

Office of Environmental Review
Department of City Planning
450 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

74
ENDORSED
FILED
San Francisco County Superior Court

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

APR 16 1990

State of California
Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
State Clearinghouse No.: 89050912

DONALD W. DICKINSON, Clerk
BY: D. MEYWOOD
Deputy Clerk

County Clerk
City and County of San Francisco
317 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Guidelines of the Secretary for Resources and San Francisco requirements, this Notice of Determination is transmitted to you for filing. At the end of the posting period, please return this Notice to the Contact Person with a notation of the period it was posted.

File Number and Project Title: 88.700ER: MUNI Diesel Coach Operating Division and Central Maintenance Facility
Address: Area bounded by Army, Indiana, Marin, and Tennessee Streets, Islais Creek and the elevated I-280 freeway.

Project Description: The railway diesel coach operating division would house the storage, routine maintenance and dispatching of a fleet of up to 200 diesel coaches, the central maintenance facility would house the heavy repair functions for MUNI's entire fleet of diesel coaches.

Lead Agency: City and County of San Francisco by Department of City Planning, 450 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102
Contact Person: Catherine Bauman Telephone: (415) 558-6392

The City and County of San Francisco decided to carry out or approve the project on April 6, 1990 (date). A copy of the document(s) may be examined at the Board of Supervisors, Room 235, City Hall, San Francisco, CA., in file No. 84-90-1

1. An environmental document has been prepared pursuant to the provisions of CEQA, as noted below. It is available to the public and may be examined at the Office of Environmental Review at the above address.

Certificate of Exemption

Negative Declaration

Environmental Impact Report

2. A determination has been made that the project in its approved form

will not have a significant effect on the environment.

will have a significant effect on the environment and findings were made pursuant to Section 15091 and a statement of overriding considerations was adopted.

3. Mitigation Measures were were not made a condition of approval.

Sincerely,
Dean L. Macris,
Director of Planning

Barbara W. Sahn

by Barbara W. Sahn,
Environmental Review Officer

Sincerely,

John Taylor

John Taylor,
Clerk, Board of Supervisors

cc: Sue C. Hestor
870 Market St, #1121
San Francisco CA 94102

cc: Project Sponsor: Jim Nelson, PUC
425 Mason Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Date of Publication of
Preliminary Negative Declaration: May 5, 1989. Amended June 20, 1989

Lead Agency: City and County of San Francisco, Department of City Planning
450 McAllister Street, 5th Floor, CA 94102

Agency Contact Person: Catherine Bauman Telephone: (415) 558-6392

Project Title: 88.700ER: MUNI Diesel Coach Operating Division and Central
Maintenance Facility
Project Sponsor: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Project Contact Person: Jim Nelson

Project Address: Area bounded by Army, Indiana, Marin and Tennessee Streets,
Islais Creek and the elevated I-280 freeway
City and County: San Francisco

Project Description: MUNI proposes to establish a Railway Diesel coach
Operating Division and Central Maintenance Facility. The facility would (1)
house the storage, routine maintenance and dispatching of a fleet of up to 200
diesel coaches; (2) house the heavy repair functions for MUNI's entire fleet
of 500 coaches which would be brought to the site as necessary.

THIS PROJECT COULD NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT. This
finding is based upon the criteria of the Guidelines of the State Secretary
for Resources, Sections 15064 (Determining Significant Effect), 15065
(Mandatory Findings of Significance) and 15070 (Decision to Prepare a Negative
Declaration), and the following reasons as documented in the Initial
Evaluation (Initial Study) for the project, which is attached:

Project Description. MUNI proposes to establish a Diesel Coach Operating
Division and Central Maintenance Facility on a site bounded by Tennessee,
Marin, Indiana and Army Streets and by the elevated I-280 freeway and Islais
Creek. The Operating Division would house the storage, routine maintenance
and dispatching of a fleet of up to 200 diesel coaches. The Central
Maintenance Facility would house the heavy repair functions for MUNI's entire
fleet of 500 coaches; coaches would be brought to the site for maintenance as
necessary. All existing buildings and structures on the site would be
demolished.

Portions of the 537,300 square foot site are currently owned by Caltrans, the
City of San Francisco, the Port of San Francisco and a private owner. In
order to carry out the project, the Public Utilities Commission must acquire
or lease the property from the current owners. There are several assessor's
lots included in the site. Blocks 4379 and 4380 (bounded by Marin, Tennessee,
Tulare and Indiana Streets) are held by the Port of San Francisco. Block 4381
and a portion of Block 4352 are owned by Granex, Inc. Portions of Block 4382
and 4352 are owned by the City of San Francisco. A portion of Block 4382 is
owned by Caltrans. The project site also includes a section of Indiana Street
which would be vacated. In order for the project to proceed, each of these

-Over-

Mitigation measures, if any, included in this project to avoid potentially
significant effects:

-See p. 9-

Final Negative Declaration adopted and issued on June 20, 1989
Amendments made to the Preliminary Negative Declaration are underlined.

cc: Robert Passmore
Paul Rosetter
Distribution List
Bulletin Board
Master Decision File

Barbara W. Sahm
BARBARA W. SAHM
Environmental Review Officer

BWS:CVB:emb
CVB:142

entities would have to agree to transfer or lease the land to the Public Utilities Commission. The City Planning Commission must determine if the transfers of property to and from City agencies, and the vacation of a section of Indiana Street, are in conformance with the Master Plan.

The project is related to other potential MUNI projects throughout the City, all of which are at early stages of the planning process. The operating division which would be located at the site is currently at the Kirkland Bus Yard, in the Fisherman's Wharf area. The Kirkland Bus Yard is proposed for residential use as part of the ongoing Fisherman's Wharf planning effort. An EIR on the Fisherman's Wharf Plan is currently being prepared by the City (File 88.587E). The Central Maintenance Facility and the Paint and Body Shop which would be located at the site are currently at the Woods Division, located at Indiana and 23rd Streets. Facilities which are currently located at 24th and Utah could move, in turn, to the Woods Division, enabling MUNI to cease operations at 24th and Utah. The project is intended to provide for a consolidation of existing operations, rather than for a substantial expansion of service. It is also intended to allow MUNI to cease operations at two locations (Kirkland and 24th/Utah) which are currently overcrowded and are surrounded by uses which may conflict with the operation of a bus yard.

The project would also require approval from the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) because it is within 100 feet of Islais Creek. BCDC would consider the project when specific building or grading activities are proposed.¹ The project design and construction would require approval from the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, which would fund a portion of the project.

The site is in an area of predominately industrial uses: It is in an M-2 (Heavy Industrial) zoning district. The portion of the site south of the line of Marin Street is in a 40-X height and bulk district. The portion of the site north of the line of Marin Street is in a 65-J height and bulk district. The elevated I-280 freeway is directly to the west. Islais Creek passes by the south side of the site. Warehousing and storage uses are located directly to the north across Army Street. Other nearby uses include a lumber supply outlet, a commercial laundry, a recreational vehicle rental yard, a trucking firm. An auto wrecking operation is located across Islais Creek to the south. The nearest residential district is on Potrero Hill to the northwest of the site. San Francisco Bay is located about 4000 feet to the east. There are a number of boats tied up at Pier 86, to the east of the site along Islais Creek, some of which have been used as residences. These boats are not charged dockage (fees for water use) by the Port and receive no Port services. There is some question as to the legality of the presence of any boats in this area.²

Facility planning and site design for the project would not begin until the site has been acquired. This environmental review will consider the likely impacts of the program as it is envisioned at this early stage in the planning process. The potential environmental impacts of the maximum expected level of activity will be analyzed. A likely site design based on the program will be assumed. If, as the project progresses, the program for the site changes so that different activities or a different level of activity are expected, or if the site design raises potential environmental issues which are not considered here, additional environmental review will be required.

This analysis assumes that, as a result of the requirements of BCDC, public access along Islais Creek would be provided and the site design would include the improvement of the edge of the Creek to enhance public access.¹ A citizens group, the Friends of Islais Creek, is currently investigating the feasibility of restoring the edges of the creek to provide attractive public access and wildlife habitat in cooperation with the Port and other property owners.³ No design has yet been developed for such a creek-side path. Should the site be acquired and the project proceed, the public access would be developed by MUNI in cooperation with interested citizens groups and would be reviewed and approved by BCDC. Any such public access or wildlife habitat improvements would not result in substantial adverse environmental impacts.

Visual. The site contains a number of industrial structures. The largest is a 26,000 square foot warehouse fronting Indiana Street south of Marin Street. It is about 42 feet tall at its highest point. There are a number of

Industrial structures fronting Indiana Street south of Army Street which were used for processing and storing coconut oil. An approximately 50-foot tall "pellet loader" adjacent to the Creek is the tallest structure on the site. All of these structures would be demolished as part of the project. These structures are visible from the south side of Islais Creek. Upper portions of the warehouse and the pellet loader can be seen, as part of the larger industrial district, from the south side of Potrero Hill to the north west. Views of lower buildings on the site from this vantage point are blocked by the about 50-foot tall elevated freeway structure.

A new two or three-story building of approximately 235,000 square feet would be constructed. It would contain bus repair bays and shops, offices and storage. A 6,000 square foot tire shop is also proposed. Other areas to be used for fare retrieval, fueling, cleaning and washing would be covered with canopies. At this early stage in the planning process, these buildings have not been sited or designed. They would, however, be of an industrial nature and would be similar in character to other functional industrial buildings in the area. A portion of the site would be used for open storage of coaches. The upper portions of any buildings would be visible, as part of the larger industrial district, from Potrero Hill. The lower portions of buildings, and parked coaches, would only be visible from viewpoints closer to the site, because of the intervening elevated freeway. Much of the project would be visible from the public access on the site along Islais Creek which would be developed as part of the project or nearby access developed independently of this project. The industrial nature of the site and of the area will influence the character of the public access along the Creek. The project would not degrade the character of this space or result in a significant negative visual impact on the space.

Transportation. The major transportation routes in the vicinity of the project are I-280 and Army Street adjacent to the site, Third Street to the east of the site and Evans Street to the west of the site. Transportation studies have been completed for several proposed projects in the vicinity, including the proposed I-280 Islais Creek Interchange,⁴ the proposed Homeporting of the USS Missouri,⁵ the Islais Creek Facilities of the San Francisco Clean Water Program,⁶ the Mariposa Facilities of the San Francisco Clean Water Program,⁷ The San Francisco Container Terminal,⁸ and the San Francisco Newspaper Agency Production Plant.⁹ All of these analyses assumed a substantial amount of traffic to be generated by the Navy's proposed homeporting project. If that project is not carried out, traffic conditions are likely to be better in the future than was projected in these studies.

These studies have shown that most intersections are currently operating at acceptable levels of service,¹⁰ and are expected to continue to do so with the addition of traffic from these proposed projects and other cumulative traffic increases. However, these studies identify intersections in the project vicinity where future congestion may be at unacceptable levels. At Third/Evans future conditions during the PM peak hour are expected to be unacceptable.^{4,5} At Third/25th, future conditions during the PM peak hour would be unacceptable unless mitigations which were assumed to occur as part of individual projects, particularly the Islais Creek Interchange and the Homeporting of the USS Missouri projects were to occur.^{4,5} The Islais Creek Interchange, if carried out, is likely to include mitigative design features. Since it now appears unlikely that the Homeporting of the USS Missouri will occur, there will be no new traffic resulting from that project and no need for measures to mitigate the transportation impacts of that project. Evans/Napoleon/Toland is currently operating at unacceptable levels of service during the PM peak hour and is expected to continue to do so.^{4,9} The peak hour for traffic using the street system is the heaviest one-hour period between 4 PM and 6 PM; therefore this is the period when additional vehicles would be most likely to result in traffic impacts. Because this is the time when most coaches are operating on their assigned routes, most of the traffic generated by this project would occur in the early morning, or after 6 PM.

The project could result in up to about 430 daily trips ends to the site by coaches from the Operating Division, 30 to 50 daily trips ends by coaches using the Central Maintenance Facility, and about 950 daily trip ends by employees traveling to and from work. Up to 15 deliveries per day would be expected, and two or three dispatchings of trucks to MUNI's other divisions. Some of these trips would not be new to the area, but would represent trips which are currently generated by the Woods facility at Indiana and 23rd Streets or the Army facility at Army and Third Street. (The Army facility is another MUNI operating division, open since 1984, that would cut back its functions late this year and close entirely when the new operating division and Central Maintenance Facility opens.)

The precise impacts of the proposed Operating Division activities on the nearby street system would depend on the lines which would be assigned to the facility and their schedules. Because of the preliminary stage in the planning process, this cannot be determined now. The following analysis uses conservative assumptions about the number of vehicles and their routes on leaving the facility in order to provide a conservative, generalized view of the potential impacts of siting a diesel bus operating division at this location. The analysis considers the impacts of this facility in the context of other nearby MUNI facilities. The peak hours for coaches from the Operating Division leaving or arriving are 6-7 AM and 6-7 PM. Coaches heading for the northern or central portions of the City (most of which are now based at Kirkland) would travel west along Army, passing through the Army/Evans intersection. Assuming that all MUNI coaches heading in these directions were assigned to either the proposed project or the Woods division two blocks away (a conservative assumption and one that cannot hold for all directions simultaneously), there would be approximately 170 additional coaches passing through this intersection daily on weekdays. During the PM peak hour there would be about three additional coaches passing through this intersection. Coaches heading for the western or southwestern portions of the City would use I-280, located adjacent to the site. They would pass through none of the congested intersections.

Coaches heading for the southeastern portion of the City would travel south along Third Street. (Most of these lines are currently assigned to the nearby Woods facility, and use much the same route that they would use in the future with the project.) They would pass through Third/Army, Third/Cargo, Third/Evans. Of these intersections, Third/Evans and Third/Army are expected to experience significant congestion in the future. Assuming that all MUNI coaches heading in these directions were assigned to either the proposed project or the Woods division two blocks away, there would be approximately 11 additional coaches passing through these intersections daily on weekdays. During the PM peak hour there would be no additional coaches. These increases in traffic associated with the proposed Operating Division could not noticeably change intersection performance.

As a result of the reassignment of coaches to the project site, there would be a decrease of about 66 Operating Division coaches traveling through the intersection of Third/25th, which may be operating at unacceptable levels of service in the future.

The project would also result in trips by coaches being repaired at the Central Maintenance Facility. This function is now performed at the Woods Division, at Indiana/23rd. As a worst case (assuming that all coaches are arriving from locations closer to Woods than to the proposed project) this would result in about two blocks being added to these 30 to 50 daily trips.

About 190 day-shift maintenance and administrative employees would be at the site, most of whom are currently assigned to the Woods facility and the Army/Third Street facility. Although their trips to work would be altered somewhat by the project, they would not represent new trips to the area, and would not result in significant changes in any nearby intersections. About 150 bus operators would be assigned to the Operating Division. The largest numbers of bus driver trips are generally before 6 AM and after 7 PM. There would be approximately 475 total employees (maintenance, administrative and operators) over the course of a weekday (340 day-shift, 126 swing shift, 7 night shift).

It is likely that a new traffic signal would be warranted at the point where vehicles leaving the site enter Army Street. (There are no existing traffic signals on Army Street adjacent to the site.) When site planning has advanced, and the access to the site designed, MUNI would work with DPW to develop appropriate signalization.

Transportation impacts associated with the project would not be significant relative to the existing capacity of the surrounding street system. The change in area traffic as a result of the project would be undetectable to drivers. The project's impact on area parking availability would also not be substantial.

Muni intends to provide employee parking on the site. Because final program and site design have not been determined, and number of parking spaces and the layout is not known. The site has a number of street frontages, where on-street parking is currently available. Most nearby uses provide some off-street parking for employees and visitors. It is unlikely that the project could result in a substantial change in the area's parking availability.

Air Quality. Construction work would temporarily raise particulate levels in the area. In order to mitigate this impact, any open holes would be watered. See Mitigation Measure 1, below.

The project would not result in new vehicle trips in the City or in the region, because the buses using the facility would be buses that are currently using other MUNI facilities, and the employees at the site would be current MUNI employees. The project would, however, result in new trips to the site which could result in air quality impacts in the vicinity of the project.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has established thresholds for projects requiring its review for potential air quality impacts. These thresholds are based on the minimum number of vehicle trips which the BAAQMD considers capable of producing air quality problems, primarily carbon monoxide in San Francisco. The project would not exceed this minimum standard as it would result in 1,445 daily vehicle trip ends to the site compared to the 2,000 daily vehicle trip end threshold that has been established by BAAQMD. For projects that exceed these thresholds a carbon monoxide analysis is generally prepared in San Francisco. An analysis of particulate emissions is not prepared because most of the particulate emissions in San Francisco result from sources other than from the operation of motor vehicles.

Because many of the trips would be made by buses that emit less carbon monoxide than do light duty vehicles, the carbon monoxide emissions would be less for this project than if all of the trips were made by the average San Francisco Bay Area vehicle mix. For example, if future project trips were made by the average Bay Area vehicle mix driving at speeds between 5 to 15 mph there would be about 4,400 to 4,800 grams per mile more carbon monoxide than if the specific vehicle mix for this project (480 bus trips, 965 other vehicle trips) were taken into account.^{12,13} Therefore, no significant air quality impacts would be generated by the proposal.

Noise. The site is in an area with high ambient noise levels from the adjacent elevated freeway and from nearby industrial uses. Uses on the site, including diesel coaches, other vehicles and repair machinery would generate noise. Noise impacts are influenced by distance from those hearing the noise, and by the presence of intervening structures. Because the configuration of the uses on the site has not been determined, a precise calculation of noise levels is not possible. It is likely that noise from the project would be perceptible at the property lines. The closest sensitive receptors are the residences on Potrero Hill, across the freeway from the site. Because of the distance, and the existence of other intervening noise sources (especially the freeway), noise from the project would be attenuated, and would not result in significant noise impacts. Noise from the project would also be perceptible to pedestrians using the public access along Islais Creek which would be developed as part of the project. The character of this public access, as well as other public access along Islais Creek, would be influenced by the industrial nature of the area. In this context, the noise impacts of the project would not be significant.

The San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code) establishes standards for noise levels in the various zoning districts. It states that any "fixed source machinery or equipment, or similar mechanical device" may not exceed 75 dBA at any time in the M-2 district, measured at the property line of any affected lot. This ordinance would apply to any machinery used on the site. It would not apply to diesel coaches.

Public Services. The project would allow a consolidation of MUNI operations at a central location. It is intended to encourage more efficient MUNI operations, in an area without nearby incompatible land uses.

The project site is in a Special Geologic Study Area as shown in the Community Safety Element of the San Francisco Master Plan. This map indicates areas in which one or more geologic hazards exist with the potential for causing land movement or inundation.

The final building plans would be reviewed by the Bureau of Building Inspection (BBI). In reviewing building plans, the BBI refers to a variety of information sources to determine existing hazards and assess requirements for mitigation. Sources reviewed include maps of Special Geologic Study Areas and known landslide areas in San Francisco as well as the building inspectors'

working knowledge of areas of special geologic concern. If indicated by available information, BBI would require that site-specific soils reports be prepared, by a licensed soils engineer, prior to construction. Potential geologic hazards would be mitigated through the permit review process through these measures.

Hazards and Water Quality. A site history has been performed,¹⁴ and site assessment performed by a contractor working under the direction of the Department of Public Health,¹⁵ in order to determine whether past uses have resulted in the presence of hazardous material at the site. The conclusions of these studies are summarized here. The site history indicates that the site is in an area which was created by bayfill between the mid-1920s and the mid-1930s. Portions of the site have been used for a variety of industrial uses since the 1960s, including coconut oil processing, warehousing, fuel storage. Soil contaminated by past uses has been discovered on property to the west of the site (Federated Metals).¹⁴ There is also some evidence of undocumented dumping activities on the site.

The site assessment included taking soil samples from 25 boreholes throughout the site, two samples from the surface, and two water samples from Islais Creek adjacent to the site. The tests revealed that contamination exists on the site. One location contains hydrocarbons well above levels which are considered hazardous waste. Other locations contain some lesser degree of contamination. Four have elevated hydrocarbon levels, although they are below the level which is considered hazardous waste. Additional testing of areas which may contain nickel contamination will be necessary to determine the appropriate clean-up methods. Several locations had elevated concentrations of nickel, or high pH levels. In addition, surface oil splotches were observed, which may contain hazardous levels of hydrocarbons, and which contain coconut oil from the Granex operations. The coconut oil appears to be non-hazardous. The water samples found detectable levels, at low tide only, of four contaminants: tetrachloroethene, toluene, arsenic, zinc. The consultant believes that the source is not on the project site.

In order to assure that hazardous materials on the site are properly handled, so that no impacts would result from construction on the site, MUNI, under the direction of the Department of Public Health, would carry out the following mitigation. All soil containing hazardous levels of hydrocarbons or metals would be removed and correctly disposed of as required by hazardous waste laws. Groundwater monitoring wells would be installed in order to characterize any groundwater contamination which may have resulted from this contamination. Any groundwater contamination discovered would be remediated as required by hazardous waste laws. Surface oil splotches would be remediated, by removing contaminated soils and properly disposing of it.

The portion of the site east of Indiana Street is located in the area subject to the ordinance "Analyzing Soil for Hazardous Wastes" which amends the Public Works Code. (Ordinance 253-86). That ordinance requires that the project sponsor for any grading work or future construction project on the site, which would involve the disturbance of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, conduct tests of the soil to determine the presence of hazardous materials as defined by State and Federal agencies, prepare a site history describing past uses on the site which would enable the Director of Public Health to require testing of the soils for additional hazardous materials, and complete a site mitigation plan to the satisfaction of the appropriate State or Federal agencies. These requirements must be met before a permit can be issued. The site assessment and mitigation described above satisfy this requirement.

The project would result in the use and storage of potentially hazardous materials. Diesel buses contain a number of fluids and materials which can result in hazards to public health or the environment if they are allowed to accumulate in water, in the soil, or to enter the sewer system. These fluids and materials include oil, gasoline, transmission fluid, radiator fluid, battery acids, lead parts, tires, solvents and cleaners, and brake pads. Fueling activities, maintenance activities and coach washing (particularly washing the undersides of buses) could, if not properly carried out, result in the discharge of hazardous materials to the air, soil or water. The following City and State laws and regulations are intended to assure that toxic materials and wastes are properly handled and do not result in hazards to public health and the environment:

State law and regulations of the California Department of Health Services regarding storage and disposal of hazardous wastes (Health & Safety Code Section 25100 et seq., Title 22, Cal. Admin. Code Sections 66001 et seq.).

San Francisco Hazardous Materials Permit and Disclosure Ordinance (Health Code Sections 1101-1199).

San Francisco flammable liquids containment permit requirements (Fire Code Sections 11.01-11.96)

San Francisco hazardous chemicals permit requirements (Fire Code Sections 13.01-13.13).

These laws and regulations are intended to insure that hazardous materials are properly handled, and that no hazardous materials would reach the Bay, accumulate in the soil, enter the sewer system or be improperly deposited in a landfill. MUNI would comply with all applicable codes when designing or operating the facility. Underground tanks would be installed to hold diesel fuel, engine oil, automatic transmission fluid, engine coolant, waste oil, waste coolant. All tanks and associated piping would include secondary containment, with leak monitoring systems, as required by the Hazardous Materials Permit and Disclosure Ordinance. In addition, Muni has installed a centralized computerized leak monitoring system serving all of its facilities.¹⁶ It is also Muni's policy to install new tanks in vaults.¹⁷ These two actions are intended to further assure that tanks do not leak, resulting in soil or water contamination.

Bus parking and circulation areas would be paved with impervious materials, and be adequately drained, to assure that contaminants would not enter the soil. Maintenance bays, fueling islands, the bus washing facility and all yard surfaces would contain drains with oil/water separators to assure that oil would not enter Islais Creek or the sewer system. Water used in the steam cleaning of buses, which could contain concentrations of heavy metals from the lubricants used in bus operation, would be collected in settling chambers. This water would then be strained through stainless steel strainers. The strained material, if found to contain unacceptable levels of heavy metals or other contaminants, would be disposed of as hazardous waste.^{16a} Spill control stations, with adequate capacity for clean-up, would be located near all areas where hazardous materials are used or stored.¹⁷ These features of the design, collectively referred to as Mitigation Measure 3, would assure that the hazardous materials used as part of the project would not result in a significant impact on the environment.

Cultural. All buildings and structures on the site would be demolished. There are no buildings on the site which have been identified as historical resources. The site history concluded that "there is a slight possibility that prehistoric archaeological remains may once have existed" on the site, but that there is "little likelihood" of recovering historic cultural resources.¹⁵ In order to mitigate this potential impact the sponsor has agreed to implement mitigation measure 4.

While local concerns or other planning considerations may be grounds for modification or denial of the proposal, there is no substantial evidence that the project could have a significant effect on the environment.

NOTES

1. Joan Lundstrom, Permit Analyst, BCDC, phone conversation, March 30, 1989.
2. Charles Mitchell, Chief Wharfinger, Port of San Francisco, phone conversation, March 30, 1989.
3. Julia Viera, Friends of Islais Creek, phone conversation, March 31, 1989.
4. Bureau of Traffic Engineering and Operations, Islais Creek Interchange Traffic Study, 1988, p.26. (DCP file No. 87.413E)
5. U.S. Department of the Navy, FEIS: Homeporting--Battleship Battlegroup/ Cruiser Destroyer Group, 1987, pp. 5-58, 5-92a. (DCP file No. 86.173E)
6. Bureau of Traffic Engineering and Operations for the San Francisco Clean Water Program, Islais Creek Facilities Traffic Study, Draft Report, 1988, p.23. (DCP file No. 87.664E)
7. DeLeuw-Cather for the San Francisco Clean Water Program, Mariposa Facilities Traffic Study, Final Report, 1988, p.29. (DCP file No. 87.663E)
8. Renato Martinez, P.E. Pier 70 Container Freight Station Traffic Report, 1986, p. 11. (DCP file No.85.123 E)
9. Transportation Study, San Francisco Newspaper Agency Production Plant, 1987.
10. Level of Service ratings range from A to F, with A representing the best conditions. Intersections operate at acceptable conditions through LOS D, with increasing deterioration thereafter.
11. Susan Chelone, MUNI, March 14, 1989 memo, available in project file.
12. Tosh Mangut, of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, telephone conversation with Sally E. Maxwell of the Office of Environmental Review, May 1, 1989. In the year 2000, buses would emit 29.76 grams (g) per mile at 5 mph, 20.52 g/mile at 10 mph and 14.81 g/mile at 15 mph.
13. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Air Quality and Urban Development, Guidelines for Assessing Impacts of Projects and Plans, revised April 27, 1989, p. VI-12.
14. Archeo-Tec, The Woods Annex Facility, San Francisco, California: A Site History, March 8, 1988.
15. Crosby & Overton, Inc., Preliminary Site Assessment of Wood's Annex Site, n.d.
16. Larry James, MUNI, Phone conversation, March 6, 1989.
- 16a. Bill Nielson, MUNI, Phone conversation, June 20, 1989.
17. Bruce Bernhard, MUNI, Phone conversation, March 6, 1989.

MITIGATION MEASURES

1. Air quality. In order to assure that the project would not result in an increase in a fine particulate matter (PM₁₀) level above acceptable levels in the area, the area under construction would be watered twice daily. This is required by the Bureau of Building Inspection and would be enforced by the Building Inspectors as part of their responsibilities.

2. Clean up of existing site contamination. In order to assure that existing contamination on the site would not result in significant impacts, all soil containing hazardous levels of hydrocarbons or metals would be removed and correctly disposed of as required by hazardous waste laws. Groundwater monitoring wells would be installed in order to characterize any groundwater contamination which may have resulted from this contamination. Surface oil splotches would be remediated, by removing contaminated soil and properly disposing of it. Before a building permit is issued by the Bureau of Building Inspection, Muni would submit a report to the Department of Public Health and the Department of City Planning showing that all hazardous materials have been removed from the site and correctly disposed of.

3. Handling of hazardous materials used during project operation. Muni would comply with all applicable laws and regulations governing the handling of hazardous materials on the site. In order to assure that the use of hazardous materials used during project operation would not result in significant impacts, the following design features would be incorporated into the project. All underground tanks and associated piping would include secondary containment, with leak monitoring systems, as required by the Hazardous Materials Permit and Disclosure Ordinance. In addition, Muni has installed a centralized computerized leak monitoring system serving all of its facilities. It is also Muni's policy to install new tanks in vaults. These two actions would further insure that tanks do not leak, resulting in soil or water contamination. Bus parking and circulation areas would be paved with impervious materials, and be adequately drained, to assure that contaminants would not enter the soil. Maintenance bays, fueling islands, the bus washing facility and all yard surfaces would contain drains with oil/water separators to assure that oil would not enter Islais Creek or the sewer system. Water used in the steam cleaning of buses, which could contain concentrations of heavy metals from the lubricants used in bus operation, would be collected in settling chambers. This water would then be strained through stainless steel strainers. The strained material, if found to contain unacceptable levels of heavy metals or other contaminants, would be disposed of as hazardous waste. Spill control stations, with adequate capacity for clean-up, would be located near all areas where hazardous materials are used or stored. Before an occupancy permit is issued by the City, Muni would submit a report to the Department of Public Health and the Department of City Planning containing a plan for the handling and disposal of hazardous materials as at the facility.

4. Prehistoric cultural resources. Should evidence of cultural or historic artifacts or features of potential significance be found during project excavation, the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) and the President of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) would be notified immediately, and any excavation which could damage such artifacts or features halted. The project sponsor would select an archaeologist to assist the Office of Environmental Review in determining the significance of the find. The archaeologist would prepare a report to be submitted to the ERO and the President of the LPAB containing an assessment of the potential significance of the find and recommendations for what measures should be implemented, including an appropriate security program, and a program for the preservation and recovery of any potential artifacts/features. The ERO would then recommend specific mitigation measures, including submittal of written reports to the ERO, if necessary. Excavation or construction activities which might damage discovered cultural resources would be suspended for a total maximum of four weeks over the course of construction to permit inspection, recommendation and retrieval, if appropriate.

The archaeologist would prepare a draft report documenting the artifacts/features that were discovered, an evaluation as to their significance, and a description as to how any archaeological testing, exploration and/or recovery program was conducted. Copies of draft reports prepared according to these mitigation measures would be sent first and directly to the Environmental Review Officer and to the President of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board for review. Following approval of the report by the ERO and the President of LPAB, a final report is to be sent to the California Archaeological Site Survey Office at Sonoma State University, the Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage and the State Office of Historic Preservation. The Office of Environmental Review shall receive three final copies of the final archaeological findings report.

ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION CHECKLIST
(Initial Study)

File No: 28.700ER Title: Muni facility at Army and Indiana
 Street Address: Army/Indiana Streets Assessor's Block/Lot: 4379-4382
 Initial Study Prepared by: Catherine Bauman 4352

A. COMPATIBILITY WITH EXISTING ZONING AND PLANS Not
Applicable Discuss

- | | | |
|---|----------|----------|
| 1) Discuss any variances, special authorizations, or changes proposed to the City Planning Code or Zoning Map, if applicable. | — | <u>X</u> |
| *2) Discuss any conflicts with any adopted environmental plans and goals of the City or Region, if applicable. | <u>X</u> | — |

B. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS - Could the project:

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DISCUSSED</u>
<u>1) Land Use</u>			
* (a) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community?	—	<u>X</u>	—
* (b) Have any substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity?	—	<u>X</u>	—
<u>2) Visual Quality</u>			
* (a) Have a substantial, demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?	—	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
(b) Substantially degrade or obstruct any scenic view or vista now observed from public areas?	—	<u>X</u>	—
(c) Generate obtrusive light or glare substantially impacting other properties?	—	<u>X</u>	—
<u>3) Population</u>			
* (a) Induce substantial growth or concentration of population?	—	<u>X</u>	—
* (b) Displace a large number of people (involving either housing or employment)?	—	<u>X</u>	—
(c) Create a substantial demand for additional housing in San Francisco, or substantially reduce the housing supply?	—	<u>X</u>	—
<u>4) Transportation/Circulation</u>			
* (a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system?	—	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
(b) Interfere with existing transportation systems, causing substantial alterations to circulation patterns or major traffic hazards?	—	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
(c) Cause a substantial increase in transit demand which cannot be accommodated by existing or proposed transit capacity?	—	<u>X</u>	—
(d) Cause a substantial increase in parking demand which cannot be accommodated by existing parking facilities?	—	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>5) Noise</u>			
* (a) Increase substantially the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas?	—	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>
(b) Violate Title 24 Noise Insulation Standards, if applicable?	—	<u>X</u>	—
(c) Be substantially impacted by existing noise levels?	—	<u>X</u>	—

* Derived from State EIR Guidelines; Appendix G, normally significant effect.

	YES	NO	DISCUSSED
6) Air Quality/Climate			
* (a) Violate any ambient air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	—	X	X
* (b) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	—	X	—
(c) Permeate its vicinity with objectionable odors?	—	X	—
(d) Alter wind, moisture or temperature (including sun shading effects) so as to substantially affect public areas, or change the climate either in the community or region?	—	X	—
7) Utilities/Public Services			
* (a) Breach published national, state or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control?	—	X	—
* (b) Extend a sewer trunk line with capacity to serve new development?	—	X	—
(c) Substantially increase demand for schools, recreation or other public facilities?	—	X	—
(d) Require major expansion of power, water, or communications facilities?	—	X	—
8) Biology			
* (a) Substantially affect a rare or endangered species of animal or plant or the habitat of the species?	—	X	—
* (b) Substantially diminish habitat for fish, wildlife or plants, or interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species?	—	X	—
(c) Require removal of substantial numbers of mature, scenic trees?	—	X	—
9) Geology/Topography			
* (a) Expose people or structures to major geologic hazards (slides, subsidence, erosion and liquefaction).	—	X	X
(b) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?	—	X	—
10) Water			
* (a) Substantially degrade water quality, or contaminate a public water supply?	—	X	X
* (b) Substantially degrade or deplete ground water resources, or interfere substantially with ground water recharge?	—	X	—
* (c) Cause substantial flooding, erosion or siltation?	—	X	—
11) Energy/Natural Resources			
* (a) Encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?	—	X	—
(b) Have a substantial effect on the potential use, extraction, or depletion of a natural resource?	—	X	—
12) Hazards			
* (a) Create a potential public health hazard or involve the use, production or disposal of materials which pose a hazard to people or animal or plant populations in the area affected?	—	X	X
* (b) Interfere with emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans?	—	X	—
(c) Create a potentially substantial fire hazard?	—	X	—
13) Cultural			
* (a) Disrupt or adversely affect a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property of historic or cultural significance to a community or ethnic or social group; or a paleontological site except as a part of a scientific study?	—	X	X
(b) Conflict with established recreational, educational, religious or scientific uses of the area?	—	X	—
(c) Conflict with the preservation of buildings subject to the provisions of Article 10 or Article 11 of the City Planning Code?	—	X	—

C. OTHER

Require approval and/or permits from City Departments other than Department of City Planning or Bureau of Building Inspection, or from Regional, State or Federal Agencies?

YES NO DISCUSSEI

X _ X

D. MITIGATION MEASURES

1) If any significant effects have been identified, are there ways to mitigate them?

YES NO N/A DISCUSSEI

X _ _

2) Are all mitigation measures identified above included in the project?

X _ _

E. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

*1) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or pre-history?

YES NO DISCUSSEI

_ X _

*2) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?

_ X _

*3) Does the project have possible environmental effects which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (Analyze in the light of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects.)

_ X _

*4) Would the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

_ X _

F. ON THE BASIS OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared by the Department of City Planning.

X I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures, numbers 14, in the discussion have been included as part of the proposed project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Barbara W. Sahm
BARBARA W. SAHM
Environmental Review Officer
for

DEAN L. MACRIS
Director of Planning

DATE: May 5, 1959

BWS:eh
OER:23