

1 [Conditionally Reversing the Categorical Exemption Determination - SFMTA Hairball  
2 Intersection Improvement Project]

2

3 **Motion conditionally reversing the determination by the Planning Department that the**  
4 **proposed San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Hairball Intersection**  
5 **Improvement Project is categorically exempt from further environmental review,**  
6 **subject to the adoption of written findings of the Board in support of this**  
7 **determination.**

8

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

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

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

24

25

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

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

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

9           WHEREAS, On November 28, 2017, this Board held a duly noticed public hearing to  
10 consider the appeal of the exemption determination filed by Appellant; and

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

16           WHEREAS, Following the conclusion of the public hearing, the Board of Supervisors  
17 conditionally reversed the exemption determination for the Project subject to the adoption of  
18 written findings of the Board in support of such determination based on the written record  
19 before the Board of Supervisors as well as all of the testimony at the public hearing in support  
20 of and opposed to the appeal; and

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

1            MOVED, That this Board of Supervisors conditionally reverses the determination by the  
2 Planning Department that the Project is exempt from environmental review, subject to the  
3 adoption of written findings of the Board in support of this determination.

4  
5 n:\land\as2017\0400241\01235506.docx

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