

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

| Project Address | | Block/Lot(s) | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| SFO - F | LOT 700 PROJECT | | NA |
| Case No. | Permit No. | Plans Dated | |
| 2014 TULE | | | |
| Addition/ | ✓ Demolition | New | Project Modification |
| Alteration | (requires HRER if over 45 years old) | Construction | (GO TO STEP 7) |
| Project description for Planning Department approval. | | | |

Demolish existing SFO ground transportation support facilities (shuttle bus, ground transportation unit, compressed natural gas station and tank storage, and fuel station and carwash) located at mid and southern portions of SFO and relocate to Plot 700, located on the northern edge of SFO.

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

| *Note: If neither class applies, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required.* | | |
|--|--|--|
| | Class 1 – Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft. | |
| | Class 3 – New Construction/ Conversion of Small Structures. Up to three (3) new single-family residences or six (6) dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU. | |
| \checkmark | Class_32 | |

STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

| If any box is checked below, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required. | | |
|--|---|--|
| | Transportation: Does the project create six (6) or more net new parking spaces or residential units? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities? | |
| | Air Quality: Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks, etc.)? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Air Pollution Exposure Zone</i>) | |
| | Hazardous Materials: If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks): Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance - or a change of use from industrial to residential? If yes, this box must be checked and the project applicant must submit an Environmental Application with a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. <i>Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, a DPH waiver from the</i> | |

| | Maher program, or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant (refer to $EP_ArcMap > Maher$ layer). | |
|---|---|--|
| | Soil Disturbance/Modification: Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater | |
| \checkmark | than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological | |
| | sensitive area? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area) | |
| | Noise: Does the project include new noise-sensitive receptors (schools, day care facilities, hospitals, | |
| | residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities) fronting roadways located in the noise mitigation | |
| | area? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Noise Mitigation Area) | |
| | Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment: Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment | |
| | on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap</i> > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > | |
| | Topography) | |
| | Slope = or > 20%: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, square footage expansion greater than $1,000$ so ft, shoring underninging rate ining wall work or grading | |
| | footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft., shoring, underpinning, retaining wall work, or grading on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? <i>Exceptions: do not check box for work performed on a</i> | |
| | previously developed portion of site, stairs, patio, deck, or fence work. (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex | |
| | Determination Layers > Topography) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and a Certificate or | |
| | higher level CEQA document required | |
| | Seismic: Landslide Zone: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, | |
| | square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft., shoring, underpinning, retaining wall work, | |
| | grading –including excavation and fill on a landslide zone – as identified in the San Francisco | |
| | General Plan? Exceptions: do not check box for work performed on a previously developed portion of the site, | |
| | stairs, patio, deck, or fence work. (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) | |
| | If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and a Certificate or higher level CEQA document required | |
| | Seismic: Liquefaction Zone: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, | |
| | square footage expansion greater than 1000 sq ft, shoring, underpinning, retaining wall work, or | |
| ļ | grading on a lot in a liquefaction zone? Exceptions: do not check box for work performed on a previously | |
| | developed portion of the site, stairs, patio, deck, or fence work. (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination | |
| | Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required | |
| | Serpentine Rock: Does the project involve any excavation on a property containing serpentine rock? <i>Exceptions: do not check box for stairs, patio, deck, retaining walls, or fence work. (refer to EP_ArcMap ></i> | |
| | CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Serpentine) | |
| *If no boxes | are checked above, GO TO STEP 3. <u>If one or more boxes are checked above, an <i>Environmental</i></u> | |
| | Application is required, unless reviewed by an Environmental Planner. | |
| | Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project does not trigger any of the | |
| \checkmark | CEQA impacts listed above. | |
| Comments | and Planner Signature (optional): | |
| The project would not result in impacts related to endangered/rare/threatened species, traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality. | | |
| Archeo clearance issued. | | |

STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS – HISTORIC RESOURCE TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

| Category A: Known Historical R | SOUTO CO TO STEP 5 |
|---|--|
| | esource. GO TO STEL 5. |
| Category B: Potential Historical | Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4. |
| Category C: Not a Historical Res | ource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6. |

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT 8/18/2014

STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

| Che | ck all that apply to the project. |
|-----|--|
| | 1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included. |
| | 2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building. |
| | 3. Window replacement that meets the Department's <i>Window Replacement Standards</i> . Does not include storefront window alterations. |
| | 4. Garage work. A new opening that meets the <i>Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts</i> , and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines. |
| | 5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way. |
| | 6. Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of- way. |
| | 7. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <i>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows</i> . |
| | 8. Addition(s) that are not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way for 150 feet in each direction; does not extend vertically beyond the floor level of the top story of the structure or is only a single story in height; does not have a footprint that is more than 50% larger than that of the original building; and does not cause the removal of architectural significant roofing features. |
| Not | e: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding. |
| | Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5. |
| | Project does not conform to the scopes of work. GO TO STEP 5 . |
| | Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5. |
| | Project involves less than four work descriptions. GO TO STEP 6. |

STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS – ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW TO BE COMPLETED BY PRESERVATION PLANNER

| Check a | Check all that apply to the project. | | |
|---------|---|--|--|
| | 1. Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4. | | |
| | 2. Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces. | | |
| | 3. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character. | | |
| | 4. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features. | | |
| | 5. Raising the building in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features. | | |
| | 6. Restoration based upon documented evidence of a building's historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings. | | |
| | 7. Addition(s), including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation</i> . | | |

| [| | | |
|-------------|--|--|--|
| | 8. Other work consistent with the Sea (specify or add comments): | cretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties | |
| _ | (specify of und comments). | | |
| $ \square$ | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | to Category C. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation | |
| | Planner/Preservation Coordinator) | | |
| | a. Per HRER dated: b. Other (<i>specify</i>): | (attach HKEK) | |
| | b. Other (specify). | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Not | e: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked | d, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below. | |
| | Further environmental review required. Based on the information provided, the project requires an | | |
| | Environmental Evaluation Application to | | |
| | Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. GO TO STEP 6. | | |
| Com | ments (optional): | I with categorical exemption review. GO TO STEP 6. | |
| | nems (optional): | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Prese | rvation Planner Signature: | | |
| OTE | | | |
| | 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETER E COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNE | | |
| | | . Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check | |
| | all that apply): | | |
| | Step 2 – CEQA Impacts | | |
| | Step 5 – Advanced Historical Review | | |
| | STOP! Must file an Environmental Evaluation Application. | | |
| | STOT: Must file all Environmental Evaluation Application. | | |
| | No further environmental review is req | uired. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA. | |
| | Planner Name: | Signature: | |
| | | Digitally signed by Jean Poling DN: dc=org, dc=sfgov, dc=cityplanning, ou=CityPlanning, | |
| | Project Approval Action: Airport Commission Approval | Jean Poling DN: dc=org, dc=stgov, dc=cityplanning, ou=CityPlanning, ou=EntyPlanning, ou=Ent | |
| | *If Discretionary Review before the Planning | | |
| | Commission is requested, the Discretionary | | |
| | Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project. | | |
| | | ment constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines | |
| | and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code. | | |
| | In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the first approval action. | | |

STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, when a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempt project changes after the Approval Action and requires a subsequent approval, the Environmental Review Officer (or his or her designee) must determine whether the proposed change constitutes a substantial modification of that project. This checklist shall be used to determine whether the proposed changes to the approved project would constitute a "substantial modification" and, therefore, be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

| Project Address (If different than front page) | | Block/Lot(s) (If different than |
|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | front page) |
| | | |
| Case No. | Previous Building Permit No. | New Building Permit No. |
| | | |
| Plans Dated | Previous Approval Action | New Approval Action |
| | | |
| Modified Project Description: | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

| Compared to the approved project, would the modified project: | | |
|---|--|--|
| | Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code; | |
| | Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312; | |
| | Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)? | |
| | Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption? | |
| If at load | t one of the above boxes is checked further environmental review is required CATEX FOR | |

If at least one of the above boxes is checked, further environmental review is required CATEX FORM

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

| The proposed modifi | cation would not result in any of the above changes. |
|--|--|
| If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior pr approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning | |
| Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written r | |
| ame: | Signature or Stamp: |
| | |
| | |
| | checked, the proposed mo I no additional environmo website and office and ma |