Community Plan Exemption Checklist

Case No.:	**2009.1163E**
Project Title:	**17th Street and Folsom Street Park**
Zoning:	P, 50-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot:	3571/018
Lot Size:	60,925 square feet
Plan Area:	Mission Subarea of the Eastern Neighborhoods
Project Sponsor:	Dawn Kamalanathan, Recreation and Park Department
Staff Contact:	Don Lewis – (415) 575-9095, don.lewis@sfgov.org

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located on the northwest corner of 17th Street and Folsom Street in the Mission neighborhood. The proposed project would subdivide the 60,925-square-foot parcel, which is currently a 219-space surface parking lot, and construct a 34,300-square-foot neighborhood park that would front on 17th Street, Folsom Street, and Shotwell Street. No structures, including restrooms, are proposed. Specific design features of the park would be defined through a community planning effort. The existing parking lot is owned by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (PUC) and is leased out to the University of California, San Francisco. Ownership would transfer from the PUC and the park would be owned and operated by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (RPD). The remaining 26,625 square feet of the lot would remain in its current use. The project site is located in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area.

B. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

This Community Plan Exemption (CPE) Checklist examines the potential environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project and indicates whether any such impacts are addressed in the applicable Programmatic EIR (PEIR) for the plan area (i.e., the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final EIR).[1] Items checked "Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR" identify topics for which a significant impact is identified in the PEIR. In such cases, the analysis considers whether the proposed project would result in impacts that would contribute to the impact identified in the PEIR. If the analysis concludes that the proposed project would contribute to a significant impact identified in the PEIR, the item is checked "Proj. Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR." Mitigation measures identified in the PEIR applicable to the proposed project are identified in the text for each topic area.

[1] *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report*, Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E, certified August 7, 2008. The FEIR is on file for public review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street Suite 400 as part of Case No. 2004.0160E, or at: http://www.sfgov.org/site/planning_index.asp?id=67762.

Items checked "Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact" identify topics for which the proposed project would result in a significant impact that is peculiar to the project, i.e., the impact is not identified as significant in the PEIR. Any impacts not identified in the PEIR will be addressed in a separate Focused Initial Study or EIR.

All items for which the PEIR identified a significant impact or the project would have a significant peculiar impact are also checked "Addressed Below," and are discussed.

Topics for which the PEIR identified a significant program-level impact are addressed in the CPE Certification of Determination. Project impacts for all other topics are discussed in the CPE Checklist.

Topics:	*Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact*	*Addressed Below*
1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING—Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity?	☒	☐	☐	☒

Please see the Certificate of Determination for discussion of this topic.

Topics:	*Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact*	*Addressed Below*
2. AESTHETICS—Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and other features of the built or natural environment which contribute to a scenic public setting?	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or which would substantially impact other people or properties?	☐	☐	☐	☐

The Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR evaluated three land use options and under each of these options, it was not anticipated that the proposed project would substantially damage scenic resources that contribute to a scenic public setting. As a proposed rezoning and planning process the Eastern Neighborhoods project would not directly result in any physical damage. Rather, any changes in urban form and visual quality would be the secondary result of individual development projects that would occur subsequent to the adoption of changes in zoning and community plans.

With respect to views, the Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR found that while development pursuant to the Plan would result in height increases and use district changes, the rezoning would not substantially degrade the views and new development up to the proposed height limits may even help define the street edge and better frame urban views. The Plan would not be considered to result in a significant adverse impact with regard to views. New construction in the Project area would generate additional night lighting but not in amounts unusual in industrial zones and within developed urban areas in general. Thus, the Final EIR concluded that light and glare impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project would replace a portion of the existing surface parking lot with a neighborhood park. While the new park would change the visual appearance of the site, it would not substantially degrade its visual character or quality. The proposed project would not involve removal or impact on trees or rock outcroppings which contribute to a scenic public setting and there would be no substantial light or glare generated. It is likely that the new neighborhood park would include lighting to ensure adequate nighttime illumination but this would be consistent with the urban setting and would not result in a significant impact.

Design and aesthetics are by definition subjective, and open to interpretation by decision-makers and members of the public. A proposed project would, therefore, be considered to have a significant adverse effect on visual quality only if it would cause a substantial and demonstrable negative change. The proposed project would not have such change.

In summary, the project would not result in a significant effect with regard to aesthetics.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
3. POPULATION AND HOUSING—Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

One of the objectives of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final EIR (FEIR) was to identify appropriate locations for housing in the City's industrially zoned land to meet a citywide need for more housing. According to the FEIR, the rezoning would not create a substantial demand for additional housing in San Francisco, or substantially reduce the housing supply. The proposed project, which would replace a portion of an existing surface parking lot with a new neighborhood park, would not be considered as a catalyst for growth as it does not include residential or commercial uses. Additionally, the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people because the project site is currently a surface parking lot. As such, construction of replacement housing would not be necessary.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
4. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5, including those resources listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the San Francisco *Planning Code*?	☒	☒	☐	☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☒	☒	☐	☒
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please see the Certificate of Determination for discussion of this topic.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
5. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION—Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☒	☐	☐	☒
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways (unless it is practical to achieve the standard through increased use of alternative transportation modes)?	☒	☐	☐	☒
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels, obstructions to flight, or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity that could not be accommodated by alternative solutions?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., conflict with policies promoting bus turnouts, bicycle racks, etc.), or cause a substantial increase in transit demand which cannot be accommodated by existing or proposed transit capacity or alternative travel modes?	☒	☐	☐	☒

Please see the Certificate of Determination for discussion of this topic.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
6. NOISE—Would the project:				
a) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☒	☒	☐	☒

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☒	☐	☐	☒
c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☒	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☒	☐	☐	☒
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, in an area within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) For a project located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☐
g) Be substantially affected by existing noise levels?	☒	☒	☐	☒

Please see the Certificate of Determination for discussion of this topic.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
7. AIR QUALITY Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. **Would the project:**				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☒	☐	☐	☒
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☒	☐	☐	☒
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please see the Certificate of Determination for discussion of this topic.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS— Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Although the PEIR did not identify a significant impact for this topic, please see the Certificate of Determination for the discussion.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
9. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:				
a) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?	☒	☐	☐	☒

Wind

The proposed park would not include buildings or other structures that would alter wind on the project site nor on surrounding development. Therefore, the project would not result in significant effects related to wind.

Shadow

Please see the Certificate of Determination for discussion of this topic.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
10. RECREATION—Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Physically degrade existing recreational resources?	☐	☐	☐	☒

In 1998, the City of San Francisco initiated the Great Parks for a Great City Assessment Project to determine the condition of the park system as well as to determine future needs. In August of 2004, the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (RPD) published a Recreation Assessment Report that evaluates the recreation needs of San Francisco residents.[2] Nine service area maps were developed for the Recreation Assessment Report. The service area maps were intended to help RPD staff and key leadership assess where services are offered, how equitable the service delivery is across the City and how effective the service is as it applies to participating levels overlaid against the demographics of where the service is provided.

As stated in the FEIR, the Mission District has the greatest share of the Eastern Neighborhood's residential population and consequently exhibits the greatest ratio of residents to existing acres of recreational resources. There are 11 RPD properties within the boundaries of the Mission plan area, including six parks clustered in the southeastern portion of the neighborhood, one in the southwest and four parks in the northern Mission. The RPD conducted a gap analysis for the 2006 Recreation and Park Acquisition Policy, which revealed areas of the City considered to be underserved by parklands and open spaces, and determined that the project area exhibits a current need for additional facilities and open space. By creating a new park, the project would ameliorate this gap. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial physical deterioration of existing recreational resources, and there would be no significant effect on recreational facilities.

[2] San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, Recreation Assessment Report, August 2004. This document is available online at http://www.parks.sfgov.org/site/recpark_index.asp?id=27310.

The proposed project would not have a significant effect on recreation or community facility resources, nor would the project contribute to any significant cumulative effects on recreational resources.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
11. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that would serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project would create pedestrian amenities and recreation opportunities for public enjoyment to serve the Mission neighborhood. As such, the proposed park would not substantially increase the existing demand for utilities and/or public services in the area, nor would there be a substantial increase in solid waste volumes, energy or water consumption. In addition, the project is within the scope of analysis for the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR and would not create additional demands beyond what was considered in the EIR.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
12. PUBLIC SERVICES— Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services such as fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other services?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project would not substantially increase demand for police or fire protection services beyond the scope of what was considered in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR and would not necessitate new school facilities in San Francisco. The proposed project would not result in a significant impact to public services.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
13. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES— Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☐

The project site is a paved, surface parking lot that is located in a developed urban area which does not support or provide habitat for any rare or endangered wildlife species, animal, or plant life or habitat, and would not interfere with any resident or migratory species. Accordingly, the proposed project would result in no impact on sensitive species, special status species, native or migratory fish species, or wildlife species. The project would not result in any significant effect with regard to biology, nor would the project contribute to any potential cumulative effects on biological resources. In addition, no significant effects were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
14. GEOLOGY AND SOILS— Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	☐	☐	☐	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Soil disturbing activities would be required for new park equipment, drainage, and fence posts and would require excavation of up to five feet below ground surface. In addition, up to ten feet of excavation below ground surface may be required for a proposed cistern. Building structures, including restrooms, are not proposed. The proposed park would not alter the overall topography of the site.

Geology impacts are generally site-specific and do not have cumulative effects with other projects. Cumulative development would be subject to the same design review and safety measures as the proposed project. These measures would render the geologic effects of cumulative project to less-than-significant levels. Thus, the project would not have a significant effect on geological or soil resources, nor would the project contribute to any significant cumulative effects on geology or soils.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
15. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY— Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion of siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☐
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☐
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☐
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	☐
j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☐

The project site is completely covered by an existing asphalt surface parking lot and would be completely covered by the proposed park. The proposed project would not change the amount of impervious surface area on the site and runoff and drainage would not be adversely affected. Because of the low-lying location of the project site, the park would incorporate stormwater management techniques such as bio-retention basins. Effects related to water resources would not be significant, either individually or cumulatively.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
16. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☒
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☒
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☐
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☐
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires?	☐	☐	☐	☐

CDM completed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment that concluded that the proposed project could result in a significant impact associated with hazardous materials.[3] Therefore, this topic will be addressed in a Focused Initial Study and necessary Mitigation Measures will be identified.

The Eastern Neighborhoods identified a significant impact related to Hazardous Building Materials and determined that *Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials* would reduce

[3] CDM, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 17th Street and Folsom Street Parking Lot, San Francisco, California*, February 16, 2010. A copy of this document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in File No. 2009.1163E.

effects to a less-than-significant level. Since there are no buildings at the project site, *Mitigation Measure L-1* does not apply to the project.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
17. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES— Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?	☐	☐	☐	☐

The proposed project would not result in a significant physical environmental effect with respect to mineral and energy resources.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
18. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.				
— Would the project				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526)?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☐

The project site does not contain agricultural uses and is not zoned for such uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to agricultural resources.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE—Would the project:				
a) 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 prehistory?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Have impacts that would be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☒	☐	☐	☐

The proposed project would subdivide the 60,925-square-foot parcel, which is currently a 219-space surface parking lot, and construct a 34,300-square-foot neighborhood park that would front on 17th, Folsom, and Shotwell Streets. No building structures, including restrooms, are proposed. The remaining 26,625 square feet of the lot would remain in its current use. As discussed in this document, and with the exception of hazards and hazardous materials, the proposed project would not result in new, peculiar environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were

already and disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR. A Focused Initial Study has been prepared for the hazards and hazardous materials topic.[4]

---

[4] San Francisco Planning Department Focused Initial Study, 17th and Folsom Streets Park, January 26, 2011. A copy of this document is available for public review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, as part of Case File No. 2009.1163E.

C. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this review, it can be determined that:

☒ The proposed project qualifies for consideration of a Community Plan exemption based on the applicable General Plan and zoning requirements; **AND**

☒ All potentially significant individual or cumulative impacts of the proposed project were identified in the applicable programmatic EIR (PEIR) for the Plan Area, and all applicable mitigation measures have been or incorporated into the proposed project or will be required in approval of the project.

☒ The proposed project may have a potentially significant impact not identified in the PEIR for the topic area(s) identified above, but that this impact can be reduced to a less-than-significant level in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A focused Initial Study and MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION is required, analyzing the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ The proposed project may have a potentially significant impact not identified in the PEIR for the topic area(s) identified above. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, analyzing the effects that remain to be addressed.

Bill Wycko
Environmental Review Officer
for
John Rahaim, Planning Director

DATE January 24, 2011