

File No. 220707 Committee Item No. 6
Board Item No. 10

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Transportation Committee Date July 11, 2022

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date July 26, 2022

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MOU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 126 – Ethics Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence |

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | PW Order No. 206648 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Offer of Improvements 073119 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Offer of Dedication 080119 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | DRAFT Modified Offer of Improvements |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Quitclaim Deed 091219 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Utility Bill of Sale - ATT |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Utility Bill of Sale - Comcast |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Utility Bill of Sale - Wave |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Map A-17-215 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Drawings Q-20-1160-1163 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | PC Motion 19409 070915 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | PC Motion 19784 111716 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | PLN Gen Plan Consistency Verification 060622 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | PW Conditional Ntc of Completion 120321 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | PW Ltr 060722 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | PG&E Ltr 120821 - Utility Acceptance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | RED Ltr 060722 |

Completed by: Erica Major Date July 7, 2022

Completed by: Erica Major Date July 14, 2022

[Sunnydale HOPE SF - Accepting the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure]

Ordinance accepting an irrevocable offer of public infrastructure and real property associated with Sunnydale HOPE SF Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 public infrastructure improvements, including the improvements described and depicted in Public Works Permit No. 19IE-00564 and subsequent Instructional Bulletins (“Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure”); declaring City property and additional property as shown on official Public Works maps as open public right-of-way; dedicating the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure to public use; designating such public infrastructure for street and roadway purposes; establishing official public right-of-way widths and street grades; amending Ordinance No. 1061 entitled “Regulating the Width of Sidewalks” to establish official sidewalk width on the abovementioned street areas; accepting the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure for City maintenance and liability purposes, subject to specified limitations; adopting findings under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; accepting a Public Works Order recommending various actions in regard to the public infrastructure improvements; and authorizing official acts, as defined herein, in connection with this Ordinance.

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

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

1 Section 1. Background and Findings.

2 (a) This ordinance is related to the development of the Sunnydale HOPE SF Project
3 (the "Project") to redevelop the Sunnydale-Velasco public housing site, approved by the City
4 through Ordinance No. 18-17, a public housing transformation collaborative effort aimed at
5 disrupting intergenerational poverty, reducing social isolation, and creating vibrant mixed-
6 income communities without mass displacement of current residents; said ordinance is on file
7 with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 161164 and is incorporated herein by
8 reference.

9 (b) The proposed acceptance of the public infrastructure improvements is within the
10 scope of the Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") for the Sunnydale HOPE SF Project
11 (the "Project") prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public
12 Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA"), certified by the Planning Commission on
13 July 9, 2015, by Motion No. 19409; said Motion is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
14 Supervisors in File No. 161164 and is incorporated herein by reference. On November 17,
15 2016, by Motion No. 19784, the Planning Commission approved CEQA Findings, including
16 adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), under Case No.
17 2010.0305ENV, for approval of the Sunnydale HOPE SF Project; said Motion is on file with
18 the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 161164 and is incorporated herein by
19 reference.

20 (c) The Board of Supervisors further finds that pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines
21 (California Code of Regulations Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq.), including Sections 15162
22 and 15164, that the actions contemplated herein are consistent with, and within the scope of,
23 the Project analyzed in the FEIR, and that (1) no substantial changes are proposed in the
24 Project and no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under
25 which this Project will be undertaken that would require major revisions to the FEIR due to the

1 involvement of any new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the
2 severity of previously identified effects and (2) no new information of substantial importance
3 that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence
4 at the time the FEIR was certified as complete shows that the Project will have any new
5 significant effects not analyzed in the FEIR, or a substantial increase in the severity of any
6 effect previously examined, or that new mitigation measures or alternatives previously found
7 not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more
8 significant effects of the Project, or that mitigation measures or alternatives which are
9 considerably different from those analyzed in the FEIR would substantially reduce one or
10 more significant effects on the environment.

11 (d) In a letter dated February 27, 2018, the Planning Department found that the
12 acceptance of the public infrastructure and real property associated with Phase 1A-1 and 1A-
13 2 of the Project, and other actions set forth in this ordinance are, on balance, in conformance
14 with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. A copy
15 of the Planning Department letter is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File
16 No. 220707.

17 (e) In Public Works Order No. 206648, dated June 7, 2022, including Map No. A-17-
18 215, dated June 7, 2022, and Drawing Nos. Q-20-1160 through Q-20-1163, dated May 26,
19 2022 (collectively, "PW Order No. 206648), the City Engineer certified and the Interim Public
20 Works Director (the "PW Director") recommended that: (1) Sunnydale Development Co. LLC,
21 a California limited liability company ("DEVELOPER") and the HOUSING AUTHORITY OF
22 THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, a public body corporate and politic
23 ("SFHA"), have irrevocably offered the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure and real
24 property, respectively, to the City and County of San Francisco ("City") as set forth in the
25 DEVELOPER Irrevocable Offer of Improvements, dated July 31, 2019, and SFHA's Offer of

1 Dedication (for the real property) dated August 1, 2019 (collectively, the “DEVELOPER
2 Offer”); (2) Public Works inspected the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure and
3 determined it to be complete as of December 3, 2021; (3) the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required
4 Infrastructure has been constructed in accordance with the Plans and Specifications and all
5 City codes, regulations, and standards governing the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required
6 Infrastructure; and (4) this Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure is ready for its
7 intended use.

8 (f) The PW Director and City Engineer also recommended to the Board of Supervisors
9 that it declare the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure and associated property as
10 shown on official Public Works maps as open public right-of-way; dedicate the Phase 1A-1
11 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure to public use; designate such public infrastructure for street
12 and roadway purposes; and accept it for City maintenance and liability purposes. The PW
13 Director and City Engineer recommended that acceptance of the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2
14 Required Infrastructure for maintenance and liability purposes be subject to the following
15 conditions: (1) the portions of streets being accepted for street and roadway purposes are
16 from back of sidewalk to back of sidewalk, unless specified otherwise or as shown on the
17 Plans and Specifications for the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure; (2) acceptance
18 of the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure for City maintenance and liability
19 purposes is from back of curb to back of curb, unless specified otherwise, and sidewalk
20 maintenance is the responsibility of the adjacent property owners in accordance with the
21 Public Works Code; (3) encroachments that are permitted, not permitted, or both, are
22 excluded from acceptance; (4) the acceptance of the streets does not obviate, amend, alter,
23 or in any way affect existing maintenance agreements between the City and parties to such
24 agreements; (5) DEVELOPER conditional assignment of all warranties and guaranties to the
25 City related to the construction of the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure and its

1 warranty obligations under Street Improvement Permit No. 19IE-00564, dated July 15, 2019,
2 and (6) the acceptance shall be expressly conditioned on the Project applicant obtaining an
3 encroachment permit or other authorization from the City to maintain encroachments in the
4 public right-of-way that are the applicant's responsibility. Copies of the PW Order No. 206648
5 and DEVELOPER Offer, including a quitclaim deed for real property, the Map No. A-17-215
6 and Drawing Nos. Q-20-1160 through Q-20-1163 are on file with the Clerk of the Board of
7 Supervisors in File No. 220707 and are incorporated herein by reference.

8 (g) In PW Order No. 206648, the PW Director and City Engineer also recommended
9 establishment of public right-of-way widths, sidewalk widths, and street grades on Harmonia
10 Street, Malosi Street and Sunrise Way in accordance with Map No. A-17-215 and Drawing
11 Nos. Q-20-1160 through Q-20-1163.

12
13 Section 2. Adoptions and Approvals.

14 (a) The Board of Supervisors adopts as its own the CEQA findings and the General
15 Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1 consistency findings in the Planning Department
16 Letter, as referenced in Section 1(b)-(d) of this ordinance, in connection with the acceptance
17 of the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure and other actions specified in this
18 ordinance.

19 (b) The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and approves PW Order No. 206648,
20 including the City Engineer's certification and PW Director's recommendation, as referenced
21 in Section 1(e)-(g) of this ordinance, concerning the acceptance of the DEVELOPER Offer,
22 Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure, and other actions set forth in the Public Works
23 Order.

1 Section 3. Acceptance of Public Infrastructure and Assumption of Maintenance and
2 Liability Responsibilities.

3 (a) Pursuant to California Streets and Highways Code Section 1806 and San
4 Francisco Administrative Code Sections 1.51 et seq., and PW Order No. 206648, the Board of
5 Supervisors hereby accepts and dedicates the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure
6 for public use.

7 (b) The DEVELOPER Offer also included real property for right-of-way purposes
8 underlying Sunrise Way, which is evidenced by a quitclaim deed from SFHA for this property.
9 The Board of Supervisors hereby accepts the quitclaim deed and authorizes the Director of
10 Real Property to execute and record said deed.

11 (c) The Board of Supervisors hereby approves Map A-17-215, declares the areas
12 shown hatched on said map as open public right-of-way, and designates these areas for
13 street and roadway purposes. Map No. A-17-215 covers the following streets or street
14 extensions: Sunrise Way between Hahn Street and Malosi Street; Malosi Street between
15 Sunrise Way and Harmonia Street; and Harmonia Street between Malosi Street and Hahn
16 Street.

17 (d) The Board of Supervisors hereby accepts the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required
18 Infrastructure for City maintenance and liability purposes, subject to the conditions listed in
19 subsections (e) and (f), below.

20 (e) The Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure accepted pursuant to
21 subsections (a)-(d), above, is subject to the following conditions: (1) the portions of streets
22 being accepted for street and roadway purposes are constructed from back of sidewalk to
23 back of sidewalk, unless specified otherwise or as shown on the Plans and Specifications for
24 the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure; (2) acceptance of the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2
25 Required Infrastructure for City maintenance and liability purposes is from back of curb to

1 back of curb, unless specified otherwise, and sidewalk maintenance is the responsibility of
2 adjacent property owners in accordance with the Public Works Code; (3) encroachments that
3 are permitted, not permitted, or both, are excluded from acceptance; (4) the acceptance of the
4 streets does not obviate, amend, alter, or in any way affect existing maintenance agreements
5 between the City and parties to such agreements; and (5) the acceptance is expressly
6 conditioned on the Project applicant obtaining an encroachment
7 permit or other authorization from the City to maintain encroachments in the public right-of-
8 way that are the applicant's responsibility.

9 (f) The Board of Supervisors hereby acknowledges DEVELOPER conditional
10 assignment of all warranties and guaranties to the City related to the construction of the
11 Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure and that its acceptance of this Phase 1A-1 and
12 1A-2 Required Infrastructure is subject to DEVELOPER warranty obligations under Street
13 Improvement Permit No. 19IE-00564.

14
15 Section 4. Establishment of Public Right-of-Way Widths, Sidewalk Widths, and Street
16 Grades.

17 (a) In accordance with PW Order No. 206648, the Board of Supervisors hereby
18 establishes the official public right-of-way widths for Harmonia Street, Malosi Street, and
19 Sunrise Way as shown on Map A-17-215.

20 (b) In accordance with PW Order No. 206648, Board of Supervisors Ordinance No.
21 1061, entitled "Regulating the Width of Sidewalks," a copy of which is in the Clerk of the Board
22 of Supervisors Book of General Ordinances, in effect May 11, 1910, is hereby amended by
23 adding thereto new sections to read as follows:

24 Section 1635. The sidewalk widths on Sunrise Way shall be modified as shown on the Public
25 Works Drawing No. Q-20-1160.

1 Section 1636. The sidewalk widths on Harmonia Street shall be modified as shown on the
2 Public Works Drawing No. Q-20-1161.

3 Section 1637. The sidewalk widths on Malosi Street shall be modified as shown on the Public
4 Works Drawing No. Q-20-1162.

5 Section 1638. The sidewalk widths on Hahn Street shall be modified as shown on the Public
6 Works Drawing No. Q-20-1163.

7 (c) The sidewalk widths established pursuant to subsection (b), above, for Harmonia
8 Street, Malosi Street, and Sunrise Way do not obviate, amend, alter, or in any other way affect
9 the maintenance obligations of the adjacent property owners as set forth in the Public Works
10 Code.

11 (d) Notwithstanding California Streets and Highways Code Sections 8000 et seq., the
12 Board of Supervisors, in accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code Sections 1.51 et
13 seq., chooses to follow its own procedures for the establishment of street grades. The Board
14 of Supervisors hereby establishes the street grades for Harmonia Street, Malosi Street, and
15 Sunrise Way as set forth in the Drawing No. A-17-215.

16 (e) The Board of Supervisors hereby directs Public Works to revise the Official Public
17 Right-of-Way, Sidewalk Width, and Street Grade maps in accordance with this ordinance.

18
19 Section 5. Authorization for Implementation. The Mayor, Clerk of the Board of
20 Supervisors, Director of Real Estate, and PW Director are hereby authorized and directed to
21 take any and all actions which they or the City Attorney may deem necessary or advisable in
22 order to effectuate the purpose and intent of this ordinance, including, but not limited to, the
23 filing of the ordinance and Map A-17-215 and Drawing Nos. Q-20-1160 through Q-20-1163 in
24 the Official Records of the City and County of San Francisco.

1 Section 6. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
2 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
3 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
4 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

5
6 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
7 DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

8 By: /s/ Robb Kapla
9 ROBB KAPLA
10 Deputy City Attorney

11 n:\legana\as2022\1800660\01606616.docx

LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[Sunnydale HOPE SF - Accepting the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure]

Ordinance accepting an irrevocable offer of public infrastructure and real property associated with Sunnydale HOPE SF Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 public infrastructure improvements, including the improvements described and depicted in Public Works Permit No. 19IE-00564 and subsequent Instructional Bulletins (“Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure”); declaring City property and additional property as shown on official Public Works maps as open public right-of-way; dedicating the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure to public use; designating such public infrastructure for street and roadway purposes; establishing official public right-of-way widths and street grades; amending Ordinance No. 1061 entitled “Regulating the Width of Sidewalks” to establish official sidewalk width on the abovementioned street areas; accepting the Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Required Infrastructure for City maintenance and liability purposes, subject to specified limitations; adopting findings under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; accepting a Public Works Order recommending various actions in regard to the public infrastructure improvements; and authorizing official acts, as defined herein, in connection with this Ordinance.

Existing Law

The Board of Supervisors passed Ordinance No. 18-17 on January 31, 2017, which approved the Sunnydale HOPE SF Project and Development Agreement. This Ordinance and related Sunnydale HOPE SF legislation established a process by which the project developer would construct specified public infrastructure and dedicate said infrastructure to the City. Upon dedication, the City would initiate the local and State law procedures to establish the areas as open public right-of-way, accept the areas for City maintenance and liability purposes, subject to certain limitations, and take related actions. In addition, Board of Supervisors’ Ordinance No. 1061 established the official sidewalk widths throughout San Francisco. Ordinance No. 1061 is uncoded, but can be located in the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors Book of General Ordinances, in effect May 11, 1910, which is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

Amendments to Current Law

This legislation would accept offers of dedication for public infrastructure and real property on Sunrise Way between Hahn Street and Malosi Street; Malosi Street between Sunrise Way and Harmonia Street; and Harmonia Street between Malosi Street and Hahn Street in accordance with Map No. A-17-215; declare said right-of-way open to the public; dedicate the

infrastructure to public use and designate it for street and roadway purposes; accept the infrastructure for maintenance and liability purposes, subject to limitations. Set grades and sidewalk widths as shown on Drawing Nos. Q-20-1161 through Q-20-1163; and amend Board of Supervisors Ordinance No. 1061 on sidewalk widths consistent with these Drawings. These legislative acts all would be in accordance with the procedures established for the Sunnydale HOPE Project and applicable local and State law. This Ordinance would make certain findings related to the legislation, including environmental findings and findings that the legislation is consistent with the Sunnydale HOPE SF Project, the General Plan, and the priority policy findings of the Planning Code Section 101.1.

Background Information

This legislation would help facilitate the development of the Sunnydale HOPE Project, a public housing transformation collaborative effort aimed at disrupting intergenerational poverty, reducing social isolation, and creating vibrant mixed-income communities without mass displacement of current residents.

n:\legana\as2022\1800660\01606739.docx

Bill of Sale

For good and valuable consideration of \$0.00, Sunnydale Infrastructure, LLC ("Seller"), does hereby sell, transfer and convey to Wave ("Buyer"), title to those portions of the facilities which are the identified as Buyer's facilities on the "as built" drawings attached hereto as Schedule 1 ("Personal Property"), subject to the terms and provisions hereof.

Seller has executed this Bill of Sale and bargained, sold, transferred, conveyed and assigned the Personal Property and Buyer has accepted this Bill of Sale and is purchasing the Personal Property: **AS IS AND WHEREEVER LOCATED, WITH ALL FAULTS AND WITHOUT ANY REPRESENTATIONS OR WARRANTIES OF WHATSOEVER NATURE, EXPRESS, IMPLIED OR STATUTORY, EXCEPT AS EXPRESSLY SET FORTH HEREIN BELOW, IT BEING THE INTENTION OF THE SELLER AND BUYER TO EXPRESSLY NEGATE AND EXCLUDE ALL WARRANTIES WHATSOEVER, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.**

Seller hereby assigns all warranties and guaranties relating to the construction of the Personal Property that were given by the independent contractor hired by Seller to construct the Personal Property. As used herein the term "**Correction Period**" shall mean one (1) year after "**Final Completion**" {as hereinafter defined). Seller shall, to Buyer's reasonable satisfaction, and provided that such work is not the subject of a warranty or guaranty assigned by Seller to Buyer, re-execute or otherwise remedy any defects in the Personal Property due to faulty workmanship that become apparent during the Correction Period. As used herein, the term "**Final Completion**" shall mean December 3, 2021.


Dated this 14th day of March 2022.

SELLER

SUNNYDALE INFRASTRUCTURE LLC,
a California limited liability company

By: New Grid LLC, Member

By: Mercy Housing Calwest
a California nonprofit public benefit corporation
Its: sole member

DocuSigned by:
By: 
Name: Ramie Dare
Title: Vice President

SCHEDULE 1

As Built Plans entitled:

Sunnydale HOPE SF Phase 1A-1
and 1A-2 Street Improvement Plans


Sheets INT2 and INT3

Prepared by: Giacalone Design Services, Inc.

AS-BUILT LEGEND

2-2" CONDUITS


NOTE:
- RED- LINE INDICATES THE SIZE, COUNT AND TYPE OF CONDUITS INSTALLED
- PLEASE REFER TO TRENCH SECTION DETAIL DRAWING FOR MORE DETAILS
- PLEASE REFER TO JOINT TRENCH COMPOSITE PLAN FOR TRENCH LOCATION



Wave Intent
Reply
REV 10-22-19
by GDSI

R/W, P.U.E. & P.S.E. ACQUISITION NOTE:
CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY RIGHT OF WAY, PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT AND/OR PUBLIC SERVICE EASEMENT ACQUISITION WITH THE APPLICANT PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION WITHIN AREAS OF QUESTION.

CAUTION!!!! ENERGIZED FACILITIES!!
CONTRACTOR TO EXERCISE EXTREME CAUTION TO AVOID DAMAGING EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES. OBSTRUCTIONS INDICATED ARE FOR INFORMATION ONLY. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY THE LOCATION AND DEPTH WITH THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES. NEITHER THE OWNER NOR THE DESIGNER ASSUME ANY RESPONSIBILITY THAT THE OBSTRUCTIONS INDICATED WILL ACTUALLY BE THE OBSTRUCTIONS ENCOUNTERED. POTHOLES IS REQUIRED. HAND EXCAVATE ONLY IN PRESENCE OF UTILITY INSPECTOR.



NOTE
PLEASE VERIFY THAT THE SERVICE POINTS IN THIS DRAWING MATCH YOUR DESIGN. IF THERE ARE ANY DISCREPANCIES, PLEASE CONTACT THE PROJECT MANAGER IN OUR OFFICE.

NOTE TO UTILITIES:
PLEASE INDICATE TIE-IN POINTS ON INTENT RESPONSE

**PRELIMINARY PLANS
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**

REVISIONS	
SYMBOL	DATE
	12-08-17
	06-15-18
	10-19-18
	03-15-19

GIACALONE
DESIGN SERVICES, INC.
5820 STONEMORE HILL RD., #345 | PLEASANTON, CA 94588
925.467.1740 | WWW.GIACALONEDSIGN.COM

JOINT TRENCH INTENT PLAN
SUNNYDALE DEVELOPMENT CO., LLC
SUNNYDALE HOPE SF
PHASE 1A-1 & 1A-2
SAN FRANCISCO
CALIFORNIA

PROJECT MANAGER:
DAVID CROWFOOT

DRAWN BY:
D. SHAY/SAO

CHECKED BY:
DSC

SCALE:
1"=30'

JOB NUMBER:
17-232

DATE LAST MODIFIED:
03-15-19

SHEET
INT2
OF 3 SHEETS



CONTRACTOR TO EXERCISE EXTREME CAUTION TO AVOID DAMAGING EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES. OBSTRUCTIONS INDICATED ARE FOR INFORMATION ONLY. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY THE LOCATION AND DEPTH WITH THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES. NEITHER THE OWNER NOR THE DESIGNER ASSUME ANY RESPONSIBILITY THAT THE OBSTRUCTIONS INDICATED WILL ACTUALLY BE THE OBSTRUCTIONS ENCOUNTERED. POTHOLES IS REQUIRED. HAND EXCAVATE ONLY IN PRESENCE OF UTILITY INSPECTOR.

NOTE











PLEASE VERIFY THAT THE SERVICE POINTS IN THIS DRAWING MATCH YOUR DESIGN. IF THERE ARE ANY DISCREPANCIES, PLEASE CONTACT THE PROJECT MANAGER IN OUR OFFICE.

NOTE TO UTILITIES:
PLEASE INDICATE TIE-IN
POINTS ON INTENT RESPONSE

PRELIMINARY PLANS
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION





TRENCH SECTION LEGEND

	MEETS UTILITY TRENCH ALLOTMENT
	EXCEEDS UTILITY TRENCH ALLOTMENT
	SFPUC PRIMARY
	SFPUC SECONDARY
	PG&E GAS
	TELEPHONE
	CABLE T.V.
	WAVE BROADBAND
	PUBLIC SAFETY/CITY FIBER OPTIC
	STREET LIGHTING

XX LF-TOTAL = TOTAL TRENCH LENGTH

XX LF-R=R = REMOVE & REPLACE PAVEMENT ONLY,
TRENCH INCLUDED IN TOTAL TRENCH LENGTH






JOINT TRENCH INTENT PLAN

SUNNYDALE DEVELOPMENT CO., LLC
SUNNYDALE HOPE SF
PHASE 1A-1 & 1A-2

SAN FRANCISCO CALIFORNIA

PROJECT MANAGER: DAVID CROWFOOT
DRAWN BY: D. SHAY/SAO
CHECKED BY: DSC
SCALE: 1"=30'
JOB NUMBER: 17-232
DATE LAST MODIFIED: 03-15-19
SHEET INT3
OF 3 SHEETS

REVISIONS			APPROVED
SYMBOL	DATE	DESCRIPTION	
	12-08-17	30% SUBMITTAL	
	06-15-18	TRENCH ROUTE REVISIONS	
	10-19-18	100% S.D. SUBMITTAL	
	03-15-19	UTILITY SUBMITTAL	

GIACALONE
DESIGN SERVICES, INC.

5820 STONERIDGE MALL RD., #345 | PLEASANTON, CA 94588
925.457.1740 | WWW.GIACALONEDSIGN.COM

Bill of Sale

For good and valuable consideration of \$0.00, Sunnydale Infrastructure, LLC ("Seller"), does hereby sell, transfer and convey to Comcast ("Buyer"), title to those portions of the facilities which are the identified as Buyer's facilities on the "as built" drawings attached hereto as Schedule 1 ("Personal Property"), subject to the terms and provisions hereof.

Seller has executed this Bill of Sale and bargained, sold, transferred, conveyed and assigned the Personal Property and Buyer has accepted this Bill of Sale and is purchasing the Personal Property: **AS IS AND WHEREEVER LOCATED, WITH ALL FAULTS AND WITHOUT ANY REPRESENTATIONS OR WARRANTIES OF WHATSOEVER NATURE, EXPRESS, IMPLIED OR STATUTORY, EXCEPT AS EXPRESSLY SET FORTH HEREIN BELOW, IT BEING THE INTENTION OF THE SELLER AND BUYER TO EXPRESSLY NEGATE AND EXCLUDE ALL WARRANTIES WHATSOEVER, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.**

Seller hereby assigns all warranties and guaranties relating to the construction of the Personal Property that were given by the independent contractor hired by Seller to construct the Personal Property. As used herein the term "**Correction Period**" shall mean one (1) year after "**Final Completion**" {as hereinafter defined). Seller shall, to Buyer's reasonable satisfaction, and provided that such work is not the subject of a warranty or guaranty assigned by Seller to Buyer, re-execute or otherwise remedy any defects in the Personal Property due to faulty workmanship that become apparent during the Correction Period. As used herein, the term "**Final Completion**" shall mean December 3, 2021.


Dated this 14th day of March 2022.

SELLER

SUNNYDALE INFRASTRUCTURE LLC,
a California limited liability company

By: New Grid LLC, Member

By: Mercy Housing Calwest
a California nonprofit public benefit corporation
Its: sole member

DocuSigned by:

By: _____
Name: Ramie Dare
Title: Vice President

SCHEDULE 1

As Built Plans entitled:


Sunnydale HOPE SF Phase 1A-1
and 1A-2 Street Improvement Plans

Sheets INT2 and INT 3

Prepared by: Giacalone Design Services, Inc.

 2-2" CONDUIT
 4" CONDUIT

- RED-LINE INDICATES THE SIZE, COUNT AND TYPE OF CONDUITS INSTALLED
- PLEASE REFER TO TRENCH SECTION DETAIL DRAWING FOR MORE DETAILS
- PLEASE REFER TO JOINT TRENCH COMPOSITE PLAN FOR TRENCH LOCATION



REVISONS			APPROVED
SYMBOL	DATE	DESCRIPTION	
	12-08-17	30% SUBMITTAL	
△	06-15-18	TRENCH ROUTE REVISIONS	

GIACALONE
DESIGN SERVICES, INC.

5820 STONERIDGE MALL RD., #345 | PLEASANTON, CA 94588
925.467.1740 | WWW.GIACALONEDSIGN.COM


JOINT TRENCH INTENT PLAN

SUNNYDALE DEVELOPMENT CO., LLC
SUNNYDALE HOPE SF
PHASE 1A-1 & 1A-2
SAN FRANCISCO CAL

PROJECT MANAGER: DAVID CROWFOOT
DRAWN BY: D. SHAY
LEAD DRAFTER:
SCALE: 1"=30'
JOB NUMBER: 17-232
DATE LAST MODIFIED: 06-15-18
SHEET INT2
OF 3 SHEETS

Cablecom co Comcast

----- Conduit

 B44 Vault
47 1/2" x 28 1/4" with 12" Extension

**Comcast
Intent Reply
4-08-19**

**Comcast
Intent Reply
REV 10-22-19
by GDSI**

R/W, P.U.E. & P.S.E. ACQUISITION NOTE:
CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY RIGHT OF WAY, PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT
AND/OR PUBLIC SERVICE EASEMENT ACQUISITION WITH THE
APPLICANT PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION WITHIN AREAS OF QUESTION.


CAUTION!!!! ENERGIZED FACILITIES!!
CONTRACTOR TO EXERCISE EXTREME CAUTION TO AVOID DAMAGING
EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES. OBSTRUCTIONS INDICATED ARE
FOR INFORMATION ONLY. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE
CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY THE LOCATION AND DEPTH WITH THE
APPROPRIATE AGENCIES. NEITHER THE OWNER NOR THE DESIGNER
ASSUME ANY RESPONSIBILITY THAT THE OBSTRUCTIONS INDICATED
WILL ACTUALLY BE THE OBSTRUCTIONS ENCOUNTERED. POTHOLING
IS REQUIRED. HAND EXCAVATE ONLY IN PRESENCE OF UTILITY
INSPECTOR.

NOTE

PLEASE VERIFY THAT THE SERVICE POINTS IN THIS DRAWING MATCH YOUR DESIGN. IF THERE ARE ANY DISCREPANCIES, PLEASE CONTACT THE PROJECT MANAGER IN OUR OFFICE.



NOTE TO UTILITIES:
PLEASE INDICATE TIE-IN
POINTS ON INTENT RESPONSE

PRELIMINARY PLANS
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION




TWO DAYS BEFORE YOU DIG
CALL USA TOLL FREE
811
CALL BEFORE YOU DIG

AS-BUILT LEGEND
2-2" CONDUIT
4" CONDUIT



Cablecom co Comcast
Conduit
B44 Vault
47 1/2 " x 28 1/4 " with 12" Extension



NOTE
PLEASE VERIFY THAT THE SERVICE POINTS IN THIS DRAWING MATCH YOUR DESIGN. IF THERE ARE ANY DISCREPANCIES, PLEASE CONTACT THE PROJECT MANAGER IN OUR OFFICE.

NOTE TO UTILITIES:
PLEASE INDICATE TIE-IN POINTS ON INTENT RESPONSE

PRELIMINARY PLANS
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

CAUTION!!!!ENERGIZED FACILITIES!!
CONTRACTOR TO EXERCISE EXTREME CAUTION TO AVOID DAMAGING EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES. OBSTRUCTIONS INDICATED ARE FOR INFORMATION ONLY. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY THE LOCATION AND DEPTH WITH THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES. NEITHER THE OWNER NOR THE DESIGNER ASSUME ANY RESPONSIBILITY THAT THE OBSTRUCTIONS INDICATED WILL ACTUALLY BE THE OBSTRUCTIONS ENCOUNTERED. POTHOLES IS REQUIRED. HAND EXCAVATE ONLY IN PRESENCE OF UTILITY INSPECTOR.

R/W, P.U.E. & P.S.E. ACQUISITION NOTE:
CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY RIGHT OF WAY, PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT AND/OR PUBLIC SERVICE EASEMENT ACQUISITION WITH THE APPLICANT PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION WITHIN AREAS OF QUESTION.

TWO DAYS BEFORE YOU DIG
CALL USA TOLL FREE
811
CALL BEFORE YOU DIG

SYMBOL	DATE	REVISIONS	
		DESCRIPTION	APPROVED
	12-08-17	30% SUBMITTAL	
	06-15-18	TRENCH ROUTE REVISIONS	

GIACALONE
DESIGN SERVICES, INC.
5820 STONERIDGE HILL RD., #345 | PLEASANTON, CA 94588
925.467.1740 | WWW.GIACALONEDSIGN.COM

JOINT TRENCH INTENT PLAN
SUNNYDALE DEVELOPMENT CO., LLC
SUNNYDALE HOPE SF
PHASE 1A-1 & 1A-2
SAN FRANCISCO CALIFORNIA

PROJECT MANAGER:
DAVID CROWFOOT
DRAWN BY:
D. SHAY
LEAD DRAFTER:
SCALE:
1"=30'
JOB NUMBER:
17-232
DATE LAST MODIFIED:
06-15-18
SHEET
INT3
OF 3 SHEETS

Bill of Sale

For good and valuable consideration of \$0.00, Sunnydale Infrastructure, LLC ("Seller"), does hereby sell, transfer and convey to AT&T California ("Buyer"), title to those portions of the facilities which are the identified as Buyer's facilities on the "as built" drawings attached hereto as Schedule 1 ("Personal Property"), subject to the terms and provisions hereof.

Seller has executed this Bill of Sale and bargained, sold, transferred, conveyed and assigned the Personal Property and Buyer has accepted this Bill of Sale and is purchasing the Personal Property: **AS IS AND WHEREEVER LOCATED, WITH ALL FAULTS AND WITHOUT ANY REPRESENTATIONS OR WARRANTIES OF WHATSOEVER NATURE, EXPRESS, IMPLIED OR STATUTORY, EXCEPT AS EXPRESSLY SET FORTH HEREIN BELOW , IT BEING THE INTENTION OF THE SELLER AND BUYER TO EXPRESSLY NEGATE AND EXCLUDE ALL WARRANTIES WHATSOEVER, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.**

Seller hereby assigns all warranties and guaranties relating to the construction of the Personal Property that were given by the independent contractor hired by Seller to construct the Personal Property. As used herein the term "**Correction Period**" shall mean one (1) year after "**Final Completion**" {as hereinafter defined). Seller shall, to Buyer's reasonable satisfaction, and provided that such work is not the subject of a warranty or guaranty assigned by Seller to Buyer, re-execute or otherwise remedy any defects in the Personal Property due to faulty workmanship that become apparent during the Correction Period. As used herein, the term "**Final Completion**" shall mean December 3, 2021.

Dated this 14th day of March 2022.

SELLER

SUNNYDALE INFRASTRUCTURE LLC,
a California limited liability company

By: New Grid LLC, Member

By: Mercy Housing Calwest
a California nonprofit public benefit corporation
Its: sole member

DocuSigned by:

By: _____
Name: Ramie Dare
Title: Vice President

SCHEDULE 1

As Built Plans entitled:

Sunnydale HOPE SF Phase 1A-1
and 1A-2 Street Improvement Plans

Sheets INT2 and INT3



Prepared by: Giacalone Design Services, In

AS-BUILT LEGEND

- 1-4" CONDUIT
- 1-2" CONDUIT
- 2-4" CONDUIT

NOTE:


- RED-LINE INDICATES THE SIZE, COUNT AND TYPE OF CONDUITS INSTALLED
- PLEASE REFER TO TRENCH SECTION DETAIL DRAWING FOR MORE DETAILS
- PLEASE REFER TO JOINT TRENCH COMPOSITE PLAN FOR TRENCH LOCATION



TRENCH SECTION LEGEND

- ☐ MEETS UTILITY TRENCH ALLOTMENT
- ☐ EXCEEDS UTILITY TRENCH ALLOTMENT
- ☐ SFPUC PRIMARY
- ☐ SFPUC SECONDARY
- ☐ PG&E GAS
- ☐ TELEPHONE
- ☐ CABLE T.V.
- ☐ WAVE BROADBAND
- ☐ PUBLIC SAFETY/CITY FIBER OPTIC
- ☐ STREET LIGHTING

XX LF-TOTAL = TOTAL TRENCH LENGTH
XX LF-R&R = REMOVE & REPLACE PAVEMENT ONLY, TRENCH INCLUDED IN TOTAL TRENCH LENGTH



NOTE

PLEASE VERIFY THAT THE SERVICE POINTS IN THIS DRAWING MATCH YOUR DESIGN. IF THERE ARE ANY DISCREPANCIES, PLEASE CONTACT THE PROJECT MANAGER IN OUR OFFICE.

NOTE TO UTILITIES:

PLEASE INDICATE TIE-IN POINTS ON INTENT RESPONSE

PRELIMINARY PLANS
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION



AT&T Intent
REV 12-04-19 by
GDSI

R/W, P.U.E. & P.S.E. ACQUISITION NOTE:

CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY RIGHT OF WAY, PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT AND/OR PUBLIC SERVICE EASEMENT ACQUISITION WITH THE APPLICANT PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION WITHIN AREAS OF QUESTION.


CAUTION!!! ENERGIZED FACILITIES!!

CONTRACTOR TO EXERCISE EXTREME CAUTION TO AVOID DAMAGING EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES. OBSTRUCTIONS INDICATED ARE FOR INFORMATION ONLY. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY THE LOCATION AND DEPTH WITH THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES. NEITHER THE OWNER NOR THE DESIGNER ASSUME ANY RESPONSIBILITY THAT THE OBSTRUCTIONS INDICATED WILL ACTUALLY BE THE OBSTRUCTIONS ENCOUNTERED. POTHOLES IS REQUIRED. HAND EXCAVATE ONLY IN PRESENCE OF UTILITY INSPECTOR.

REVISIONS

SYMBOL	DATE	DESCRIPTION
	12-08-17	30% SUBMITTAL
	06-15-18	TRENCH ROUTE REVISIONS
	10-19-18	100% S.D. SUBMITTAL
	03-15-19	UTILITY SUBMITTAL

GIACALONE



DESIGN SERVICES, INC.

5820 STONEMORE HILL RD., #345 | PLEASANTON, CA 94686
925.467.1740 | WWW.GIACALONEDSIGN.COM

JOINT TRENCH INTENT PLAN

SUNNYDALE DEVELOPMENT CO., LLC
SUNNYDALE HOPE SF

PHASE 1A-1 & 1A-2

CALIFORNIA

SAN FRANCISCO

PROJECT MANAGER:
DAVID CROWFOOT

DRAWN BY:
D. SHAY/SAO

CHECKED BY:
DSC

SCALE:
1"=30'

JOB NUMBER:
17-232

DATE LAST MODIFIED:
03-15-19



SHEET











INT2


OF 3 SHEETS

CONTRACTOR TO EXERCISE EXTREME CAUTION TO AVOID DAMAGING EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES. OBSTRUCTIONS INDICATED ARE FOR INFORMATION ONLY. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY THE LOCATION AND DEPTH WITH THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES. NEITHER THE OWNER NOR THE DESIGNER ASSUME ANY RESPONSIBILITY THAT THE OBSTRUCTIONS INDICATED WILL ACTUALLY BE THE OBSTRUCTIONS ENCOUNTERED. POTHOLES IS REQUIRED. HAND EXCAVATE ONLY IN PRESENCE OF UTILITY INSPECTOR.

R/W, P.U.E. & P.S.E. ACQUISITION NOTE:
CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY RIGHT OF WAY, PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT
AND/OR PUBLIC SERVICE EASEMENT ACQUISITION WITH THE
APPLICANT PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION WITHIN AREAS OF QUESTION.



TRENCH SECTION LEGEND	
	MEETS UTILITY TRENCH ALLOTMENT
	EXCEEDS UTILITY TRENCH ALLOTMENT
	SFPUC PRIMARY
	SFPUC SECONDARY
	PG&E GAS
	TELEPHONE
	CABLE T.V.
	WAVE BROADBAND
	PUBLIC SAFETY/CITY FIBER OPTIC
	STREET LIGHTING
<p>XX LF-TOTAL= TOTAL TRENCH LENGTH</p> <p>XX LF-R&R = REMOVE & REPLACE PAVEMENT ONLY, TRENCH INCLUDED IN TOTAL TRENCH LENGTH</p>	




NOTE

PLEASE VERIFY THAT THE SERVICE POINTS IN THIS DRAWING MATCH YOUR DESIGN. IF THERE ARE ANY DISCREPANCIES, PLEASE CONTACT THE PROJECT MANAGER IN OUR OFFICE.

NOTE TO UTILITIES:
PLEASE INDICATE TIE-IN
POINTS ON INTENT RESPONSE

PRELIMINARY PLANS
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION



REVISONS			APPROVED
SYMBOL	DATE	DESCRIPTION	
	12-08-17	30% SUBMITTAL	
<u>A</u>	06-15-18	TRENCH ROUTE REVISIONS	
<u>A</u>	10-19-18	100% S.D. SUBMITTAL	
<u>A</u>	03-15-19	UTILITY SUBMITTAL	

GIACALONE
DESIGN SERVICES, INC.

5820 STONERIDGE MALL RD., #345 | PLEASANTON, CA 94588
925-467.1740 | WWW.GIACALONEDSIGN.COM

JOINT TRENCH INTENT PLAN

SUNNYDALE DEVELOPMENT CO., LLC
SUNNYDALE HOPE SF
PHASE 1A-1 & 1A-2

SAN FRANCISCO CALIFORNIA

PROJECT MANAGER: DAVID CROWFOOT
DRAWN BY: D. SHAY/SAO
CHECKED BY: DSC
SCALE: 1"=30'
JOB NUMBER: 17-232
DATE LAST MODIFIED: 03-15-19
SHEET INT3
OF 3 SHEETS



June 7, 2022

Carla Short
Interim Director of Public Works
San Francisco Public Works
49 South Van Ness, Suite 1600
San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: Public Street Parcels – Block 6311, Lots 009-010
Acceptance of Quitclaim Deed

Dear Interim Director Short:

The Sunnydale HOPE SF Project is a public housing transformation collaborative effort in the Sunnydale neighborhood. Phase 1A1+1A2 includes construction of public roadways and infrastructure, including: Harmonia Street, Malosi Street and Sunrise Way ("Sunnydale 1A1+1A2 Public Infrastructure"). Construction of Sunnydale 1A1+1A2 Public Infrastructure was completed on December 3, 2021 and San Francisco Public Works determined it to have been constructed in accordance with the Plans and Specifications and all applicable City codes, regulations and standards governing the same and it is ready for its intended use. (Draft Public Works Order June 2022).

The Planning Department reviewed the Hunters View Project, including the Sunnydale 1A1+1A2 Public Infrastructure and dedication, and determined and made environmental findings in a Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") for the Sunnydale HOPE SF Project. The Planning Commission certified the FEIR on July 9, 2015 (Motion No. 19409). By Motion Nos. 19784 and 20018, the Planning Commission adopted findings, as required by CEQA, regarding the alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant environmental effects analyzed in the FEIR, and a proposed mitigation monitoring and reporting program.

As set forth in a letter dated February 27, 2018, the Planning Department found that acceptance of the public infrastructure and real property associated with Harmonia Street, Malosi Street and Sunrise Way, is consistent with the eight priority policies of Planning Code section 101.1 and in conformance with the General Plan. On June 6, 2022, the Planning Department issued a General Plan Consistency Verification confirming that the acceptance of the right-of-way improvements for the Sunnydale HOPE SF Phase 1A1+1A2 improvements (as shown in Street Improvement Plans dated 5/17/19) and Master Encroachment Permit are generally consistent with the General plan and Planning Code Section 101.1.

In light of the above, I recommend the City accept the Sunnydale 1A1+1A2 Public Infrastructure and dedications of Assessor's Block 6311, Lots 009-010, as show in Final Map No. 9537, recorded on October 15, 2019 (Book 136 of Survey Maps, pgs. 206-216) via Quitclaim Deed.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Andrico Q. Penick", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Andrico Q. Penick
Director of Property

This document is exempt from payment of a recording fee pursuant to California Government Code Section 27383

**RECORDING REQUESTED BY AND
WHEN RECORDED RETURN TO:**

Housing Authority of the City and
County of San Francisco
1815 Egbert Street
San Francisco, CA 94124
Attn: Acting Executive Director

SPACE ABOVE THIS LINE FOR RECORDER'S USE

Block/Lot: _____

Address: _____, San Francisco, California

QUITCLAIM DEED
(Sunnydale-Velasco)

In accordance with Section 10.3.3 of that certain Master Development Agreement dated as of March 3, 2017, by and between the Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, a public body, corporate and politic (the "Authority"), the City and County of San Francisco, a municipal corporation, and Sunnydale Development Co., LLC, a California limited liability company, recorded in the official records of the City and County of San Francisco on March 3, 2017, as document number 2017-K416598-00, for good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged by the Authority, the Authority, does hereby quitclaim to the City and County of San Francisco, a municipal corporation, all of its right, title and interest in and to all of that real property located in the City and County of San Francisco, California described in Exhibit A attached hereto.

Remainder of Page Left Intentionally Blank

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Authority has executed this quitclaim deed as of
September 12, 2019.

**HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**, a public body
corporate and politic

By: Barbara T. Smith
Barbara T. Smith
Acting Executive Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Goldfarb & Lipman LLP
Special Legal Counsel

By: _____
Dianne Jackson McLean

Notary Acknowledgement and Exhibit A attached

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Authority has executed this quitclaim deed as of _____, 20__.

**HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**, a public body
corporate and politic


By: _____

Barbara T. Smith
Acting Executive Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Goldfarb & Lipman LLP
Special Legal Counsel

By: _____


Dianne Jackson McLean

Notary Acknowledgement and Exhibit A attached

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

COUNTY OF San Francisco)

On Sept. 12, 2019, before me, Cindy E. Gamez, Notary Public, personally appeared Barbara Taylor Smith, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.



Name: Cindy E. Gamez
Notary Public

EXHIBIT A

Legal Description of Property

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

ALL THAT REAL PROPERTY SITUATED IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

LOT A (SUNRISE WAY), **LOT B** (MALOSI STREET) AND **LOT C** (HARMONIA STREET), PUBLIC STREETS OFFERED FOR DEDICATION, AS SHOWN ON THAT MAP ENTITLED, "FINAL MAP 9537", RECORDED _____, 2019, IN BOOK _____ OF CONDOMINIUM MAPS, PAGES _____, INCLUSIVE, IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

APN'S: 6311-009, 6312-009 and 6311-010



CERTIFICATE OF ACCEPTANCE

As required under Government Code Section 27281, this is to certify that the interest in real property conveyed by the Quitclaim Deed dated _____, from The Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco a public body, corporate and politic to the City and County of San Francisco, a municipal corporation ("Grantee"), is hereby accepted by order of its Board of Supervisors' Ordinance No. _____, adopted on _____, and Grantee consents to recordation thereof by its duly authorized officer.

Dated: _____

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
a municipal corporation

By: _____
Andrico Q. Penick
Director of Property

APPROVED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Bruce Storrs
City and County Surveyor



San Francisco Public Works
General – Director's Office
49 South Van Ness Ave., Suite 1600
San Francisco, CA 94103
(628) 271-3160 www.SFPublicWorks.org

Public Works Order No: 206648

Recommending the formal acceptance of an irrevocable offer of public improvements associated with Sunnydale HOPE SF Project, Phase 1, Subphase 1A-1 and, 1A-2, including improvements located within portions of Sunrise Way, Malosi Street and, Harmonia Street Public Infrastructure for public use; accepting the Sub-Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Public Infrastructure for City maintenance and liability purposes, subject to specified limitations; establishing official street grades; and amending Ordinance No. 1061 entitled "Regulating the Width of Sidewalks" to establish official sidewalk width on the abovementioned street areas.

WHEREAS, SUNNYDALE INFRASTRUCTURE, LLC, a California limited liability company ("SUNNYDALE") and the HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, a public body corporate and politic ("SFHA"), have irrevocably offered the Sub-Phase 1A-1 and 1A-2 Public Infrastructure and real property, respectively, to the City and County of San Francisco ("City") as set forth in the SUNNYDALE Irrevocable Offer of Improvements dated February 28, 2022, (collectively, "SUNNYDALE Offer"); and

WHEREAS, On May 27, 2021, Public Works completed inspection of the Phase 1, Sub-phase 1A-1 and, 1A-2 Public Infrastructure and the City Engineer, by issuance of a Notice of Completion, determined it to be complete in accordance with the Plans and Specifications and all City codes, regulations, and standards governing the Phase 1 Public Infrastructure and ready for its intended use; and

WHEREAS, The Interim Public Works Director (hereinafter the "Public Works Director" or "Director") recommends and the City Engineer certifies to the Board of Supervisors that the Phase 1, Sub-Phase 1A-1 and, 1A-2 Public Infrastructure as shown in Street Improvement Permit No. 19IE-00564 be accepted for public use. Public Works recommends that the Board of Supervisors accept the Sub-Phase 1A-1 and, 1A-2 Public Infrastructure for City maintenance and liability purposes in accordance with Streets and Highways Code Sections 1806 and San Francisco Administrative Code 1.51 et seq. and subject to the exceptions specified herein; and

WHEREAS, the official public right-of-way widths for the applicable portions of Sunrise Way, Malosi Street and, Harmonia Street and sidewalk widths established as shown on Drawings Q-20-1160 through Q-20-1163 do not obviate, amend, alter, or in any other way affect the maintenance obligations of the adjacent property owners as set forth in the Public Works Code; and

WHEREAS, Drawing A-17-215 shows the street grades for the applicable portions of Sunrise Way, Malosi Street and, Harmonia Street; and

WHEREAS, In a letter dated June 6, 2022 the Department of City Planning re-affirmed that the acceptance of the public infrastructure and real property associated with the Phase 1, Sub-Phase

1A-1 and, 1A-2 Public Infrastructure and associated actions are, on balance, in conformity with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1; and

WHEREAS, The proposed street acceptance for City maintenance and liability and other actions related to the Phase 1 Public Infrastructure are within the scope of the Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") for the Potrero HOPE SF Project (the "Project") dated December 10, 2015, prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA"). The Planning Commission certified the FEIR on December 10, 2015, by Motion No. 19529. The Planning Commission in Motion No. 19530 adopted findings, as required by CEQA, regarding the alternatives, mitigation measures, significant environmental effects analyzed in the FEIR, a statement of overriding considerations for approval of the Project, and a proposed mitigation monitoring and reporting program. Planning Commission Motion Nos. 19529 and 19530 are collectively referred to as the "Planning Commission CEQA Findings;" and

WHEREAS, it is recommended that the Board of Supervisors finds that pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq.), including Sections 15162 and 15164, that the actions contemplated herein are consistent with, and within the scope of, the Project analyzed in the FEIR and addendum, and that (1) no substantial changes are proposed in the Project and no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which this Project will be undertaken that would require major revisions to the FEIR due to the involvement of any new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects and (2) no new information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the FEIR was certified as complete shows that the Project will have any new significant effects not analyzed in the FEIR, or a substantial increase in the severity of any effect previously examined, or that new mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the Project, or that mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the FEIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDERED THAT,

The Director approves all of the following documents either attached hereto or referenced herein:

1. Offer of Improvements for the Phase 1, Sub-Phase 1A-1 and, 1A-2 Public Infrastructure.
2. Ordinance to accept the Phase 1, Sub-Phase 1A-1 and, 1A-2 Public Infrastructure for City maintenance and liability purposes
3. Official Street Dedication and Grade Map A-17-215

4. Official Sidewalk and Roadway Width – Q-20-1160 through Q-20-1163

The Director recommends that the Board of Supervisors approve the legislation to accept the BRIDGE Offer. Hereinafter, the Director's recommendation also includes the City Engineer's certification of actions under the City Engineer's authority.

The Director further recommends that the Board of Supervisors approve the legislation to dedicate the Phase 1, Sub-Phase 1A-1 and, 1A-2 Public Infrastructure to public use, designate it as open public right-of-way for permit and roadway purposes, and accept it for City maintenance and liability purposes subject to the following:

1. The portions of streets being designated as open public right of way for street and roadway purposes are from back of sidewalk to back of sidewalk, unless specified otherwise or as shown on the Plans and Specifications for the Phase 1 Public Infrastructure;
2. Acceptance of the Phase 1, Sub-Phase 1A-1 and, 1A-2 Public Infrastructure for City maintenance and liability purposes is from back of curb to back of curb, unless specified otherwise, and sidewalk maintenance is the responsibility of the adjacent property owners in accordance with the Public Works Code;
3. Encroachments that are permitted, not permitted, or both, are excluded from acceptance;
4. The acceptance of the streets does not obviate, amend, alter, or in any way affect existing maintenance agreements between the City and parties to such agreements;
5. BRIDGE's conditional assignment of all warranties and guaranties to the City related to the construction of the Phase 1 Public Infrastructure and its warranty obligations under Street
6. Improvement Permit No. 19IE-00564; and
7. The acceptance shall be expressly conditioned on the Project applicant obtaining an encroachment permit or other authorization from the City to maintain encroachments in the public right-of-way that are the applicant's responsibility.

Notwithstanding California Streets and Highways Code Sections 8000 et seq., and in accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code Sections 1.51 et seq. the Director recommends that the Board of Supervisors elect to follow its own procedures for the establishment of street grades.

The Director recommends that the Board of Supervisors approve the legislation to amend Board of Supervisors Ordinance No. 1061, entitled "Regulating the Width of Sidewalks," a copy of which is in the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors Book of General Ordinances, in effect May 11, 1910, by adding thereto a new section to read as follows:

Section 1639. The width of sidewalks on portions of Sunrise Way, Malosi Street and Harmonia Street shall be modified as shown on the Public Works Drawings Q-20-1160 through Q-20-1163, dated May 26, 2022 through May 29, 2022.

The Director recommends that the Board of Supervisors approve the legislation and direct Public Works to revise the Official Public Right-of-Way, Sidewalk Width, and Street Grade maps in accordance with the legislation.

X

DocuSigned by:

Patrick Rivera

Rivera, Patrick

Acting Manager, Project Management

X

DocuSigned by:

Ko, Albert J

Ko, Albert J

City Engineer

X

DocuSigned by:

Carla Short

073CF73A4EA6486...

Short, Carla

Interim Director



GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY VERIFICATION

June 6, 2022

Phillip C. Wong
Project Manager, Office of Economic and Workforce Development
City Hall, Room 496,
San Francisco, CA 94102-4605

Project Title: Sunnydale HOPE SF – Phase 1 – Acceptance of Public Improvements and Sidewalk Modifications; Approval of Master Major Encroachment Permit
Assessor's Block/Lot: [Several – see attached Planning Commission Motion]
Design Review Approval No: 2010.0305PRJ
Zoning District: RM-1 / 65-X / Sunnydale HOPE SF SUD
Staff Contact: Mathew Snyder, (628) 652-7460, mathew.snyder@sfgov.org

Dear Mr. Wong:

This letter is to confirm that the acceptance of the right-of-way improvements for the Sunnydale HOPE SF Phase 1A1 and 1A2 improvements as shown in Street Improvement Plans dated 5/17/19 and approved by Public Works Street Use and Mapping 7/15/19 under Permit No. 19/E-00514 are generally consistent with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1. The Master Encroachment Permit is similarly generally consistent with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1.

The Sunnydale HOPE SF Project received its master approval in the spring of 2017 including the Planning Commission's adoption of master General Plan and Planning Section 101.1 consistency findings under Planning Commission Motion 19785.

Staff has reviewed the Plans for which the subject Board of Supervisors is scheduled to accept and found them consistent with the Master Approvals. Therefore, the action before the Board of Supervisors can count on the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1 Consistency Findings of Motion 19785 for the subject action.

Please don't hesitate to call with any questions.

Sincerely,

Mat Snyder

Mat Snyder
Senior Planner

Attachment
Planning Commission Motion No. 19785



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Motion No. 19785

SUNNYDALE GENERAL PLAN FINDINGS

HEARING DATE: NOVEMBER 17, 2016

Case No.: 2010.0305 E GPA PCT PCM DEV GEN SHD
Project Address: **Sunnydale Hope SF Master Plan Project**
Zoning: RM-1 (Residential – Mixed, Moderate Density)
40-X Height and Bulk Districts
Block/Lot: Assessor's Block/Lots: 6356/ 061, 062, 063 ,064, 065, 066, 067 and 068; 6310/
001; 6311/001; 6312/ 001; 6313/001; 6314/ 001; 6315/001
Project Sponsor: Mercy Housing and Related California
1360 Mission Street, #300
San Francisco, CA 94103

Staff Contact: Mat Snyder – (415) 575-6891
mathew.snyder@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

ADOPTING FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND WITH SECTION 101.1 OF THE CITY PLANNING CODE FOR THE SUNNYDALE HOPE SF MASTER PLAN PROJECT.

Preamble

San Francisco Charter Section 4.105 and Administrative Code Section 2A.53 of the Administrative Code requires General Plan referrals to the Planning Commission for certain matters so that the Commission may determine if such actions are in conformity with the General Plan and Section 101.1 of the Planning Code. Actions, including but not limited to legislative actions, subdivisions, right-of-way dedications and vacations, and the purchasing of property are required to be in conformity with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1.

In 2008, Mercy Housing, ("Project Sponsor") was selected by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (hereinafter "MOHCD") (then, the Mayor's Office of Housing) and the San Francisco Housing Authority to work with the local Sunnydale and Velasco and surrounding Visitacion Valley communities to create a Master Plan for the complete redevelopment of the site that would not only include reconstructed Housing Authority units, but additional affordable units along with market rate units, neighborhood serving retail, community service, new parks and open space, and new streets and infrastructure ("The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan Project" or "Project"). As a part of the HOPE SF selection process, the Project Sponsor was also selected to act as the Master Developer for the Project.

HOPE SF is the nation's first large-scale public housing transformation collaborative aimed at disrupting intergenerational poverty, reducing social isolation, and creating vibrant mixed-income communities without mass displacement of current residents. Launched in 2007, HOPE SF is a twenty-year human and real estate capital commitment by the City. HOPE SF, the City's signature anti-poverty

and equity initiative, is committed to breaking intergenerational patterns related to the insidious impacts of trauma and poverty, and to creating economic and social opportunities for current public housing residents through deep investment in education, economic mobility, health and safety.

The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan Project ("The Project") is a 50-acre site located in the Visitacion Valley neighborhood and is generally bounded by McLaren Park to the north, Crocker Amazon Park to the west, Hahn Street to the East and Velasco to the south. The San Francisco Housing Authority currently owns and operates 775 units on approximately 50 acres (including streets) site. The site currently consists of 775 affordable units and is owned and operated by the San Francisco Housing Authority.

As the selected Master Developer, the Project Sponsor applied to the Planning Department to enter a Development Agreement with the City under Administrative Code Chapter 56. The Project Sponsor also submitted an application for environmental review. On December 12, 2012, the Department issued a Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report ("NOP") for the Project. On December 19, 2014, the Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report / Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("DEIR/DEIS") for the Project and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR/DEIS for public review and comment. The DEIR/DEIS was available for public comment from December 12, 2014 through February 17, 2015. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on January 22, 2015 on the DEIR/DEIS at a regularly scheduled meeting to solicit public comment regarding the DEIR/DEIS.

The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the public review period for the DEIR/DEIS, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR/DEIS in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period. This material was presented in a Response to Comments document, published on June 24, 2015, distributed to the Planning Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR/DEIS, and made available to others upon request at the Department.

A Final Environmental Impact Report / Final Environmental Impact Statement ("FEIR/FEIS" or "Final EIR/EIS") was prepared by the Department, consisting of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Response to Comments document.

On July 9, 2015, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the Final EIR/EIS and found that the contents of the report and the procedures through which the Final EIR/EIS was prepared, publicized, and reviewed complied with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA"), 14 California Code of Regulations sections 15000 et seq. ("CEQA Guidelines"), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code ("Chapter 31").

The Commission found the Final EIR/EIS was adequate, accurate and objective, reflected the independent analysis and judgment of the Department and the Commission, and that the summary of comments and responses contained no significant revisions to the Draft EIR/EIS, and approved the Final EIR/EIS for the Project in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31.

The Planning Department, Jonas P. Ionin, is the custodian of records, located in the File for Case No. 2010.0305E, at 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California.

Department staff prepared a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the Project and these materials were made available to the public and this Commission for this Commission's review, consideration and action.

On September 15, 2016, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 19738 initiating General Plan amendments to further the Project. The initiated amendments would (1) amend Map 4 of the Urban Design Element, "Urban Design Guidelines for the Heights of Buildings", by designating the Sunnydale site within the 40-88 height designation area; and (2) amend Map 03 of the Recreation and Open Space Element, "Existing and Proposed Parks and Open Space", providing indications of the new parks within the site on the map.

On October 24, 2016, the Board of Supervisors initiated Planning Code Text and Map amendments that would create the Sunnydale HOPE SF Special Use District ("SUD") and provisions regarding it. The Map amendments would map the subject site within the SUD and within a 40/65-X Height and Bulk District.

By this action, the Planning Commission adopts General Plan Consistency findings, including a finding that the Project, as identified in the Final EIR, is consistent with Planning Code Section 101.1.

Other than those actions described above, several actions will be required for the project over its multi-year buildout. These actions include but are not limited to approval of subdivisions, right-of-way dedications and vacations.

The Planning Commission wishes to facilitate the physical, environmental, social and economic revitalization of Project site, using the legal tools available through the Planning and Administrative Codes, while creating jobs, housing and open space in a safe, pleasant, attractive and livable mixed use neighborhood that is linked rationally to adjacent neighborhoods. The Commission wishes to enable implementing actions.

The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan Project provides for a type of development, intensity of development and location of development that is consistent with the overall goals and objectives and policies of the General Plan as well as the Eight Priority Policies of Section 101.1, as expressed in the findings contained in Attachment A to this Motion.

Attachment A

To Planning Commission Motion No.

Case No. 2010.0305 E GPA PCT PCM DEV GEN SHD

The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan Project General Plan Findings

and

Planning Code Section 101.1 Findings

The following constitute findings that the Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan Project (Project) and approval actions thereto are, on balance, consistent with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1. The SUNNYDALE Master Plan Project is described within the Final EIR, Certified by the Planning Commission on July 9, 2015, with Planning Commission Motion No. 19409.

Approval actions that will be required to implement the Project include, but are not limited to: (1) Adoption of General Plan, Planning Code Text, and Map Amendments that would establish a Sunnydale HOPE SF Special Use District and associated Design Standards and Guidelines Document, and would increase heights in some locations; (2) Approval of a Development Agreement between the City of County of San Francisco, the Master Developer, and the San Francisco Housing Authority; (3) shadow impact findings; and (4) various mapping, street vacation and street dedication actions; and (5) the purchase of the site at Sunnydale and Hahn for the development of affordable housing.

HOUSING ELEMENT

The principle objectives of the Housing Element are to provide new housing; retain the existing supply; enhance physical conditions and safety without jeopardizing use or affordability; support affordable housing production by increasing site availability and capacity; increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the affordable housing production system; protect the affordability of existing housing; expand financial resources for permanently affordable housing; ensure equal access; avoid or mitigate hardships imposed by displacement; reduce homelessness and the risk of homelessness in coordination with relevant agencies and providers; pursue place making and neighborhood building principles in increasing the supply of housing; and strengthen citywide affordable housing programs through coordinated regional and state efforts.

The Project is consistent with and implements the following objectives and policies of the Housing Element:

OBJECTIVE 1	Identify and make available for development adequate sites to meet the City's housing needs, especially permanently affordable housing.
POLICY 1.1	Plan for the full range of housing needs in the City and County of San Francisco, especially affordable housing.
POLICY 1.3	Work proactively to identify and secure opportunity sites for permanently affordable housing.
Objective 4	Foster a housing stock that meets the needs of all residents across lifecycles.
POLICY 4.1	Develop new housing, and encourage the remodeling of existing housing, for families with children.
POLICY 4.2	Provide a range of housing options for residents with special needs for housing support and services.
POLICY 4.5	Ensure that new permanently affordable housing is located in all of the city's neighborhoods, and encourage integrated neighborhoods, with a diversity of unit types provided at a range of income levels.
Objective 5	Ensure that all residents have equal access to available units.
POLICY 5.5	Minimize the hardships of displacement by providing essential relocation services.
POLICY 5.6	Offer displaced households the right of first refusal to occupy replacement housing units that are comparable in size, location, cost, and rent control protection.
Objective 7	Secure funding and resources for permanently affordable housing, including innovative programs that are not solely reliant on traditional mechanisms or capital.
POLICY 7.5	Encourage the production of affordable housing through process and zoning accommodations, and prioritize affordable housing in the review and approval processes.

Objective 8	Build public and private sector capacity to support, facilitate, provide and maintain affordable housing.
POLICY 8.1	Support the production and management of permanently affordable housing.
POLICY 8.3	Generate greater public awareness about the quality and character of affordable housing projects and generate communitywide support for new affordable housing.
Objective 9	Preserve units subsidized by the federal, state or local sources.
POLICY 9.3	Maintain and improve the condition of the existing supply of public housing, through programs such as HOPE SF.
POLICY 11.1	Promote the construction and rehabilitation of well-designed housing that emphasizes beauty, flexibility, and innovative design, and respects existing neighborhood character.
POLICY 11.2	Ensure implementation of accepted design standards in project approvals.
POLICY 11.3	Ensure growth is accommodated without substantially and adversely impacting existing residential neighborhood character.
POLICY 11.6	Foster a sense of community through architectural design, using features that promote community interaction.
Objective 12	Balance housing growth with adequate infrastructure that serves the City's growing population.
POLICY 12.1	Encourage new housing that relies on transit use and environmentally sustainable patterns of movement.
POLICY 12.2	Consider the proximity of quality of life elements, such as open space, child care, and neighborhood services, when developing new housing units.
POLICY 12.3	Ensure new housing is sustainably supported by the City's public infrastructure systems.

The Hope SF initiative, including the Sunnydale Hope SF Master Development Project, is a central affordable housing and community development program for the City and County of San Francisco. Through the Hope SF initiative, existing affordable housing sites for very low income residents will be rebuilt with better connected mixed-income, complete neighborhoods that increase the permanent affordable housing stock of the City as well as provides a range of housing options for residents with special needs and for a range of income levels.

The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Development Project will take advantage of the underutilized site to create both additional affordable housing and market rate housing thereby furthering Policies 1.1 and 1.4 provided above. The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Development Project will seek to minimize displacement of existing residents and will provide essential relocation services that include maintenance of subsidized housing opportunities and the right to return as provided in the Right to Return Ordinance. The proposed funding of this large scale project is creative and leverages extensive public and private sources of capital. The project will receive zoning and priority approval processes to encourage the production of affordable housing.

The high visibility of this project will increase capacity of builders and owners of affordable and mixed income communities as well as raise greater public awareness of the high quality design and character of affordable housing. Policy 9.3 specifically names HOPE SF as leading initiative to maintain and improve the condition of existing supply of public housing in the Plan Area. As a site that is currently well under the Planning Code's density limit, the Hope SF also looks to take advantage of the additional allowed density to construct both affordable and market-rate units. The market-rate development will both create a mixed-income neighborhood and will cross-subsidizing the cost of reconstructing the existing dilapidated affordable housing. Also central to the Hope SF initiative, is the construction of new infrastructure including new streets and parks that meet -- and in some cases exceed -- current City standards for ecological performance, safety, and comfort.

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

The principle objectives for Commerce & Industry are to manage economic growth and change, maintain a sound and diverse economic base and fiscal structure, provide expanded employment opportunities for city residents particularly the unemployed and underemployed in a wide range of fields and levels, improve viability of existing businesses as well as attract new businesses – particularly in new industries, and assure entrepreneurial opportunities for local businesses.

The following objectives and policies are relevant to the Project:

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| OBJECTIVE 6 | MAINTAIN AND STRENGTHEN VIABLE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL AREAS EASILY ACCESSIBLE TO CITY RESIDENTS. |
| POLICY 6.1 | Ensure and encourage the retention and provision of neighborhood-serving goods and services in the city's neighborhood commercial districts, while recognizing and encouraging diversity among the districts. |
| POLICY 6.2 | Promote economically vital neighborhood commercial districts which foster small business enterprises and entrepreneurship and which are responsive to economic and technological innovation in the marketplace and society. |
| POLICY 6.4 | Encourage the location of neighborhood shopping areas throughout the city so that essential retail goods and personal services are accessible to all residents. |
| POLICY 6.7 | Promote high quality urban design on commercial streets. |

The Project meets and furthers the Objectives and Policies of the Commerce and Industry Element by reinforcing the typical San Francisco pattern of including resident serving uses along with residential development. The Project will generally permit small scale retail and community related uses throughout and requiring ground floor non-residential uses on a portion of Sunnydale and Hawn Streets, which will serve as a part of the neighborhood's "Hub". Design and Land Use regulations for the development will require that neighborhood commercial retail be established in a pedestrian-oriented active environment typical of San Francisco neighborhoods and specifically called for in the Commerce and Industry Element. The possible provision of retail space will provide entrepreneurial opportunities for local residents and workers. Of course, new development will provide construction business opportunities, especially with outreach to small businesses through the City's SBE program, along with opportunities for property management and maintenance.

RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

The principle objectives of the Recreation and Open Space Element are to preserve large areas of open space sufficient to meet the long-range needs of the Bay Region, develop and maintain a diversified and balanced citywide system of high quality public open space, provide a continuous public open space along the shoreline, and provide opportunities for recreation and the enjoyment of open space in every neighborhood.

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| OBJECTIVE 1 | ENSURE A WELL-MAINTAINED, HIGHLY UTILIZED, AND INTEGRATED OPEN SPACE SYSTEM |
| POLICY 1.1 | Encourage the dynamic and flexible use of existing open spaces and promote a variety of recreation and open space uses, where appropriate. |
| POLICY 1.11 | Encourage private recreational facilities on private land that provide a community benefit, particularly to low and moderate-income residents. |
| OBJECTIVE 2 | INCREASE RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE TO MEET THE LONG-TERM NEEDS OF THE CITY AND BAY REGION |
| POLICY 2.7 | Expand partnerships among open space agencies, transit agencies, private sector and nonprofit institutions to acquire, develop and/or manage existing open spaces. |
| POLICY 2.8 | Consider repurposing underutilized City-owned properties as open space and recreational facilities. |
| OBJECTIVE 3 | IMPROVE ACCESS AND CONNECTIVITY TO OPEN SPACE |
| POLICY 3.1 | Creatively develop existing publicly-owned right-of-ways and streets into open space. |
| POLICY 3.2 | Establish and Implement a network of Green Connections that increases access to parks, open spaces, and the waterfront. |
| POLICY 3.6 | Maintain, restore, expand and fund the urban forest. |

The Project meets and furthers the Objectives and Policies of the Recreation and Open Space by creating a new street and open space network within an area that is currently characterized by wide disconnected streets, steep unoccupied terrain, and lack of recreational opportunities. Altogether, 3.5 acres of new parks and open space are proposed for the site. Further, the new street network will improve connectivity from existing residential neighborhoods, parks and open spaces.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

The Transportation Element is largely concerned with the movement of people and goods. It addresses the need for multi-modal streets and facilities, implementation of the City's transit-first policy, the need to limit parking and auto capacity on the roads, and ways to incentivize travel by transit, bike and by foot. It also addresses the relationship between transportation and land use and how the two should be coordinated to reduce the need for auto trips.

The following objectives and policies are relevant to the Project:

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| OBJECTIVE 1 | MEET THE NEEDS OF ALL RESIDENTS AND VISITORS FOR SAFE, CONVENIENT AND INEXPENSIVE TRAVEL WITHIN SAN FRANCISCO AND BETWEEN THE CITY AND OTHER PARTS OF THE REGION WHILE MAINTAINING THE HIGH QUALITY LIVING ENVIRONMENT OF THE BAY AREA. |
| POLICY 1.2 | Ensure the safety and comfort of pedestrians throughout the city. |
| POLICY 1. 6 | Ensure choices among modes of travel and accommodate each mode when and where it is most appropriate. |
| POLICY 2.5 | Provide incentives for the use of transit, carpools, vanpools, walking and bicycling and reduce the need for new or expanded automobile and automobile parking facilities. |
| OBJECTIVE 18 | ESTABLISH A STREET HIERARCHY SYSTEM IN WHICH THE FUNCTION AND DESIGN OF EACH STREET ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE CHARACTER AND USE OF ADJACENT LAND. |
| POLICY 18.2 | Design streets for a level of traffic that serves, but will not cause a detrimental impact on adjacent land uses, or eliminate the efficient and safe movement of transit vehicles and bicycles. |
| POLICY 18.4 | Discourage high-speed through traffic on local streets in residential areas through traffic "calming" measures that are designed not to disrupt transit service or bicycle movement, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sidewalk bulbs and widenings at intersections and street entrances;• Lane off-sets and traffic bumps; |

- Narrowed traffic lanes with trees, landscaping and seating areas; and
- colored and/or textured sidewalks and crosswalks.

POLICY 20.5 Place and maintain all sidewalk elements, including passenger shelters, benches, trees, newsracks, kiosks, toilets, and utilities at appropriate transit stops according to established guidelines.

OBJECTIVE 23 IMPROVE THE CITY'S PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION SYSTEM TO PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT, PLEASANT, AND SAFE MOVEMENT.

POLICY 23.1 Provide sufficient pedestrian movement space with a minimum of pedestrian congestion in accordance with a pedestrian street classification system.

POLICY 23.2 Widen sidewalks where intensive commercial, recreational, or institutional activity is present, sidewalks are congested and where residential densities are high.

POLICY 23.3 Maintain a strong presumption against reducing sidewalk widths, eliminating crosswalks and forcing indirect crossings to accommodate automobile traffic.

POLICY 23.6 Ensure convenient and safe pedestrian crossings by minimizing the distance pedestrians must walk to cross a street.

OBJECTIVE 24 IMPROVE THE AMBIENCE OF THE PEDESTRIAN ENVIRONMENT.

POLICY 24.2 Maintain and expand the planting of street trees and the infrastructure to support them.

POLICY 24.3 Install pedestrian-serving street furniture where appropriate.

POLICY 24.5 Where consistent with transportation needs, transform streets and alleys into neighborhood-serving open spaces or "living streets", especially in neighborhoods deficient in open space.

OBJECTIVE 26 CONSIDER THE SIDEWALK AREA AS AN IMPORTANT ELEMENT IN THE CITYWIDE OPEN SPACE SYSTEM.

- OBJECTIVE 27 ENSURE THAT BICYCLES CAN BE USED SAFELY AND
CONVENIENTLY AS A PRIMARY MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION, AS
WELL AS FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES.
- OBJECTIVE 28 PROVIDE SECURE AND CONVENIENT PARKING FACILITIES FOR
BICYCLES.
- POLICY 28.1 Provide secure bicycle parking in new governmental, commercial, and
residential developments.
- OBJECTIVE 34 RELATE THE AMOUNT OF PARKING IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS AND
NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS TO THE CAPACITY OF
THE CITY'S STREET SYSTEM AND LAND USE PATTERNS.
- POLICY 34.3 Permit minimal or reduced off-street parking supply for new buildings in
residential and commercial areas adjacent to transit centers and along
transit preferential streets.
- OBJECTIVE 35 MEET SHORT-TERM PARKING NEEDS IN NEIGHBORHOOD
SHOPPING DISTRICTS CONSISTENT WITH PRESERVATION OF A
DESIRABLE ENVIRONMENT FOR PEDESTRIANS AND RESIDENTS.

The Project meets and furthers the Objectives and Policies of the Transportation Element by requiring the creation of a new fine-grained street grid in place of the curvilinear configured and disconnected street and block pattern that exists today. The Project accommodates the creation of a new mixed-use predominately development in a pattern that encourages walking and using transit. The Project also calls for streetscape improvements that will calm auto traffic while assuring pedestrian and bicyclist comfort and enjoyment.

URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT

The Urban Design Element addresses the physical character and order of the City. It establishes objectives and policies dealing with the city pattern, conservation (both of natural areas and historic structures), major new developments, and neighborhood environment. It discusses meeting “human needs”, largely by assuring quality living environments, and by protecting and enhancing those characteristics of development that make San Francisco special.

The following objectives and policies are relevant to the Project:

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| OBJECTIVE 1 | EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION. |
| POLICY 1.1 | Recognize and protect major views in the city, with particular attention to those of open space and water. |
| POLICY 1.2 | Recognize, protect and reinforce the existing street pattern, especially as it is related to topography. |
| POLICY 1.3 | Recognize that buildings, when seen together, produce a total effect that characterizes the city and its districts. |
| POLICY 1.5 | Emphasize the special nature of each district through distinctive landscaping and other features. |
| POLICY 1.6 | Make centers of activity more prominent through design of street features and by other means. |
| POLICY 1.7 | Recognize the natural boundaries of districts, and promote connections between districts. |
| POLICY 2.9 | Review proposals for the giving up of street areas in terms of all the public values that streets afford. |
| POLICY 2.10 | Permit release of street areas, where such release is warranted, only in the least extensive and least permanent manner appropriate to each case. |
| OBJECTIVE 3 | MODERATION OF MAJOR NEW DEVELOPMENT TO COMPLEMENT THE CITY PATTERN, THE RESOURCES TO BE CONSERVED, AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT. |

- POLICY 3.3 Promote efforts to achieve high quality of design for buildings to be constructed at prominent locations.
- POLICY 3.4 Promote building forms that will respect and improve the integrity of open spaces and other public areas.
- POLICY 3.5 Relate the height of buildings to important attributes of the city pattern and to the height and character of existing development.
- POLICY 3.7 Recognize the special urban design problems posed in development of large properties.
- POLICY 3.8 Discourage accumulation and development of large properties, unless such development is carefully designed with respect to its impact upon the surrounding area and upon the city.
- OBJECTIVE 4 IMPROVEMENT OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT TO INCREASE PERSONAL SAFETY, COMFORT, PRIDE AND OPPORTUNITY .
- POLICY 4.3 Provide adequate lighting in public areas.
- POLICY 4.4 Design walkways and parking facilities to minimize danger to pedestrians.
- POLICY 4.5 Provide adequate maintenance for public areas.
- POLICY 4.6 Emphasize the importance of local centers providing commercial and government services.
- POLICY 4.8 Provide convenient access to a variety of recreation opportunities.
- POLICY 4.10 Encourage or require the provision of recreation space in private development.
- POLICY 4.12 Install, promote and maintain landscaping in public and private areas.
- POLICY 4.13 Improve pedestrian areas by providing human scale and interest.

On balance, the Project is consistent with and furthers the Urban Design Element. The project enables the establishment of a new vibrant mixed-use-predominately-residential neighborhood on currently underutilized land. The Project will connect to the Visitacion Valley street grid and block pattern where

it currently does not today, thereby reinforcing Visitacion Valley's street pattern. The Project's compact urban development of modulated buildings will step along the site's topography; open spaces and green streets will punctuate the new block pattern. Taken together, these characteristics will enable the revitalized Sunnydale Hope SF neighborhood to be both individually distinctive and better integrated into the larger Visitacion Valley neighborhood. Streets will be designed to Better Streets standards and will be safe, comfortable, and inviting. While the proposal includes allowing heights of buildings to be as tall as 65-feet at some locations (taller than what's allowed within other residentially portions of Visitacion Valley), design standards will require that they be broken down both vertically and horizontally and be designed to the human scale. The portion of the site that allows the tallest heights will be reserved for the center of the neighborhood's planned commercial and community-serving center, thereby demarking the Project's civic heart. While the view across the site will change in nature with additional buildings in the foreground, other views will be improved and protected by aligning new streets with existing streets allowing continual views down them and assuring they are not blocked in the future. On balance, the urban design character of the site will be significantly improved; therefore, the Project is consistent with the Urban Design Element.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ELEMENT

The Environmental Protection Element is concerned with protecting the natural environment within San Francisco's urban context. The element provides objectives and policies for the following topics: the Bay, ocean and shoreline, air, fresh water, land, flora and fauna, transportation noise, and energy.

The following objectives and policies are relevant to the Project:

OBJECTIVE 1 ACHIEVE A PROPER BALANCE AMONG THE CONSERVATION, UTILIZATION, AND DEVELOPMENT OF SAN FRANCISCO'S NATURAL RESOURCES.

Policy 1.4 Assure that all new development meets strict environmental quality standards and recognizes human needs.

OBJECTIVE 15 INCREASE THE ENERGY EFFICIENCY OF TRANSPORTATION AND ENCOURAGE LAND USE PATTERNS AND METHODS OF TRANSPORTATION WHICH USE LESS ENERGY.

POLICY 15.3 Encourage an urban design pattern that will minimize travel requirements among working, shopping, recreation, school and childcare areas.

The Project is consistent with and implements the Environmental Protection Element in that it calls for mixed-use, moderate density, transit-friendly, sustainable development. The Project and all related City approvals are consistent with the Environmental Protection Element as the Project satisfies and implements the preponderance of Element's objectives and policies: the Project furthers the Element's emphasis on the need for compact, and sustainable development.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ELEMENT

The Community Facilities element addresses police facilities, neighborhood center facilities, fire facilities, library facilities, public health facilities, and touches upon educational facilities, institutional facilities (colleges, etc.) wastewater facilities, and solid waste facilities.

The following objectives and policies are relevant to the Project:

OBJECTIVE 3 ASSURE THAT NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTS HAVE ACCESS TO
NEEDED SERVICES AND A FOCUS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD
ACTIVITIES

POLICY 3.6 Base priority for the development of neighborhood centers on relative
need.

OBJECTIVE 4 PROVIDE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS THAT ARE RESPONSIVE TO
THE COMMUNITY SERVED.

POLICY 4.1 Assure effective neighborhood participation in the initial planning,
ongoing programming, and activities of multi-purpose neighborhood
centers

The Project is consistent with and implements the Community Facilities Element. The Project allows for community serving uses on the ground floor throughout the development. A community center and senior housing development is planned for "The Hub" portion of the site, that among other community-based uses will include child care. Whether or not community uses will eventually establish themselves in other permitted locations will depend on community needs and demands as well as broader market factors as the Project gets built out.

PUBLIC SAFETY ELEMENT

- OBJECTIVE 2 REDUCE STRUCTURAL AND NON-STRUCTURAL HAZARDS TO LIFE SAFETY, MINIMIZE PROPERTY DAMAGE AND RESULTING SOCIAL, CULTURAL AND ECONOMIC DISLOCATIONS RESULTING FROM FUTURE DISASTERS.
- POLICY 2.1 Assure that new construction meets current structural and life safety standards.
- POLICY 2.3 Consider site soils conditions when reviewing projects in areas subject to liquefaction or slope instability.
- POLICY 2.9 Consider information about geologic hazards whenever City decisions that will influence land use, building density, building configurations or infrastructure are made.
- POLICY 2.12 Enforce state and local codes that regulate the use, storage and transportation of hazardous materials in order to prevent, contain and effectively respond to accidental releases.

The Project is consistent with and implements the Community Safety Element. All improvements, including infrastructure, buildings and open space improvements will be constructed to local seismic standards, taking into account, among other considerations, the geological condition of the soil and where applicable, any remediation activity.

AIR QUALITY ELEMENT

The Air Quality Element is concerned, in part, with reducing the level of pollutants in the air, thus protecting and improving public health, welfare and the quality of life of the citizens of San Francisco and the residents of the metropolitan region. It emphasizes that opportunities for economic growth in the area can be enhanced through implementation of transportation, land use and other policies in harmony with clean air goals.

The following objectives and policies are relevant to the Project:

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| OBJECTIVE 3 | DECREASE THE AIR QUALITY IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT BY COORDINATION OF LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION DECISIONS. |
| POLICY 3.1 | Take advantage of the high density development in San Francisco to improve the transit infrastructure and also encourage high density and compact development where an extensive transportation infrastructure exists. |
| POLICY 3.2 | Encourage mixed land use development near transit lines and provide retail and other types of service oriented uses within walking distance to minimize automobile dependent development. |
| POLICY 3.6 | Link land use decision making policies to the availability of transit and consider the impacts of these policies on the local and regional transportation system. |
| POLICY 3.9 | Encourage and require planting of trees in conjunction with new development to enhance pedestrian environment and select species of trees that optimize achievement of air quality goals |

The Project is consistent with and implements the Air Quality Element in that it calls for mixed-use predominately residential, moderate density, sustainable development that will enable efficient use of land and encourage travel by transit and by foot, thereby reducing auto use. The Project will be built to LEED Neighborhood Development standards. The Project is consistent with the Air Quality Element because it satisfies and implements the preponderance of Element's objectives and policies; most importantly, the Project furthers the Element's emphasis on efficient and compact development.

General Plan Priority Finding

(Planning Code Section 101.1 Findings)

Planning Code Section 101.1(b) establishes eight priority policies and is a basis by which differences between competing policies in the General Plan are resolved. As described below, the Project is consistent with the eight priority policies set forth in Planning Code Section 101.1(b).

1. That existing neighborhood serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in or ownership of such businesses enhanced.

The Project will preserve and enhance existing neighborhood serving retail uses. The Project would potentially accommodate roughly 15,000 square feet of new retail uses. The retail uses are envisioned to be local serving. The project does not include the removal of any existing neighborhood serving retail and is not expected to unduly compete against long established Visitacion Valley neighborhood commercial districts along Leland Avenue.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.

The Project accommodates new development on land that is underutilized and improvements that are dilapidated. While it would remove existing housing, the housing will be replaced by significantly improved housing in a neighborhood pattern much more similar to the rest of Visitacion Valley than what exists today. Existing tenants will be actively engaged in the relocation planning process and will be offered on-site relocation opportunities as part of a larger community building strategy employed by HOPE SF to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of the neighborhood. . Outside of the boundaries of the Housing Authority site

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced.

The Project is a part of the Hope SF, the Mayor's signature anti-poverty initiative aimed at eradicating intergenerational poverty. As noted above, existing affordable units will be demolished and replaced with significantly improved units at the same affordable levels as the units removed. Along with replacement units for extremely low income households, about 295 additional affordable units for low income households are also proposed.

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.

The Project anticipates and accommodates new transit as planned through the City's Muni Forward Project. Design of streets and bus stops will include bus bulbs and bus shelters; street cross sections and corner design will assure sufficient space for bus travel. Moreover, the Project includes the creation of a pedestrian-oriented street and open space network that will encourage alternative modes of transportation. The Project will provide less than one-to-one parking, further encouraging travel by other modes of travel other than by single-occupancy vehicle.

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.

The Project would not adversely affect the industrial sector or service sectors. No such uses would be displaced by the Project. Construction activity generated by the Project, however, will support these sectors.

6. That the City achieves the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

All new construction would be subject to the City's Building Code, Fire Code and other applicable safety standards. Thus, the Project would improve preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake by prompting development that would comply with applicable safety standards.

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

The Project would not accommodate the removal, demolition, or of any known landmark or historic building.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

On balance, the Project would improve the City's open space and park system and would not adversely effect parks access to sunlight and vistas. The project includes providing roughly 3.5 acres of additional parks to the City's overall park system. The site is immediately adjacent to and downslope to Herz Playground and McLaren Park. Because the proposal does include constructing buildings immediately across the street from the park, new shadows will be created on the park.. However, the EIR has shown that the new shadows would not cause a significant adverse effect. Given that additional parks and accessible green space is being added by the

Project, and the impacts of the proposed development on Herz Playground and McLaren Park are limited, on balance, the Project is consistent with this General Plan Priority Finding.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: February 27, 2018
Case No. 2017-012495GPR
1654 Sunnydale Hope SF
Block/ Lot No: 6310/001

Project Sponsors: Ramie Dare
Mercy Housing CA
1360 Mission Street, Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94103

Applicant: Same as Above

Staff Contact: Ilaria Salvadori - (415) 575-9086
Ilaria.salvadori@sfgov.org

Recommendation: Finding the project, on balance, is **in conformity** with the
General Plan

*Recommended
By:*


John Rahaim, Director of Planning

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

The Planning Department is in receipt of your General Plan Referral Application (Case No. 2017-012485GPR). The application is for a master street vacation to obtain the City's approval to vacate the existing public rights of way, subject to conditions, at a single Board of Supervisors meeting. The application is filed by the Developer (Applicant), in consultation with the City Surveyor and San Francisco Public Works. Upon commencing each development phase, the Developer will demonstrate its satisfaction of the applicable conditions for each phase, thus allowing the San Francisco Public Works director to approve the street vacation for that phase.

1654 Sunnydale Avenue
Case No. 2017-012495GPR

The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan Project consists of the transformation of the 48.8 acre Sunnydale/Velasco public housing complex into a new, mixed income housing development with new affordable and market-rate housing as well as new street and utility infrastructure, open spaces and neighborhood facilities. The demolition of existing housing and infrastructure will happen in 10-11 phases. At completion the master planned development will include 1700 units of affordable and market rate housing. This development is in the Sunnydale Special Use District and is the Project in 25 year Development agreement between the City, the San Francisco Housing Authority and Sunnydale Development Co. LLC, the Developer (Applicant).

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

On November 17, 2016, the Planning Commission took the following actions regarding the Project:

- Certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (Motion No. 19784)
- Adopted CEQA Finding including a statement of overriding considerations (Motion No. 19784)
- Adopted Findings of Consistency with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1 (Case No. 2010.0305E)

GENERAL PLAN COMPLIANCE AND BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

As described in attached document Case No. 2010.0305 E, the Project is consistent with the Eight Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 and is, on balance, **in-conformity** with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan.

The Project is therefore, on balance, consistent with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1.

Cc: Javier Rivera- Bureau of Streets and Mapping, San Francisco Public Works

Attachments:

- 2017-012495GPR Letter Attachment 1 -CPC Approval - CEQA Findings - Final Motion.pdf
- 2017-012495GPR Letter Attachment 2 -Case No. 2010.0305 E Master Plan General Plan Findings.pdf



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Motion No. 19785

SUNNYDALE GENERAL PLAN FINDINGS

HEARING DATE: NOVEMBER 17, 2016

Case No.: 2010.0305 E GPA PCT PCM DEV GEN SHD
Project Address: **Sunnydale Hope SF Master Plan Project**
Zoning: RM-1 (Residential – Mixed, Moderate Density)
40-X Height and Bulk Districts
Block/Lot: Assessor's Block/Lots: 6356/ 061, 062, 063 ,064, 065, 066, 067 and 068; 6310/
001; 6311/001; 6312/ 001; 6313/001; 6314/ 001; 6315/001
Project Sponsor: Mercy Housing and Related California
1360 Mission Street, #300
San Francisco, CA 94103
Staff Contact: Mat Snyder – (415) 575-6891
mathew.snyder@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

ADOPTING FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND WITH SECTION 101.1 OF THE CITY PLANNING CODE FOR THE SUNNYDALE HOPE SF MASTER PLAN PROJECT.

Preamble

San Francisco Charter Section 4.105 and Administrative Code Section 2A.53 of the Administrative Code requires General Plan referrals to the Planning Commission for certain matters so that the Commission may determine if such actions are in conformity with the General Plan and Section 101.1 of the Planning Code. Actions, including but not limited to legislative actions, subdivisions, right-of-way dedications and vacations, and the purchasing of property are required to be in conformity with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1.

In 2008, Mercy Housing, ("Project Sponsor") was selected by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (hereinafter "MOHCD") (then, the Mayor's Office of Housing) and the San Francisco Housing Authority to work with the local Sunnydale and Velasco and surrounding Visitacion Valley communities to create a Master Plan for the complete redevelopment of the site that would not only include reconstructed Housing Authority units, but additional affordable units along with market rate units, neighborhood serving retail, community service, new parks and open space, and new streets and infrastructure ("The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan Project" or "Project"). As a part of the HOPE SF selection process, the Project Sponsor was also selected to act as the Master Developer for the Project.

HOPE SF is the nation's first large-scale public housing transformation collaborative aimed at disrupting intergenerational poverty, reducing social isolation, and creating vibrant mixed-income communities without mass displacement of current residents. Launched in 2007, HOPE SF is a twenty-year human and real estate capital commitment by the City. HOPE SF, the City's signature anti-poverty

and equity initiative, is committed to breaking intergenerational patterns related to the insidious impacts of trauma and poverty, and to creating economic and social opportunities for current public housing residents through deep investment in education, economic mobility, health and safety.

The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan Project ("The Project") is a 50-acre site located in the Visitacion Valley neighborhood and is generally bounded by McLaren Park to the north, Crocker Amazon Park to the west, Hahn Street to the East and Velasco to the south. The San Francisco Housing Authority currently owns and operates 775 units on approximately 50 acres (including streets) site. The site currently consists of 775 affordable units and is owned and operated by the San Francisco Housing Authority.

As the selected Master Developer, the Project Sponsor applied to the Planning Department to enter a Development Agreement with the City under Administrative Code Chapter 56. The Project Sponsor also submitted an application for environmental review. On December 12, 2012, the Department issued a Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report ("NOP") for the Project. On December 19, 2014, the Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report / Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("DEIR/DEIS") for the Project and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR/DEIS for public review and comment. The DEIR/DEIS was available for public comment from December 12, 2014 through February 17, 2015. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on January 22, 2015 on the DEIR/DEIS at a regularly scheduled meeting to solicit public comment regarding the DEIR/DEIS.

The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the public review period for the DEIR/DEIS, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR/DEIS in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period. This material was presented in a Response to Comments document, published on June 24, 2015, distributed to the Planning Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR/DEIS, and made available to others upon request at the Department.

A Final Environmental Impact Report / Final Environmental Impact Statement ("FEIR/FEIS" or "Final EIR/EIS") was prepared by the Department, consisting of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Response to Comments document.

On July 9, 2015, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the Final EIR/EIS and found that the contents of the report and the procedures through which the Final EIR/EIS was prepared, publicized, and reviewed complied with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA"), 14 California Code of Regulations sections 15000 et seq. ("CEQA Guidelines"), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code ("Chapter 31").

The Commission found the Final EIR/EIS was adequate, accurate and objective, reflected the independent analysis and judgment of the Department and the Commission, and that the summary of comments and responses contained no significant revisions to the Draft EIR/EIS, and approved the Final EIR/EIS for the Project in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31.

The Planning Department, Jonas P. Ionin, is the custodian of records, located in the File for Case No. 2010.0305E, at 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California.

Department staff prepared a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the Project and these materials were made available to the public and this Commission for this Commission's review, consideration and action.

On September 15, 2016, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 19738 initiating General Plan amendments to further the Project. The initiated amendments would (1) amend Map 4 of the Urban Design Element, "Urban Design Guidelines for the Heights of Buildings", by designating the Sunnydale site within the 40-88 height designation area; and (2) amend Map 03 of the Recreation and Open Space Element, "Existing and Proposed Parks and Open Space", providing indications of the new parks within the site on the map.

On October 24, 2016, the Board of Supervisors initiated Planning Code Text and Map amendments that would create the Sunnydale HOPE SF Special Use District ("SUD") and provisions regarding it. The Map amendments would map the subject site within the SUD and within a 40/65-X Height and Bulk District.

By this action, the Planning Commission adopts General Plan Consistency findings, including a finding that the Project, as identified in the Final EIR, is consistent with Planning Code Section 101.1.

Other than those actions described above, several actions will be required for the project over its multi-year buildout. These actions include but are not limited to approval of subdivisions, right-of-way dedications and vacations.

The Planning Commission wishes to facilitate the physical, environmental, social and economic revitalization of Project site, using the legal tools available through the Planning and Administrative Codes, while creating jobs, housing and open space in a safe, pleasant, attractive and livable mixed use neighborhood that is linked rationally to adjacent neighborhoods. The Commission wishes to enable implementing actions.

The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan Project provides for a type of development, intensity of development and location of development that is consistent with the overall goals and objectives and policies of the General Plan as well as the Eight Priority Policies of Section 101.1, as expressed in the findings contained in Attachment A to this Motion.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Motion No. 19784

SUNNYDALE CEQA FINDINGS

HEARING DATE: NOVEMBER 17, 2016

Case No.: 2010.0305 E GPA PCT PCM DEV GEN SHD
Project Address: Sunnydale Hope SF Master Plan Project
Zoning: RM-1 (Residential – Mixed, Moderate Density)
40-X Height and Bulk Districts
Block/Lot: Assessor's Block/Lots: 6356/ 061, 062, 063 ,064, 065, 066, 067 and 068; 6310/
001; 6311/001; 6312/ 001; 6313/001; 6314/ 001; 6315/001
Project Sponsor: Mercy Housing and Related California
1360 Mission Street, #300
San Francisco, CA 94103

Staff Contact: Mat Snyder – (415) 575-6891
mathew.snyder@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

ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS (AND A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS) UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND STATE GUIDELINES IN CONNECTION WITH THE ADOPTION OF THE SUNNYDALE HOPE SF MASTER PLAN PROJECT AND RELATED ACTIONS NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT SUCH PLANS.

Preamble

In 2008, Mercy Housing, ("Project Sponsor") was selected by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (hereinafter "MOHCD") (then, the Mayor's Office of Housing) and the San Francisco Housing Authority to work with the local Sunnydale and Velasco and surrounding Visitacion Valley communities to create a Master Plan for the complete redevelopment of the site that would not only include reconstructed Housing Authority units, but additional affordable units along with market rate units, neighborhood serving retail, community service, new parks and open space, and new streets and infrastructure ("The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan Project" or "Project"). As a part of the HOPE SF selection process, the Project Sponsor was also selected to act as the Master Developer for the Project.

As the selected Master Developer, the Project Sponsor applied to the Planning Department to enter a Development Agreement with the City under Administrative Code Chapter 56. The Project Sponsor also submitted an application for environmental review. On December 12, 2012, the Department issued a Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report ("NOP") for the Project. On December 19, 2014, the Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report / Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("DEIR/DEIS") for the Project and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR/DEIS for public review and comment. The DEIR/DEIS was available for public comment from December 12, 2014 through February 17, 2015. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on January 22, 2015 on the DEIR/DEIS at a regularly scheduled meeting to solicit public comment regarding the DEIR/DEIS.

The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the public review period for the DEIR/DEIS, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR/DEIS in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period. This material was presented in a Response to Comments document, published on June 24, 2015, distributed to the Planning Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR/DEIS, and made available to others upon request at the Department.

A Final Environmental Impact Report / Final Environmental Impact Statement ("FEIR/FEIS" or "Final EIR/EIS") was prepared by the Department, consisting of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Response to Comments document.

Project Environmental Impact Report files WAS made available for review by this Commission and the public. These files were available for public review at the Planning Department at 1650 Mission Street, and are part of the record before this Commission.

On July 9, 2015, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the Final EIR/EIS and found that the contents of the report and the procedures through which the Final EIR/EIS was prepared, publicized, and reviewed complied with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA"), 14 California Code of Regulations sections 15000 et seq. ("CEQA Guidelines"), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code ("Chapter 31").

The Commission found the Final EIR/EIS was adequate, accurate and objective, reflected the independent analysis and judgment of the Department and the Commission, and that the summary of comments and responses contained no significant revisions to the Draft EIR/EIS, and approved the Final EIR/EIS for the Project in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31.

On July 9, 2015, by Motion No. 19704, the Commission certified the Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") as accurate, complete and in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA").

The Planning Department, Jonas P. Ionin, is the custodian of records, located in the File for Case No. 2008.0305E, at 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California.

Department staff prepared a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the Project and these materials were made available to the public and this Commission for this Commission's review, consideration and action.

Project Description

By this action, the Planning Commission adopts Environmental Findings (and a Statement of Overriding Considerations) under the California Environmental Quality Act and State Guidelines in connection with the adoption of the Potrero Hope SF Master Plan Project and related actions necessary to implement such plans. The Project is generally described below here.

The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan Project is part of the City's Hope SF Program, which looks to transform several of the City's Housing Authority sites to revitalized mixed-use mixed-income well integrated neighborhoods.

The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan project ("Project") includes demolishing all existing units, vacating portions of the right of way and building new streets that would better relate to the existing

street grid. The Project would transform the six existing super blocks into about 34 new fine-grained blocks. The site is designed with a central "Hub" that would feature a series of parks, open spaces, a community center, space for retail, and other community-serving uses.

At completion, the Project would include up to 1,770 units, including Housing Authority replacement units (775 units), a mix of additional affordable units (a minimum of approximately 200 low-income units), and market rate units (up to 694 units). New buildings within Sunnydale would provide a consistent street wall with "eyes-on-the-street" active ground floor treatment. A variety of building types would be constructed throughout including individual townhomes, small apartment buildings and larger corridor apartment buildings. Approximately 1,437 parking spaces would be provided for the units largely below grade. Approximately 60,000 gross square feet of community serving uses, including retail, would also be constructed.

In 2008, Mercy Housing was selected by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (hereinafter "MOHCD") (then, the Mayor's Office of Housing) and the San Francisco Housing Authority to work with the local Sunnydale and Velasco and surrounding Visitacion Valley community to create a Master Plan for the site that would not only include reconstructed Housing Authority units, but additional affordable units along with market rate units, neighborhood serving retail, community service, new parks and open space, and new streets and infrastructure. Mercy Housing is also the Master Developer for the site.

On top of the Development Agreement, project approvals will include General Plan Amendments, Planning Code Text Amendments, Planning Code Map Amendments, Approval of a Design Standards and Guidelines document, and Adoption of Shadow findings pursuant to Planning Code Section 295.

Other than those actions described above, several actions will be required for the project over its multi-year buildout. These actions include but are not limited to approval of subdivisions, right-of-way dedications and vacations.

The Planning Commission wishes to facilitate the physical, environmental, social and economic revitalization of Project site, using the legal tools available through the Planning and Administrative Codes, while creating jobs, housing and open space in a safe, pleasant, attractive and livable mixed use neighborhood that is linked rationally to adjacent neighborhoods.

MOVED that the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the Final EIR and the record associated herewith, including but not limited to the comments and submissions made to this Planning Commission and the Planning Department's responses to those comments and submissions, and based thereon, hereby adopts the Project Findings required by CEQA attached hereto as Attachment A including a statement of overriding considerations, and adopts the MMRP, that shall be included as a condition of approval for each and all of the approval actions set forth in the Motions described above.

Motion No. 19784
November 17, 2016

2010.0305 E GPA PCT PCM DEV GEN SHD
Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan Project
Adoption of CEQA Findings

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the San Francisco Planning Commission on November 17, 2016.



Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

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

NOES: None

ABSENT: Fong

ADOPTED: November 17, 2016

Attachment A

To Planning Commission Motion No.

Case No. 2010.0305 E GPA PCT PCM DEV GEN SHD

The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan Project General Plan Findings

and

Planning Code Section 101.1 Findings

The following constitute findings that the Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan Project (Project) and approval actions thereto are, on balance, consistent with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1. The SUNNYDALE Master Plan Project is described within the Final EIR, Certified by the Planning Commission on July 9, 2015, with Planning Commission Motion No. 19409.

Approval actions that will be required to implement the Project include, but are not limited to: (1) Adoption of General Plan, Planning Code Text, and Map Amendments that would establish a Sunnydale HOPE SF Special Use District and associated Design Standards and Guidelines Document, and would increase heights in some locations; (2) Approval of a Development Agreement between the City of County of San Francisco, the Master Developer, and the San Francisco Housing Authority; (3) shadow impact findings; and (4) various mapping, street vacation and street dedication actions; and (5) the purchase of the site at Sunnydale and Hahn for the development of affordable housing.

HOUSING ELEMENT

The principle objectives of the Housing Element are to provide new housing; retain the existing supply; enhance physical conditions and safety without jeopardizing use or affordability; support affordable housing production by increasing site availability and capacity; increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the affordable housing production system; protect the affordability of existing housing; expand financial resources for permanently affordable housing; ensure equal access; avoid or mitigate hardships imposed by displacement; reduce homelessness and the risk of homelessness in coordination with relevant agencies and providers; pursue place making and neighborhood building principles in increasing the supply of housing; and strengthen citywide affordable housing programs through coordinated regional and state efforts.

The Project is consistent with and implements the following objectives and policies of the Housing Element:

OBJECTIVE 1	Identify and make available for development adequate sites to meet the City's housing needs, especially permanently affordable housing.
POLICY 1.1	Plan for the full range of housing needs in the City and County of San Francisco, especially affordable housing.
POLICY 1.3	Work proactively to identify and secure opportunity sites for permanently affordable housing.
Objective 4	Foster a housing stock that meets the needs of all residents across lifecycles.
POLICY 4.1	Develop new housing, and encourage the remodeling of existing housing, for families with children.
POLICY 4.2	Provide a range of housing options for residents with special needs for housing support and services.
POLICY 4.5	Ensure that new permanently affordable housing is located in all of the city's neighborhoods, and encourage integrated neighborhoods, with a diversity of unit types provided at a range of income levels.
Objective 5	Ensure that all residents have equal access to available units.
POLICY 5.5	Minimize the hardships of displacement by providing essential relocation services.
POLICY 5.6	Offer displaced households the right of first refusal to occupy replacement housing units that are comparable in size, location, cost, and rent control protection.
Objective 7	Secure funding and resources for permanently affordable housing, including innovative programs that are not solely reliant on traditional mechanisms or capital.
POLICY 7.5	Encourage the production of affordable housing through process and zoning accommodations, and prioritize affordable housing in the review and approval processes.

Objective 8	Build public and private sector capacity to support, facilitate, provide and maintain affordable housing.
POLICY 8.1	Support the production and management of permanently affordable housing.
POLICY 8.3	Generate greater public awareness about the quality and character of affordable housing projects and generate communitywide support for new affordable housing.
Objective 9	Preserve units subsidized by the federal, state or local sources.
POLICY 9.3	Maintain and improve the condition of the existing supply of public housing, through programs such as HOPE SF.
POLICY 11.1	Promote the construction and rehabilitation of well-designed housing that emphasizes beauty, flexibility, and innovative design, and respects existing neighborhood character.
POLICY 11.2	Ensure implementation of accepted design standards in project approvals.
POLICY 11.3	Ensure growth is accommodated without substantially and adversely impacting existing residential neighborhood character.
POLICY 11.6	Foster a sense of community through architectural design, using features that promote community interaction.
Objective 12	Balance housing growth with adequate infrastructure that serves the City's growing population.
POLICY 12.1	Encourage new housing that relies on transit use and environmentally sustainable patterns of movement.
POLICY 12.2	Consider the proximity of quality of life elements, such as open space, child care, and neighborhood services, when developing new housing units.
POLICY 12.3	Ensure new housing is sustainably supported by the City's public infrastructure systems.

The Hope SF initiative, including the Sunnydale Hope SF Master Development Project, is a central affordable housing and community development program for the City and County of San Francisco. Through the Hope SF initiative, existing affordable housing sites for very low income residents will be rebuilt with better connected mixed-income, complete neighborhoods that increase the permanent affordable housing stock of the City as well as provides a range of housing options for residents with special needs and for a range of income levels.

The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Development Project will take advantage of the underutilized site to create both additional affordable housing and market rate housing thereby furthering Policies 1.1 and 1.4 provided above. The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Development Project will seek to minimize displacement of existing residents and will provide essential relocation services that include maintenance of subsidized housing opportunities and the right to return as provided in the Right to Return Ordinance. The proposed funding of this large scale project is creative and leverages extensive public and private sources of capital. The project will receive zoning and priority approval processes to encourage the production of affordable housing.

The high visibility of this project will increase capacity of builders and owners of affordable and mixed income communities as well as raise greater public awareness of the high quality design and character of affordable housing. Policy 9.3 specifically names HOPE SF as leading initiative to maintain and improve the condition of existing supply of public housing in the Plan Area. As a site that is currently well under the Planning Code's density limit, the Hope SF also looks to take advantage of the additional allowed density to construct both affordable and market-rate units. The market-rate development will both create a mixed-income neighborhood and will cross-subsidizing the cost of reconstructing the existing dilapidated affordable housing. Also central to the Hope SF initiative, is the construction of new infrastructure including new streets and parks that meet -- and in some cases exceed -- current City standards for ecological performance, safety, and comfort.

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

The principle objectives for Commerce & Industry are to manage economic growth and change, maintain a sound and diverse economic base and fiscal structure, provide expanded employment opportunities for city residents particularly the unemployed and underemployed in a wide range of fields and levels, improve viability of existing businesses as well as attract new businesses – particularly in new industries, and assure entrepreneurial opportunities for local businesses.

The following objectives and policies are relevant to the Project:

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| OBJECTIVE 6 | MAINTAIN AND STRENGTHEN VIABLE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL AREAS EASILY ACCESSIBLE TO CITY RESIDENTS. |
| POLICY 6.1 | Ensure and encourage the retention and provision of neighborhood-serving goods and services in the city's neighborhood commercial districts, while recognizing and encouraging diversity among the districts. |
| POLICY 6.2 | Promote economically vital neighborhood commercial districts which foster small business enterprises and entrepreneurship and which are responsive to economic and technological innovation in the marketplace and society. |
| POLICY 6.4 | Encourage the location of neighborhood shopping areas throughout the city so that essential retail goods and personal services are accessible to all residents. |
| POLICY 6.7 | Promote high quality urban design on commercial streets. |

The Project meets and furthers the Objectives and Policies of the Commerce and Industry Element by reinforcing the typical San Francisco pattern of including resident serving uses along with residential development. The Project will generally permit small scale retail and community related uses throughout and requiring ground floor non-residential uses on a portion of Sunnydale and Hawthorn Streets, which will serve as a part of the neighborhood's "Hub". Design and Land Use regulations for the development will require that neighborhood commercial retail be established in a pedestrian-oriented active environment typical of San Francisco neighborhoods and specifically called for in the Commerce and Industry Element. The possible provision of retail space will provide entrepreneurial opportunities for local residents and workers. Of course, new development will provide construction business opportunities, especially with outreach to small businesses through the City's SBE program, along with opportunities for property management and maintenance.

RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

The principle objectives of the Recreation and Open Space Element are to preserve large areas of open space sufficient to meet the long-range needs of the Bay Region, develop and maintain a diversified and balanced citywide system of high quality public open space, provide a continuous public open space along the shoreline, and provide opportunities for recreation and the enjoyment of open space in every neighborhood.

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| OBJECTIVE 1 | ENSURE A WELL-MAINTAINED, HIGHLY UTILIZED, AND INTEGRATED OPEN SPACE SYSTEM |
| POLICY 1.1 | Encourage the dynamic and flexible use of existing open spaces and promote a variety of recreation and open space uses, where appropriate. |
| POLICY 1.11 | Encourage private recreational facilities on private land that provide a community benefit, particularly to low and moderate-income residents. |
| OBJECTIVE 2 | INCREASE RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE TO MEET THE LONG-TERM NEEDS OF THE CITY AND BAY REGION |
| POLICY 2.7 | Expand partnerships among open space agencies, transit agencies, private sector and nonprofit institutions to acquire, develop and/or manage existing open spaces. |
| POLICY 2.8 | Consider repurposing underutilized City-owned properties as open space and recreational facilities. |
| OBJECTIVE 3 | IMPROVE ACCESS AND CONNECTIVITY TO OPEN SPACE |
| POLICY 3.1 | Creatively develop existing publicly-owned right-of-ways and streets into open space. |
| POLICY 3.2 | Establish and Implement a network of Green Connections that increases access to parks, open spaces, and the waterfront. |
| POLICY 3.6 | Maintain, restore, expand and fund the urban forest. |

The Project meets and furthers the Objectives and Policies of the Recreation and Open Space by creating a new street and open space network within an area that is currently characterized by wide disconnected streets, steep unoccupied terrain, and lack of recreational opportunities. Altogether, 3.5 acres of new parks and open space are proposed for the site. Further, the new street network will improve connectivity from existing residential neighborhoods, parks and open spaces.

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

The Transportation Element is largely concerned with the movement of people and goods. It addresses the need for multi-modal streets and facilities, implementation of the City's transit-first policy, the need to limit parking and auto capacity on the roads, and ways to incentivize travel by transit, bike and by foot. It also addresses the relationship between transportation and land use and how the two should be coordinated to reduce the need for auto trips.

The following objectives and policies are relevant to the Project:

OBJECTIVE 1 MEET THE NEEDS OF ALL RESIDENTS AND VISITORS FOR SAFE, CONVENIENT AND INEXPENSIVE TRAVEL WITHIN SAN FRANCISCO AND BETWEEN THE CITY AND OTHER PARTS OF THE REGION WHILE MAINTAINING THE HIGH QUALITY LIVING ENVIRONMENT OF THE BAY AREA.

POLICY 1.2 Ensure the safety and comfort of pedestrians throughout the city.

POLICY 1.6 Ensure choices among modes of travel and accommodate each mode when and where it is most appropriate.

POLICY 2.5 Provide incentives for the use of transit, carpools, vanpools, walking and bicycling and reduce the need for new or expanded automobile and automobile parking facilities.

OBJECTIVE 18 ESTABLISH A STREET HIERARCHY SYSTEM IN WHICH THE FUNCTION AND DESIGN OF EACH STREET ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE CHARACTER AND USE OF ADJACENT LAND.

POLICY 18.2 Design streets for a level of traffic that serves, but will not cause a detrimental impact on adjacent land uses, or eliminate the efficient and safe movement of transit vehicles and bicycles.

POLICY 18.4 Discourage high-speed through traffic on local streets in residential areas through traffic "calming" measures that are designed not to disrupt transit service or bicycle movement, including:

- Sidewalk bulbs and widenings at intersections and street entrances;
- Lane off-sets and traffic bumps;

- Narrowed traffic lanes with trees, landscaping and seating areas; and
- colored and/or textured sidewalks and crosswalks.

POLICY 20.5 Place and maintain all sidewalk elements, including passenger shelters, benches, trees, newsracks, kiosks, toilets, and utilities at appropriate transit stops according to established guidelines.

OBJECTIVE 23 IMPROVE THE CITY'S PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION SYSTEM TO PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT, PLEASANT, AND SAFE MOVEMENT.

POLICY 23.1 Provide sufficient pedestrian movement space with a minimum of pedestrian congestion in accordance with a pedestrian street classification system.

POLICY 23.2 Widen sidewalks where intensive commercial, recreational, or institutional activity is present, sidewalks are congested and where residential densities are high.

POLICY 23.3 Maintain a strong presumption against reducing sidewalk widths, eliminating crosswalks and forcing indirect crossings to accommodate automobile traffic.

POLICY 23.6 Ensure convenient and safe pedestrian crossings by minimizing the distance pedestrians must walk to cross a street.

OBJECTIVE 24 IMPROVE THE AMBIENCE OF THE PEDESTRIAN ENVIRONMENT.

POLICY 24.2 Maintain and expand the planting of street trees and the infrastructure to support them.

POLICY 24.3 Install pedestrian-serving street furniture where appropriate.

POLICY 24.5 Where consistent with transportation needs, transform streets and alleys into neighborhood-serving open spaces or "living streets", especially in neighborhoods deficient in open space.

OBJECTIVE 26 CONSIDER THE SIDEWALK AREA AS AN IMPORTANT ELEMENT IN THE CITYWIDE OPEN SPACE SYSTEM.

- OBJECTIVE 27 ENSURE THAT BICYCLES CAN BE USED SAFELY AND
CONVENIENTLY AS A PRIMARY MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION, AS
WELL AS FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES.
- OBJECTIVE 28 PROVIDE SECURE AND CONVENIENT PARKING FACILITIES FOR
BICYCLES.
- POLICY 28.1 Provide secure bicycle parking in new governmental, commercial, and
residential developments.
- OBJECTIVE 34 RELATE THE AMOUNT OF PARKING IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS AND
NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS TO THE CAPACITY OF
THE CITY'S STREET SYSTEM AND LAND USE PATTERNS.
- POLICY 34.3 Permit minimal or reduced off-street parking supply for new buildings in
residential and commercial areas adjacent to transit centers and along
transit preferential streets.
- OBJECTIVE 35 MEET SHORT-TERM PARKING NEEDS IN NEIGHBORHOOD
SHOPPING DISTRICTS CONSISTENT WITH PRESERVATION OF A
DESIRABLE ENVIRONMENT FOR PEDESTRIANS AND RESIDENTS.

The Project meets and furthers the Objectives and Policies of the Transportation Element by requiring the creation of a new fine-grained street grid in place of the curvilinear configured and disconnected street and block pattern that exists today. The Project accommodates the creation of a new mixed-use predominately development in a pattern that encourages walking and using transit. The Project also calls for streetscape improvements that will calm auto traffic while assuring pedestrian and bicyclist comfort and enjoyment.

URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT

The Urban Design Element addresses the physical character and order of the City. It establishes objectives and policies dealing with the city pattern, conservation (both of natural areas and historic structures), major new developments, and neighborhood environment. It discusses meeting "human needs", largely by assuring quality living environments, and by protecting and enhancing those characteristics of development that make San Francisco special.

The following objectives and policies are relevant to the Project:

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| OBJECTIVE 1 | EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION. |
| POLICY 1.1 | Recognize and protect major views in the city, with particular attention to those of open space and water. |
| POLICY 1.2 | Recognize, protect and reinforce the existing street pattern, especially as it is related to topography. |
| POLICY 1.3 | Recognize that buildings, when seen together, produce a total effect that characterizes the city and its districts. |
| POLICY 1.5 | Emphasize the special nature of each district through distinctive landscaping and other features. |
| POLICY 1.6 | Make centers of activity more prominent through design of street features and by other means. |
| POLICY 1.7 | Recognize the natural boundaries of districts, and promote connections between districts. |
| POLICY 2.9 | Review proposals for the giving up of street areas in terms of all the public values that streets afford. |
| POLICY 2.10 | Permit release of street areas, where such release is warranted, only in the least extensive and least permanent manner appropriate to each case. |
| OBJECTIVE 3 | MODERATION OF MAJOR NEW DEVELOPMENT TO COMPLEMENT THE CITY PATTERN, THE RESOURCES TO BE CONSERVED, AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT. |

- POLICY 3.3 Promote efforts to achieve high quality of design for buildings to be constructed at prominent locations.
- POLICY 3.4 Promote building forms that will respect and improve the integrity of open spaces and other public areas.
- POLICY 3.5 Relate the height of buildings to important attributes of the city pattern and to the height and character of existing development.
- POLICY 3.7 Recognize the special urban design problems posed in development of large properties.
- POLICY 3.8 Discourage accumulation and development of large properties, unless such development is carefully designed with respect to its impact upon the surrounding area and upon the city.
- OBJECTIVE 4 IMPROVEMENT OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT TO INCREASE PERSONAL SAFETY, COMFORT, PRIDE AND OPPORTUNITY .
- POLICY 4.3 Provide adequate lighting in public areas.
- POLICY 4.4 Design walkways and parking facilities to minimize danger to pedestrians.
- POLICY 4.5 Provide adequate maintenance for public areas.
- POLICY 4.6 Emphasize the importance of local centers providing commercial and government services.
- POLICY 4.8 Provide convenient access to a variety of recreation opportunities.
- POLICY 4.10 Encourage or require the provision of recreation space in private development.
- POLICY 4.12 Install, promote and maintain landscaping in public and private areas.
- POLICY 4.13 Improve pedestrian areas by providing human scale and interest.

On balance, the Project is consistent with and furthers the Urban Design Element. The project enables the establishment of a new vibrant mixed-use-predominately-residential neighborhood on currently underutilized land. The Project will connect to the Visitacion Valley street grid and block pattern where

it currently does not today, thereby reinforcing Visitacion Valley's street pattern. The Project's compact urban development of modulated buildings will step along the site's topography; open spaces and green streets will punctuate the new block pattern. Taken together, these characteristics will enable the revitalized Sunnydale Hope SF neighborhood to be both individually distinctive and better integrated into the larger Visitacion Valley neighborhood. Streets will be designed to Better Streets standards and will be safe, comfortable, and inviting. While the proposal includes allowing heights of buildings to be as tall as 65-feet at some locations (taller than what's allowed within other residentially portions of Visitacion Valley), design standards will require that they be broken down both vertically and horizontally and be designed to the human scale. The portion of the site that allows the tallest heights will be reserved for the center of the neighborhood's planned commercial and community-serving center, thereby demarking the Project's civic heart. While the view across the site will change in nature with additional buildings in the foreground, other views will be improved and protected by aligning new streets with existing streets allowing continual views down them and assuring they are not blocked in the future. On balance, the urban design character of the site will be significantly improved; therefore, the Project is consistent with the Urban Design Element.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ELEMENT

The Environmental Protection Element is concerned with protecting the natural environment within San Francisco's urban context. The element provides objectives and policies for the following topics: the Bay, ocean and shoreline, air, fresh water, land, flora and fauna, transportation noise, and energy.

The following objectives and policies are relevant to the Project:

OBJECTIVE 1 ACHIEVE A PROPER BALANCE AMONG THE CONSERVATION, UTILIZATION, AND DEVELOPMENT OF SAN FRANCISCO'S NATURAL RESOURCES.

Policy 1.4 Assure that all new development meets strict environmental quality standards and recognizes human needs.

OBJECTIVE 15 INCREASE THE ENERGY EFFICIENCY OF TRANSPORTATION AND ENCOURAGE LAND USE PATTERNS AND METHODS OF TRANSPORTATION WHICH USE LESS ENERGY.

POLICY 15.3 Encourage an urban design pattern that will minimize travel requirements among working, shopping, recreation, school and childcare areas.

The Project is consistent with and implements the Environmental Protection Element in that it calls for mixed-use, moderate density, transit-friendly, sustainable development. The Project and all related City approvals are consistent with the Environmental Protection Element as the Project satisfies and implements the preponderance of Element's objectives and policies: the Project furthers the Element's emphasis on the need for compact, and sustainable development.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ELEMENT

The Community Facilities element addresses police facilities, neighborhood center facilities, fire facilities, library facilities, public health facilities, and touches upon educational facilities, institutional facilities (colleges, etc.) wastewater facilities, and solid waste facilities.

The following objectives and policies are relevant to the Project:

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| OBJECTIVE 3 | ASSURE THAT NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTS HAVE ACCESS TO NEEDED SERVICES AND A FOCUS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVITIES |
| POLICY 3.6 | Base priority for the development of neighborhood centers on relative need. |
| OBJECTIVE 4 | PROVIDE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS THAT ARE RESPONSIVE TO THE COMMUNITY SERVED. |
| POLICY 4.1 | Assure effective neighborhood participation in the initial planning, ongoing programming, and activities of multi-purpose neighborhood centers |

The Project is consistent with and implements the Community Facilities Element. The Project allows for community serving uses on the ground floor throughout the development. A community center and senior housing development is planned for "The Hub" portion of the site, that among other community-based uses will include child care. Whether or not community uses will eventually establish themselves in other permitted locations will depend on community needs and demands as well as broader market factors as the Project gets built out.

PUBLIC SAFETY ELEMENT

- OBJECTIVE 2 REDUCE STRUCTURAL AND NON-STRUCTURAL HAZARDS TO LIFE SAFETY, MINIMIZE PROPERTY DAMAGE AND RESULTING SOCIAL, CULTURAL AND ECONOMIC DISLOCATIONS RESULTING FROM FUTURE DISASTERS.
- POLICY 2.1 Assure that new construction meets current structural and life safety standards.
- POLICY 2.3 Consider site soils conditions when reviewing projects in areas subject to liquefaction or slope instability.
- POLICY 2.9 Consider information about geologic hazards whenever City decisions that will influence land use, building density, building configurations or infrastructure are made.
- POLICY 2.12 Enforce state and local codes that regulate the use, storage and transportation of hazardous materials in order to prevent, contain and effectively respond to accidental releases.

The Project is consistent with and implements the Community Safety Element. All improvements, including infrastructure, buildings and open space improvements will be constructed to local seismic standards, taking into account, among other considerations, the geological condition of the soil and where applicable, any remediation activity.

AIR QUALITY ELEMENT

The Air Quality Element is concerned, in part, with reducing the level of pollutants in the air, thus protecting and improving public health, welfare and the quality of life of the citizens of San Francisco and the residents of the metropolitan region. It emphasizes that opportunities for economic growth in the area can be enhanced through implementation of transportation, land use and other policies in harmony with clean air goals.

The following objectives and policies are relevant to the Project:

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| OBJECTIVE 3 | DECREASE THE AIR QUALITY IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT BY COORDINATION OF LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION DECISIONS. |
| POLICY 3.1 | Take advantage of the high density development in San Francisco to improve the transit infrastructure and also encourage high density and compact development where an extensive transportation infrastructure exists. |
| POLICY 3.2 | Encourage mixed land use development near transit lines and provide retail and other types of service oriented uses within walking distance to minimize automobile dependent development. |
| POLICY 3.6 | Link land use decision making policies to the availability of transit and consider the impacts of these policies on the local and regional transportation system. |
| POLICY 3.9 | Encourage and require planting of trees in conjunction with new development to enhance pedestrian environment and select species of trees that optimize achievement of air quality goals |

The Project is consistent with and implements the Air Quality Element in that it calls for mixed-use predominately residential, moderate density, sustainable development that will enable efficient use of land and encourage travel by transit and by foot, thereby reducing auto use. The Project will be built to LEED Neighborhood Development standards. The Project is consistent with the Air Quality Element because it satisfies and implements the preponderance of Element's objectives and policies; most importantly, the Project furthers the Element's emphasis on efficient and compact development.

General Plan Priority Finding

(Planning Code Section 101.1 Findings)

Planning Code Section 101.1(b) establishes eight priority policies and is a basis by which differences between competing policies in the General Plan are resolved. As described below, the Project is consistent with the eight priority policies set forth in Planning Code Section 101.1(b).

1. That existing neighborhood serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in or ownership of such businesses enhanced.

The Project will preserve and enhance existing neighborhood serving retail uses. The Project would potentially accommodate roughly 15,000 square feet of new retail uses. The retail uses are envisioned to be local serving. The project does not include the removal of any existing neighborhood serving retail and is not expected to unduly compete against long established Visitacion Valley neighborhood commercial districts along Leland Avenue.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.

The Project accommodates new development on land that is underutilized and improvements that are dilapidated. While it would remove existing housing, the housing will be replaced by significantly improved housing in a neighborhood pattern much more similar to the rest of Visitacion Valley than what exists today. Existing tenants will be actively engaged in the relocation planning process and will be offered on-site relocation opportunities as part of a larger community building strategy employed by HOPE SF to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of the neighborhood. . Outside of the boundaries of the Housing Authority site

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced.

The Project is a part of the Hope SF, the Mayor's signature anti-poverty initiative aimed at eradicating intergenerational poverty. As noted above, existing affordable units will be demolished and replaced with significantly improved units at the same affordable levels as the units removed. Along with replacement units for extremely low income households, about 295 additional affordable units for low income households are also proposed.

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.

The Project anticipates and accommodates new transit as planned through the City's Muni Forward Project. Design of streets and bus stops will include bus bulbs and bus shelters; street cross sections and corner design will assure sufficient space for bus travel. Moreover, the Project includes the creation of a pedestrian-oriented street and open space network that will encourage alternative modes of transportation. The Project will provide less than one-to-one parking, further encouraging travel by other modes of travel other than by single-occupancy vehicle.

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.

The Project would not adversely affect the industrial sector or service sectors. No such uses would be displaced by the Project. Construction activity generated by the Project, however, will support these sectors.

6. That the City achieves the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

All new construction would be subject to the City's Building Code, Fire Code and other applicable safety standards. Thus, the Project would improve preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake by prompting development that would comply with applicable safety standards.

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

The Project would not accommodate the removal, demolition, or of any known landmark or historic building.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

On balance, the Project would improve the City's open space and park system and would not adversely effect parks access to sunlight and vistas. The project includes providing roughly 3.5 acres of additional parks to the City's overall park system. The site is immediately adjacent to and downslope to Herz Playground and McLaren Park. Because the proposal does include constructing buildings immediately across the street from the park, new shadows will be created on the park.. However, the EIR has shown that the new shadows would not cause a significant adverse effect. Given that additional parks and accessible green space is being added by the

Exhibit A to Motion No.
Hearing Date: November 17, 2016

Case No. 2010.0305 E
Sunnydale Hope SF Master Plan

Project, and the impacts of the proposed development on Herz Playground and McLaren Park are limited, on balance, the Project is consistent with this General Plan Priority Finding.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Motion No. 19784

SUNNYDALE CEQA FINDINGS

HEARING DATE: NOVEMBER 17, 2016

Case No.: 2010.0305 E GPA PCT PCM DEV GEN SHD
Project Address: **Sunnydale Hope SF Master Plan Project**
Zoning: RM-1 (Residential – Mixed, Moderate Density)
40-X Height and Bulk Districts
Block/Lot: Assessor's Block/Lots: 6356/ 061, 062, 063 ,064, 065, 066, 067 and 068; 6310/
001; 6311/001; 6312/ 001; 6313/001; 6314/ 001; 6315/001
Project Sponsor: Mercy Housing and Related California
1360 Mission Street, #300
San Francisco, CA 94103

Staff Contact: Mat Snyder – (415) 575-6891
mathew.snyder@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

ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS (AND A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS) UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND STATE GUIDELINES IN CONNECTION WITH THE ADOPTION OF THE SUNNYDALE HOPE SF MASTER PLAN PROJECT AND RELATED ACTIONS NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT SUCH PLANS.

Preamble

In 2008, Mercy Housing, ("Project Sponsor") was selected by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (hereinafter "MOHCD") (then, the Mayor's Office of Housing) and the San Francisco Housing Authority to work with the local Sunnydale and Velasco and surrounding Visitacion Valley communities to create a Master Plan for the complete redevelopment of the site that would not only include reconstructed Housing Authority units, but additional affordable units along with market rate units, neighborhood serving retail, community service, new parks and open space, and new streets and infrastructure ("The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan Project" or "Project"). As a part of the HOPE SF selection process, the Project Sponsor was also selected to act as the Master Developer for the Project.

As the selected Master Developer, the Project Sponsor applied to the Planning Department to enter a Development Agreement with the City under Administrative Code Chapter 56. The Project Sponsor also submitted an application for environmental review. On December 12, 2012, the Department issued a Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report ("NOP") for the Project. On December 19, 2014, the Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report / Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("DEIR/DEIS") for the Project and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR/DEIS for public review and comment. The DEIR/DEIS was available for public comment from December 12, 2014 through February 17, 2015. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on January 22, 2015 on the DEIR/DEIS at a regularly scheduled meeting to solicit public comment regarding the DEIR/DEIS.

The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the public review period for the DEIR/DEIS, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR/DEIS in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period. This material was presented in a Response to Comments document, published on June 24, 2015, distributed to the Planning Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR/DEIS, and made available to others upon request at the Department.

A Final Environmental Impact Report / Final Environmental Impact Statement ("FEIR/FEIS" or "Final EIR/EIS") was prepared by the Department, consisting of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Response to Comments document.

Project Environmental Impact Report files WAS made available for review by this Commission and the public. These files were available for public review at the Planning Department at 1650 Mission Street, and are part of the record before this Commission.

On July 9, 2015, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the Final EIR/EIS and found that the contents of the report and the procedures through which the Final EIR/EIS was prepared, publicized, and reviewed complied with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA"), 14 California Code of Regulations sections 15000 et seq. ("CEQA Guidelines"), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code ("Chapter 31").

The Commission found the Final EIR/EIS was adequate, accurate and objective, reflected the independent analysis and judgment of the Department and the Commission, and that the summary of comments and responses contained no significant revisions to the Draft EIR/EIS, and approved the Final EIR/EIS for the Project in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31.

On July 9, 2015, by Motion No. 19704, the Commission certified the Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") as accurate, complete and in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA").

The Planning Department, Jonas P. Ionin, is the custodian of records, located in the File for Case No. 2008.0305E, at 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California.

Department staff prepared a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the Project and these materials were made available to the public and this Commission for this Commission's review, consideration and action.

Project Description

By this action, the Planning Commission adopts Environmental Findings (and a Statement of Overriding Considerations) under the California Environmental Quality Act and State Guidelines in connection with the adoption of the Potrero Hope SF Master Plan Project and related actions necessary to implement such plans. The Project is generally described below here.

The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan Project is part of the City's Hope SF Program, which looks to transform several of the City's Housing Authority sites to revitalized mixed-use mixed-income well integrated neighborhoods.

The Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan project ("Project") includes demolishing all existing units, vacating portions of the right of way and building new streets that would better relate to the existing

street grid. The Project would transform the six existing super blocks into about 34 new fine-grained blocks. The site is designed with a central "Hub" that would feature a series of parks, open spaces, a community center, space for retail, and other community-serving uses.

At completion, the Project would include up to 1,770 units, including Housing Authority replacement units (775 units), a mix of additional affordable units (a minimum of approximately 200 low-income units), and market rate units (up to 694 units). New buildings within Sunnydale would provide a consistent street wall with "eyes-on-the-street" active ground floor treatment. A variety of building types would be constructed throughout including individual townhomes, small apartment buildings and larger corridor apartment buildings. Approximately 1,437 parking spaces would be provided for the units largely below grade. Approximately 60,000 gross square feet of community serving uses, including retail, would also be constructed.

In 2008, Mercy Housing was selected by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (hereinafter "MOHCD") (then, the Mayor's Office of Housing) and the San Francisco Housing Authority to work with the local Sunnydale and Velasco and surrounding Visitacion Valley community to create a Master Plan for the site that would not only include reconstructed Housing Authority units, but additional affordable units along with market rate units, neighborhood serving retail, community service, new parks and open space, and new streets and infrastructure. Mercy Housing is also the Master Developer for the site.

On top of the Development Agreement, project approvals will include General Plan Amendments, Planning Code Text Amendments, Planning Code Map Amendments, Approval of a Design Standards and Guidelines document, and Adoption of Shadow findings pursuant to Planning Code Section 295.

Other than those actions described above, several actions will be required for the project over its multi-year buildout. These actions include but are not limited to approval of subdivisions, right-of-way dedications and vacations.

The Planning Commission wishes to facilitate the physical, environmental, social and economic revitalization of Project site, using the legal tools available through the Planning and Administrative Codes, while creating jobs, housing and open space in a safe, pleasant, attractive and livable mixed use neighborhood that is linked rationally to adjacent neighborhoods.

MOVED that the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the Final EIR and the record associated herewith, including but not limited to the comments and submissions made to this Planning Commission and the Planning Department's responses to those comments and submissions, and based thereon, hereby adopts the Project Findings required by CEQA attached hereto as Attachment A including a statement of overriding considerations, and adopts the MMRP, that shall be included as a condition of approval for each and all of the approval actions set forth in the Motions described above.

Motion No. 19784
November 17, 2016

2010.0305 E GPA PCT PCM DEV GEN SHD
Sunnydale HOPE SF Master Plan Project
Adoption of CEQA Findings

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the San Francisco Planning Commission on November 17, 2016.


Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

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

NOES: None

ABSENT: Fong

ADOPTED: November 17, 2016

RECORDING REQUESTED BY:
City and County of San Francisco

WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:
Director of Property
Real Estate Department
City and County of San Francisco
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94102

Documentary Transfer Tax is Zero;
No fee for recording pursuant to
Government Code § 27383

APN: Block ____, Lot ____

Space above this line for Recorder's Use

IRREVOCABLE OFFER OF IMPROVEMENTS
(Lots A, B and C and Off-Site Improvements in Phase 1)

Sunnydale Infrastructure, LLC, a California limited liability company, hereby irrevocably offers to the City and County of San Francisco, a municipal corporation (the "City"), and its successors and assigns, (i) those certain public improvements located on Lots A, B and C more particularly described in **Exhibit A** and as shown on **Exhibit B** attached hereto, which improvements are described and depicted in Public Works Permit No. 19IE-00564, and (ii) water, sewer, auxiliary water supply system, fire suppression, and joint trench utility improvements in off-site locations on Sunrise Way, Hahn Street, Sawyer Street and Sunnydale Avenue per Street Improvement Permit plans in Permit No 19IE-00564.

With respect to this offer of improvements, it is understood and agreed that: (i) upon acceptance of this offer of public improvements, the City shall own and be responsible for public facilities and improvements, subject to the maintenance obligation of fronting property owners or other permittees pursuant to the Public Works Code, including, but not limited to, Public Works Code Sections 706 and 786, and (ii) the City and its successors and assigns shall incur no liability or obligation whatsoever with respect to such offer of improvements, unless and until such offer has been formally accepted by the Director of Public Works or the Board of Supervisors and subject to any exception that may be provided in a separate instrument, such as a permit under Public Works Code Section 786, or other local law.

The provisions hereof shall inure to the benefit of and be binding upon the heirs, successors, assigns and personal representatives of the respective parties hereto.

(Signatures on following page)

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned has executed this instrument as of this 31st
day of July, 2019.

Sunnydale Infrastructure, LLC,
a California limited liability company

By: Ramie Dare
Name: Ramie Dare
Its: Vice President

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California)
County of San Francisco)

On August 1, 2019, before me, CLAUDIA FLORES, a Notary Public, personally appeared RAMIG DAEG, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature

Claudia Flores



Exhibit A

Description of Improvements

Improvements as permitted in Street Improvement Permit #19IE-00564

Exhibit "B"

Plat Map




DIAGRAM OF PERMIT LOCATION

SUNNYDALE PHASE 1A-1 AND 1A-2

RECORDING REQUESTED BY:
City and County of San Francisco

WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:
Director of Property Real
Estate Department
City and County of San Francisco
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 400 San
Francisco, CA 94102

Documentary Transfer Tax is Zero;
No fee for recording pursuant to
Government Code § 27383

APN: Block____, **Lot** ____

Space above this line for Recorder's Use

OFFER OF DEDICATION
(Lots A, B, and C in Final Map Phase 1)

The Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, a public body corporate and politic (the "Authority"), being the fee title owner of record of the herein described property, hereby irrevocably offers to dedicate, by quitclaim deed, to the City and County of San Francisco, a municipal corporation (the "City"), and its successors and assigns, for street sidewalk and right-of-way purposes, any and all right, title and interest in the real property situated in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, as described in **Exhibit A** and shown on **Exhibit B** attached hereto and made a part hereof. The City acknowledges that such offer is subject to the final approval of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development.

It is understood and agreed that the City, and its successors and assigns, shall incur no liability or obligation whatsoever with respect to such offer of dedication, and except as may be provided by separate instrument, shall not assume any responsibility for the offered parcels of land or any improvements thereon or therein, unless and until such offer has been accepted by appropriate action of the Board of Supervisors of the City.

The provisions hereof shall inure to the benefit of and be binding upon the heirs, successors, assigns and personal representatives of the respective parties hereto.

(Signatures on following page)

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned has executed this instrument as of this 1
day of AUGUST, 2019.

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
a public body corporate and politic

By: Barbara T. Smith
Barbara T. Smith
Acting Executive Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Dianne Jackson McLean
Dianne Jackson McLean
Goldfarb & Lipman LLP
Special Legal Counsel

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California)
County of San Francisco)

On August 1, 2019, before me, Florence C Cheng, a Notary Public, personally appeared Barbara J Smith, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature




Exhibit A

Legal Description

ALL THAT REAL PROPERTY SITUATED IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:


LOT A (SUNRISE WAY), LOT B (MALOSI STREET) AND LOT C (HARMONIA STREET), PUBLIC STREETS OFFERED FOR
DEDICATION, AS SHOWN ON THAT MAP ENTITLED, "FINAL MAP 9537", RECORDED _____, 2019, IN BOOK
____ OF CONDOMINIUM MAPS, PAGES _____, INCLUSIVE, IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER OF THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

APN'S: _____



Exhibit B

Plat Map



SEE SHEET 11

LOT D
APN 6311-011
AREA=7.40± ACRES
FUTURE PHASED
FINAL MAP AREA

10' WIDE
SEWER EASEMENT
(3722 O.R. 31)

APN 6311-001
(PARCEL 2; 3658 O.R. 150)

LOT B
APN 6312-009
AREA=25,540 SQ.FT.
MALOSI STREET (64' WIDE)
(OFFER OF DEDICATION AS A PUBLIC STREET)


APN 6311-001
(PARCEL 2; 3658 O.R. 150)

LOT 1
APN 6312-010
AREA=95,215 SQ.FT.

3' WIDE
UTILITY EASEMENT
(TYPICAL) ("O" MAPS 57)
VACATED PER ORD. NO. 22-19
(2019-)

LOT C
APN 6311-010
AREA=33,022 SQ.FT.
HARMONIA STREET (80' WIDE)
(OFFER OF DEDICATION AS A PUBLIC STREET)

SEE SHEET 11



NOTE:
THE CITY WILL GRANT TO THE DEVELOPER OF THIS SUBDIVISION, A PERMIT TO
ENTER ACROSS APN 6374-036 AND 6312-007 (SHADED LOTS). THESE LOTS
WILL BE DEDICATED AS A PUBLIC STREET PRIOR TO THE FIRST TCO.

DETAIL A
SCALE: 1"=20'

FINAL MAP 9537

SUNNYDALE HOPE SF PROJECT; PID 9537 - PHASE 1
A MERGER AND 6 LOT SUBDIVISION
A 20 RESIDENTIAL UNIT CONDOMINIUM PROJECT WITHIN LOT 2
BEING A MERGER AND SUBDIVISION OF THAT CERTAIN REAL
PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN THAT QUITCLAIM DEED TO THE
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO, RECORDED AUGUST 29, 1940, IN BOOK 3658,
PAGE 150, PARCELS 2 AND 3, OFFICIAL RECORDS AND THAT
CERTAIN QUITCLAIM DEED OF VACATED BLYTHDALE AVE.,
RECORDED _____, 2019, DOC. 2019.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
MARTIN M. RON ASSOCIATES, INC.
Land Surveyors
859 HARRISON STREET, SUITE 200
San Francisco, California 94107
AUGUST 2019 SHEET 10 OF 11

APN 6311-001, APN 6312-001 242 HAHN ST., 1501 SUNNYDALE AVE.,
& A PORTION OF BLYTHDALE AVE. 1 BLYTHDALE AVE., 600-700 VELASCO AVE.

DETAIL B
NOT TO SCALE

SEE SHEET 11

LOT A
APN 6311-009
AREA=19,314 SQ.FT.
SUNRISE WAY (64' WIDE)
(OFFER OF DEDICATION AS A PUBLIC STREET)

APN 6312-001
(PARCEL 3; 3658 O.R. 150)

SUNRISE WAY
(60' WIDE)


HAHN STREET (66' WIDE)

SEE SHEET 9

PHASE 1 BOUNDARY - LOTS A, B, C, 1 AND 2

VELASCO AVE. (49.06' WIDE)
N70°36'00"W 502.01'

APN 6311-011




LEGEND

APN XXXX-XXX

ASSESSORS BLOCK AND LOT NUMBER
PROPERTY LINE



AREA TO BE DEDICATED AS A PUBLIC
STREET



VICINITY MAP
NOT TO SCALE

CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR'S STATEMENT:

APPROVED AS TO FORM THIS 7th DAY OF June, 2022

BY: William E. Blackwell Jr.



WILLIAM E. BLACKWELL JR. L.S. 8251
ACTING CITY & COUNTY SURVEYOR

THIS MAP COMPRISING OF 2 SHEETS, IS APPROVED AND MADE OFFICIAL AND THE PARCELS SHOWN HEREON ARE DECLARED TO BE AN OPEN PUBLIC STREET, DEDICATED TO PUBLIC USE TO BE KNOWN BY THE NAME AS SHOWN ON THIS MAP BY ORDINANCE NO. M19-140, OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPTED THE 24TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2019.


RIGHT OF WAY DEDICATION DEEDED TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BY _____, DEED RECORDED _____ IN BOOK _____ AND PAGE _____.

RECORDER'S STATEMENT

FILED THIS _____ DAY OF _____
AT _____ M., IN BOOK _____ OF SURVEY MAPS, AT PAGES _____, INCLUSIVE,

AT THE REQUEST OF SFPW-BUREAU OF STREET USE AND MAPPING.

SIGNED: _____
COUNTY RECORDER
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA




CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS

MAP SHOWING DEDICATION AND OPENING OF SUNRISE WAY, MALOSI STREET, AND HARMONIA STREET

FILE: A-17-215	SHEET 1 OF 2	SCALE: 1"= 50'	REVISION
----------------	--------------	----------------	----------

VELASCO AVE. (49.06' WIDE)
N70°36'00"W 502.01'

APN 6311-011



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS


MAP SHOWING DEDICATION AND OPENING OF SUNRISE WAY, MALOSI STREET, AND HARMONIA STREET

FILE: A-17-215


SHEET 2 OF 2

SCALE: 1" = 50'


REVISION



J:\Survey\Sidewalk Changes\2020\2020_005 - Sunnydale HOPE SF\DWG\AB 6312 LOT 011_Sunrise Way.dwg May 26, 2022 - 10:30am J:\Survey\Sidewalk Changes\2020\2020_005 - Sunnydale HOPE SF\DWG\AB 6312 LOT 011_Sunrise Way.dwg



LEGEND



ASSESSORS BLOCK NUMBER
NEW CURB LINE
PROPERTY LINE
EXISTING OFFICIAL CURB TO REMAIN
EXISTING OFFICIAL CURB TO BE REMOVED

AREA UNDER SFPW JURISDICTION FOR MAINTENANCE,
SEE SHEET 3 OF 3

LINE TABLE		
LINE #	LENGTH	BEARING
L1	1.00	S69°20'01"E
L2	20.13	N69°20'01"W
L3	27.60	N69°20'01"W
L4	43.20	N69°20'01"W

LINE TABLE		
LINE #	LENGTH	BEARING
L5	71.03	N69°20'01"W
L6	46.57	S69°20'01"E
L7	47.32	N69°20'01"W
L8	74.74	S69°20'01"E


LINE TABLE		
LINE #	LENGTH	BEARING
L9	37.08	S69°20'01"E
L10	33.16	N69°20'01"W
L11	17.74	S69°20'01"E
L12	66.92	N69°20'01"W

CURVE TABLE			
CURVE #	LENGTH	RADIUS	DELTA
C1	29.41	20.00	84°15'39"
C2	31.42	20.00	90°00'00"
C3	6.44	10.00	36°52'12"
C4	12.87	20.00	36°52'12"
C5	12.87	20.00	36°52'11"
C6	6.44	10.00	36°52'12"
C7	6.44	10.00	36°52'12"
C8	12.88	20.00	36°53'30"
C9	12.87	20.00	36°52'08"
C10	6.44	10.00	36°52'12"
C11	5.22	10.00	29°55'35"

CURVE TABLE			
CURVE #	LENGTH	RADIUS	DELTA
C12	10.46	20.00	29°57'48"
C13	10.46	20.00	29°57'48"
C14	5.22	10.00	29°55'35"
C15	6.44	10.00	36°52'12"
C16	12.87	20.00	36°52'08"
C17	12.87	20.00	36°52'12"
C18	6.44	10.00	36°52'12"
C19	6.44	10.00	36°52'12"
C20	12.87	20.00	36°52'12"
C21	11.71	20.00	33°33'26"
C22	5.86	10.00	33°33'26"



APPROVED:


WILLIAM E. BLACKWELL JR., PLS 8251
ACTING CITY & COUNTY SURVEYOR

5/26/22
DATE

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS

OFFICIAL SIDEWALK CHANGES AND SIDEWALK WIDTHS FOR SUNRISE WAY BETWEEN
HAHN STREET AND MALOSI STREET, FRONTING AB 6311 LOT 011 & AB 6312 LOT 010


FILE: Q-20-1160

SHEET 1 OF 3

SCALE: 1"= 30'

REVISION

LEGEND





MAP REFERENCES:

Q-18-026 TITLED "TENTATIVE
MAP #1 SUN VALLEY
SUBDIVISION" DATED FEBRUARY
1946 ON FILE WITH OFFICE OF
THE CITY AND COUNTY
SURVEYOR.

OFFICIAL GRADE MAP NO. 248
ON FILE WITH OFFICE OF THE
CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.

OFFICIAL GRADE MAP NO. 272
ON FILE WITH OFFICE OF THE
CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.



APPROVED:

William E. Blackwell Jr.
WILLIAM E. BLACKWELL JR., PLS 8251
ACTING CITY & COUNTY SURVEYOR

5/26/22
DATE

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS

OFFICIAL SIDEWALK CHANGES AND SIDEWALK WIDTHS FOR SUNRISE WAY BETWEEN
HAHN STREET AND MALOSI STREET, FRONTING AB 6311 LOT 011 & AB 6312 LOT 010

FILE: Q-20-1160

SHEET 2 OF 3

SCALE: 1" = 30'

REVISION

Jawong May 26, 2022 - 10:36am J:\Survey\Sidewalk Changes\2020\2020_005 - Sunnydale HOPE SF\DWG\AB 6312 LOT 011_Sunrise Way.dwg

LEGEND



- 6311 010
- ASSESSORS BLOCK AND LOT NUMBER
- NEW CURB LINE
- PROPERTY LINE
- EXISTING OFFICIAL CURB TO REMAIN
- EXISTING OFFICIAL CURB TO BE REMOVED
-
- AREA UNDER SFPW JURISDICTION FOR MAINTENANCE

MAP REFERENCES:

Q-18-026 TITLED "TENTATIVE
MAP #1 SUN VALLEY
SUBDIVISION" DATED FEBRUARY
1946 ON FILE WITH OFFICE OF
THE CITY AND COUNTY
SURVEYOR.

OFFICIAL GRADE MAP NO. 248
ON FILE WITH OFFICE OF THE
CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.

OFFICIAL GRADE MAP NO. 272
ON FILE WITH OFFICE OF THE
CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.



APPROVED:

William E. Blackwell Jr.
WILLIAM E. BLACKWELL JR., PLS 8251
ACTING CITY & COUNTY SURVEYOR

5/26/22
DATE

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS

OFFICIAL SIDEWALK CHANGES AND SIDEWALK WIDTHS FOR SUNRISE WAY BETWEEN
HAHN STREET AND MALOSI STREET, FRONTING AB 6311 LOT 011 & AB 6312 LOT 010


FILE: Q-20-1160

SHEET 3 OF 3

SCALE: 1" = 30'

REVISION

Jawong May 26, 2022 - 10:41am J:\Survey\Sidewalk Changes\2020\2020_005 - Sunnydale HPPE SF\DIV\AB 6312 LOT 011_Harmonia St.dwg




MAP REFERENCES:

STREET VACATION MAP TITLED
"SUR 2018-002" DATED
DECEMBER 19, 2019 ON FILE
WITH OFFICE OF THE CITY AND
COUNTY SURVEYOR.

Q-12-019 TITLED "SUNNYDALE
HOUSING PROJECT CAL.-1-3"
DATED NOVEMBER 22, 1939 ON
FILE WITH OFFICE OF THE CITY
AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.

OFFICIAL GRADE MAP NO. 248
ON FILE WITH OFFICE OF THE
CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.

LEGEND



ASSESSORS BLOCK NUMBER

NEW CURB LINE

PROPERTY LINE

EXISTING OFFICIAL CURB TO REMAIN

EXISTING OFFICIAL CURB TO BE REMOVED

AREA UNDER SFPW JURISDICTION FOR MAINTENANCE,
SEE SHEET 3 OF 3

LINE TABLE

LINE #	LENGTH	BEARING
L1	23.72	S69°20'01"E
L2	286.91	N69°20'01"W
L3	17.19	S69°20'01"E
L4	11.02	S20°49'57"W
L5	10.98	N20°39'58"E
L6	124.12	N69°20'01"W
L7	164.99	N69°20'01"W
L8	3.67	N69°20'01"W

CURVE TABLE

CURVE #	LENGTH	RADIUS	DELTA
C1	31.42	20.00	89°59'58"
C2	7.48	10.00	42°50'00"
C3	14.95	20.00	42°49'58"
C4	14.95	20.00	42°50'00"
C5	7.48	10.00	42°50'00"
C6	25.13	16.00	90°00'00"
C7	25.15	16.00	90°04'42"
C8	6.44	10.00	36°52'12"
C9	12.87	20.00	36°52'12"
C10	12.87	20.00	36°52'12"
C11	6.44	10.00	36°52'12"
C12	50.27	32.00	90°00'00"



APPROVED:

William E. Blackwell Jr.

WILLIAM E. BLACKWELL JR., PLS 8251

ACTING CITY & COUNTY SURVEYOR

5/26/22
DATE

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS

OFFICIAL SIDEWALK WIDTHS OF HARMONIA STREET BETWEEN HAHN STREET AND MALOSI
STREET, FRONTING AB 6312 LOT 010 & AB 6311 LOTS 002 & 011


FILE: Q-20-1161

SHEET 1 OF 3

SCALE: 1"= 30'



REVISION

LEGEND



MAP REFERENCE:

OFFICIAL GRADE MAP NO. 248
ON FILE WITH OFFICE OF THE
CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.



APPROVED:

William E. Blackwell Jr.
WILLIAM E. BLACKWELL JR., PLS 8251
ACTING CITY & COUNTY SURVEYOR

5/26/22
DATE

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS

OFFICIAL SIDEWALK WIDTHS OF HARMONIA STREET BETWEEN HAHN STREET AND MALOSI STREET, FRONTING AB 6312 LOT 010 & AB 6311 LOTS 002 & 011


FILE: Q-20-1161

SHEET 2 OF 3

SCALE: 1" = 30'

REVISION

LEGEND



ASSESSORS BLOCK AND LOT NUMBER



NEW CURB LINE

PROPERTY LINE

EXISTING OFFICIAL CURB TO REMAIN

EXISTING OFFICIAL CURB TO BE REMOVED

AREA UNDER SFPW JURISDICTION FOR MAINTENANCE



APPROVED:

William E. Blackwell Jr.

WILLIAM E. BLACKWELL JR., PLS 8251

ACTING CITY & COUNTY SURVEYOR

5/24/22


DATE

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS

OFFICIAL SIDEWALK WIDTHS OF HARMONIA STREET BETWEEN HAHN STREET AND MALOSI STREET, FRONTING AB 6312 LOT 010 & AB 6311 LOTS 002 & 011

FILE: Q-20-1161	SHEET 3 OF 3	SCALE: 1"= 30'	REVISION
-----------------	--------------	----------------	----------



VICINITY MAP
NOT TO SCALE

LEGEND

6311

ASSESSORS BLOCK NUMBER

NEW CURB LINE

PROPERTY LINE

EXISTING OFFICIAL CURB TO REMAIN

EXISTING OFFICIAL CURB TO BE REMOVED

AREA UNDER SFPW JURISDICTION FOR
MAINTENANCE, SEE SHEET 2 OF 2

REFERENCE(S):

Q-12-019 TITLED "SUNNYDALE
HOUSING PROJECT CAL.-1-3"
DATED NOVEMBER 22, 1939 ON
FILE WITH OFFICE OF THE CITY
AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.

OFFICIAL GRADE MAP NO. 248 ON
FILE WITH OFFICE OF THE CITY
AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.

LINE TABLE		
LINE #	LENGTH	BEARING
L1	37.77	S20°39'58"W
L2	286.77	N20°39'58"E
L3	69.89	S20°39'58"W
L4	31.89	S20°39'58"W
L5	286.39	N20°39'58"E
L6	38.15	S20°39'58"W

CURVE TABLE			
CURVE #	LENGTH	RADIUS	DELTA
C1	6.44	10.00	36°52'13"
C2	12.81	20.00	36°41'37"
C3	12.56	20.00	35°59'35"
C4	6.44	10.00	36°52'38"
C5	6.44	10.00	36°52'12"
C6	12.56	20.00	35°59'35"
C7	12.81	20.00	36°41'37"
C8	6.44	10.00	36°52'11"



APPROVED:

William B. Blacker J

WILLIAM E. BLACKWELL JR., PLS 8251

ACTING CITY & COUNTY SURVEYOR

5/29/22

DATE _____

*CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS*

OFFICIAL SIDEWALK WIDTHS OF MALOSI STREET BETWEEN SUNRISE WAY AND HARMONIA STREET, FRONTING AB 6311 LOT 011 AND AB 6312 LOT 010


FILE: Q-20-1162

SHEET 1 OF 2


SCALE: 1" = 30'

REVISION

Jawong May 26, 2022 - 10:45am J:\Survey\Sidewalk Changes\2020\2020_005 - Sunnydale HOPE SF\DWG\AB 6312 LOT 011_Malosi St.dwg






LEGEND



ASSESSORS BLOCK AND LOT NUMBER
NEW CURB LINE
PROPERTY LINE
EXISTING OFFICIAL CURB TO REMAIN
EXISTING OFFICIAL CURB TO BE REMOVED

AREA UNDER SFPW JURISDICTION FOR MAINTENANCE



APPROVED:

William E. Blackwell Jr.

WILLIAM E. BLACKWELL JR., PLS 8251

ACTING CITY & COUNTY SURVEYOR

5/29/22


DATE

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS

OFFICIAL SIDEWALK WIDTHS OF MALOSI STREET BETWEEN SUNRISE WAY AND HARMONIA STREET, FRONTING AB 6311 LOT 011 AND AB 6312 LOT 010

FILE: Q-20-1162	SHEET 2 OF 2	SCALE: 1" = 40'	REVISION
-----------------	--------------	-----------------	----------

Jawong May 26, 2022 - 10:47am J:\Survey\Sidewalk Changes\2020\2020_005 - Sunnydale HDPE SF\DWG\AB 6312 LOT 011 Hahn St.dwg




MAP REFERENCES:

STREET VACATION MAP TITLED
"SUR 2018-002" DATED
DECEMBER 19, 2019 ON FILE
WITH OFFICE OF THE CITY AND
COUNTY SURVEYOR.

Q-12-019 TITLED "SUNNYDALE
HOUSING PROJECT CAL.-1-3"
DATED NOVEMBER 22, 1939 ON
FILE WITH OFFICE OF THE CITY
AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.


OFFICIAL GRADE MAP NO. 248
ON FILE WITH OFFICE OF THE
CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.

LINE TABLE		
LINE #	LENGTH	BEARING
L1	126.06	S20°39'58"W



LEGEND

6312 011	ASSESSORS BLOCK AND LOT NUMBER
—————	NEW CURB LINE
- - - - -	PROPERTY LINE
—————	EXISTING OFFICIAL CURB TO REMAIN
- - - - -	EXISTING OFFICIAL CURB TO BE REMOVED



APPROVED:

William E. Blackwell Jr.
WILLIAM E. BLACKWELL JR. PLS 8251
ACTING CITY & COUNTY SURVEYOR

5/29/22
DATE

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS

OFFICIAL SIDEWALK CHANGE ALONG THE WESTERLY PORTION OF HAHN STREET
BETWEEN HARMONIA STREET AND SUNRISE WAY, FRONTING AB 6312 LOT 011

FILE: Q-20-1163

SHEET 1 OF 1

SCALE: 1" = 20'

REVISION



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Motion

HEARING DATE: JULY 9, 2015

Hearing Date: July 9, 2015
Case No.: **2010.0305E**
Project Name: **Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan Project**
Zoning: RM-1 (Residential, Mixed - Low Density) Use District
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 6310/001, 6311/001, 6312/001, 6313/001, 6314/001, and 6315/001
Project Sponsor: Sunnydale Development Co., LLC
1360 Mission Street, Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94103
Staff Contact: Kansai Uchida – (415) 575-9048
kansai.uchida@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

ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATED TO THE CERTIFICATION OF A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR A PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING SUNNYDALE AND VELASCO PUBLIC HOUSING COMPLEXES AND CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS, NEW HOUSING UNITS, INFRASTRUCTURE, OPEN SPACE, AND COMMUNITY AMENITIES.

The environmental document for this project is a joint Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) which satisfies both the California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act.

MOVED, that the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") hereby CERTIFIES the Final Environmental Impact Report identified as Case No. 2010.0305E, Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan Project (hereinafter "Project"), based upon the following findings:

1. The City and County of San Francisco, acting through the Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") fulfilled all procedural requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code Section 21000 *et seq.*, hereinafter "CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Admin. Code Title 14, Section 15000 *et seq.*, hereinafter "CEQA Guidelines") and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (hereinafter "Chapter 31").
 - A. The Department determined that an Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "EIR") was required and provided public notice of that determination by publication in a newspaper of general circulation on December 19, 2012.
 - B. On December 19, 2014, the Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "DEIR") and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning

www.sfplanning.org

Commission public hearing on the DEIR; this notice was mailed to the Department's list of persons requesting such notice.

- C. Notices of availability of the DEIR and of the date and time of the public hearing were posted near the project site by Department staff on December 18, 2014.
 - D. On December 17, 2014, copies of the DEIR were mailed or otherwise delivered to a list of persons requesting it, to those noted on the distribution list in the DEIR, to adjacent property owners, and to government agencies, the latter both directly and through the State Clearinghouse.
 - E. Notice of Completion was filed with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on December 19, 2014.
- 2. Two duly advertised public hearings on said DEIR were held. Planning Department staff held a duly advertised public hearing on January 20, 2015 in the community room at the Sunnydale housing complex, at which opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the DEIR. The Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on January 22, 2015 at which opportunity for public comment was given, and no public comment was received on the DEIR. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on February 17, 2015.
 - 3. The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the 60-day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected errors in the DEIR. This material was presented in a Draft Comments and Responses document, published on June 24, 2015, distributed to the Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR, and made available to others upon request at the Department.
 - 4. A Final Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "FEIR") has been prepared by the Department, consisting of the DEIR, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, and the Comments and Responses document all as required by law.
 - 5. Project EIR files have been made available for review by the Commission and the public. These files are available for public review at the Department at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, and are part of the record before the Commission.
 - 6. On July 9, 2015, the Commission reviewed and considered the FEIR and hereby does find that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
 - 7. The Planning Commission hereby does find that the FEIR concerning File No. 2010.0305E, Sunnydale-Velasco HOPE SF Master Plan Project, reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City and County of San Francisco, is adequate, accurate and objective, and that the Comments

and Responses document contains no significant revisions to the DEIR, and hereby does CERTIFY THE COMPLETION of said FEIR in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

8. The Commission, in certifying the completion of said FEIR, hereby does find that the project described in the EIR:
 - A. Will have no significant project-specific effect on the environment; and
 - B. Will have a significant cumulative effect on the environment in that it, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would cause levels of service at intersections to deteriorate and would conflict with applicable congestion management programs as well as plans, ordinances, or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.
9. The Planning Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR prior to approving the Project.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting of July 9, 2015.

Jonas Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Wu, Fong, Antonini, Johnson, Moore, Richards

NOES:

ABSENT: Hillis

ADOPTED: July 9, 2015

Buried Problems and a Buried Process:

The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard in a Time of Climate Change

June 1, 2022



City and County of San Francisco
Civil Grand Jury
2021-2022

About the Civil Grand Jury

The Civil Grand Jury is a government oversight panel of volunteers who serve for one year. It makes findings and recommendations based on its investigations. Reports of the Civil Grand Jury do not identify individuals by name, and disclosure of information about individuals interviewed by the Jury is prohibited. (California Penal Code §929)

2021-2022 Jurors

Michael N. Hofman, Foreperson

Will McCaa, Foreperson Pro Tem

Sara Miles, Corresponding Secretary

Charles Lai, Recording Secretary

Mark Seielstad, Parliamentarian

Tony An

Rick Crane

Tony David

Phyllis V. Deets

Jason Golz

Cort Gross

Jeanine Jue

Tim Novacic

Cynthia Travis

Joanie van Rijn

Dylan Walker

Jeffrey D. Weitzel

Cover Image from: Pathways Climate Institute and San Francisco Estuary Institute-Aquatic Science Center, "Shallow Groundwater Response to Sea Level Rise in the San Francisco Bay Area: Existing and Future Conditions," estimated release date 2022

SUMMARY

The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard is a Superfund site on the southeastern shore of San Francisco. The Navy, overseen by EPA and state regulators, has been cleaning up radiological and chemical contamination in the Shipyard for over thirty years. As the cleanup is completed and approved, the Navy has agreed to transfer the property to the City in stages to create San Francisco's biggest housing development. A developer, working with the San Francisco Office of Community Infrastructure and Investment, plans to build thousands of homes at the Shipyard, along with office towers, parks, a school and millions of feet of commercial space.

The Civil Grand Jury began this investigation with a question about the potential impact of groundwater rise due to climate change on the future of the Shipyard. Over the past decade, new coastal adaptation science has emerged to show the ways shallow groundwater reacts to sea level rise. In brief, as the sea level rises, shallow groundwater near the shore rises with it, and can cause flooding, damage infrastructure, and mobilize any contaminants in the soil. The Jury asked if rising groundwater could pose special risks to health and safety in the low-lying, heavily polluted landscape of the Shipyard.

The Jury learned that experts believe the Shipyard's soil and topography make it very likely that shallow groundwater there will be strongly affected by sea level rise. The Jury further found that rising groundwater in the Shipyard could interact in dangerous ways with future infrastructure, and with hazardous toxins the Navy plans to leave buried in the soil.

We wanted to know if this new science and these risks had been taken into account by the City, by OCII, or by the Navy and its regulators. We found that they had not.

To address this lack of information, the Jury recommends that the City hire expert scientists to examine these risks in detail. The City of Alameda set an example with a recent study predicting how shallow groundwater on the island would react to sea level rise, and how rising groundwater might interact with contaminants at different sites. The Jury recommends that San Francisco, acting through the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, commission a similar independent study specific to the Shipyard, so that future development plans can be informed by a thorough, professional analysis of rising groundwater there.

The Jury also wished to issue recommendations about how such a groundwater study might help improve the Shipyard cleanup. But the Jury cannot issue recommendations to the Navy or to the EPA and state regulators, and so looked for a solution that could come from inside the City. The Jury discovered that the process that governs the cleanup is forbiddingly complex, and essentially invisible within the City. Yet the stakes for San Francisco in that process—for health,

for environmental safety, and for the resilience of future development in the Shipyard—are enormous. But hardly anyone in the City is paying attention.

Within the City, expertise about the Superfund process that governs the cleanup exists only in the San Francisco Department of Public Health’s Hunters Point Shipyard Program, a program that until recently had only one employee. Several other departments in the City have familiarity with the science of groundwater rise and might have flagged the risks to the Shipyard, but these departments are unfamiliar with the cleanup and the Superfund process, and do not communicate with SFDPH about the Shipyard.

This leaves the City poorly prepared to address emerging issues such as groundwater rise at the Shipyard—or any other risks the Navy and its regulators may overlook. There is no mechanism in place to discover such issues, to develop a response, or to follow through with the Navy and regulators to a resolution.

The Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors create, without delay, a permanent Hunters Point Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee, made up of representatives from City departments with pertinent expertise. This committee should proactively look out for the City’s best interests in the cleanup. It should perform general due diligence, and communicate the City’s concerns to the Navy and regulators ahead of major decision-making about the cleanup.

To address the opacity of the Superfund governance process, the Jury recommends that SFDPH create all necessary explanatory materials to support the work of the Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee. To ensure that the Committee is informed about key cleanup decision points with enough time to weigh in, the Jury recommends that a representative of SFDPH appear before the Committee frequently for briefing.

Finally, to return to where this report started, the Jury recommends that the Cleanup Oversight Committee review the results of the recommended groundwater rise study, determine what it means for the future of the Shipyard, and respectfully but assertively share the City’s position with the Navy, EPA, and state regulators. The intersection of rising ground water and buried contaminants poses a credible risk to human health and well-being. Given the rapidity with which the climate is changing, the City needs to take immediate and sustained action to protect its residents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	3
TABLE OF CONTENTS	5
INTRODUCTION	7
BACKGROUND	8
The Soil and the Poison: How Did They Get There?	8
Who Bears the Burden?	9
The Cleanup and Beyond	10
THE THREAT OF RISING GROUNDWATER	15
The Basics	15
Rising Groundwater in the Shipyard: What Could Go Wrong?	19
Groundwater Rise and the Navy’s Cleanup Plans	23
The Groundwater Maps San Francisco Needs	24
A DISCONNECT IN THE CITY	26
A Steep Hill	26
Roles and Responsibilities	27
The Disconnect	28
Taking a Position	28
THE JURY’S REMEDY	30
Lifting the Fog	32
Tracking Progress	33
Closing the Loop	34
CONCLUSION	35
METHODOLOGY	36
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	37

REQUIRED AND INVITED RESPONSES	39
Appendix A: General Audience Media	40
Appendix B: Scientific Papers	41
Appendix C: Municipal and Regional Planning for Groundwater Rise	42
Appendix D: Community and Environmental Advocacy Groups	44
Appendix E: Cleanup Documentation	45
Appendix F: Superfund Legal Framework	47
Appendix G: Hunters Point Shipyard Litigation	49

INTRODUCTION

Like every Civil Grand Jury investigation, this one began with a question. The Jury looked at the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, a 638-acre Superfund site on the southeastern shore of San Francisco, where the Navy has been cleaning up radiological and chemical contamination for over thirty years. If all goes to plan, once the cleanup is complete, the Shipyard, along with adjacent Candlestick Point, will become the largest redevelopment in San Francisco since the 1906 earthquake, with thousands of homes and millions of square feet of commercial property.

The Jury posed the question: When the sea level rises, what will happen to the shallow groundwater in the residually-contaminated soil under those apartment buildings and office towers? The science is relatively new, but among coastal adaptation experts, this is now understood to be true: as the seas rise, shallow groundwater near the coast will tend to rise with them, and when groundwater rises through polluted soil, it's bad.

This led the Jury to a second question: Have the Navy and the regulators that oversee the cleanup evaluated the risks posed by groundwater rising with sea level rise in the Shipyard? Has the City and County of San Francisco? In both cases, the Jury found that they had not.

The Jury followed this thread and discovered that, within the City, too few people are paying too little attention to the Shipyard cleanup, leaving the City structurally unprepared for any challenging situation related to the cleanup. The City is not actively searching for overlooked risks such as groundwater rise. And the City is not performing sufficient due diligence on the decisions made by the Navy and regulators, to ensure that they are aligned with the interests and priorities of the people of San Francisco.

This is a solvable problem. Those who are not paying attention can be made aware, and the full spectrum of the City's resources can be applied to protecting our interests in the Shipyard cleanup, and making sure the Navy and regulators don't miss anything else in the years to come. And there is still hope that groundwater rise will be addressed in the Shipyard before it is too late.

BACKGROUND

The Soil and the Poison: How Did They Get There?

The history of the Hunters Point Shipyard begins in 1867, when the first dry dock opened on the peninsula.¹ In 1941, the Navy bought the site, recruited tens of thousands of workers, and turned the Shipyard into a major repair and maintenance facility for warships. Through 1944, the Navy built four new large dry docks, and expanded the peninsula by smashing an adjacent hill into gravel and dumping it into the Bay.² Figure 1 shows the work in progress.³

Figure 1: The Shipyard Under Construction



San Francisco History Center, San Francisco Public Library

¹ Kelley & VerPlanck Historical Resources Consulting, "[Bayview Hunters Point Area B Survey](#)," p 41, prepared for the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, February 11, 2010

² "[Bayview Hunters Point Area B Survey](#)," p 93

³ [San Francisco History Center](#), San Francisco Public Library

In 1946, the United States conducted Operation Crossroads, a pair of atom bomb tests in the Pacific that went wrong, leaving the Navy with dozens of vessels badly contaminated by radioactive fallout. A new laboratory at Hunters Point developed a technique of decontaminating ships by sandblasting them in dry dock, and many of the radioactive vessels ultimately passed through the Shipyard. The laboratory became the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory (NRDL), which operated until 1969, and was the site of extensive radiological experimentation and research. The Shipyard became a regional hub for the disposal of radioactive waste, with workers packing NRDL's voluminous waste and material from decontaminated ships, as well as material from other nuclear facilities all over the Bay Area, into 47,000 large steel drums and sinking them in the ocean near the Farallon Islands.⁴

In 1974, the Navy ceased operations at the Shipyard, and in 1976 leased the site to Triple A Machine Shop. By 1984, not long after the passage of the Federal Superfund law, the writing was on the wall that the Navy would have to take responsibility for what had been left behind in the Shipyard, and it started taking stock of the mess.⁵

Forty years on, what we now know about the witches' brew in the Shipyard defies easy summarization. Radioactive material had been spilled, burned, or improperly disposed of, and still pollutes the soil, the base landfill, and the Bay.⁶ Conventional shipyard operations left behind piles of asbestos, ponds of oil, crushed heavy metals, discarded batteries, spilled acids, and other toxic chemicals.⁷ Triple A Machine Shop illegally dumped large amounts of extremely carcinogenic PCBs and heavy metals at the site.⁸

Who Bears the Burden?

The history of the Bayview Hunters Point community in the last century is complex, but two salient trends stand out: what the land was used for, and who lived there. Before World War II, the neighborhood had already been a locale for unpleasant, industrial uses, such as the Shipyard and slaughterhouses. After the war, as industrial real estate became scarce in other parts of the City, the Bayview became a destination for more and dirtier industrial development.

By 1945, over 18,000 workers, a third of them Black, had come to work at the Hunters Point Shipyard, most housed in Navy barracks there or in nearby Bayview. After the war, racist housing policies blocked Black workers and their families from moving to safer, less polluted parts of the City, so many stayed in the shadow of the Shipyard. By 1970, the census counted

⁴ Chen, Kevin, and Gabrielle Hecht, "[Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory \(NRDL\) Briefing Book](#)," Nuclear Insecurity in the Bay Area and Beyond, Stanford University, 2020

⁵ US Navy, "[Initial Assessment Study of Hunters Point Naval Shipyard \(Disestablished\) San Francisco, California](#)," Chapter 2, pp 2-3, Naval Energy and Environmental Support Activity, October 1984

⁶ US Navy, "[Hunters Point Shipyard History of the Use of General Radioactive Materials, 1939 – 2003 Final Historical Radiological Assessment](#)," Chapters 6-7, 2003

⁷ "[Initial Assessment Study of Hunters Point Naval Shipyard \(Disestablished\) San Francisco, California](#)"

⁸ Zamora, Jim Heron and Jane Kay, "[Triple A Machine Shop Toxics Case](#)," SFGate, December 9, 1996

over twenty thousand Black residents in Bayview Hunters Point, two thirds of the area's population.⁹

The history of environmental racism in Bayview Hunters Point has been met by a decades-long history of Black-led environmental justice activism. Community leaders have fought not only for responsible cleanup of the Shipyard, but to shut down a dirty power plant,¹⁰ clean up the City's biggest sewage treatment plant,¹¹ stop industrial dumping,¹² and monitor local air quality.¹³ (See [Appendix D](#) for an overview of environmental and community activism around Hunters Point.)

But the statistics remain grim. In 2018, the San Francisco Department of Public Health found that Bayview Hunters Point is significantly more at risk of health and environmental catastrophes than other neighborhoods.¹⁴ 27% of the neighborhood is situated within a quarter-mile of a contamination risk, and Bayview Hunters Point residents have worse health outcomes, higher maternal deaths, twice the rate of breast cancer, and three times more “preventable hospitalizations” than other San Franciscans. The California EPA's CalEnviroScreen, a metric combining the pollution burden and social vulnerabilities of communities, shows the most beleaguered census tract in Bayview Hunters Point, just inland of the Shipyard, scoring worse than 92% of census tracts in the entire state.¹⁵ Contamination from the Shipyard is part of a long, toxic history.

The Cleanup and Beyond

On November 21, 1989, the decommissioned Shipyard was added to the National Priorities List;¹⁶ in lay terms, it became a Superfund site. According to the Superfund law, properly known as the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), responsibility for cleaning up the Shipyard lies with the Navy. Section 120 of CERCLA, which covers toxic sites owned by the federal government, obliges the Navy to enter into a formal agreement with the regulators who oversee the cleanup, to establish the ground rules of their working relationship. That agreement¹⁷ was signed by the Regional Administrator

⁹ “[Bayview Hunters Point Area B Survey](#),” pp 136-143

¹⁰ Fulbright, Leslie, “[Big Victory for Hunters Point Activists: As PG&E Closes its Old, Smoky Power Plant, the Neighborhood Breathes a Sigh of Relief](#),” *San Francisco Chronicle*, May 15, 2006

¹¹ Katz, Mitchell, “[Health Programs in Bayview Hunter's Point & Recommendations for Improving the Health of Bayview Hunter's Point Residents](#),” p. 8, San Francisco Department of Public Health, September 19, 2006

¹² Mojada, Ida, “[City Struggles to Rein in Illegal Dumping in Bayview](#),” *SF Weekly*, February 22, 2019

¹³ Wolfram, Jessica, “[Bayview Air Monitoring Program Helps Residents Breathe Easier](#),” *San Francisco Examiner*, October 8, 2021

¹⁴ “San Francisco Department of Public Health, “[The Bayview Hunters Point Community Resilience Assessment](#),” 2018

¹⁵ California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, “[Cal EnviroScreen](#),” October 2021

¹⁶ US Environmental Protection Agency, “[National Priorities List Sites](#)”

¹⁷ US Navy, “[Federal Facility Agreement for Naval Station Treasure Island, Hunters Point Annex](#),” January 1992

of EPA, Region 9, on January 22nd, 1992. (See [Appendix F](#) for more detail on the Superfund legal framework.)

“Federal Facility Agreement signatories” is a very important bit of jargon: when it comes to the cleanup at the Hunters Point Shipyard, the agencies that signed the agreement are the deciders. The Navy makes and carries out the plans for cleanup. The regulators approve the plans and oversee their execution. The Federal Facility signatories for the Hunters Point Shipyard site are:

- the Navy
- the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- the California Department of Toxic Substances Control
- the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board


The City and County of San Francisco is not a signatory, and does not have a decision-making role, but SFDPH participates in the process and routinely offers written comment on cleanup documents.

In April of 1992, the Navy divided the 638-acre Shipyard into more manageable administrative units called “parcels”¹⁸ so that it could clean up the Shipyard piece by piece, and transfer each parcel separately to the City once its cleanup was approved. (See Figure 2)

Parcel A sits on top of a hill, the site of former Navy barracks, and so was believed to be relatively clean. Parcels B, C, D, and E sliced up the remainder of the peninsula like a pie. Parcel F was later added to encompass the underwater portion of the site, and the most desirable portion of Parcel D was separated out into Parcel G. Later carve-outs and subdivisions have increased the total number of parcels to north of a dozen.

¹⁸ US Navy, “[Final Site Assessment Report, Potentially Contaminated Sites Parcels B,C,D, and E, Naval Station Treasure Island Hunters Point Annex, San Francisco California,](#)” p.6.

Figure 2: Parcel Map



Parcel Map
Fourth Five-Year Review of Remedial Actions, Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California



In January of 1994, the Navy and the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA)¹⁹ signed a memorandum of understanding,²⁰ setting in motion a multi-decade quest to transform the Shipyard into a mini-city in its own right. In 1997, the Board of Supervisors approved SFRA's redevelopment plan²¹ for the Shipyard, and in 1999, SFRA selected Lennar Corporation as the master developer.²²

In April 2004, the City, the Navy, and SFRA signed a Conveyance Agreement²³ to outline a framework for the transfer of each parcel to the City, after the Navy completes the parcel's environmental cleanup and state and federal regulators confirm it is safe. The City is not required to accept any parcel.

The hilltop Parcel A was transferred to the City in December 2004, marking the beginning of Phase I of the redevelopment project, and Lennar soon began construction. After 2012, SFRA's successor agency, the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII), took over responsibility for working on Shipyard redevelopment. By 2015, new homeowners were moving into what Lennar branded "The San Francisco Shipyard," advertising "luxury condominiums and townhomes with breathtaking bay views...the ultimate experience in urban living."²⁴

In 2016, Lennar restructured the Shipyard project under a new spinoff company, FivePoint Holdings, in which it is an investor.²⁵ Optimism and grand visions are still the order of the day in promoting Phase II development in the Shipyard's low-lying parcels. FivePoint's 2017 Request for Statements of Interest described its plans for "new infrastructure, state-of-the-art amenities, parks and open space, neighborhood retail centers, and a diverse range of housing and employment opportunities along the picturesque waterfront," calling the Shipyard "the largest redevelopment effort in San Francisco since the 1906 earthquake."²⁶ OCII's 2018 project update proposed to add hotels, parks, "artist and maker space," and 4.5 million square feet of office

¹⁹ The [San Francisco Redevelopment Agency \(SFRA\)](#) was incorporated in 1948 under the California Community Redevelopment Law. Though separate from the City and County of San Francisco, the agency carried out redevelopment efforts authorized by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. All redevelopment agencies were dissolved in 2012 by order of the California Supreme Court. The [Office of Community Infrastructure and Investment](#) (OCII) is SFRA's state-approved local successor agency.

²⁰ US Navy, "[Transmittal of Interim Update for Base Realignment and Closure \(BRAC\) Cleanup Plan \(BCP\) of March 1995](#)," p. 12 (ES 6), August 8, 1995

²¹ San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, "[Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan](#)," July 14, 1997

²² San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, "[Resolution No. 68-99 Authorizing An Exclusive Negotiations Agreement With Lennar/Bvhp, Llc, a California Limited Liability Company, for The Hunters Point Shipyard; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area](#)," June 1, 1999

²³ San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, "[Resolution No. 50-2004. Adopting Environmental Findings Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and Authorizing Execution of the Following Documents with the United States Department of the Navy Concerning the Former Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Site](#)," April 21, 2004

²⁴ <https://liveatsfshipyard.com/>

²⁵ Five Point Holdings PR Newswire, "[Strategic Combination of FivePoint Holdings Creates Largest Developer of Mixed-Use Communities In Coastal California](#)," May 4, 201

²⁶ Gensler for FivePoint Development LLC, "[Request for Statements of Interest and Qualifications \("RFQ"\) for Design, Engineering, & Professional Consulting Services, SF Shipyard](#)," September 6, 2017

space to “embrace the legacy, authenticity and unique character of the Shipyard as we look to the future and create a model for city-making.”²⁷

At the time of the original redevelopment plan back in 1997, the hope was that the Shipyard could be cleaned up so completely that people could live there as if it had never been polluted; in Superfund language, it was to be made suitable for “unrestricted use.”²⁸

But by the time cleanup plans were documented for the parcels beyond Parcel A, around 2009-10, the documents left no doubt that unrestricted use was out of reach. The very rock that had been dumped into the Bay to make the shipyard was poisonous,²⁹ and some pollutants in the soil and groundwater were so pervasive it was impossible to remove them completely. The plans were adjusted. In developed areas, pavement would be required everywhere to shield people from the toxic dirt. In open spaces, thick layers of clean, imported soil would have to be laid down in order for the parks to be safe. In many areas, new buildings would be required to be fitted with special equipment to divert poisonous vapors away from their interiors.³⁰

Then, in a trickle of reports throughout the 2010s,³¹ followed by criminal convictions and lawsuits,³² it emerged that Tetra Tech, the Navy contractor responsible for testing and cleaning up radiological contamination in the Shipyard, had been falsifying data for years. The safety of the Shipyard was thrown into doubt, public trust damaged, and homeowners who had bought properties in Parcel A sued the developer, claiming they were misled about the extent of contamination.³³ Ultimately the only solution was for the Navy to repeat all of the soil testing, thus delaying the cleanup and the transfer of remaining parcels to the City by years. At the time of this report, only retesting in Parcel G is underway. The cleanup of the Shipyard, which was supposed to be winding down by the early 2020s, will continue for years to come.

²⁷ “[The Shipyard and Candlestick Project Update](#),” OCII Commission, March 20, 2018

²⁸ <https://www.lawinsider.com/dictionary/unrestricted-use-remedial-action>

²⁹ San Francisco Department of Public Health, “[Draft Executive Summary Regarding the Environmental Remediation of the Hunters Point Shipyard](#),” Attachment 8, Attachment 10, April 2010

³⁰ US EPA, “[Hazard Ranking System Subsurface Intrusion Component](#),” January 9, 2017

³¹ Nguyen, Vicky, Liz Wagner, Felipe Escamilla, “[Contractor Submitted False Radiation Data at Hunters Point](#),” *NBC Bay Area*, October 13, 2014; Brinklow, Adam, “[Alleged Radiation Cover-Up at Hunters Point Prompts EPA Investigation](#),” *Curbed SF*, September 22, 2016; Roberts, Chris, “[Almost Half of Toxic Cleanup at Hunters Point Shipyard is Questionable or Faked, According to Initial Review](#),” *Curbed SF*, January 26, 2018

³² US Attorney’s Office, District of Northern California, “[United States Joins Lawsuits Against Tetra Tech EC Inc. Alleging False Claims In Connection With Shipyard Cleanup](#),” US Department of Justice, October 26, 2018

³³ CBS Bay Area, “[Settlement Approved For San Francisco Hunters Point Homeowners In Lawsuit Over Alleged Contamination](#),” April 1, 2022

THE THREAT OF RISING GROUNDWATER

The Basics

Much of the low, flat portion of Hunters Point that extends into the Bay was constructed during World War II, out of a nearby hill that had been pulverized and dumped into the water. When a shoreline is made of such permeable material, salt ocean water soaks in, effectively extending the ocean under the ground. But the soil usually also contains shallow fresh water, from rain and other sources. Because salt water is heavier than fresh, this fresh groundwater floats on top of the saltwater layer underground.

As shown in Figure 3,³⁴ the shallow groundwater surface near the shore fluctuates with the sea: with the tides on a daily basis, and with sea level rise as the planet warms. When it rises enough, emergent groundwater can be pushed up from the earth—often years before there is overland flooding from the sea itself. Conventional defenses against sea level rise, such as sea walls, offer no protection from flooding from below, and can even exacerbate flooding by creating a barrier that keeps risen groundwater from flowing out.³⁵ (For more about the effects of sea level rise on groundwater see [Appendix A](#), a selection of general audience media on this subject, and [Appendix B](#), a selection of scholarly articles.)

The first time this concept appears in the scientific literature is in 2007,³⁶ when the Navy’s plans for cleaning up most of the Shipyard were already being prepared. In 2012, a pair of landmark papers about the cases of Honolulu³⁷ and New Haven³⁸ explored how groundwater propelled upward by sea level rise could create hazards in urban environments. By 2019, scientists had awakened to the risks rising groundwater posed along the shoreline of the San Francisco Bay,

³⁴ City of Alameda, “[The Response of the Shallow Groundwater Layer and Contaminants to Sea Level Rise](#),” September 2020

³⁵ Habel, Shellie, Charles H. Fletcher & Tiffany R. Anderson, *et al.* “[Sea-Level Rise Induced Multi-Mechanism Flooding and Contribution to Urban Infrastructure Failure](#),” *Scientific Reports*, March 2, 2020


³⁶ Masterson, John P. and Stephen Garabedian, “[Effects of Sea-Level Rise on Ground Water Flow in a Coastal Aquifer System](#),” pp. 209–217, *Groundwater* 45, no. 2, March–April 2007

³⁷ Rotzoll, Kolja and Charles H. Fletcher, “[Assessment of groundwater inundation as a consequence of sea-level rise](#),” pp 477–481, *Nature Climate Change*, 2013

³⁸ Bjerklie, David M., John R. Mullaney, Janet R. Stone, Brian J. Skinner, and Matthew A. Ramlow, “[Preliminary investigation of the effects of sea-level rise on groundwater levels in New Haven, Connecticut](#),” U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2012–1025, 2012

and two papers—one from UC Berkeley³⁹ and the other from the US Geological Survey (USGS)⁴⁰—created maps of how sea level rise might affect groundwater along the Bay edge.

Figure 3



City of Alameda, [The Response of the Shallow Groundwater Layer and Contaminants to Sea Level Rise](#)

A new Bay Area project⁴¹ builds on the work of the UC Berkeley paper and will release its results in the second half of 2022. This study is the work of the Pathways Climate Institute (Pathways) and the San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI), and will produce the most detailed maps to date of the groundwater surface under different sea level rise scenarios in Alameda, Marin, and San Mateo counties, as well as in San Francisco. In San Francisco, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning (ORCP) has partnered with Pathways and SFEI to support

³⁹ Plane, Ellen, Kristina Hill, and Christine May, "[A Rapid Assessment Method to Identify Potential Groundwater Flooding Hotspots as Sea Levels Rise in Coastal Cities](#)" *Water* 11, no. 11, 2019

⁴⁰ Bufus, Kevin M, P. L. Barnard, D. J. Hoover, J. A. Finzi Hart, and C. I. Voss, "[Increasing threat of coastal groundwater hazards from sea-level rise in California](#)," pp 946–952 *Nature Climate Change*, 2020

⁴¹Pathways Climate Institute and San Francisco Estuary Institute-Aquatic Science Center, "Shallow Groundwater Response to Sea Level Rise in the San Francisco Bay Area: Existing and Future Conditions," estimated release date 2022. See advance study summary [here](#).

mapping the city's groundwater surface—a crucial step in understanding how to plan for sea-level rise in different parts of the city.

The Jury has obtained permission to include a preview of the Pathways+SFEI maps for Hunters Point in this report. Figure 4 shows where the highest annual shallow groundwater surface is currently, and where it would be with a scenario of four feet of sea level rise—well within the range scientists expect to see by the end of the century.⁴²

Refer back to Figure 2 for the outlines of Shipyard Parcels C and G, both areas with buried contaminants, and both slated for development. With four feet of sea level rise, the wettest conditions are expected to bring groundwater within three feet of the surface in large portions of these parcels, and the southwest corner of Parcel G is predicted to be surrounded by flooding. Those floodwaters could be poisoned with toxic metals and volatile organic compounds. Throughout the century, as groundwater rises in Parcels C and G (as well as in Parcel B, also planned for development,) buried contaminants that are now dry and stationary could become wet and mobile.


As vivid and alarming as the maps in Figure 4 are, they have significant limitations, and are not adequate for the City to use to inform important decisions about the future of the Shipyard.

- In the Shipyard, the Pathways+SFEI maps are based on very limited data. Plentiful groundwater data has been generated by the Navy, but it is not made available in a format useful to outside researchers. The Pathways+SFEI maps for the Shipyard are based on data from just two wells.
- The regional nature of the Pathways+SFEI study limits it from taking into account the specific characteristics of the soil in the Shipyard.
- The site cleanup and future development will change the terrain of the Shipyard, and maps are needed that take these changes into account.
- Most crucially, the Pathways+SFEI study does not model groundwater flows in the Shipyard that could predict how soil and groundwater contaminants might move around under different sea level rise scenarios.

With all that's at stake in the Hunters Point Shipyard, the City urgently needs better, more detailed predictions of how groundwater will react to sea level rise at this site.

⁴² National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, “[2022 Sea Level Rise Technical Report, Coastal County Snapshots](#),” U.S. Department of Commerce

Figure 4: Groundwater Rise in the Shipyard



Pathways Climate Institute and San Francisco Estuary Institute-Aquatic Science Center,, "Shallow Groundwater Response to Sea Level Rise in the San Francisco Bay Area: Existing and Future Conditions,"estimated release 2022

Rising Groundwater in the Shipyard: What Could Go Wrong?

Build a peninsula out of fill dirt and crushed rock. Run an oily, messy shipyard on it for decades. Site a radiological research laboratory there. Process thousands of tons of radioactive waste on its way to disposal in the ocean. Put out fires in the landfill, and mop up chemical spills. Then spend decades scrubbing the place clean as best you can, and build a small, new city with thousands of homes, schools, and extensive commercial properties on top of the remains. What could go wrong? What could go wrong if the average height of the water table was three feet higher than assumed, back when all this cleanup and construction was originally planned? What if it were six feet higher? What could go wrong during an extreme precipitation event at the end of a wet winter, supercharged by climate change and rising tides, when the ground cannot hold any more water?

There are so many things that have gone wrong already, both in the toxically burdened Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood and in the Shipyard itself. Anything that could subject the people of this community and the people who will eventually live in the Shipyard to further risks must be taken very seriously.

Earthquakes, Flooding and Infrastructure

Even before toxic and radioactive materials are considered, the lens of straight engineering offers a junk drawer full of problems. Fill soil like that in the Shipyard is at high risk of liquefaction during an earthquake,⁴³ and rising groundwater can increase the likelihood and severity of liquefaction.⁴⁴ Setting aside earthquakes, when groundwater rises and encounters an impermeable surface like pavement, the foundation of a building, or a sewer line, the water pushes up on it as if it were a boat. Pavement can crack and leak under this pressure.⁴⁵ Buildings with underground parking garages can float and settle back down, less stable than before.⁴⁶ High groundwater can shove around underground infrastructure like sewers, gas mains and storm drains, and the water can remove soil when it drains away again, leading to other structural problems.⁴⁷

Mobilized Contaminants

The Navy and its regulators have deemed it safe to leave some hazardous material buried on site throughout the Shipyard. These decisions did not take into account, however, that every inch of

⁴³ United States Geological Survey, "[Liquefaction Susceptibility](#)," USGS, Earthquakes Hazard Program

⁴⁴ Grant, Alex R., Anne M. Wein, Kevin M. Befus, Juliette Finzi Hart, Mike T. Frame, Rachel Volentine, Patrick Barnard, and Keith L. Knudsen, "[Changes in Liquefaction Severity in the San Francisco Bay Area with Sea-Level Rise](#)," *Geo-Extreme 2021: Climatic Extremes and Earthquake Modeling*, 2021

⁴⁵ May, Christine, A.T. Mohan, O. Hoang, M. Mak, Y. Badet, "[The Response of the Shallow Groundwater Layer and Contaminants to Sea Level Rise](#)," City of Alameda, September 2020

⁴⁶ NYC Economic Development Corporation, "[Lower Manhattan Climate Resilience Study](#)," p. 23, 2019

⁴⁷ Chisolm, Elizabeth and John C. Matthews, "[Impact of Hurricanes and Flooding on Buried Infrastructure](#)," *Leadership and Management in Engineering* 12, pp 151-156, 2012

groundwater rise has the potential to bring the water table into contact with previously stationary contaminants. In the areas of the Shipyard where development is planned, pavement is intended to serve as an important line of defense against toxins in the soil.⁴⁸ But if the pavement is not elevated well above the future water table, water will eventually batter through the pavement from below, and may carry toxins with it. In areas planned for parks, layers of imported soil are supposed to serve as protection. But if they are not thick enough, the soil will periodically become soaked through with water that may bear contaminants.

Volatile Organic Compounds

The most pernicious toxins that are known to remain in the Shipyard are Volatile Organic Chemicals (VOCs.) Throughout the site, the Navy's remediation plans are to excavate and remove the most concentrated VOC spills, or to chemically treat them in place. But like discarded plastic litter, VOCs get everywhere, and keep turning up in unexpected places for years.

According to Navy plans, any VOCs that remain in the Shipyard's soil and in the groundwater are to be managed with "institutional controls."⁴⁹ Institutional controls are active measures that have to be maintained into the future—potentially indefinitely—to maintain safety. They include remedies such as the ongoing monitoring of wells, or requiring "vapor barriers" in buildings to divert vaporized VOCs away from indoor spaces.

Experts the Jury consulted were skeptical of the ability of institutional controls to protect people from VOCs in a time of climate change. VOCs mix easily with water, and as groundwater moves faster, or in new directions, it will carry VOCs with it. If groundwater rises all the way to the surface to cause flooding, VOCs will come along for the ride. And VOCs have a superpower: where sewer lines have been damaged by age, rising groundwater, or earthquakes, water carrying VOCs can leak into the sewers. Toxic vapors can then rise off that water and travel up the pipes into homes and other structures.⁵⁰ In the multi-story residential buildings planned for the Shipyard, those toxic vapors would have many stories to rise, and could reach into a large number of bathrooms and sleeping areas.

⁴⁸ See [Appendix E](#) for documents. [Parcel G ROD](#), p. 33. [Amended Parcel B ROD](#), Chapter 9, p. 5. [Parcel C ROD](#), p. 56.

⁴⁹ See [Appendix E](#) for documents. [Parcel G ROD](#), p. 42. [Amended Parcel B ROD](#), Chapter 12, p. 11. [Parcel C ROD](#), p. 57.

⁵⁰ P. Wong-Yim, T.L. Taras, B.K. Davis, M.J. Wade, "[Risk Assessment for Sites with Volatile Contaminants in Shallow Groundwater](#)," [Appendix E: Cleanup Documentation](#), California Department of Toxic Substances Control, 2007.

Toxic Metals

The Navy's Records of Decision (RODs) for the Shipyard are full of references to “ubiquitous metals”⁵¹ in the fill material that composes much of the peninsula. The most prevalent toxic metals in this fill are manganese and arsenic, and groundwater sits in this material continuously and stews. These metals don't dance around in groundwater like VOCs, but they are mobile enough that the Navy makes numerous references to the risk of groundwater transmitting toxic metals into the Bay.⁵² The Jury believes serious study is needed to find out if rising groundwater might also create a pathway for the toxic metals in Shipyard soil to affect human beings— either through flooding, or by pushing the metals up into a cap of previously clean, imported soil.

Paper Workarounds

Then there is the curious case of Parcel G, which is expected to be the next parcel transferred to the City. In 2009, a Record of Decision stated that Parcel G would be mostly restricted from residential use, though the developer had recently created new plans for residential development throughout the parcel.

Under the aegis of the Office of Community Infrastructure and Investment, a creative solution was devised in 2016. A Feasibility Study⁵³ divided Parcel G into fifty-foot by fifty-foot grid squares. In each grid square, if a soil sample taken earlier in the process contained any one of twelve dangerous chemicals in concentrations higher than a chosen threshold, that square failed the test, and was restricted from residential use. In some cases, when the failing soil sample was directly surrounded on all sides by passing samples, only the immediate area of the failing soil sample was restricted.⁵⁴ Despite a scattering of dangerous chemicals known to be in the soil, consultants working for OCII had found a way to clear almost all of Parcel G for residential development.

Under this solution, the dense neighborhood of apartment buildings and condo towers planned for Parcel G will be shot through with patches—from the size of a parking space to the size of a few basketball courts—where, on paper, it is deemed unsafe for people to live. The argument the Feasibility Study seems to make is that the real protection will come from required covers of pavement or clean soil, and that restricted grid squares are just a bureaucratic workaround to adhere to the letter of the rules.⁵⁵ But under conditions of rising groundwater, soil contaminants may not stay put in the restricted grid squares, and flooding may carry them right up to the surface, onto the sidewalks where children play. That paper workaround needs to be revisited in the light of a credible prediction of future groundwater behavior.

⁵¹ See [Appendix E](#) for documents. [Amended Parcel B ROD](#), Chapter 1, p. 4; US Navy, “[Explanation of Significant Differences to the Final Record of Decision for Parcel G](#)”, p. 5, April 18, 2017. [Parcel C ROD](#), p. 18

⁵² See [Appendix E](#) for documents. [Parcel C ROD](#), p. 13 [Parcel G ROD](#), p. 23, 42

⁵³ Langan Engineering, “[Feasibility Assessment for Evaluating Areas with Residential Land Use Restrictions, Parcel G, Hunters Point Naval Shipyard](#),” Office of Community Infrastructure and Investment, November 30, 2016

⁵⁴ “[Feasibility Assessment](#),” p. 22, pp 27-28.

⁵⁵ “[Feasibility Assessment](#),” p. 23

Unexpected Conditions

The most worrisome risks that rising groundwater poses in the Shipyard, though, are the ones we don't yet know about—and aren't necessarily looking for. The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Risk Management Plan⁵⁶ is a document describing the procedures that must be followed during construction in the Shipyard, to minimize the risks posed by the hazardous materials there, and it explicitly acknowledges that more dangers could be hiding in the soil. The Plan's Appendix E, the "Unexpected Condition Response Plan," is a 28-page sub-document describing what to do if workers find something in the dirt that wasn't supposed to be there.

By way of example, Unexpected Conditions may include visibly discolored soil and/or contaminated groundwater in an area not previously identified by the Navy, soil and/or groundwater exhibiting a strong chemical odor in an area not previously identified by the Navy, unexpected subsurface structures (e.g., pits, sumps, underground storage tanks, etc.), radioactive materials, material potentially presenting an explosive hazard (MPPEH), and/or other visual or olfactory evidence of a historical release at a location not previously identified by the Navy.⁵⁷

The Shipyard was, after all, a shipyard. It was also home to a radiological research laboratory, from which the Navy has documented first-hand accounts of radioactive materials being mishandled.⁵⁸ Radioactive ships were decontaminated via sandblasting in the open air. Tons of radioactive waste from other nuclear facilities were brought to the Shipyard to be prepared for disposal. A radioactive deck marker turned up buried in a supposedly clean parcel near newly built homes.⁵⁹ Navy contractors threw away radioactive soil samples to hide the extent of contamination, and engaged in years of fraud that went un-caught by signatories. The Navy has not tested every inch of soil in the Shipyard, nor is there any plan to do so; it's to be expected that additional dangerous materials lurk underground where the Navy didn't look. That's why there is a 28-page, break-glass-in-case-of-emergency manual about what to do if a backhoe operator stumbles onto something that literally smells bad, is explosive—or worse.

⁵⁶ Geostyntec Consultants, "[Risk Management Plan for Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California](#)," 2019

⁵⁷ "[Risk Management Plan](#)," Appendix E, p E-1

⁵⁸ US Navy, "[Hunters Point Shipyard History of the Use of General Radioactive Materials, 1939 – 2003 Final Historical Radiological Assessment](#)," Chapter 6, 2004.

⁵⁹ Heenan, Catherine, "[Highly radioactive object found at former Hunters Point Naval Shipyard](#)," *KRON News*, September 14, 2018

The implicit assumption in this entire risk management strategy is that anything that remains in the soil won't become a problem unless someone digs it up. In a world of rapid climate change, in which groundwater is rising into previously dry soil, that assumption no longer works.

Some of the risks described in this section may not manifest as serious problems in the decades to come, and possibly many of them won't. But with cancer-causing chemicals and radioactive materials, only one thing needs to go wrong. Two or three things going wrong can add up to a disaster.

Many of these risks can be avoided with foresight. It is critical that decisions about the Shipyard's future safety are informed with the best predictions science can provide about how shallow groundwater there will react to sea level rise.

Finding 1:

In the Hunters Point Shipyard, shallow groundwater rising with sea level rise and residual hazardous substances pose serious but poorly understood risks that should concern the City and County of San Francisco, the Navy, future developers, future property owners, and future residents.

Groundwater Rise and the Navy's Cleanup Plans

These serious risks have not been accounted for by the Navy in designing its remedies. They have not been accounted for, either, by the other Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) signatories.

The Records of Decision in which the Navy described its selected remedies for cleaning up the Shipyard were published mostly in 2009-10, before all but the earliest scientific literature about groundwater rise was published. Even years later, as the body of literature grew, new RODs and revisions to old ones still lacked any mention of groundwater rise. (See [Appendix E](#).)

The Superfund law requires reviews of cleanups every five years at sites where hazardous materials remain, to ensure that remedies have been designed and carried out appropriately.⁶⁰ The most recent Five-Year Review for Hunters Point was published in 2019.⁶¹ Had the Navy considered the new risks of rising groundwater, revisions to its previous plans would have appeared there, most likely in answers to two questions in the Technical Assessment section.

Question B in the section is, *"Are the exposure assumptions, toxicity data, cleanup levels, and [remedial goals] used at the time of the remedy still valid?"* In its answer, the Navy does not mention any new exposure pathways related to groundwater rise.⁶² Question C is, *"Has any other information come to light that could call into question the protectiveness of the remedy?"* Here,

⁶⁰ US Environmental Protection Agency, "[Superfund: Five Year Reviews](#)," updated March, 2021

⁶¹ US Navy, "[Final Fourth Five Year Review](#)," Section Six, July 2019

⁶² "[Final Fourth Five Year Review](#)," pp 6-14

the Navy muses about whether it needs to make any changes to its plans in light of updated sea level rise guidance from the State of California—and concludes that it does not.⁶³

The Jury spoke with several individuals from directly involved regulatory agencies, and with leading experts deeply ensconced in studying groundwater rise in the Bay Area. All confirmed that, aside from some glimmers of awareness at regulatory agencies, groundwater rise has not yet been meaningfully considered in the cleanup at the Hunters Point Shipyard.

Finding 2:

The Federal Facility Agreement signatories have neglected to investigate how groundwater rise may lessen the effectiveness of the Navy’s cleanup at the Hunters Point Shipyard Superfund site.

The Groundwater Maps San Francisco Needs

Much like Hunters Point, the island of Alameda is low-slung and home to a decommissioned Naval facility. Among the communities along the Bay shore concerned with groundwater rise, the City of Alameda has led the way in improving upon approximate regional models with high-quality, locale-specific, actionable analysis. As an input to its 2020 Climate Action and Resiliency Plan, Alameda commissioned a detailed, professional study⁶⁴ of how sea-level rise will affect shallow groundwater and soil contamination on and around the island. The study’s authors diligently extracted local groundwater data from multiple sources to create a detailed map of the groundwater surface under the wettest, most flood-prone current conditions. They then performed rigorous modeling to predict how that groundwater surface would rise under a progressively more severe set of sea-level rise scenarios. The study then evaluated the future risks posed by groundwater flooding in known areas of contaminated soil, providing the planners of Alameda with high-quality analysis to use in preparing their community for sea level rise. (See [Appendix C](#) for a selection of reports and planning documents by cities, states and regions that address groundwater rise.)

In support of its cleanup efforts at the Shipyard, the Navy has already sunk dozens of groundwater monitoring wells. The City must persuade the Navy to make that water level data available to expert, independent scientists. The City should follow Alameda’s lead and commission a study to create detailed maps of the groundwater surface at the Shipyard site under different sea-level rise scenarios. It should take into account planned changes to the site, such as shoreline structures and the addition of clean soil, and carefully map projected groundwater flows and the locations of known contaminants.

⁶³ “[Final Fourth Five Year Review](#),” pp 6-16

⁶⁴ City of Alameda, “[The Response of the Shallow Groundwater Layer and Contaminants to Sea Level Rise](#),” 2020

The Navy and other Federal Facility Agreement signatories should consider this new information in their updated planning. But even if they do not, the City must act. It is critical for the City and OCII to understand these forecasts in order to inform decisions about development, to make Hunters Point as safe and resilient as possible, and to know where to watch out for trouble in the future.

Recommendation 1:

By August 1st, 2022, the Mayor and/or the City Administrator should direct the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, in collaboration with the Department of Public Health, to commission and manage an independent, third-party study of Hunters Point Shipyard to predict the future shallow groundwater surface, groundwater flows, and potential interactions of groundwater with hazardous materials and planned modifications to the site under multiple sea level rise scenarios.

Recommendation 2:

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should collaborate to provide funding for the study recommended in R1, in the Fiscal Year 22-23 budget, or by September 1st, 2022.

Thanks to its involvement in the forthcoming Pathways+SFEI Shallow Groundwater project, ORCP has institutional knowledge of groundwater rise and existing relationships with outside experts. The Jury believes ORCP is the best City agency to take responsibility for this study.

The Jury wishes to emphasize that this research must be conducted with utmost impartiality and thoroughness by experts familiar with the science of groundwater rise in contaminated soil. San Francisco has understandably placed great importance on the future development of the Shipyard. It cannot cut corners in an era of climate change, as it carefully weighs all risks to the health and safety of the city's people.

A DISCONNECT IN THE CITY

Information is power, especially good information. But outcomes depend on what the City does with it. Within the City, perhaps findings from the recommended groundwater study may eventually inspire updates to codes for construction and infrastructure in the Shipyard. But most urgently, the Jury believes that good new groundwater rise information needs to be considered by decision-makers in the cleanup.

To make that happen, the City must engage fully with the cleanup governance process. The Shipyard cleanup is governed by the Federal Facility Agreement signatories: the Navy, EPA, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. The City does not get a veto or a vote in decisions about the cleanup. To bring groundwater rise—or any other issue it considers important—to the attention of the signatories, the City must use diplomacy and persuasion, strategic engagement, and its own written comments on cleanup documents.

A Steep Hill

The first problem identified by this report is that rising groundwater threatens to damage the future infrastructure of the Shipyard and expose future residents to hazardous substances. And that neither the City, OCII, nor the signatories are paying sufficient attention to these risks.

But if the City is aware of the risks rising groundwater poses elsewhere in San Francisco, why is it not paying attention in the Shipyard? This question leads to the second, more essential problem identified in this report.

A fundamental challenge posed by the Shipyard is that the process which governs the cleanup is arcane and very difficult to understand. Dozens of documents are generated every year, all written in dense technical jargon, and overwhelming for the uninitiated to navigate or to even locate. The workflow in which these documents exist is equally daunting. And yet the process is critical to understand if the City is to persuade the FFA signatories to consider its perspective on groundwater rise—or on other important issues. For someone with knowledge of the process, there are windows of opportunity and avenues of approach the City can use to productively engage with the signatories.⁶⁵ But for most of the City, the cleanup governance process is inaccessible, even invisible.

However, hidden inside this impenetrable system, the signatories are engaging with important questions that concern anyone who might someday live in the Shipyard. They should certainly concern the leaders of San Francisco.

⁶⁵ In 2016-2017, OCII worked with the signatories to modify the ROD for Parcel G to make most of the parcel available for residential development.

What does it mean for a parcel of land to be safe for people to live on? What does it mean for it to be safe to go to work there? If a community is safe only if certain rules are followed, how can we be sure those rules will be enforced, today and in the future? There are an infinity of such questions that could be asked as the cleanup proceeds. Some are addressed directly by the signatories, others implicitly, and many are not considered at all. But it is very difficult to follow the signatories' thinking by reading the documents.

The Navy is obligated to engage in community outreach and make an effort to help the public understand the answers to some of these questions. But a City leader trying to understand the priorities of cleanup decision-makers, or a resident who isn't satisfied with an answer from a Navy representative, or a City employee trying to determine exactly what risks have been considered—that person has a steep hill to climb.

Finding 3:

The process governing the cleanup at the Shipyard encompasses decisions and value judgments that matter to all San Franciscans, but the extremely technical nature of the process inhibits City leaders and citizens alike from understanding it, or even knowing what is at stake.

Roles and Responsibilities

Inside the City, the Hunters Point Shipyard Program in SFDPH is the only entity with significant experience with the process governing the Shipyard cleanup. Other City departments have little if any responsibility in the Shipyard. Most of the Shipyard remains Navy property, and even after it is transferred it will be a redevelopment area with special rules.

Those City departments with domain knowledge about groundwater rise do not engage with the process by which decisions are made about the Shipyard cleanup. Because the process is functionally invisible, there is no prompt for those departments to ask questions, or to reach out and invite someone who knows about the Shipyard cleanup to join in their groundwater rise discussions.

These obstacles are not confined to groundwater rise. Take any sphere where the City has roles to play in an ordinary neighborhood: water and sewer infrastructure, planning, building, climate change adaptation, the environment, and more. The departments, offices, and programs responsible for this range of work have little incentive to ask if the problems they think about every day are also problems in the Shipyard. If they did ask, the daunting entry into understanding the cleanup governance process might well dissuade them before they got an answer. It might never occur to them that their expertise could be applied to solving problems in the Shipyard.

Finding 4:

Despite the enormous stakes of the process governing the Shipyard cleanup, there is little understanding of the process throughout the City, or of how the City can influence this process.

The Disconnect

For thirty years, SFDPH has worked with the signatories on the cleanup, sending a representative to the monthly meetings prescribed by the Federal Facility Agreement and issuing written comments on cleanup documents. It has done so with minimal staff and little input or participation from other experts in the City. Over time, SFDPH's role in the Shipyard cleanup has evolved organically into a detail-oriented focus on the technical aspects of the cleanup governance process, and on enforcing City health codes related to the Shipyard.

In the case of groundwater rise, SFDPH's health-oriented mandate, limited Shipyard Program staffing, and its narrow, technical approach to the cleanup process were not sufficient to spot this emerging risk. Because the City departments with the relevant expertise were not involved with the Shipyard, the City was not prepared to catch the oversight when the FFA signatories, following their rigorous, regimented process, also failed to take notice of the risk.

Beyond groundwater rise, the City is exposed to *any* future mistake, overlooked issue, or questionable decision the signatories might make that is outside the skill set of SFDPH's Hunters Point Shipyard Program. So long as the full spectrum of the City's expertise is not proactively brought to bear, the City cannot properly look out for the important interests San Franciscans have in the Shipyard cleanup.

Finding 5:

The City and County of San Francisco is poorly prepared to discover new information pertinent to the Shipyard cleanup, to proactively look for risks and problems overlooked or under-prioritized by the Federal Facility Agreement signatories, or to develop responses to new information or problems.

Taking a Position

Looking out for the interests of San Francisco in the Shipyard cleanup also means the City must take a position about what it wants out of the cleanup, and express that position effectively to the signatories. Through SFDPH's Shipyard Program, the City has well-developed relationships with the signatories and can communicate with them informally in meetings and phone calls, or formally in comments on cleanup documents. But with most of the City disengaged from the

cleanup, there is no working group that can synthesize the City's position so that it can be conveyed.

For the City to articulate a well-considered stance about the Shipyard cleanup is not a simple matter. Difficult material needs to be digested; diverse perspectives need to be voiced and debated. When the City takes a strong position, as it should on the issue of groundwater rise, its concerns are likely to be just the beginning of a lengthy dialogue with the signatories, and will require follow-through.

The City's inability to adopt a position and convey it directly to the signatories was evident after the Tetra Tech scandal, when the Navy contractor responsible for cleaning up radioactive materials at the Shipyard was revealed to have been falsifying data. In 2016, Mayor Ed Lee and Malia Cohen, then Supervisor for District 10, where the Shipyard is located, sent a strongly-worded letter to the head of the EPA:⁶⁶

The safety of our residents and workers is paramount, and we are committed to a thorough cleanup at the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. This cleanup must be done in a way that protects the public health of our residents and the environment....San Francisco will not accept the transfer of any land until federal and state regulators are satisfied that the land is clean and safe, and our own Department of Public Health validates that decision.

Had the City been comprehensively engaged in the cleanup governance process, this strong opening from the Mayor and Supervisor Cohen could have been followed by more specific messaging, delivered not to distant Washington D.C., but to the actual case workers in the Bay Area doing the hard negotiations about how to proceed in the aftermath of the fraud. This messaging could have been delivered via the very same channels the signatories use to communicate with each other.

For those paying attention, the following years saw EPA expressing pointed displeasure at the Navy in its written comments on major documents.^{67 68} The City could have used its own written comments to support the EPA's calls for better transparency from the Navy and more thorough measures to correct for the fraud. But there was no venue in which key stakeholders in the City could convene to articulate a position, and the City missed the opportunity to weigh in with the signatories about what must happen after Tetra Tech's failures.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ [“Letter from San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee and District 10 Supervisor Malia Cohen to Environmental Protection Agency Regarding Investigation into Cleanup at the Former Hunters Point Naval Shipyard,”](#) September 19, 2016

⁶⁷ US Navy, [“Final Fourth Five Year Review,”](#) Appendix F, p. 1, July 2019

⁶⁸ [Parcel G Removal Site Evaluation Work Plan,](#) Appendix A, Attachment 2.1, EPA Recommendations for Task Specific Plan for Parcel G, p. 1

⁶⁹ SFDPH's comments on these documents can be found at: [“Final Fourth Five Year Review,”](#) Appendix F, p. 44. [Parcel G Removal Site Evaluation Work Plan,](#) Appendix A, “Responses to Comments,” p. 24.

Finding 6:

No proactive mechanism exists for the City and County of San Francisco to articulate its interests and concerns about the cleanup to the Federal Facility Agreement signatories, nor does a mechanism exist for the City to monitor progress towards obtaining satisfactory responses to such interests and concerns from the signatories.

THE JURY'S REMEDY

The Jury believes that the essence of the City's disconnect from the Shipyard cleanup lies in the lack of attention paid to it by leaders throughout the City. And if they did pay attention, the Superfund process would demand a great investment of effort to understand. To address the first part of the problem, the Jury's recommendation is to create a serious and effective body whose explicit purpose is paying attention to the cleanup.

Recommendation 3:

By September 1st, 2022, the Board of Supervisors should pass an ordinance to create a permanent Hunters Point Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee that includes the Controller or their designee, relevant technical experts from the Public Utilities Commission and the Department of Public Works, and representatives from other relevant City departments, to perform due diligence on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco into the Federal Facility Agreement signatories' decision-making, and to prepare an agenda of questions and requests to be communicated to the signatories by the Department of Public Health in advance of major cleanup document releases.

In light of the widespread poor understanding of the cleanup governance process highlighted in Finding 4, the Jury offers the following discussion to help the Board create an effective oversight committee as quickly as possible, and aid the inaugural members of the committee as they begin their work.

The Jury believes this permanent Hunters Point Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee should:

Perform Due Diligence on Major Cleanup Documents on Behalf of the City

The heartbeat of the Superfund process is documentation. If there are important things happening in the cleanup, they will be described in a document. If there is an important upcoming issue that the committee wishes to weigh in on, the venue to engage with the signatories is the process

surrounding the documents concerning that issue. The Committee should complement the detailed-oriented review performed by SFDPH with a big-picture assessment of how new developments in the cleanup interact with the interests of San Francisco. The documents are difficult to understand, but Recommendation 4 offers a solution to that problem.

A partial list of important documents that the committee should consider reviewing if they appear on the schedule are:

- The Fifth Five-Year Review (scheduled for 2023)
- Documents that modify existing Records of Decision (Amendments and “Explanations of Significant Differences”)
- The Record of Decision for Parcel F (the parcel in the Bay)
- Retesting Work Plans for Parcels B, C and D (correcting for the fraudulent testing performed by Tetra Tech)
- Findings of Suitability for Transfer

Work with SFDPH to Communicate with the FFA Signatories

After familiarizing itself with the content of a draft or upcoming document, the Committee may have questions, concerns, or priorities to communicate to all the signatories. The Committee may invite signatories to speak with it directly, but often it will be appropriate to communicate via the existing channel of SFDPH’s Shipyard Program, especially for matters that require extended discussion. The Committee should coordinate with SFDPH on written comments on documents.

Periodically Update a Standing Position on the Cleanup

The Jury believes that even when the Committee finds little to disagree with in an important cleanup document, it should make a written statement of its priorities and standing goals for the cleanup, and that SFDPH should include these in written comment on that document.

When an issue demands a stronger position, such as in the case of groundwater rise or a crisis such as the Tetra Tech scandal, the committee may also refer the issue to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor, so that the City’s elected leaders are empowered to make a well-informed response on behalf of the City.

Routinely Look for What is Missing from the Documents

It should not be forgotten that the issue of groundwater rising with sea level rise is not discussed in the cleanup documents. The committee should periodically undertake exercises to apply its members’ expertise and knowledge of San Francisco to spot important issues the signatories overlooked.

The Committee's Members

The Jury sees the Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee as a vehicle to give City departments that are currently disengaged from the cleanup a responsibility to pay attention. As such, the Jury believes that the committee should be composed mostly or entirely of representatives from relevant City departments. As a starting point, the Jury suggests:

- Departments that employ people with expertise relevant to the cleanup, broadly defined
- Departments whose responsibilities in the Shipyard, even decades in the future, will be affected by the presence of contaminants in the soil and groundwater

To this end, the Jury named the Department of Public Works and the Public Utilities Commission in the recommendation as departments that clearly meet both criteria. The Jury also named the Office of the Controller as a center of excellence for impartial oversight in the City. Other departments the Board might consider include:

- The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning
- The Port
- The Planning Department
- The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
- The Department of the Environment
- The Department of Public Health, not limited to the Shipyard Program

An Upcoming Milestone and the Need for Urgency

Five-Year Reviews are important milestones in the Superfund process calendar, when the signatories re-examine the continued suitability of cleanup actions that were decided upon in the past. As it is a time of reflection and discussion for the signatories, this is probably the best window of opportunity for the City to engage with them. It is certainly the best opportunity to persuade the signatories to consider the impact of groundwater rise on their remedial actions in the Shipyard.

The scheduled date given to the Jury for the draft version of the Fifth Five-Year Review is April 18th, 2023, although that date may slip. The Jury strongly urges the Board of Supervisors to pass the Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee ordinance and populate the committee with all due urgency, so that the Committee has time to orient itself and become familiar with the issues in time to inform its comments on the Fifth Five-Year Review draft.

Lifting the Fog

If the Jury could direct recommendations to the Navy, it would have some stern words about the importance of writing cleanup documents in plain English so they are comprehensible to any reasonably well-informed lay reader.

But whether or not the Navy does a better job, the City must address the incomprehensibility of the Superfund process so it is not an obstacle to the Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee's work.

Recommendation 4:

By September 1st, 2022, the Mayor should direct the Department of Public Health to support the Cleanup Oversight Committee in its due diligence function by providing explanatory materials and briefings about cleanup governance documents and the discourse among Federal Facility Agreement signatories, as well as additional materials at the request of the Committee.

Recommendation 5:

By September 1st, 2022, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should collaborate to ensure that funding is available to generate the material specified in R4, in the Fiscal Year 22-23 budget or by September 1st, 2022, and in future budgets.

The Jury suggests that the Committee be empowered to specify to the Department of Public Health what explanatory materials it requires to support its due diligence work. These materials would benefit not only the Committee, but other relevant entities in the City, and interested members of the general public as well.

The Jury expects that, in practice, the briefings and materials would be generated by the environmental consultants who already work with OCII and SFDPH's Shipyard Program and routinely review cleanup governance documents. Recommendation 5 is to provide funding for this work.

Tracking Progress

When the Committee makes a request of the Federal Facility Agreement signatories, what follows may not be a simple, transactional answer, but an extended process of consultation and discussion. The Shipyard Program in the Department of Public Health should represent the City in that process, and must keep the Committee updated frequently on the progress of the talks.

Recommendation 6:

From September 1st, 2022 and going forward, whenever there are outstanding questions and requests to the Federal Facility Agreement signatories, and especially during the lead-up to major cleanup document releases, a member of the management chain overseeing the Hunters Point Shipyard Program in the Department of Public Health should appear before the Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee at regular intervals to report on discussions with the Federal Facility Agreement signatories.

Closing the Loop

If the Jury's recommendations are adopted, soon after the Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee convenes, a detailed study of the groundwater in the Shipyard under different sea level rise scenarios will fall into its inbox. The Committee should study and evaluate this material, and prepare a statement about what it wants the signatories to consider and respond to. It should share that statement with the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and the Department of Public Health, to ensure that the Federal Facility Agreement signatories receive this analysis with the unified moral authority of the City and County of San Francisco behind it.

Recommendation 7:

By March 1st, 2023, the Hunters Point Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee should prepare a report on its recommended requests for the Federal Facility Agreement signatories based on the groundwater study recommended in R1, and deliver that report to the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Department of Public Health.

As noted above, the best venue in the Superfund process to address important new information is the Five-Year Review, and the scheduled date for the next draft Review is April 18th, 2023. If that schedule holds, there will be a short time to move forward with both the groundwater rise study and the Committee, and to socialize the City's concerns about groundwater rise with the signatories ahead of comments on the Review.

The Jury encourages those City departments who are members of the Committee and have experience with groundwater rise to communicate their own knowledge of the issue to other Committee members as soon as possible, so that the Committee as a whole has a shared understanding of groundwater rise, and is prepared to evaluate the study's maps.

The Jury encourages the Department of Public Health to begin communicating with the signatories as soon as the groundwater rise study is commissioned, to create the most receptive atmosphere possible for the results.

CONCLUSION

In the early part of this century, there was little anticipation of how much could go wrong at the Hunters Point Shipyard. No one imagined that the low-lying, more polluted parcels would still be unready for transfer to the City in 2022. No one thought the City would need to be so vigilant in the cleanup process for so long, or that the City would need to put in place a mechanism to ensure such vigilance.

In the course of the Jury's investigation, we did not identify any City department that was failing to perform the tasks expected of it with regard to the cleanup. But thirty years in, it is clear that those expectations are much too low. Plans have gone terribly awry; serious new issues have been overlooked, and far too few people have been paying attention. As the cleanup continues for another decade or more, more things will go wrong, more mistakes will be made, and the situation will keep changing.

The Jury began this investigation by looking at the risks that rising groundwater poses in the Shipyard. Rising groundwater should be the first issue the awakened City successfully takes to the Federal Facility Agreement signatories for action.

It should not be the last. The next time something goes wrong, the next time something is overlooked, the City must be prepared to engage fully—for the sake of those who live in Bayview Hunters Point today, and for all the individuals and families who will live in the Shipyard over the next century.

METHODOLOGY

The Jury's research included extensive reading on the Hunters Point Shipyard. All our sources are cited in the report footnotes. See also [Appendix E](#), for a guide to cleanup documentation, and [Appendix F](#), for an outline of the Superfund legal framework governing the cleanup.

The Jury conducted interviews with current and former representatives of the Federal Facilities Agreement signatories, the Office of Community Infrastructure and Investment, and relevant departments in the City and County of San Francisco.

The Jury conducted interviews with representatives of community and non-profit groups; see [Appendix D](#) for a list of groups involved in the debate.

The Jury did extensive research on the emerging science of groundwater rise. All our sources are cited in the footnotes. See also [Appendix A](#) for additional general-audience reports, [Appendix B](#) for additional scientific papers, and [Appendix C](#) for municipal and Bay Area regional plans that address groundwater rise.

The Jury interviewed leading scientists and researchers in the field, and attended a two-day regional conference on the science and implications of sea level rise around the Bay, including groundwater rise.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

- F1: In the Hunters Point Shipyard, shallow groundwater rising with sea level rise and residual hazardous substances pose serious but poorly understood risks that should concern the City and County of San Francisco, the Navy, future developers, future property owners, and future residents.
- F2: The Federal Facility Agreement signatories have neglected to investigate how groundwater rise may lessen the effectiveness of the Navy's cleanup at the Hunters Point Shipyard Superfund site.
- F3: The process governing the cleanup at the Shipyard encompasses decisions and value judgments that matter to all San Franciscans, but the extremely technical nature of the process inhibits City leaders and citizens alike from understanding it, or even knowing what is at stake.
- F4: Despite the enormous stakes of the process governing the Shipyard cleanup, there is little understanding of the process throughout the City, or even that the City can influence this process.
- F5: The City and County of San Francisco is poorly prepared to discover new information pertinent to the Shipyard cleanup, to proactively look for risks and problems overlooked or under-prioritized by the Federal Facility Agreement signatories, or to develop responses to new information or problems..
- F6: No proactive mechanism exists for the City and County of San Francisco to articulate its interests and concerns about the cleanup for the Federal Facility Agreement signatories, nor does a mechanism exist for the City to monitor progress towards obtaining satisfactory responses to such interests and concerns from the signatories.

Recommendations

- R1: By August 1st, 2022, the Mayor and/or the City Administrator should direct the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, in collaboration with the Department of Public Health, to commission and manage an independent, third-party study of Hunters Point Shipyard to predict the future shallow groundwater surface, groundwater flows, and potential interactions of groundwater with hazardous materials and planned modifications to the site under multiple sea level rise scenarios. (F1)

- R2: The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should collaborate to provide funding for the study recommended in R1, in the Fiscal Year 22-23 budget, or by September 1st, 2022. (F1)
- R3: By September 1st, 2022, the Board of Supervisors should pass an ordinance to create a permanent Hunters Point Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee that includes the Controller or their designee, relevant technical experts from the Public Utilities Commission and the Department of Public Works, and representatives from other relevant City departments, to perform due diligence on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco into the Federal Facility Agreement signatories' decision-making, and to prepare an agenda of questions and requests to be communicated to the signatories by the Department of Public Health in advance of major cleanup document releases. (F4, F5, F6)
- R4: By September 1st, 2022, the Mayor should direct the Department of Public Health to support the Cleanup Oversight Committee in its due diligence function by providing explanatory materials and briefings about cleanup governance documents and the discourse among Federal Facility Agreement signatories, as well as additional materials at the request of the Committee. (F3)
- R5: By September 1st, 2022, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should collaborate to ensure that funding is available to generate the material specified in R4, in the Fiscal Year 22-23 budget or by September 1st, 2022, and in future budgets. (F3)
- R6: From September 1st, 2022 and going forward, whenever there are outstanding questions and requests to the Federal Facility Agreement signatories, and especially during the lead-up to major cleanup document releases, a member of the management chain overseeing the Hunters Point Shipyard Program in the Department of Public Health should appear before the Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee at regular intervals to report on discussions with the Federal Facility Agreement signatories. (F6)
- R7: By March 1st, 2023, the Hunters Point Shipyard Cleanup Oversight Committee should prepare a report on its recommended requests for the Federal Facility Agreement signatories based on the groundwater study recommended in R1, and deliver that report to the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Department of Public Health. (F2)

REQUIRED AND INVITED RESPONSES

Required Responses

Pursuant to California Penal Code §933 and §933.05, the Jury requests responses to the following Findings and Recommendations from these City institutions.

From the Office of the Mayor within 60 days:

F1, F2, F3, F4, F5
R1, R2, R4, R5, R6, R7

From the San Francisco Board of Supervisors within 90 days:

F4, F5, F6
R2, R3, R7

Invited Responses

The Jury requests responses to the following Recommendations from these City departments within 60 days.

From the Office of the City Administrator: R1

From the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning: R1

From the Department of Public Health: R4, R6

Appendix A: General Audience Media

A selection of additional recent reporting on groundwater rise and its consequences, written for a general audience

Alameda Sun, “[City Leading Bay Area in Studying Impacts of Sea Level Rise Locally](#),” December 3, 2020

Hershey, Cole, “[The Coming Tide: North Bay Cities Grapple With Sea Level Rise](#),” *Pacific Sun*, March 16, 2021

Hill, Kristina, “[Groundwater and Sea Level Rise](#),” PowerPoint presentation, November 2019

Klivens, Laura, “[Groundwater Beneath Your Feet Is Rising With the Sea. It Could Bring Long-Buried Toxic Contamination With It](#),” *KQED*, December 15, 2020

Klivens, Laura, “[Near Coasts, Rising Seas Could Also Push Up Long-Buried Toxic Contamination](#),” *NPR Morning Edition*, February 8, 2021

Pierre-Louis, Kendra, “[How rising groundwater caused by climate change could devastate coastal communities](#),” *MIT Technology Review*, December 13, 2021

Romero, Ezra David, “[How Rising Sea Levels Could Push Up a 'Toxic Soup' Into Bay Area Neighborhoods](#),” *KQED*, April 8, 2022

Stock, Stephen, Robert Campos, Mark Villareal, and Michael Horn, “[Toxins Long Buried May Surface as Groundwater Rises](#),” *NBC Bay Area*, November 4, 2021

Tada, Grace Mitchell, “[The Sea Beneath Us](#),” *Bay Nature Magazine*, Spring 2019

Tada, Grace Mitchell, “[The Rising Tide Underfoot](#),” *Hakai Magazine*, November 17, 2020

Wisckol, Martin, “[Why Groundwater Flooding is Becoming a Threat to Coastal Cities as Sea Levels Rise](#),” *Orange County Register*, September 16, 2021

Xia, Rosanna, “[Some California Cities Think They’re Safe from Sea Level Rise. They’re Not. New Data Shows](#),” *Los Angeles Times*, August 17, 2020

Appendix B: Scientific Papers

A selection of additional scientific papers on groundwater rise with sea-level rise, and on groundwater rise in contaminated sites

Barnard, Patrick, “[USGS Coastal Storm Modeling System \(CoSMoS\) Groundwater Mapping](#),” Pacific Coastal and Marine Science Center, August 18, 2020

Bjerklie, David, John R. Mullaney, Janet Radway Stone, Brian J. Skinner, and Matthew A. Ramlow, “[Preliminary investigation of the effects of sea-level rise on groundwater levels in New Haven, Connecticut](#),” United States Geological Survey, 2012

Carter, Jacob, Casey Kalman, “[A Toxic Relationship: Extreme Coastal Flooding and Superfund Sites](#),” *Union of Concerned Scientists*, July 28, 2020

Habel, Shellie, Charles Fletcher, Tiffany Anderson, and Philip Thompson, “[Sea-Level Rise Induced Multi-Mechanism Flooding and Contribution to Urban Infrastructure Failure](#),” *Scientific Reports 10*, March 2020

May, Christine, “[Coastal Hydrology: Rising Groundwater and Sea-Level Rise](#),” *Nature Climate Change*, Vol. 10, October 2020, pp 889-891

Plane, Ellen, Kristina Hill, and Christine May, “[A Rapid Assessment Method to Identify Potential Groundwater Flooding Hotspots as Sea Levels Rise in Coastal Cities](#)” *Water* 11, no. 11, May 2019

Rodriguez, Ozzy, “[Adapting Superfund Remedial Plans for Climate Change](#),” Environmental Law Program, Harvard Law School, March 12, 2021

Rotzoll, Kolja, Charles H. Fletcher, “[Assessment of groundwater inundation as a consequence of sea-level rise](#),” *Nature Climate Change*, 2012

Appendix C: Municipal and Regional Planning for Groundwater Rise

A selection of city, state and regional reports and planning documents addressing groundwater rise

Adapting to Rising Tides, “[Contaminated Lands](#),” San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, 2021

Bay Area Council, “[California Resilience Challenge Spotlight: Keeping the Groundwater at Bay](#),” July 31, 2020

California Coastal Commission, “[Critical Infrastructure at Risk: Sea Level Rise Planning Guidance for California’s Coastal Zone](#),” August 2021

California Legislative Analyst’s Office, “[What Threat Does Sea-Level Rise Pose to California](#),” August 2020

City of Alameda, “[The Response of the Shallow Groundwater Layer and Contaminants to Sea Level Rise](#),” September 2020

City of Alameda, “[Climate Adaptation and Hazard Mitigation Plan](#),” November 2021

County of San Mateo, US Geological Survey, Silvestrum, and SF Bay Conservation and Development Commission, “[Bay Area Groundwater and Sea level Rise Workshop Summary](#),” November 13, 2019

2019-2020 Marin County Civil Grand Jury, “[Climate Change: How Will Marin Adapt?](#),” September 11, 2020

SeaChange San Mateo County, Office of Sustainability “[Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment](#),” March 2018

SeaChange San Mateo County, “[The Shallow Groundwater Layer and Sea Level Rise: Description of Approaches](#),” November 2019

Segura, Martin, “[Sea Level Rise and Chemical Contamination](#),” Department of Health Hazard Evaluation and Emergency Response, State of Hawaii, May 20, 2021

Appendix D: Community and Environmental Advocacy Groups

A selection of groups active in the debate over the Hunters Point Shipyard

[Bayview Hunters Point Community Advocates](#); archives at [UCSF Industry Documents Collection](#)

[Committee to Bridge the Gap](#)

[Greenaction](#)

[Marie Harrison Community Foundation](#)

[Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility](#)

Southeast Alliance for Environmental Justice (1995-2001)

Appendix E: Cleanup Documentation

A guide to documents about the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard cleanup

List of Hunters Point Entries in EnviroStor

EnviroStor is the California Department of Toxic Substance Control's online data management system for tracking cleanup, permitting, enforcement, and investigation efforts at hazardous waste facilities and sites with known or suspected contamination issues. For any parcel entry, click "**Site/Facility Docs**" to see the list of documents about that parcel.

The documents below can help illuminate key points in the process for Hunters Point.

Parcel B

US Navy, "[Final Amended Record of Decision, Parcel B](#)," January 14, 2009

Parcel C

US Navy, "[Final Record of Decision for Parcel C](#)," September 30, 2010

Parcel D-1

US Navy, "[Final Record of Decision for Parcels D-1 and UC-1](#)," July 24, 2009

Parcel E

US Navy, "[Final Record of Decision for Parcel E](#)," December 2013

ROD for non-landfill areas

US Navy, "[Final Record of Decision for Parcel E-2](#)," November 2012

ROD for landfill areas

Parcel G

As described in page 21 of this report, Parcel G's original Record of Decision was modified so that almost all the parcel could be deemed suitable for residential development.

US Navy, "[Final Record of Decision for Parcel G](#)," February 18, 2009

Explains "durable cover," and states that ubiquitous metals and contaminants are to be left in place; places restrictions on residential use

Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, "[Feasibility Assessment for Evaluating Areas with Residential Land Use Restrictions, Parcel G](#)," Office of Community Infrastructure and Investment, November 30, 2016

Analysis proposing changes to allow residential use in most of Parcel G

US Navy, "[Explanation of Significant Differences for the Final Record of Decision for Parcel G](#)," April 18, 2017

US Navy, "[Final Parcel G Removal Site Evaluation Work Plan](#)," June, 2019
Retesting plan for Parcel G following Tetra Tech fraud

US Navy, "[Final Fourth Five-Year Review](#)," July 2019

Appendix F: Superfund Legal Framework

Following the environmental disaster at Love Canal in the 1970s,⁷⁰ lawmakers in the United States decided that reforms at the federal level were needed to address the most contaminated sites in the country. While existing legislation enabled the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to manage chemical substances, there was an unmet need for accountability and the regulation of waste sites. In 1980, Congress enacted the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, (CERCLA) known as the Superfund program, to establish liability at toxic waste sites and create a framework for cleaning up contamination.

CERCLA introduced financial deterrents to polluters through establishing strict liability for contamination—whether it occurred prior to or after the 1980 legislation—in cases where hazardous waste has been or will be released and costs will be incurred. Such costs include cleanup expenses, health screenings, damage to natural resources, and costs related to the investigation and remediation of polluted areas.

In the case of the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard (HPNS,) a site owned and operated by the federal government during and after the release of hazardous waste, liability is outlined by Section 120 of CERCLA. Section 120 states that federal agencies are subject to Superfund liability and must comply with all outlined requirements at their sites, including preliminary assessment, site investigation, remedial investigation, feasibility studies, records of decision, remedial design, remedial actions, community engagement, and long-term operation and maintenance.⁷¹

HPNS was deactivated as a Naval facility in 1974. Hazardous chemicals, along with radioactive contamination, were identified at HPNS in 1986, and the EPA placed the site on the National Priorities List (making it a Superfund site) in 1989.⁷² In 1992, a Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) was signed by the Navy and regulators: EPA, California’s Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC,) and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board.)⁷³

The Federal Facilities Agreement establishes the Navy’s responsibility for the Shipyard’s cleanup, and provides a framework in which signatories will certify the Navy’s compliance with

⁷⁰ Environmental Protection Agency, “[Superfund: CERCLA Overview](#),” updated February 4, 2022

⁷¹ Environmental Protection Agency, “[Federal Facilities-Military Base Closures: Application of CERCLA Section 120](#)”

⁷² US Environmental Protection Agency, “[National Priorities List Sites](#)”

⁷³ US Navy, “[Federal Facility Agreement for Naval Station Treasure Island, Hunters Point Annex](#),” January 1992

federal and California law. The FFA, in principle, ensures that past and present contamination at HPNS will be investigated and action will be taken to “protect the public health, welfare and the environment” in each of the Shipyard’s parcels. The Navy will undertake and pay for all testing, feasibility studies and remediation actions at HPNS, in accordance with applicable regulations. The FFA requires all work to be performed under the supervision of a qualified professional engineer, a certified engineering geologist, or a registered geologist with hazardous waste cleanup expertise. All the Navy’s documents related to the HPNS cleanup are subject to review and comment by the EPA, DTSC and the Water Board.

Appendix G: Hunters Point Shipyard Litigation

A selection of litigation related to the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard

In 2018, two supervisors of the radiation control technicians working for Tetra Tech at the Shipyard [pled guilty to falsifying remediation records](#), and were sentenced to eight months in prison. Several related cases, and other lawsuits connected to the Shipyard, remain in litigation.

Case: [United States of America v. Tetra Tech EC, Inc.](#)

Filed: August 19, 2013

Court: U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Brought on behalf of the United States of America, alleging that Tetra Tech acted negligently in its oversight of testing specialists, who did not have adequate qualifications and did not meet requirements for radiological testing practices. The suit alleges that Tetra Tech defrauded the government by certifying that minimum standards and procedures for nuclear remediation services were met as part of its contractual obligations.

The case is actively being litigated at the time of this report.

Case: [United States ex rel. Jahr, et al. v. Tetra Tech, EC, Inc., et al., United States ex rel. Smith v. Tetra Tech EC, Inc., et al., and United States ex rel. Wadsworth v. Tetra Tech EC, Inc.](#)

Filed: October 26, 2018

Court: U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

This is a group of consolidated whistleblower cases brought on behalf of the United States of America, under the *qui tam* provisions of the False Claims Act, alleging that Tetra Tech misrepresented the source of soil samples from Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard and falsified results of radiological surveys conducted at the site.

The case is actively being litigated at the time of this report.

Case: [Bayview Hunters Point Residents et al v. Tetra Tech EC, Inc. et al](#)

Filed: March 18, 2019

Court: U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Brought on behalf of residents of Bayview Hunters Point, alleging that Tetra Tech acted negligently in its radiological testing practices and falsified results, putting residents relying on accurate representation in harm's way. The case also names Lennar/Five Point Holdings, the developer at Hunters Point Shipyard.

The case is actively being litigated at the time of this report.

Case: [Pennington, et.al v. Tetra Tech, Inc.; Tetra Tech Ec, Inc.; Lennar Corporation; Hps1 Block 50 Llc; Hps1 Block 51 Llc; Hps1 Block 53 Llc; Hps1 Block 54 Llc; Hps1 Block 56/57 Llc; Hps Development Co.; Five Point Holdings, Llc; Bill Dougherty; Andrew Bolt; Emile Haddad; And Does 1-100, Motion for Preliminary Approval of Pennington Plaintiffs' Class Settlement with Homebuilder Defendants](#)

Filed: August 14, 2020

Court: U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

This motion for settlement grew out of an initial lawsuit from 2018 against Lennar, Five Point Holdings, and Tetra Tech by four homeowners in Parcel A, which grew to include 662 plaintiffs in 347 condominium and townhouse units at the Shipyard.

The \$6.3 million settlement agreement between FivePoint Holdings and homeowners was approved in April 2022. Tetra Tech denied any wrongdoing, and is not part of the settlement.

Case: [Five Point Holdings, LLC et al v. Tetra Tech, Inc. et al](#)

Filed: February 27, 2020

Court: U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Brought on behalf of the developers building a mixed-use community at Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, on land (Parcel A,) which had been remediated by the Navy and then transferred to the City of San Francisco. The case alleges negligent testing practices and fraud to cover them up by Tetra Tech resulted in economic damage and delay for the developer's planned use of the site. The case is actively being litigated at the time of this report.

Case: [Abbey v. United States of America, Department of the Navy](#)

Filed: September 14, 2020

Court: U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Brought on behalf of officers and employees of the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) alleging that the Navy acted negligently in not accurately disclosing the degree of radioactive and hazardous substances present at Building 606 in the Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard site. The

suit alleges that the Navy represented Building 606 as safe for use, and that hundreds of SFPD employees worked there from 1997 to the present, incurring harm. The case is actively being litigated at the time of this report.

Case: [*Tetra Tech EC, Inc. et al v. United States Environmental Protection Agency et al*](#)

Filed: November 17, 2020

Court: U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Brought on behalf of Tetra Tech, alleging that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency acted unlawfully in its declaration of the Final Parcel G Removal Site Evaluation Work Plan for the Former Hunters Point Naval Shipyard (June 2019.) The case alleges that no explanation for the change was articulated to Tetra Tech, the declaration relied on unproven allegations, and contrary evidence was not considered at time of declaration. The case is actively being litigated at the time of this report.

Case: [*Mothers Against Toxic Housing, Inc. et al v. United States Environmental Protection Agency et al*](#)

Filed: August 3, 2021

Court: Contra Costa County Superior Court

Brought on behalf of a group of community organizations alleging that the City of Richmond violated California environmental standards when approving the Campus Bay Project mixed-use development plan, and ignored scientific data about rising sea levels. The case is actively being litigated at the time of this report.

RECORDING REQUESTED BY:
City and County of San Francisco

WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:
Director of Property
Real Estate Department
City and County of San Francisco
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94102

Documentary Transfer Tax is Zero;
No fee for recording pursuant to
Government Code § 27383

APN: Block 6311 Lots 009, 010 and Block 6312 Lot 009

Space above this line for Recorder's Use

MODIFIED IRREVOCABLE OFFER OF IMPROVEMENTS
(Lots A, B and C and Off-Site Improvements in Phase 1)

Sunnydale Infrastructure, LLC, a California limited liability company, prepared an Offer of Improvements in connection with the recording of the Final Map recorded on October 15, 2019 with the San Francisco Assessor-Recorder as DOC-2019-K843478-00 (the "Original Offer") in favor of the City and County of San Francisco, a municipal corporation (the "City"). This Modified Irrevocable Offer of Improvements amends and supersedes that certain Original Offer prepared in connection to that certain final map recorded on October 15, 2019 as DOC-2019-K843478-00.

Sunnydale Infrastructure, LLC, a California limited liability company, hereby irrevocably offers to the City and its successors and assigns, (i) those certain public improvements located on Lots A, B and C more particularly described in **Exhibit A** and as shown on **Exhibit B** and **Exhibit C** attached hereto, which improvements are described and depicted in Public Works Permit No. 19IE-00564, and (ii) water, sewer, auxiliary water supply system, fire suppression, and joint trench utility improvements in off-site locations on Sunrise Way, Hahn Street, Sawyer Street and Sunnydale Avenue per Street Improvement Permit plans in Permit No 19IE-00564.

With respect to this offer of improvements, it is understood and agreed that: (i) upon acceptance of this offer of public improvements, the City shall own and be responsible for public facilities and improvements, subject to the maintenance obligation of fronting property owners or other permittees pursuant to the Public Works Code, including, but not limited to, Public Works Code Sections 706 and 786, and (ii) the City and its successors and assigns shall incur no liability or obligation whatsoever with respect to such offer of improvements, unless and until such offer has been formally accepted by the Director of Public Works or the Board of Supervisors and subject to any exception that may be provided in a separate instrument, such as a permit under Public Works Code Section 786, or other local law.

The provisions hereof shall inure to the benefit of and be binding upon the heirs, successors, assigns and personal representatives of the respective parties hereto.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned has executed this instrument as of this ____
day of _____, 20____.

Sunnydale Infrastructure, LLC,
a California limited liability company

By: _____

Name: _____

Its: _____

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California)
County of San Francisco)

On _____, before me, _____, a Notary Public, personally appeared _____, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature _____

Exhibit A

Description of Improvements


Improvements as permitted in Street Improvement Permit #19IE-00564

Improvements within the Five (5) to Eight (8) foot strip along the Northwesterly side of the Existing
Westerly Property Line as shown in Exhibit C.


Exhibit "B"

Plat Map

See attached



Sunrise Way Utility Composite Plan and Profile





Patrick Rivera, PE, Acting Bureau Manager | Bureau of Project Management
patrick.rivera@sfdpw.org | T. 628.271.2456 | 49 South Van Ness Ave. 7th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103

12/3/2021

Sunnydale Infrastructure, LLC
C/O Ramie Dare
Vice President

Subject: Sunnydale HOPE SF Phase 1A1 1A2 Public Improvements - Conditional Notice of Completion and Certificate of Conformity for Temporary Sunrise Way

Dear Ms. Dare,

This letter is in response to the request from Sunnydale Infrastructure, LLC, dated November 16, 2021, requesting a Notice of Completion (NOC) be granted for the Sunnydale HOPE SF Phase 1A1-1A2 Public Improvements Project constructed pursuant to Street Improvement Permit SIP #19IE-00564 and amended through Instructional Bulletins 1-16.

The City has reviewed the status in the field, the plan documents, testing documentation and the recommendation of Public Works Bureau of Construction Management. Based on our review, San Francisco Public Works hereby grants a Conditional Notice of Completion and a Certificate of Conformity for Temp Sunrise Way as illustrated in Attachment 1. The following items must be completed prior to a request for acceptance of the subject improvements:

- Replace temporary streetlights with permanent streetlights at the intersections of Santos/Sunrise (3 each) and Hahn/Harmonia (1 each)
- Switch streetlight circuits from existing PG&E power service to permanent SFPUC power once established (*note: this item is dependent upon availability of SFPUC power and may not be complete prior to acceptance*)
- Maintain solar light at intersection of Hahn/Sunrise until PG&E completes streetlight upgrade to streetlight pole at SE corner of intersection
- Deliver streetlight spare parts to SFPUC
- Complete punchlist items including (refer to Attachment 2):
 - Address erosion and mulch displacement within bioretention
 - Grind inlet for better flow (west side of Sunrise, 2nd bioretention from Hahn)
 - Fix broken irrigation line (west side of Harmonia, 1st bioretention from Hahn)
 - SFPUC inspection of Power vault lid grounding and associated punchlist items
- Complete final inspection of trees and plants, including inside bioretention area, after expiration of Plant Establishment period and Guarantee Period in accordance with Specification Section 32-93-00.
- Paint "NO PUBLIC ACCESS" in 12" High white letters on maintenance vehicle access-only driveway
- Submit color curb application for the 2 passenger loading zones on Malosi Street and pay associated application/curb painting fees

- Submit Final As-built Record Drawings (PDF and AutoCad) – contractor redline as-builts currently under City review
- Submit Backflow Preventer report(s)
- Submit AT&T acceptance letter
- Submit Wave acceptance letter
- Submit PG&E gas acceptance letter
- Submit Recordation Notice
- Finalize Master Major Encroachment Permit and Maintenance Matrix and obtain Board of Supervisors Approval

Please contact me for further inquiries or assistance.

Sincerely,

Shawna Gates
Project Manager
Public Works Infrastructure Task Force

Attachments: 1. Exhibit showing Conditional NOC and Certificate of Conformity Limits
 2. Final Conditional NOC Punchlist, dated 12/2/21
 3. Subdivider's Request for Notice of Completion, dated 11/16/21
 4. Executed Street Maintenance Agreement
 5. Interim Public Access Easement (PAE) Agreement

CC: Albert Ko, SF Public Works City Engineer
 Patrick Rivera, SF Public Works
 John Thomas, SF Public Works
 Molly Petrick, SF Public Utilities Commission
 Michael Acosta, SF Public Works
 Tolio Ybarra, TMI
 Phillip Wong, OEWD
 Brendan Dwyer, MOHCD
 Ryan Vanzuylen, MOHCD



Patrick Rivera, PE, Acting Bureau Manager | Bureau of Project Management
patrick.rivera@sfdpw.org | T. 628.271.2456 | 49 South Van Ness Ave. 7th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103

June 7, 2022

To: President of the Board of Supervisors – Shamann Walton

Fr: John Thomas, Manager, Public Works Infrastructure Task Force

Re: Legislative Package for Sunnydale HOPE SF Phase 1A1 and 1A2 Street Acceptance

This package contains the proposed ordinance and legislation materials for the Sunnydale HOPE SF Phase 1A1 and 1A2 Street Acceptance legislation. If approved, this legislation will reconvey the Phase 1A1 and 1A2 streets from Sunnydale Infrastructure LLC, who is leasing these areas from the San Francisco Housing Authority, back to the City.

Background

The Sunnydale HOPE SF development (“Project”) is part of HOPE SF, a public/private transformation collaborative aimed at disrupting intergenerational poverty, reducing social isolation, and creating vibrant, mixed-income communities without mass displacement of current residents. The Project is being executed through a partnership of the City, San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA), and the Developer, Sunnydale Infrastructure LLC, consisting of Mercy Housing and Related California. In March 2017, the City and SFHA approved and executed a Development Agreement and a Master Development Agreement, and the City approved the Sunnydale HOPE SF Special Use District to facilitate the development of the Project.

The Sunnydale HOPE SF development plan consists of up to 1,770 new affordable and moderate-income housing units, including one for one replacement of the original 775 public housing units and at least 194 new affordable housing units, 3.6 acres of open spaces, new street and utility infrastructure, and up to 30,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving spaces. The build out of the master plan will occur in phases, so that the existing public housing residents can remain housed on site, and then relocate into their new affordable housing as each phase of construction is completed.

The first phase of the Project was completed in February 2020 and includes 41 one-for-one public housing replacement units, 13 new affordable units and one on-site manager unit on a former, vacant lot owns by the City at 1491 Sunnydale Avenue. Phase 1A1 and 1A2 of the Project is within the Sunnydale and Velasco public housing footprint, which is owned by the SFHA. This phase includes 77,875 square feet of new public streets and infrastructure including, Malosi Street, Harmonia Street, and Sunrise Way, and a 167-unit affordable housing development (Block 6).

Phase 1A1 and 1A2 Street Acceptance Ordinance

As outlined in the Sunnydale HOPE SF Development Agreement (DA) and Ground Lease between Sunnydale Infrastructure LLC and the San Francisco Housing Authority, Sunnydale Infrastructure LLC has undertaken and constructed the Phase 1A1 and 1A2 Infrastructure Improvements and this work was completed in December 2021. Sunnydale Infrastructure LLC received a conditional Notice of Completion from San Francisco Public Works on December 3, 2021. Sunnydale Infrastructure LLC has now applied with the City for a Street Acceptance Ordinance for the acceptance of the public infrastructure built as

part of Phase 1A1 and 1A2. If adopted, the Ordinance would declare as City property, accept for City maintenance and liability purposes, and dedicate for public street and roadway purposes the Phase 1A1 and 1A2 public infrastructure, which includes Malosi Street, Harmonia Street, and Sunrise Way. The Street Acceptance Ordinance has been prepared by City staff and reviewed by the SFHA and Sunnydale Infrastructure LLC and will be presented for approval to San Francisco's Board of Supervisors.

This legislative package includes:

1. Street Acceptance Ordinance
2. Legislative Digest
3. Public Works Order No. XXXX
4. Offer of Improvements
5. Modified Offer of Improvements
6. Offer of Dedication
7. Quitclaim Deed
8. Utility Bill of Sale – AT&T
9. Utility Bill of Sale – Comcast
10. Utility Acceptance – PG&E
11. Utility Bill of Sale - Wave
12. A-17-215
13. Q-20-1160, Q-20-1161, Q-20-1162, and Q-20-1163 Drawings
14. Planning Commission Motions 19409, 19784
15. Planning General Plan Consistency Verification
16. Public Works Notice of Completion (NOC)
17. Real Estate Division Letter



2180 Harrison St.
San Francisco, CA 94110

December 8, 2021

Ramie Dare
Sunnydale Block 6 Housing Partnership
1256 Market St.
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: 242 Hahn/290 Malosi St gas service and main, PM 35098623

Dear Ms. Dare:

This is to notify you of the final acceptance by PG&E of the gas facilities you installed under the applicant-installed provisions of PG&E's extension rules for the above referenced project.

The final "walk through" and review of inspection records has been completed. PG&E accepted ownership when the applicant-installed gas service and main pipe were pressurized on 10/26/21.

With final acceptance by PG&E of this applicant-installed system, PG&E has assumed ownership and responsibility for all maintenance and operation of the system. Your warranty to PG&E, covers the cost of any repairs to the service trench for two years and to the gas service facilities for one year beginning as of 10/26/21.

If you have any questions, please call me at 415-695-3681.

Sincerely,

Mark Jackanich
Industrial Power Engineer