and landscaping within the open space areas would provide shade, function as a buffer between the travel lanes and sidewalks, and add aesthetic value by softening the edges of the urban landscape that currently exists. In addition, bulbouts at corners, marked crosswalks, and raised midblock crossings would result in traffic calming and enhanced sight lines for both motorists and pedestrians at crossings. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities along 24th Street, 19th Street, Minnesota Street, and within Warm Water Cove Park would provide visually delineated paths of travel for

⁵ *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final EIR*, p. 77. This document is available for review in Case File No. 2011.1381E at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA.

pedestrians, cyclists as well as for motorists. No unique scenic resources would be adversely affected. This would not result any additional or more severe aesthetics impacts than were identified in the FEIR.

The proposed project would result in installation of additional lighting along pedestrian paths, nighttime lighting, and street lighting. Street lighting would operate in accordance with current City regulations and would not result in adverse light and glare effects, similar to those discussed in the FEIR. As a result, the proposed project's physical features would not affect a scenic vista, nor would it create new sources of substantial light or glare, or cast shadows. Therefore, the proposed project would have no significant impacts with respect to public views, scenic vistas, light, or glare. Thus, similar to the conclusions reached in the FEIR, there would be no significant adverse impacts related to aesthetics and visual character resulting from the proposed project.

Historic Architectural and Archeological Resources

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR found that implementation of areawide zoning controls would result in a significant, adverse environmental impact related to historical resources. Demolition or significant alteration of buildings that are identified as historical resources, potential resources, or age-eligible properties could be anticipated to occur as a result of development subsequent to implementation of the zoning and area plans. The FEIR indicates that such impacts could occur individually (to single buildings) as well as cumulatively (to known or potential historic districts).

The DPRP does not propose the demolition or significant alteration of a historical resource such that the significance of the historical resource would be impaired. However, the proposed DPRP provides guidance for implementation of open space and streetscape improvement projects. Due to the programmatic nature of the proposed DPRP, it is not known at this time if future development would involve a request for demolition or significant alteration of a historic resource. Any development proposal undertaken in San Francisco is subject to review to determine whether the project would result in potential impacts to the environment, including historical resources. When an Environmental Evaluation Application is filed with the Environmental Planning Division of the Planning Department for a project that would result in demolition or alteration of an individual historic architectural resource or a contributor to a historic district or conservation district, or would result in new construction within or immediately adjacent to such a district, Preservation staff will conduct an initial evaluation of the building and of the proposed project. Should staff determine that there is potential for the project to materially alter an individual resource or an important historic characteristic of the district, the project sponsor will be required to contract for preparation of an Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) by a qualified professional consultant who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards in Historic Architecture, Architectural History, History, or Preservation Planning. If, through this process, a significant impact on a resource or a district is identified and concurred with by Preservation staff and the Environmental Review Officer (ERO), mitigation measures and alternatives will be required to avoid or reduce the impact on the resource or the district to a less-than-significant level, if feasible. Any new development, alterations, or additions to existing structures within the DPRP would be required to undergo a separate development review process and be subject to standards and guidelines created at that time. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant effect on historical resources.

Implementation of the DPRP could include excavation or other construction methods that could disturb archeological resources. The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR determined that implementation of the Area Plan could result in significant impacts on archeological resources and identified three mitigation measures that would reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level. Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR Mitigation Measure J-1 applies to properties for which a final archeological

research design and treatment plan (ARDTP) is on file at the Northwest Information Center and the Planning Department and calls for the development of an addendum to the ARDTP that includes the development of an archeological testing program. Mitigation Measure J-2 applies to properties for which no archeological assessment report has been prepared or for which the archeological documentation is incomplete or inadequate to serve as an evaluation of potential effects on archeological resources under CEQA and calls for the development of ARDTP or other appropriate action for the treatment of archeological resources. Mitigation Measure J-3, which applies to properties in the Mission Dolores Archeological District, requires that a specific archeological testing program be conducted by a qualified archeological consultant with expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. Both J-1 and J-2 are applicable for the DPRP.

Any future projects that could entail new development, changes of use or new uses, or alterations to existing structures and streetscapes that adoption of the DPRP would facilitate are unknown at this time because no specific development projects are proposed and being analyzed at this time. Any development proposal undertaken in San Francisco is subject to review to determine whether the project would result in potential impacts to the environment, including archeological resources. Impacts to archeological resources can only be understood once a specific project has been proposed because the effects are highly dependent on both the individual project site conditions and the characteristics of the proposed ground-disturbing activity. For any project involving any soils-disturbing or soils improving activities including excavation, utilities installation, grading, soils remediation, compaction/chemical grouting would be subject to Archeology Review (PAR) by the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist. Based on the PAR, the ERO shall determine if there is a potential for future individual projects to result in an effect to an archeological resource, including human remains, and, if so, what further actions are warranted to reduce the potential effect of the project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any new significant archeological impacts, substantial increases in the significance of previously identified effects, or necessitate implementation of additional or considerably different mitigation measures than those identified in the FEIR.

Transportation

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes would not result in significant impacts related to pedestrians, bicyclists, loading, or construction traffic. The FEIR states that in general, the analyses of pedestrian, bicycle, loading, emergency access, and construction transportation impacts are specific to individual development projects, and that project-specific analyses would need to be conducted for future development projects under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans.

The proposed project would include streetscape improvements throughout the plan area. As described in Table 1 of the project description (p. 6), streetscape changes would include installing new sidewalks, widening existing sidewalks in approximately 16 areas, 48 new corner bulb-outs, new crosswalks at 25 intersections, 3 new raised mid-block crosswalks, new *class III* bicycle facilities⁶ on 24th Street between Illinois Street and Warm Water Cove Park and on 19th Street between Indiana Street and Minnesota Street, new *class II* sharrows⁷ on Minnesota Street between 19th Street and Mariposa Street, a pedestrian

⁶ Class III bicycle facilities are typically wide travel lanes shared by bikes and vehicles. They are commonly marked with sharrows and wayfinding signs to indicate shared use and the direction of travel.

⁷ Class II bicycle facilities with sharrows are typically bike lanes where a portion of the road is reserved for the preferential or the exclusive use of bicyclists and marked with sharrows.

boardwalk over the wetlands within Warm Water Cove Park, and a 10 foot reduction of the width of the street width on 24th Street from Michigan Street to Warm Water Cove Park. Other project features include enhancements at the following existing parks: Esprit Park, Tunnel Top Park, Warm Water Cove Park, Minnesota Grove Park, Woods Park, and Progress Park.

Traffic and Vehicle Miles Traveled

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR included a level of service analysis at 40 study intersections within the plan area, eight within the Central Waterfront subarea. However, as discussed above under “Senate Bill 743,” in response to state legislation that called for removing automobile delay from CEQA analysis, the Planning Commission adopted resolution 19579 replacing automobile delay with a vehicle miles travelled metric for analyzing transportation impacts of a project. Therefore, impacts and mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR associated with automobile delay are not discussed in this addendum.

The proposed project is to provide a plan for future streetscape and open space improvements in the Central Waterfront/Dogpatch neighborhood, and would not include any land use changes. While the proposed would include new and enhanced public open spaces at Esprit Park, Tunnel Top Park, Warm Water Cove, Minnesota Grove, Woods Park, Progress Park, it is anticipated that these spaces would be used by people in the neighborhood, since they are local neighborhood parks rather than citywide or regional destinations. Thus, the proposed project would not result in nor enable an increase in vehicle trips.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any new significant traffic impacts, substantial increases in the significance of previously identified traffic effects, or necessitate implementation of additional or considerably different mitigation measures than those identified in the FEIR.

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

Many factors affect travel behavior. These factors include density, diversity of land uses, design of the transportation network, access to regional destinations, distance to high-quality transit, development scale, demographics, and transportation demand management. Typically, low-density development at great distance from other land uses, located in areas with poor access to non-private vehicular modes of travel, generate more automobile travel compared to development located in urban areas, where a higher density, mix of land uses, and travel options other than private vehicles are available.

Given these travel behavior factors, San Francisco has a lower vehicle miles travelled ratio than the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area region. In addition, some areas of the city have lower vehicle miles travelled ratios than other areas of the city. These areas of the city can be expressed geographically through transportation analysis zones. Transportation analysis zones are used in transportation planning models for transportation analysis and other planning purposes. The zones vary in size from single city blocks in the downtown core, multiple blocks in outer neighborhoods, to even larger zones in historically industrial areas like the Hunters Point Shipyard.

The San Francisco County Transportation Authority uses the San Francisco Chained Activity Model Process (SF-CHAMP) to estimate VMT by private automobiles and taxis for different land use types. Travel behavior in SF-CHAMP is calibrated based on observed behavior from the California Household Travel Survey 2010-2012, Census data regarding automobile ownership rates and county-to-county worker flows, and observed vehicle counts and transit boardings. SF-CHAMP uses a synthetic

population, which is a set of individual actors that represents the Bay Area’s actual population, who make simulated travel decisions for a complete day. The transportation authority uses tour-based analysis for retail, office, residential, and other land uses, such as day care centers, which examines the entire chain of trips over the course of a day, not just trips to and from the project. For retail uses, the transportation authority uses trip-based analysis, which counts VMT from individual trips to and from the project (as opposed to entire chain of trips). A trip-based approach, as opposed to a tour-based approach, is necessary for retail projects because a tour is likely to consist of trips stopping in multiple locations, and the summarizing of tour VMT to each location would over-estimate VMT.^{8,9}

A project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would cause substantial additional VMT. The State Office of Planning and Research’s (OPR) *Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* (“proposed transportation impact guidelines”) recommends screening criteria to identify types, characteristics, or locations of projects that would not result in significant impacts to VMT. If a project meets one of the three screening criteria provided (*map-based screening, small projects, and proximity to transit stations*), then it is presumed that VMT impacts would be less than significant for the project and a detailed VMT analysis is not required. Map-based screening is used to determine if a project site is located within a transportation analysis zone that exhibits low levels of VMT; small projects are projects that would generate fewer than 100 vehicle trips per day; and the proximity to transit stations criterion includes projects that are within a half mile of an existing major transit stop, have a floor area ratio of greater than or equal to 0.75, vehicle parking that is less than or equal to that required or allowed by the planning code without conditional use authorization, and are consistent with the applicable sustainable communities strategy.

Induced Travel Demand

A project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would substantially induce additional automobile travel by increasing physical roadway capacity in congested areas (i.e., by adding new mixed-flow lanes) or by adding new roadways to the network. OPR’s proposed transportation impact guidelines includes a list of transportation project types that would not likely lead to a substantial or measureable increase in VMT. If a project fits within the general types of projects (including combinations of types), then it is presumed that VMT impacts would be less than significant and a detailed VMT analysis is not required.

The proposed project is not a transportation project. However, the project would include features that would alter the transportation network. These features include new bulb-outs, crosswalks, bicycle facilities, sidewalks, street trees, pedestrian/bicyclist pathways, and a reduction in the street width on 24th Street from Michigan Street to Warm Water Cove Park. These features fit within the general types of projects that would not substantially induce automobile travel.

⁸ To state another way: a tour-based assessment of VMT at a retail site would consider the VMT for all trips in the tour, for any tour with a stop at the retail site. If a single tour stops at two retail locations, for example, a coffee shop on the way to work and a restaurant on the way back home, then both retail locations would be allotted the total tour VMT. A trip-based approach allows us to apportion all retail-related VMT to retail sites without double-counting.

⁹ San Francisco Planning Department, Executive Summary: Resolution Modifying Transportation Impact Analysis, Appendix F, Attachment A, March 3, 2016.

Moreover, the proposed project does not include any land use development and would not enable or incentivize land use development. Thus, it is not anticipated to increase VMT in the plan area, and would not result in any new impacts or necessitate implementation of additional or considerably different mitigation measures than those identified in the FEIR.

Transit

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes could result in significant impacts on transit ridership, and identified seven transportation mitigation measures. Even with mitigation, however, it was anticipated that the significant adverse cumulative impacts on transit lines could not be reduced to a less than significant level. Thus, these impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable.

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in an incremental increase in the demand for public transit. The proposed project, which would include new bulb-outs, crosswalks, sidewalks, pedestrian/bicyclist pathways, and open space, is not anticipated to induce growth and generate new transit trips beyond those identified and analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. For these reasons, the proposed project would not cause a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity.

Muni routes 8BX Bayshore B Express, 14X Mission Express, 22 Fillmore, and 48 Quintara/24th Street operate within the project area. The design of the proposed bulb-outs would be subject to review and approval by the SFMTA. SFMTA review would ensure the bulb-outs are designed to accommodate turns by Muni vehicles. Thus, the proposed new bulb-outs would not interfere with transit operations. Under the proposed project, the 24th Street would be reduced from to 33 feet to approximately 23 feet from east of Michigan Street to Warm Water Cove Park and *class III* bicycle facilities would be installed on 24th Street from Illinois Street to Warm Water Cove Park. As the proposed bike lane on 24th Street would not be located within an existing transit only lane and there are no transit routes along this portion of 24th Street, the proposed right-of-way reduction would not result in transit delays. Similarly, the proposed *class II* bicycle facilities on Minnesota Street between 19th Street and Mariposa Street and the proposed *class III* bicycle facilities on 19th Street between Indiana Street and Minnesota Street would not be located within an existing transit only lane and there are no transit routes along these portions of Minnesota Street and 19th Street. Thus, these bicycle facilities would not result in transit delay.

Other project features include new crosswalks and sidewalks within the project area, as described above in the Project Description section. This includes widening the sidewalk on the north side of 24th Street between Illinois Street to Warm Water Cove Park, widening various sections of the existing sidewalks along the east and west sides of Minnesota Street between 19th Street and Cesar Chavez Street, widening various sections of Indiana Street from 22nd Street to Islais Creek, and modifications to existing sidewalks along the north and south sides of Cesar Chavez Street east of Michigan Street and the north and south sides of Marin Street between Indiana and Tennessee streets and east of Michigan Street. The 22 Fillmore bus line runs through the location of the proposed new crosswalk at the intersection of 18th Street/Indiana Street and the 48 Quintara/24th Street route runs through the location of the proposed new crosswalks at the intersections of 22nd Street/Pennsylvania Street, and 25th Street/Pennsylvania Street. These new crosswalks would be installed at existing intersections and would not be signalized or stop controlled. There are no transit routes along the other streets where new cross walks are proposed. The SFMTA and San Francisco Public Works would review the proposed new sidewalks, widening of existing sidewalks and sidewalk modifications to ensure that the travel lanes on the streets adjacent to these sidewalks would be of an adequate width to provide access for vehicles, including transit buses.

For these reasons, the proposed new crosswalks, sidewalks, sidewalk widening, and other modifications would not result in transit delays. Thus, the proposed project would not result in new significant impacts on transit service levels beyond what was analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any new significant transit impacts, substantial increases in the significance of previously identified effects, or necessitate implementation of additional or considerably different mitigation measures than those identified in the FEIR.

Pedestrians

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes would not result in significant impacts related to pedestrians. The proposed project is not anticipated to induce growth that would generate pedestrian trips. The proposed project does not include any changes that would create overcrowding of neighboring sidewalks, create hazardous conditions for pedestrians or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility. As noted in the FEIR (pp. 287), traffic calming measures, such as bulb-outs and ladder (i.e., striped) crosswalks, would enhance pedestrian travel and safety. The proposed project would improve pedestrian facilities through 48 new corner bulb-outs, new striped crosswalks at 25 intersections, 3 new raised mid-block crosswalks, new sidewalks and widened sidewalks in 15 areas, and the pedestrian/bicyclist pathways proposed for Warm Water Cove. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any new significant pedestrian impacts, substantial increases in the significance of previously identified effects, or necessitate implementation of additional or considerably different mitigation measures than those identified in the FEIR.

Bicycle

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes would not result in significant impacts related to bicycles. The proposed project is not anticipated to induce growth that would generate bicycle trips. The proposed project does not include any changes that would create hazardous conditions for pedestrians or otherwise interfere with bicycle accessibility. Bicycle conditions would be improved by through the proposed traffic calming measures, the new *class III* bicycle facilities proposed for 24th Street between Illinois and Warm Water Cove Park, and the pedestrian/bicyclist pathways proposed for Warm Water Cove. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any new significant bicycle impacts, substantial increases in the significance of previously identified effects, or necessitate implementation of additional or considerably different mitigation measures than those identified in the FEIR.

Construction

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes would not result in significant transportation-related construction impacts. Implementation of the proposed project would include construction of the streetscape elements (bulb-outs, crosswalks, sidewalks, bike facilities) and the public open spaces. Many of the proposed project's elements would be constructed as part of open space and streetscape improvements identified in the Central Waterfront Area Plan and Blue Greenway Planning and Design Guidelines. In addition, the FEIR anticipated construction in the Central Waterfront Area would result in additional traffic from truck movements to and from project sites, but that these effects would be temporary and intermittent, and impacts would be less than significant. Thus, the proposed project would not result in more construction activity than what was anticipated in the FEIR. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any new significant transportation-related construction impacts, substantial increases in the significance of previously identified effects, or requirement for additional or considerably different mitigation measures than those identified in the FEIR.

Loading

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes would not result in significant impacts related to loading. The proposed project is not a land use development project, and is not anticipated to induce growth that would generate loading trips. The proposed project would alter existing sidewalk facilities and add 48 new curb bulb-outs. While the new bulb-outs would reduce the space available for loading activities, the potential reduction in loading space in the plan area is not anticipated to create potentially hazardous conditions affecting traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians or significant delays affecting transit. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any new significant loading impacts, substantial increases in the significance of previously identified effects, or necessitate implementation of additional or considerably different mitigation measures than those identified in the FEIR.

Parking

San Francisco does not consider parking supply as part of the permanent physical environment and therefore, does not consider changes in parking conditions to be environmental impacts as defined by CEQA. Parking deficits are considered to be social effects, rather than impacts on the physical environment as defined by CEQA. Under CEQA, a project's social impacts need not be treated as significant impacts on the environment. Parking conditions are not static, as parking supply and demand varies from day to day, from day to night, from month to month, etc. Hence, the availability of parking spaces (or lack thereof) is not a permanent physical condition, but changes over time as people change their modes and patterns of travel.

However, the potential secondary effects of parking availability are analyzed to determine whether a substantial deficit in parking caused by a project creates hazardous conditions affecting traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians or significant delays affecting transit or render other modes of travel infeasible, depending on the project and its setting. The proposed project includes streetscape changes and new recreational facilities, and would not include any land use development or enable land use development. Thus, the proposed project would not increase parking demand in the area covered by the Dogpatch Public Realm Plan. The proposed streetscape changes could reduce the amount of on-street parking in the Dogpatch Public Realm Plan area the locations of the proposed changes. However, these changes would add or widen existing sidewalks, add new bulbouts, and add new bicycle facilities, thereby improving conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists. As discussed above, the proposed changes would be reviewed by the SFMTA prior to approval, ensuring the proposed project would not result significant transit delays. In addition, the proposed streetscape changes would not present traffic safety hazards or create new sources of substantial conflict with existing traffic. The number of travel lanes in the Dogpatch Public Realm Plan area would remain the same and any reduction in on-street parking would reduce traffic conflicts. Thus, the proposed project would not result in a substantial parking deficit that could create hazardous conditions or significant delays in travel

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any new significant parking impacts, substantial increases in the significance of previously identified effects, or necessitate implementation of additional or considerably different mitigation measures than those identified in the FEIR.

For the reasons described above, the proposed project would not change or alter the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR findings with respect to transportation and circulation impacts and would not require new mitigation measures. In addition, there are no changed circumstances or new information that would change the FEIR's impact findings with respect to the transportation and circulation network.

Noise

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR noted that the existing ambient noise environment within the DPRP area is dominated by vehicular traffic on the U.S. 101 and I-280 freeways and traffic on local roadways. The FEIR concluded that compliance with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code) and implementation of Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR Mitigation Measure F-2 would reduce construction related noise impacts from any subsequent development projects to a less than significant level.

Implementation of the DPRP would not result in substantial trip generation that could cause a noticeable increase in the ambient noise level in the project vicinity (typically, traffic has to double for there to be a noticeable increase in noise levels, which is not expected as part of this project). Any future construction that would occur with implementation of the proposed project would temporarily generate noise and possibly vibrations that could be considered an annoyance by occupants of nearby properties. Construction noise is regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance. Given the similarity in construction noise expected under the proposed project, the construction noise impact conclusions reached for the FEIR would be substantially the same and implementation of the proposed project would not result in any new significant noise impacts, substantial increases in the significance of previously identified effects, or necessitate implementation of additional or considerably different mitigation measures than those identified in the FEIR.

Air Quality

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified potentially significant air quality impacts resulting from construction activities and impacts to sensitive land uses¹⁰ as a result of exposure to elevated levels of diesel particulate matter (DPM) and other toxic air contaminants (TACs). The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified four mitigation measures that would reduce these air quality impacts to less-than-significant levels and stated that with implementation of identified mitigation measures, the Area Plan would be consistent with the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy, the applicable air quality plan at that time. All other air quality impacts were found to be less than significant.

Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 addresses air quality impacts during construction, and FEIR Mitigation Measures G-3 and G-4 address proposed uses that would emit DPM and other TACs.¹¹

Construction Dust Control

Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 Construction Air Quality requires individual projects involving construction activities to include dust control measures and to maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions of particulates and other pollutants. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors subsequently approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes, generally referred to as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008). The intent of the Construction Dust Control Ordinance is to reduce the quantity of fugitive dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order

¹⁰ The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) considers sensitive receptors as: children, adults or seniors occupying or residing in: 1) residential dwellings, including apartments, houses, condominiums, 2) schools, colleges, and universities, 3) daycares, 4) hospitals, and 5) senior care facilities. BAAQMD, Recommended Methods for Screening and Modeling Local Risks and Hazards, May 2011, page 12.

¹¹ The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR also includes Mitigation Measure G-2, which has been superseded by Health Code Article 38, as discussed below, and is no longer applicable.

to protect the health of the general public and of on-site workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by DBI.

Construction activities associated with individual future projects would result in construction dust, primarily from ground-disturbing activities. In compliance with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance, the project sponsor and contractor responsible for construction activities at the project site would be required to control construction dust on the site through a combination of watering disturbed areas, covering stockpiled materials, street and sidewalk sweeping and other measures. For projects over one half-acre, such as some proposed open space improvements, the Dust Control Ordinance requires that the sponsoring agency submit a Dust Control Plan for approval by the San Francisco Department of Public Health. The site-specific Dust Control Plan could require the project sponsor to implement additional dust control measures such as installation of dust curtains and windbreaks and to provide independent third-party inspections and monitoring, provide a public complaint hotline, and suspend construction during high wind conditions.

The regulations and procedures set forth by the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance would ensure that construction dust impacts would not be significant.

Criteria Air Pollutants

While the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR determined that at a program-level the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in significant regional air quality impacts, the FEIR states that “Individual development projects undertaken in the future pursuant to the new zoning and area plans would be subject to a significance determination based on the BAAQMD’s quantitative thresholds for individual projects.”¹² The BAAQMD’s *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* (Air Quality Guidelines) provide screening criteria¹³ for determining whether a project’s criteria air pollutant emissions would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. Pursuant to the Air Quality Guidelines, projects that meet the screening criteria do not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants.

Future individually proposed projects would be screened against the Air Quality Guidelines screening criteria; however, it is unlikely that any of the projects proposed under the DPRP would exceed these criteria, which, for a “city park” is 2,613 acres for operational criteria pollutants and 67 acres for construction criteria pollutants. All of the open spaces proposed for improvements are well within these sizes and linear street improvements would also not be expected to exceed these screening thresholds since, typically, they would disturb smaller footprints and are likely to be sequenced such that only a few proposed project would be under construction at any given time.

Because criteria air pollutant emissions during construction and operation of the proposed project would meet the Air Quality Guidelines screening criteria, the DPRP would not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants.

12 San Francisco Planning Department, Eastern Neighborhood’s Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report. See page 346. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=4003>. Accessed June 4, 2014.

13 Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, updated May 2011. See pp. 3-2 to 3-3.

Health Risk

Since certification of the FEIR, San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes, generally referred to as the Enhanced Ventilation Required for Urban Infill Sensitive Use Developments or Health Code, Article 38 (Ordinance 224-14, amended December 8, 2014)(Article 38). The purpose of Article 38 is to protect the public health and welfare by establishing an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone and imposing an enhanced ventilation requirement for all urban infill sensitive use development within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone as defined in Article 38 are areas that, based on modeling of all known air pollutant sources, exceed health protective standards for cumulative PM_{2.5} concentration, cumulative excess cancer risk, and incorporates health vulnerability factors and proximity to freeways. Projects within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone require special consideration to determine whether the project's activities would expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations or add emissions to areas already adversely affected by poor air quality.

A portion of the DPRP area is within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone (APEZ). Because of this and because individual future projects would be sponsored by City agencies, any project construction within the APEZ would be subject to the Clean Construction Ordinance, which requires public projects to reduce emissions at construction sites in certain areas with high levels of background concentrations of air pollutants (APEZ). This would be achieved through requiring engines with higher emissions standards on construction equipment and would be expected to reduce DPM exhaust from construction equipment by 89 to 94 percent compared to uncontrolled construction equipment.¹⁴ Through the implementation of the requirements of the Clean Construction Ordinance, which supersedes FEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 Construction Air Quality, contractors for publicly-funded construction projects can substantially reduce their emissions and the associated public health risk at construction sites.

In addition, in 2012, Planning Department conducted environmental analysis of various improvements proposed to 6.1-acre Minnie and Lovie Ward playfields, including replacement of the existing grass turf with synthetic turf, installation of 12 60- to 80-foot tall light standards, replacement of the existing bleachers and fencing, and various other improvements.¹⁵ The renovation of the fields assumed excavation to a depth of approximately 1 foot below the existing ground surface (bgs) over the field area and approximately 10 feet bgs for the installation of the light standards (an area approximately 30 to 36 inches in diameter per light standard).

Air quality analysis conducted to estimate impacts from project construction found that renovations of the Minnie Lovie playfields would not result in significant air quality impacts, both with respect to criteria air pollutants or health risks (toxic air contaminants). The analysis was conservative in that it did not account for compliance with the Clean Construction Ordinance. Thus, it is likely that future

¹⁴ PM emissions benefits are estimated by comparing off-road PM emission standards for Tier 2 with Tier 1 and 0. Tier 0 off-road engines do not have PM emission standards, but the United States Environmental Protection Agency's *Exhaust and Crankcase Emissions Factors for Nonroad Engine Modeling – Compression Ignition* has estimated Tier 0 engines between 50 hp and 100 hp to have a PM emission factor of 0.72 g/hp-hr and greater than 100 hp to have a PM emission factor of 0.40 g/hp-hr. Therefore, requiring off-road equipment to have at least a Tier 2 engine would result in between a 25 percent and 63 percent reduction in PM emissions, as compared to off-road equipment with Tier 0 or Tier 1 engines. The 25 percent reduction comes from comparing the PM emission standards for off-road engines between 25 hp and 50 hp for Tier 2 (0.45 g/bhp-hr) and Tier 1 (0.60 g/bhp-hr). The 63 percent reduction comes from comparing the PM emission standards for off-road engines above 175 hp for Tier 2 (0.15 g/bhp-hr) and Tier 0 (0.40 g/bhp-hr). In addition to the Tier 2 requirement, ARB Level 3 VDECSs are required and would reduce PM by an additional 85 percent. Therefore, the mitigation measure would result in between an 89 percent (0.0675 g/bhp-hr) and 94 percent (0.0225 g/bhp-hr) reduction in PM emissions, as compared to equipment with Tier 1 (0.60 g/bhp-hr) or Tier 0 engines (0.40 g/bhp-hr).

¹⁵ Planning Department, *Minnie and Lovie Ward Playfields Renovation, Final Mitigated Negative Declaration*, February 8, 2012.

individual projects under the DPRP, which would be subject to the Clean Construction Ordinance, would likewise not result in construction-related air quality impacts.

In addition, the proposed project would not conflict with the *2017 Clean Air Plan* (which is the most recent regional air quality plan and supersedes the *Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy* discussed in the FEIR), because the DPRP would support the primary objectives of the plan by creating an environment that is more amenable to bicyclists and pedestrians, thus reducing mobile-related air emissions. Moreover, the DPRP would also not hinder the implementation of the *2017 Clean Air Plan*, would not result in VMT that could exceed the plan's population growth; and would not cause localized CO impacts.

Based on the above, the proposed project would not change or alter the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR findings with respect to air quality impacts and would not require new mitigation measures. In addition, there are no changed circumstances or new information that would change the FEIR's impact findings with respect to air quality.

Shadow

Planning Code Section 295 generally prohibits new structures above 40 feet in height that would cast additional shadows on open space that is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, at any time of the year, unless that shadow would not result in a significant adverse effect on the use of the open space. Under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, sites surrounding parks could be redeveloped with taller buildings without triggering Section 295 of the Planning Code because certain parks are not subject to Section 295 of the Planning Code (i.e., under jurisdiction of departments other than the Recreation and Parks Department or privately owned). The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR could not conclude if the rezoning and community plans would result in less-than-significant shadow impacts because the feasibility of complete mitigation for potential new shadow impacts of unknown proposals could not be determined at that time. Therefore, the FEIR determined shadow impacts to be significant and unavoidable. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

The Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR found that adoption of new use districts, associated land use controls and implementation of the area plans could result in significant, adverse shadow impacts on the following parks and open spaces within Central Waterfront: Victoria Manalo Draves Park, South of Market Recreation Center/Eugene Friend Recreation Center, Alice Street Community Gardens, and South Park in East SoMa; KidPower Park, Franklin Square, Mission Playground, Alioto Mini-Park, 24th and York Mini Park and the James Rolph Playground in the Mission; Potrero del Sol Park and Jackson Playground in Showplace Square/Potrero Hill; and, Esprit Park, Warm Water Cove and Wood Yard Mini-Park in the Central Waterfront.

The proposed project includes open space improvements in Esprit Park, Tunnel Top Park, Warm Water Cove Park, Minnesota Grove, Woods Yard Park, and Progress Park, and streetscape improvements throughout the Central Waterfront Plan Area. As stated on pg. 3 of this addendum, the proposed DPRP would involve replacing trees and landscaping, improving amenities and infrastructure, refining circulation paths, addressing drainage and irrigation concerns, treating stormwater runoff, improving nighttime lighting, and providing public art. Additionally, the proposed project would result in streetscape improvements including construction of sidewalks, curb bulb outs, marked crosswalks, raised midblock crossings, a bike route, sharrows, and a boardwalk. The proposed project would not include buildings construction. Implementation of the DPRP could lead to an incremental increase in shading of portions of nearby streets and sidewalks and private property at times, shadows upon streets

and sidewalks are expected to be minimal and not exceed levels commonly expected in urban areas. Although the DPRP does not propose specific projects at this time, because of the potential for new shadow impacts associated with the proposed project, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Any future development proposal over 40-feet in height would be subject to the Planning Department's requirement to prepare a shadow study to evaluate project-specific shading impacts to comply with Planning Code Section 295 and CEQA. In addition, future development or additions in the area surrounding Esprit Park, Warm Water Cove, and Wood Yard Park would also be subject to site-specific environmental analysis, and shadow effects could be limited through design of individual projects that takes into consideration shading effects on nearby parks. While open space and streetscape improvements pursuant to the implementation of the DPRP may result in a nominal increase in new shadow, the proposed project would not result in any new significant shadow impacts, substantial increases in the significance of previously identified effects, or necessitate implementation of additional or considerably different mitigation measures than those identified in the FEIR.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR noted that implementation of any of the proposed project's rezoning options would encourage construction of new development within the project area. The FEIR found that there is a high potential to encounter hazardous materials during construction activities in many parts of the project area because of the presence of 1906 earthquake fill, previous and current land uses associated with the use of hazardous materials, and known or suspected hazardous materials cleanup cases. However, the FEIR found that existing regulations for facility closure, Underground Storage Tank (UST) closure, and investigation and cleanup of soil and groundwater would ensure implementation of measures to protect workers and the community from exposure to hazardous materials during construction.

Since certification of the FEIR, Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance, was expanded to include properties throughout the city where there is potential to encounter hazardous materials, primarily industrial zoning districts, sites with industrial uses or underground storage tanks, sites with historic bay fill, and sites in close proximity to freeways or underground storage tanks. The over-arching goal of the Maher Ordinance is to protect public health and safety by requiring appropriate handling, treatment, disposal and when necessary, remediation of contaminated soils that are encountered in the building construction process. Projects that disturb 50 cubic yards or more of soil that are located on sites with potentially hazardous soil or groundwater within Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area are subject to this ordinance.

Given that the proposed project would not include buildings construction, and no structures would be demolished that contain hazardous materials and no construction activities are expected to involve hazardous materials, implementation of the DPRP would not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Due to the programmatic nature of the proposed DPRP, it is not known at this time if future development would involve disturbance of 50 cubic yards or more of soil. Future projects that may be implemented within the context of the DPRP would be required to comply with existing hazardous materials regulations. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any new significant hazardous materials impacts, substantial increases in the significance of previously identified effects, or necessitate implementation of additional or considerably different mitigation measures than those identified in the FEIR.

Less than Significant Environmental Effects

The Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR found that the implementation of area-wide zoning and associated Area Plans would not result any significant environmental impacts in the following areas: Population, Housing, Business Activity and Employment (Growth Inducement); Parks, Recreation and Open Space; Mineral and Agricultural Resources; Wind; Utilities and Public Services; Biology; Geology/Topography; Water; and Energy and Natural Resources. Each of these topics is analyzed and discussed in detail including, but not limited to, in the Final EIR (and Initial Study or “IS”) Chapters: 4.D; 4.H; 4.M; 6.D; 7.A, B,-D (IS); 8.A-C (IS); 9.A, B (IS); 10.A-C (IS); 11.A-B (IS). Adoption of the proposed DPRP would not change these conclusions because there are no changed circumstances surrounding the proposed project that would cause significant environmental impacts to which the proposed project would contribute considerably, and no new information has become available that shows that the proposed project would cause significant environmental impacts.

Effects That Can Be Avoided or Reduced to Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures

The Final EIR found that the implementation of area-wide zoning and associated Area Plans would result in potentially significant environmental impacts that may be avoided with implementation of mitigation measures; adoption of the proposed DPRP would not alter these conclusions because there are no changed circumstances surrounding the proposed project that would cause significant environmental impacts to which the proposed project would contribute considerably, and no new mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce significant impacts . The Final EIR’s mitigation measures, incorporated here by reference, may apply to future development projects within the DPRP as applicable, if project-specific review finds that such a project were to result in potentially significant environmental impacts.¹⁶ The measures are summarized below.

Measure F-2, Construction Noise: requires contractors to utilize noise attenuation measures during construction to minimize noise effects. Measures may include: temporary barriers around construction sites; noise control blankets; ongoing monitoring of noise attenuation measures through by taking noise measurements; and posting construction schedule, construction contact and complaint procedures for affected parties.

Measure F-5, Siting of Noise Generating Uses: similar to above, this measure directs the Planning Department to require 24-hour exterior noise meter testing prior to any project-specific entitlement to ensure that the siting of potentially noisy land uses do not adversely affect nearby sensitive receptors.

Measure J-1, Properties with Previous Studies: requires applicability of certain properties within the project area for which a final archeological research design and treatment plan (ARD/TP) is on file at the Northwest Information Center and the Planning Department. Any project resulting in soils-disturbance of 2.5 feet or greater below existing grade proposed within the AMM-A shall be required to submit to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval an addendum to the respective ARD/TP prepared by a qualified archeological consultant with expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The addendum to the ARD/TP shall evaluate the potential effects of the project on CEQA-significant archeological resources with respect to the site- and project-specific information absent in the ARD/TP.

¹⁶ *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program*, Planning Commission Motion No. 17659, adopted August 7, 2008. This document is available for review in Case File No. 2011.1381E at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA.

Measure J-2, Properties with No Previous Studies: requires preparation of a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study by an archeological consultant with expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The Sensitivity Study should: determine the historical uses of the project site based on any previous archeological documentation and Sanborn maps; determine types of archeological resources/properties that may have been located within the project site and whether the archeological resources/property types would potentially be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources; determine if 19th or 20th century soils-disturbing activities may adversely affected the identified potential archeological resources; assess potential project effects in relation to the depth of any identified potential archeological resource; and include a conclusion assessing whether any CRHP-eligible archeological resources could be adversely affected by the proposed project and recommendation as to appropriate further action.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the Department concludes that the analyses conducted and the conclusions reached in the FEIR certified on August 7, 2008 remain valid, and that no supplemental environmental review is required for the proposed project. Implementation of the proposed DPRP would not cause new significant impacts not identified in the FEIR, or result in a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce significant impacts. No changes have occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the original project that would cause significant environmental impacts to which the proposed project would contribute considerably, and no new information has been put forward which shows that the proposed project would cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, no supplemental environmental review is required beyond this addendum.

I do hereby certify that the above determination has been made pursuant to State and Local requirements.

DATE 5/2/18



Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer

FIGURE 1.
PROPOSED OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS BY
THE DOGPATCH PUBLIC REALM PLAN




FIGURE 2. PROPOSED STREET IMPROVEMENTS BY THE DOGPATCH PUBLIC REALM PLAN




FIGURE 3. TYPES OF STREETScape IMPROVEMENTS RECOMMENDED FOR DOGPATCH

Intersection Traffic Calming

Bulbout (In 1 Direction)



High Visibility Crosswalk



Bulbout ('Bi-Directional')



Custom Crosswalk Treatment



Bulbout Designed for Transit



Raised Crosswalk



Intersection Control (Stop Sign/ Traffic Signal)



For more information about citywide street design standards, guidelines, and implementation strategies, see San Francisco Better Streets Plan at www.sfbetterstreets.org

For cost information on these improvements, please see Chapter 5: Recommendations for Implementation..

Street Traffic Calming

Stamped / Textured Asphalt



Mid-Block Crossing



Shared Street



Raised Crosswalk



Bicycle Facilities

Class II Bicycle Lane



Bicycle Corral/Bike Parking



Class III Bicycle Route



Bicycle Share Station



Class IV Cycletrack



Ped Facilities

New Sidewalk



At-Grade Ped Path (Interim Solution)



Sidewalk Planting & Trees



Street Furnishing



Street Lighting



Pedestrian-Scale Lighting

