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Project Overview

The Project Site, which is described in greater detail on the following page, is located in the Mission Bay portion of the City (Figure 1, page 3). The Project Sponsor (Seawall Lot 337 Associates, LLC) of the Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 Mixed-Use Project (Mission Rock Project or Project) proposes a mixed-use, multi-phase waterfront development of Seawall Lot 337, rehabilitation and reuse of Pier 48, and construction of approximately 5.4 acres of net new open space, for a total of 8 acres of open space on site. The Project would also include public access areas, assembly areas, and an internal grid of public streets, shared public ways, and utilities infrastructure. Overall, the Project would involve construction of up to approximately 3.7 million gross square feet (gsf) of residential, commercial, and retail uses, and a public

---

1 The Project Sponsor’s proposal includes Block P20 as part of the Project Site. This lot along the southern edge of Seawall Lot 337 is owned by the Port but is part of the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area and subject to the jurisdiction of the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure as the Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. Local and state approvals would be necessary for the Project to include Block P20 as part of the Project Site. Except where indicated otherwise, references in this document to Seawall Lot 337 include Block P20; as part of the Project, Block P20 would be merged into Seawall Lot 337.
parking garage on the Project Site. Both Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 are owned by the Port of San Francisco (Port).

The approximately 27-acre Project Site consists of several areas: the 13.63-acre Seawall Lot 337, the 0.32-acre strip of land on the south side of Seawall Lot 337, referred to as Block P20 (see Footnote 1, on page 1), the 5.84-acre Pier 48, the 2.57-acre China Basin Park, and 4.62 acres of existing streets and access areas within and adjacent to the boundaries of Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48/Pier 50. As noted above, the Project Site is in the Mission Bay area of the City and is adjacent to the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area.

On Seawall Lot 337, the Project Sponsor proposes residential, commercial, retail, parking, and open space uses on the 11 proposed parcels. Retail uses would be included on the lower floors of each of the 11 parcels. Above the lower floor retail space, the Project Sponsor proposes predominantly residential uses on some parcels, predominantly commercial uses on other parcels, a parking structure on one parcel, and flexible zoning controls that would allow for the development of either commercial or residential as the predominant uses on three of the 11 parcels. The 11 parcels on Seawall Lot 337 would be developed to include the following mix of uses: approximately 750,000 gsf to 1.3 million gsf of residential uses, consisting of both market-rate and affordable housing; approximately 1.25 million to 1.6 million gsf of commercial²/office/research and development (R&D) uses; approximately 150,000 to 250,000 gsf of retail/entertainment/ancillary uses on the lower floors of each parcel; and enclosed parking. As noted above, total development would not exceed approximately 3.7 million gsf. In total, the Project would also provide approximately 3,100 parking spaces: 2,300 spaces within the parking structure; 700 spaces in underground or enclosed areas within the commercial and residential buildings; and 100 on-street spaces along the internal streets. The 11 parcels on Seawall Lot 337 could be developed up to heights ranging from 90 feet (approximately 7 stories) to a maximum of 380 feet (approximately 35 stories) for the tallest building, excluding the up to 20-foot-tall mechanical penthouse roof enclosures.

Pier 48 is proposed to be developed by Anchor Brewing and Distilling Company (Anchor Brewing) under an interim lease with the Port (not to exceed 30 years) in order to expand its existing brewery and distillery operations on Mariposa Street. The rehabilitation and reuse of Pier 48 would result in approximately 212,500 gsf of light industrial, restaurant, retail, and exhibition uses. There would be continued and enhanced public access and the potential for expanded maritime uses at Pier 48. Prior to being developed by Anchor Brewing, Pier 48 would continue to be used for storage, exhibit, and event parking uses.

² For purposes of this NOP, commercial uses include office, research and development (R&D)/biotech, and other similar non-retail uses. Retail uses are included under their own use category and include shops, restaurants, and entertainment venue uses, or other uses that promote pedestrian activity. These definitions are different from the San Francisco Planning Code.
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Project Site

The Project Site encompasses approximately 1,176,000 sf (approximately 27 acres) and, as noted above, includes several existing areas: Seawall Lot 337, Block P20, Pier 48, China Basin Park, and adjacent streets and access areas (Figure 2, page 6). Table 1, below, presents a breakdown of the existing areas within the Project Site. Each area is discussed in more detail below.

Table 1. Existing Project Site Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Approximate Square Feet</th>
<th>Approximate Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seawall Lot 337</td>
<td>594,000</td>
<td>13.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block P20</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier 48</td>
<td>254,500</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheds A, B, and C</td>
<td>181,200</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>31,300</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aprons</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Basin Park</td>
<td>112,000</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Streets and Access Areas</td>
<td>201,500</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry A. Francois Boulevard</td>
<td>153,400</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier 48 Access Area</td>
<td>26,300</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Wharf between Piers 48 and 50</td>
<td>21,800</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,176,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Seawall Lot 337. As shown in Figure 2, page 6, Seawall Lot 337 is a roughly rectangular parcel bounded by Terry A. Francois Boulevard to the north, Terry A. Francois Boulevard and Piers 48 and 50 to the east, Block P20 (explained in more detail below) and Mission Rock Street to the south, and Third Street to the west. Pier 48 is bounded by the San Francisco Bay to the north, east, and south and Terry A. Francois Boulevard to the west. Except for two small, portable pay station kiosks and a billboard, Seawall Lot 337 currently does not contain any permanent structures and functions mainly as a surface parking lot. Temporary structures are erected periodically to accommodate event uses. The existing surface lot provides parking for patrons of AT&T Park and parking for approximately 500 daytime commuters (primarily those working in nearby commercial buildings). In addition, the lot has provided space for special events, such as Cirque du Soleil circus performances and associated parking. Seawall Lot 337 is in a Mission Bay, Open Space (MB-OS) Use District and an OS Height and Bulk District. It is also public.

---

3 Seawall Lot 337 was rezoned in 1991 as part of an earlier Mission Bay Redevelopment Plan that the Board of Supervisors later rescinded without rescinding the rezoning of Seawall Lot 337. As discussed in Footnote 1, with the exception of Block P20, the current Mission Bay South Redevelopment Plan, adopted in 1998, does not include the Project Site.
trust land covered by special state legislation (SB 815) that allows non-trust uses under specified circumstances.\(^4\)

**Block P20.** The Project Site includes a 0.32-acre (14,024-sf), approximately 20-foot-wide strip of land adjacent to the south side of Seawall Lot 337 along the north side of Mission Rock Street. This area is currently within the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Plan Area and is referred to as Block P20 within that plan’s documents. Block P20 has a land use designation of Open Space Use District and OS Height and Bulk District. Block P20 is subject to the public trust and, unlike Seawall Lot 337, was not covered by SB 815.\(^5\) The Port Commission approved the inclusion of Block P20 in the Project Site, subject to necessary approvals by the Board of Supervisors and the San Francisco Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (successor agency to the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency) with respect to redevelopment plan and zoning changes, and the State Lands Commission and the State Legislature with respect to its use for non-trust uses under SB 815 or similar successor legislation (see Footnote 4, below, and Footnote 5, below, for a further explanation of SB 815). Figure 2, on the next page, depicts the location of Block P20.

**Pier 48.** Pier 48 is a pile-supported facility, approximately 254,500-sf (5.84-acre) in size. About 181,200 gsf of Pier 48 consists of enclosed warehouse space that includes two one-story main sheds (Shed A and Shed B) connected by a one-story connector shed (Shed C) at the east end of the pier (as shown in Figure 2, on the next page). The majority of the Pier 48 facility was completed in 1929, with the connector shed (Shed C) built in 1938. Due to fire damage, Shed C and portions of Sheds A and B were renovated by the Port in 2003. The three sheds on Pier 48 are all approximately 40 feet in height. Between Shed A and Shed B is an approximately 31,300-sf uncovered “valley,” or open-to-sky space. Currently, Shed A and Shed C are used for parking for AT&T Park events and special events, such as Oktoberfest. Shed B is used for storage of voting machines by the City’s Department of Elections. The three sheds on Pier 48 are all approximately 40 feet in height. Between Shed A and Shed B is an approximately 31,300-sf uncovered “valley,” or open-to-sky space. Currently, Shed A and Shed C are used for parking for AT&T Park events and special events, such as Oktoberfest. Shed B is used for storage of voting machines by the City’s Department of Elections. The three sheds on Pier 48 are all approximately 40 feet in height. Between Shed A and Shed B is an approximately 31,300-sf uncovered “valley,” or open-to-sky space. Currently, Shed A and Shed C are used for parking for AT&T Park events and special events, such as Oktoberfest. Shed B is used for storage of voting machines by the City’s Department of Elections. The three sheds on Pier 48 are all approximately 40 feet in height. Between Shed A and Shed B is an approximately 31,300-sf uncovered “valley,” or open-to-sky space. Currently, Shed A and Shed C are used for parking for AT&T Park events and special events, such as Oktoberfest. Shed B is used for storage of voting machines by the City’s Department of Elections. The three sheds on Pier 48 are all approximately 40 feet in height. Between Shed A and Shed B is an approximately 31,300-sf uncovered “valley,” or open-to-sky space. Currently, Shed A and Shed C are used for parking for AT&T Park events and special events, such as Oktoberfest. Shed B is used for storage of voting machines by the City’s Department of Elections. The eastern apron of Pier 48 is currently part of the premises the Port leases to Cross Link, Inc., dba Westar Marine Services (Westar), a barge, water taxi, and tug operator. The southern berth of Pier 48 is occupied by tugs and maintenance facilities for ferry boats. The northern apron is vacant and not actively used for any purpose. There is no existing public access to the 42,000-gsf (0.96-acre) pier aprons as these aprons are in varying states of disrepair or are encumbered by existing maritime industrial uses incompatible with unrestricted public access. Pier 48 is the southernmost pier structure within the Port of San Francisco Embarcadero National Register Historic District (Embarcadero Historic District), which is listed in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). Pier 48 is within the M-2 (Heavy Industrial) Use District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

---

\(^4\) Public trust lands are held on behalf of the people of the state for purposes of commerce, navigation, and fisheries. In addition, the Burton Act (stats. 1967, ch. 1333), under which the State of California transferred San Francisco Harbor to the City and its port, imposes statutory trust obligations on the Port. Senate Bill 815 (SB 815), approved in 2007, authorizes the California State Lands Commission to lift public trust use restrictions from designated Port seawall lots, including Seawall Lot 337, for up to 75 years or until January 1, 2094 upon making certain findings as specified in SB 815.

\(^5\) SB 815 suspends application of public trust use restrictions for certain seawall lots, including Seawall Lot 337. However, since Block P20 is not part of the existing Seawall Lot 337 this area is not currently covered by SB 815.
Figure 2
Existing Land Uses at the Project Site
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Source: Seawall Lot 337 Associates, LLC, 2013
China Basin Park. Approximately 2.57 acres of the northern portion of the Project Site are improved as China Basin Park and perimeter walkways. China Basin Park was constructed following the opening of AT&T Park and was opened to the public in 2001. The park includes a lawn lined with a single row of 26 trees and a paved bicycle/pedestrian pathway. The park features views of the San Francisco Bay (Bay) and its surroundings, and contains viewing areas, benches, picnic areas, lighting, a small baseball diamond, a statue of former Giants player Willie McCovey, and historic markers representing the Giants teams from 1958 through 1999. Figure 2, on the prior page, depicts the location of China Basin Park. China Basin Park is within the MB-OS Use District and an OS Height and Bulk District.

Existing Streets and Access Areas. The Project Site includes approximately 3.52 acres of Terry A. Francois Boulevard. This street curves around Seawall Lot 337 from Third Street to the northwest to Mission Rock Street to the southeast. The 0.6-acre Pier 48 access area is located directly to the west of Pier 48. To the south, between Pier 48 and Pier 50 and east of Terry A. Francois Boulevard, is a 0.50-acre area currently referred to as the Pier 48 Marginal Wharf (see Figure 2, on the prior page).

Access to the Project Site is currently provided via Third Street, Mission Rock Street, and Terry A. Francois Boulevard. Bridges located at the Third Street and Fourth Street crossings over Mission Creek provide pedestrian, bicycle, San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni), and vehicle access from the South of Market area (SOMA) and the Fourth and King Streets Caltrain Station to the Project Site. In addition, ferries from the City of Larkspur in Marin County transport attendees of AT&T Park ballgames to and from the ballpark. The ferry dock is located at the China Basin Ferry Terminal, north of the Project Site across China Basin, along the eastern edge of AT&T Park.

Adjacent Uses

The Project Site is adjacent to Mission Bay, which is characterized by large parcels of land and streets that generally follow a grid pattern. Third Street is the primary arterial street in Mission Bay South, traveling in a north-south direction. The majority of the streets in the Mission Bay area are two-way. Topographic features in the Project vicinity are minimal, and grading is generally flat. Mission Bay is currently under development, with the parcels adjacent to the Project Site in various stages of completion. Several adjacent parcels are either vacant, serve temporarily as surface parking lots, are under construction, or serve as construction staging locations. In addition, several nearby parcels contain newly constructed buildings (completed from the late 1990s to the present) in contemporary architectural styles. Figure 3, on the next page, illustrates the land uses and development status for parcels adjacent to the Project Site.

Mission Bay, which covers 303 acres of land between the Bay and Interstate 280 (I-280), is a mixed-use, transit-oriented development. Upon full implementation of the Mission Bay North and South Redevelopment Plans (expected to occur between 2020 and 2030, depending on market conditions), Mission Bay is anticipated to include a total of approximately 6,000 housing units, 4.4 million gsf of office/life science/biotechnology space, a University of California San Francisco (UCSF) research campus containing 2.65 million gsf of building space, a 878,000 gsf UCSF hospital complex (not included in the UCSF research campus), and various other retail, hotel, open space, and public facility uses. Over 11,000 residents and 31,000 permanent jobs are expected to be added to the Mission Bay area by full buildout.

---

6 The 0.32-acre Block P20 strip of land that is part of the proposed Project Site and within the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Plan Area is included within these 303 acres.
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Figure 3
Project Site and Surrounding Land Uses
North of the Project Site, across China Basin, is AT&T Park, home of the San Francisco Giants major league baseball team. Located at 24 Willie Mays Plaza, the ballpark opened in April 2000 and has a seating capacity of 41,503. The regular major league baseball season runs from early April to late September, followed by the postseason in October and early November. AT&T Park attracts an average of 3.5 million visitors to the neighborhood annually. Visitors attend baseball games or other events and patronize the local restaurants, retail stores, and bars. In addition to two to five preseason games and up to 12 postseason games, there are 81 regular home games per year, of which approximately 27 are held during the day (a maximum of 13 mid-week day games), and approximately 54 are held in the evening. AT&T Park hosts approximately 145 non-baseball related special events per year, including concerts, charity and private events, and other sporting events attended by a total of approximately 170,000 visitors annually.

Mission Creek was once a waterway that extended from the Mission neighborhood to the Bay, but is now channelized and undergrounded going west from China Basin to approximately I-280. Mission Creek Park lines the creek on the north and south and includes open grassy areas, pathways, a small amphitheater, overlook areas, a non-motorized boat launch, sports courts, and a dog play area.

East and south of Seawall Lot 337 and to the south of Pier 48 is Pier 50, which is currently an active maritime industrial pier. Pier 50 houses the Port’s primary maintenance facility (in Shed D), which supports Port maintenance activities along the waterfront. Pier 50's three other warehouse sheds (Sheds A, B, and C) accommodate industrial maritime support and harbor service operations. Pier 50 provides a berthing facility for the U.S. Department of Transportation Marine Administration (MARAD) ready-reserve berthing, which in turn provides transport for military troop deployments and national emergencies. There are numerous other smaller interim tenants at Pier 50, which typically use the pier for storage and parking uses. In addition, towing and tug boat services, operated by Westar, are located in Shed C. Westar operations are based out of Pier 50, with storage areas for equipment and vessels at the north apron of Pier 50 and at the south apron of Pier 48, as discussed above, on page 5.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

As discussed above, under Project Overview, the Project includes the construction of a total of approximately 3.7 million gsf of mixed-use, multi-phased development throughout the Project Site. This includes development on the proposed 11 parcels (Parcels A through K) on Seawall Lot 337 and the rehabilitation and reuse of Pier 48. The Project also includes doubling the size of the existing China Basin Park, establishing two new parks and open space areas on Seawall Lot 337, providing a promenade along the waterfront, and rehabilitating Pier 48, including for public access and maritime uses.

Figure 4, on the next page, illustrates the proposed site plan. Each of these components is described in greater detail on page 11.
Figure 4
Proposed Site Plan and Height Ranges
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Seawall Lot 337

The proposed 11 parcels (A through K) on Seawall Lot 337 could be developed to a total of 3.7 million gsf. The total development, depending on market conditions, could include a mix of: approximately 750,000 gsf to 1.3 million gsf of a combination of market-rate and affordable residential uses; approximately 1.25 million to 1.6 million gsf of commercial uses; approximately 150,000 to 250,000 gsf of retail uses; and approximately 3,000 parking spaces that would be underground or enclosed within the on-site buildings and the proposed parking structure. Approximately 100 additional on-street parking spaces would be provided along the internal streets, for a total of 3,100 parking spaces throughout Seawall Lot 337. Land uses on the three designated flexible parcels (Parcels H, I, and J) would be dependent on market conditions, as discussed below. Under no scenario would both the upper range of residential and the upper range of commercial land uses (1.3 million gsf and 1.6 million gsf, respectively) be developed on Seawall Lot 337. The ultimate development on the site would be within the ranges discussed above but, in total, would not exceed approximately 3.7 million gsf. Development Controls and Design Guidelines (Design Guidelines) are currently being prepared that would guide the physical development on the Project Site. The Design Guidelines would guide the proposed development with respect to bulk, massing, setbacks, and other physical design and use aspects of the Project.

As depicted in Figure 4, on the prior page, the Project Sponsor proposes flexible zoning on three parcels in order to respond to future market demands. To this end, Parcels H, I, and J on Seawall Lot 337 are proposed to be designated to allow either residential or commercial as the predominant uses above the lower floor retail. The Project Sponsor would determine the primary land uses of the three flexible zoning parcels above the lower floor retail (i.e., residential or commercial) at the time of filing for design approvals for parcel development proposals. Three on-site parcels (Parcels A, F, and K) would be designated as either primarily residential above the lower floor retail and four parcels (Parcels B, C, E, and G) would be designated as primarily commercial above the lower floor retail. One parcel (Parcel D) would include a 9-floor, 2,300-space parking structure and a 60,000 gsf building with commercial and retail uses on the lower floors.

Seawall Lot 337 would be divided into 11 rectilinear parcels that would be configured in a grid pattern, separated by a system of internal streets. Parcel sizes would range from approximately 17,830 sf (Parcel K) to 97,500 sf (Parcel D). The parcel dimensions would align the proposed streets with existing neighboring streets in the adjacent Mission Bay neighborhood. The dimensions of parcels would, on average, be approximately one third to one half the size of the typical Mission Bay block.

Retail on the lower floors would be permitted on any of the commercial, residential, parking, or flexible parcels; that is, on all 11 parcels on site. Table 2, on the next page, summarizes the proposed development program by parcel.

As shown in Table 2, the buildings proposed on Seawall Lot 337 could range in height from 90 feet to 380 feet, depending on the land use. In general, buildings with predominantly commercial uses could range in height from 90 feet (7 stories) to 280 feet (20 stories), while buildings with mainly residential uses could range in height from 160 feet (15 stories) to 380 feet (35 stories).
### Table 2. Development Potential—Parcel Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Area (sf)</th>
<th>Usea</th>
<th>Height Range (feet)b</th>
<th>Parking (spaces)c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel A</td>
<td>43,410</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>240–320</td>
<td>Up to 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel B</td>
<td>41,100</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>120–160</td>
<td>Up to 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel C</td>
<td>40,210</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>220–280</td>
<td>Up to 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel D</td>
<td>97,500</td>
<td>Parking/Commerciald</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel E</td>
<td>25,110</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>90–120</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel F</td>
<td>25,110</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>320–380</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel G</td>
<td>33,060</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>120–160</td>
<td>Up to 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel H</td>
<td>31,090</td>
<td>Flexible–Residential or Commercial</td>
<td>120–160</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel I</td>
<td>31,320</td>
<td>Flexible–Residential or Commercial</td>
<td>130–190</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel J</td>
<td>31,460</td>
<td>Flexible–Residential or Commercial</td>
<td>130–190</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel K</td>
<td>17,830</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>100–160</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>417,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes:

a. All parcels could include retail on the lower floors.
b. The number of stories for each building can be estimated using the assumption that residential buildings average 11 feet per story and commercial buildings average 14 feet per story.
c. In addition to the parking structure on Parcel D, buildings on Parcels A, B, C, and G could contain up to 250 parking spaces each, and all other buildings could include small amounts of on-site parking (less than approximately 10 spaces per parcel). In combination, excluding the Parcel D parking structure, the parcels would not exceed a total of 700 enclosed parking spaces distributed within the residential or commercial buildings. Including these 700 spaces, the parking structure (2,300 spaces) and on-street parking (100 spaces), the Project would include a maximum of 3,100 parking spaces.
d. Parcel D would include two separate, but attached, buildings totaling approximately 850,000 gsf. A narrow building along Third Street would include approximately 53,000 gsf of commercial space and 7,000 gsf of lower floor retail space. The parking structure building on the remainder of Parcel D, adjacent to Vara Street, would be approximately 790,000 gsf, including approximately 15,000 gsf of retail on the lower floors.
The land uses proposed on Seawall Lot 337 are as follows:

- **Residential Uses.** The Project would include between 750,000 gsf and 1.3 million gsf of residential uses (approximately 500 to 1,500 units) on Seawall Lot 337. The specific unit mix has not been determined but could consist roughly of the following: approximately 10 percent micro-units and studios, approximately 40 percent one-bedroom units; approximately 40 percent two-bedroom units; and approximately 10 percent units with more than two bedrooms. As discussed above, housing would be provided on Parcels A, F, and K, and potentially on flexibly-zoned Parcels H, I, and J. New rental housing built for the Project would meet inclusionary housing requirements under Section 415 of the City’s Planning Code or as determined by the Mayor’s Office of Housing.

- **Commercial Uses.** Approximately 1.25 million gsf to 1.6 million gsf of commercial space would be developed on Seawall Lot 337. As discussed above, commercial uses would be provided on Parcels B, C, E, and G and potentially on the flexible Parcels H, I, and J above the retail uses on the lower floors. Parcel D would include approximately 53,000 gsf of commercial space within multiple stories of the proposed parking garage structure along the Third Street facade. On Seawall Lot 337, commercial uses could include office, R&D/biotech, and similar non-retail uses.

- **Retail Uses.** The lower floor areas of the proposed on-site development on Seawall Lot 337 would contain shops, restaurants, cafes, regional- and neighborhood-serving retail uses, a possible entertainment venue, community spaces, and building lobbies. A total of approximately 150,000 to 250,000 gsf of retail space would be located throughout Seawall Lot 337 on the lower floors of residential and commercial buildings and on the lower floors of the parking structure (Parcel D). In addition, retail uses could be provided in potential rooftop lounges on Parcels A, G, and K.

In addition, the Project would also upgrade and resize existing water, wastewater, drainage, gas and electric, and other utility infrastructure within the Project site, as necessary. The Project Sponsor is investigating a Project-wide utility solution to serve a portion of the Project’s energy needs. The Project Sponsor is also considering sustainable sources of energy such as a solar photovoltaic system and bay source cooling.\(^7\)

Site excavation to accommodate development would be required, including removal and disposal of some potentially hazardous materials at appropriately permitted off site facilities.

**Open Spaces and Parks**

The Project’s approximately 8 acres of new and expanded open spaces would include China Basin Park, Mission Rock Square, Channel Plaza, and a waterfront promenade. Figure 4, page 10, depicts the location of these proposed open spaces. This would provide a net increase of approximately 5.4 acres of new park space over the existing conditions at the Project Site.

The parks would be connected by a new north-south, pedestrian-oriented street network and shared public way from China Basin Park to the north and Bosque Street to the south, as well as by new

\(^7\) Bay source cooling involves a water pumping system that would use bay water for heating and cooling buildings.
sidewalks and roadways. These areas would also provide access to the City’s proposed Blue Greenway. The open spaces and parks would include new trees and vegetation. In addition, trees and landscaping improvements would be planted along the block frontages. Each of the new and expanded open space and park features is described in more detail below and summarized in Table 3, below.

Table 3. Proposed Parks and Open Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>General Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China Basin Park</td>
<td>5.12a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Rock Square</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Plaza</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier 48 Aprons/ Waterfront Promenade</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>~8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note:

- Acreage includes the existing 2.57-acre China Basin Park.

- **China Basin Park.** The existing 2.57-acre China Basin Park was opened to the public in 2001 in connection with the AT&T Park project and is located just south of China Basin (across the channel from AT&T Park). The proposed expansion to a 5.12-acre China Basin Park would include a 1.4-acre Great Lawn, a reconfigured Junior Giants field for children, a lawn area, coastal native biofiltration gardens, a pedestrian plaza connecting Lefty O’Doul Bridge to Pier 48, retail esplanade, and a promenade at the Bay’s edge along the length of the Project Site. At Project completion, China Basin Park would be able to accommodate assembly and special event uses for up to approximately 5,000 people.

- **Mission Rock Square.** The new 1.3-acre Mission Rock Square would be located in the center of Seawall Lot 337 and be framed by a mix of residential and commercial uses above retail on the lower floors. A pedestrian-only path (Channel Street) would connect Mission Rock Square to the proposed Channel Plaza to promote bicycle and pedestrian connections to the waterfront. Mission Rock Square would be able to accommodate assembly and special event uses for up to approximately 2,000 people. The design of Mission Rock Square, Channel Street, and the interior pedestrian walkways would be intended to connect Project open space to the Mission Creek Park system, the Blue Greenway, and the bayfront.

---

8 The Blue Greenway is a City-sponsored project dedicated to planning and creating a public open space and water access network in southeastern San Francisco, from Mission Creek to the southern San Francisco County line.

9 Biofiltration gardens function as soil and plant-based filtration devices to remove pollutants in runoff through a variety of physical and biological treatment processes.
• **Channel Plaza.** A new open space at Channel Plaza would be constructed in the location of the current Marginal Wharf between Piers 48 and 50, east of Terry A. Francois Boulevard. Channel Plaza would be a 0.58-acre, hardscaped plaza. It would offer direct public access to the bayfront and serve as a maritime access point for industrial activities occurring at Pier 48, the Pier 48 Marginal Wharf, and Pier 50.

• **Pier 48 Aprons/Waterfront Promenade.** The Pier 48 aprons, totaling 0.96 acre (42,000 gsf), would be preserved and improved for public access, a waterfront promenade, and maritime operations. The northern apron of Pier 48 would be prioritized for public access and would be accessible for maritime uses where feasible. The eastern and southern aprons would be prioritized for maritime uses and open for public access where feasible. The northern apron would connect to the Blue Greenway via China Basin Park, the retail esplanade, and the bicycle and pedestrian promenade on the eastern side of Terry A. Francois Boulevard. The northern apron would also include a carry-down boat launch for public access to launch human-powered watercrafts (such as kayaks) into the Bay. In addition, the northern apron could include boat mooring capabilities for water taxis or excursion vessels.

**Pier 48**

The Pier 48 sheds would be rehabilitated consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Secretary’s Standards)\(^\text{10}\) and the Port of San Francisco Historic Preservation Review Guidelines for Pier and Bulkhead Wharf Substructures (Port Historic Guidelines). The Project Sponsor proposes to repurpose the 212,500 gsf of pier sheds and valley to accommodate a range of uses, including light industrial/manufacturing, barging, associated general office and storage, retail, restaurant, tour and exhibition space, event-related uses, and continued maritime operations on the aprons and along Channel Plaza. The proposed tenant, Anchor Brewing, would occupy all usable interior shed space and the currently open-to-sky valley space of Pier 48 under a 30-year interim lease. At Project completion, the Anchor Brewing brewery/distillery would be approximately 190,400 gsf, the restaurant would be approximately 11,000 gsf, and the retail/exhibition/museum/meeting room uses would be approximately 11,100 gsf.

The exterior of the Pier 48 structures would not be expanded. Exterior modifications would be limited to refurbishing windows, installing door systems and storefront windows within existing roll-up door openings, and refurbishing certain areas of the roof. The Project may include covering some portion of the open-to-sky valley area and loading area modifications such as refinishing floors and completing minor structural repairs.

Truck loading and unloading activities for Anchor Brewing would primarily occur in the Pier 48 valley. Facilities would be installed to permit barging for receiving or disbursing materials and finished products on the northern or southern aprons. Barges could travel between Pier 48 and the cities of Oakland and Stockton or other nearby maritime facilities. Delivery trucks would be accommodated at the north end of Terry A. Francois Boulevard and would back into the Pier 48 valley.

\(^{10}\) The Secretary’s Standards are a series of concepts regarding the maintenance, repair, and replacement of historic materials, as well as the design of any additions or alterations.
Proposed Parking and Circulation

The Project Site would be accessible for all modes of transportation via Third Street, the reconfigured Mission Rock Street (currently under construction as part of the Mission Bay South redevelopment project), and the reconfigured Terry A. Francois Boulevard. The Project would include vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements along those streets to accommodate the increase in on-site activity. In addition, new interior multi-modal neighborhood streets would be established throughout Seawall Lot 337. The existing and proposed streets serving the Project Site are described below and are illustrated in Figure 4, on page 10.11

- **Interior Neighborhood Streets.** The proposed new interior neighborhood streets are Exposition Street and Bosque Street, each in an east-west alignment, and Vara Street, in a north-south alignment. All proposed neighborhood streets would be designed as slow-traffic areas.12 When games or other major events are scheduled at the ballpark, no on-street parking on Bosque Street and the southern portions of Vara Street would be allowed. This would allow for additional vehicle travel lanes and would be similar to the existing traffic management plan in use for ballpark events on the streets adjoining the existing surface parking lot on Seawall Lot 337.

- **Shared Public Way.** The proposed new interior shared public way would be located one block east of Third Street, extending between Bosque Street to the south to just beyond Exposition Street to the north. This shared public way, which would prioritize pedestrians over bicycles and automobiles, would consist of a single shared paved surface with no curbs or gutters. Automobiles would be able to access it from the adjoining streets via curb-cuts similar to a typical driveway. The prioritized pedestrian right-of-way would be delineated through the placement of street furniture and landscaping. The shared public right-of-way would make it possible for adjoining retail or restaurants to utilize the street sidewalks for outdoor seating and retail space, with vehicular access limited primarily to deliveries, drop-offs/pick-ups or emergency vehicles. When games or other major events are scheduled at the ballpark, the shared public way would be closed to vehicles, with the exception of emergency vehicles.

- **Channel Street.** Traffic on Channel Street currently travels in an east-west direction and terminates where Channel Street bisects Third Street, just west of Seawall Lot 337. Under the Project, Channel Street would be extended onto Seawall Lot 337 to connect to Terry A. Francois Boulevard. The western portion of Channel Street would traverse the Project Site in an east-west orientation and would intersect with the shared public way and terminate at Mission Rock Square. This western segment of the shared public way would be designed for low traffic volumes, no on-street parking, and sidewalks on both sides of the street. The eastern portion of Channel Street, to the east of Mission Rock Square, would link Vara Street to the west with Terry A. Francois Boulevard to the east. This segment of Channel Street would be a bicycle and pedestrian-only section for people traveling from Mission Rock Square eastward to Channel Plaza.

11 The exact dimensions of travel and parking lanes and of sidewalks are being evaluated by the City; however, the fundamental classification and function of streets (i.e., shared public way or neighborhood street) are not anticipated to change.

12 “Slow-traffic areas” or “slow-traffic streets” would limit vehicular traffic speeds by installing traffic calming devices such as curb extensions/bulb-outs.
• **Third Street.** The east side of Third Street between Channel Street and the Lefty O’Doul Bridge would be improved, and new and improved sidewalks, curbs, gutters, and on-street parking spaces would be provided. Along this segment of Third Street, the street would be restriped to allow for an additional parking lane on the eastern side of the street. A bicycle lane would be provided on the eastern side of the street. A sidewalk would be provided on the eastern side of the street, south of Channel Street to Mission Rock Street. Improvements to the western side of Third Street would occur as part of the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Plan.

• **Mission Rock Street.** Mission Rock Street, which forms the southern boundary of the Project Site, will be reconfigured and realigned as part of the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project prior to proposed Project development. The reconfiguration will allow for multi-modal traffic to serve Piers 48 and 50, the adjoining Mission Bay neighborhood, and the under-construction San Francisco Public Safety Building to the south. Mission Rock Street will include two travel lanes heading west and one travel lane heading east, with sidewalks on both sides of the street. Under the Project, the proposed parking garage on Parcel D would be located on the north side of Mission Rock Street.

• **Terry A. Francois Boulevard.** Terry A. Francois Boulevard is proposed to be reconfigured under the Project to include two separate design segments within the Project Site. The southern on-site segment would link Mission Rock Street to the south with the proposed new (internal) Bosque Street to the north and it would serve as the entrance to Pier 50. This segment would be designed to accommodate truck movements into and out of Pier 50 with travel lanes in each direction. The northern on-site segment of Terry A. Francois Boulevard would consist of the segment from Bosque Street to the south to the proposed new (internal) Exposition Street at Pier 48 to the north. This portion of Terry A. Francois Boulevard would be designed as a slow-traffic street with travel lanes in each direction. A two-way bicycle lane would be provided along the entire length of the reconfigured street and would be separated from the motorized vehicle travel lanes. Following the proposed reconfiguration, Terry A. Francois Boulevard would no longer connect with Third Street.

As discussed above, approximately 3,100 parking spaces would be located throughout the Project Site to serve the proposed on-site commercial, residential, and retail development. The proposed parking garage would accommodate other public and transit-based parking, similar to existing conditions. The 2,300-space parking garage would also serve patrons of AT&T Park events. The overall operations of the parking garage would be managed to optimize the parking shared between retail, commercial, AT&T Park users, and other public and transit-based parking users. Public parking would continue to be provided on Pier 48, but only as an interim use until full buildout of the Project. Pier 48 would not include public parking after full buildout of the Project, but could provide a small amount of parking (approximately ten spaces) for employees who work at Anchor Brewing.

The Project as proposed would include a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program that would include a plan to coordinate and facilitate parking and traffic at and around the Project Site on AT&T Park event days.
Notice of Preparation of an EIR
December 11, 2013
Case No. 2013.0208E
Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 Mixed-Use Project

Shoreline Protection/Sea Level Rise

The Port has identified areas in its jurisdiction along the San Francisco Bay waterfront, including the Project Site, which would be subject to inundation during a 100-year flood event, assuming a sea level rise ranging from 0.39–2.0 feet by 2050 and 1.38–5.48 feet by 2100.13 Proposed measures to prevent inundation of Seawall Lot 337 during a 100-year flood under the projected 2100 sea level rise would be incorporated into the design of Seawall Lot 337. For example, proposed finished floors of the development would accommodate rising tide levels at the projected 2100 levels.

PROJECT PHASING

For purposes of construction phasing, the Project Site has been divided into four areas, with four construction phases occurring per area. Each area would consist of two to four parcels and associated areas for streets and open spaces. Table 4, below, summarizes the currently anticipated Project phasing by area. As shown, some overlap in construction activities is anticipated between the four areas; however, in general, the construction of Area 1 would occur from 2015 to 2018, Area 2 from 2016 to 2019, Area 3 from 2017 to 2020, and Area 4 from 2018 to 2021.14 Construction of each area would consist of four components: (1) demolition and rough grading, (2) infrastructure, (3) foundations and building, and (4) paving and landscaping. On average, each area would be constructed over about 2.25 years.

Table 4. Preliminary Project Phasing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Total Number of Work Days</th>
<th>Proposed Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>2015–2018</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>Parcel A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parcel B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parcel C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parcel D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pier 48 – Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>2016–2019</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>Parcel G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parcel K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>China Basin Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pier 48 – Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>2017–2020</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>Parcel E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parcel F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission Rock Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>2018–2021</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>Parcel H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parcel I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parcel J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Channel Plaza</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Seawall Lot 337 Associates, LLC 2013


14 The phasing of Project implementation is subject to change due to market conditions and other unanticipated factors.
PROPOSED LAND USE AND ZONING CHANGES

Seawall Lot 337 is currently within the MB-OS Use District and Pier 48 is within the M-2 Use District. China Basin Park is within the MB-OS Use District and OS Height and Bulk District. Block P20 is currently designated as open space in the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Plan. The Project Sponsor would request rezoning of the Project Site through a Special Use District or other similar rezoning mechanism, through amendments to the Planning Code, Zoning Map and Mission Bay South Redevelopment Plan, and, as needed, corresponding amendments to the City’s General Plan and Port’s Waterfront Land Use Plan. If approved by the Port Commission, the Planning Commission, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, the SUD would include flexible zoning controls that permit certain parcels (Parcels H, I, and J) to be developed for either commercial or residential uses. The SUD would specify controls on height, density limits, bulk, and setback requirements. It also would establish a design review process and Design Guidelines that would apply across the Project Site.

As discussed above and illustrated in Figure 4 (on page 10), this proposed flexible zoning would allow for a mixed-use development that responds to future market conditions. The proposed new zoning would permit the following uses:

- Parcels H, I, and J would be permitted for either commercial or residential uses above the retail on the lower floors.
- Parcels A, F, and K would be restricted to primarily residential use above the lower floor retail.
- Parcels B, C, E, and G would be restricted to primarily commercial use above the lower floor retail.
- Parcel D would be zoned to allow for nine stories of structured public parking, with commercial space and retail uses on portions of the lower floors.
- All development parcels would be permitted to include retail and parking on the lower floors.
- Pier 48 would be permitted for light industrial/manufacturing, barging, associated general office and storage, retail, restaurants, tours, exhibitions, events, public access, and maritime uses.
- The SUD would incorporate certain development controls, such as height limits ranging from a minimum of 90 feet to up to a maximum of 380 feet by parcel (as described above), allowed development density expressed as permissible floor area ratio (FAR) limits, bulk limits, building setbacks on upper floors, and other controls on proposed development.
- Approximately 8 acres of new and expanded open spaces would include China Basin Park, Mission Rock Square, Channel Plaza, and a Pier 48 Aprons/waterfront promenade.
- Proposed zoning would permit assembly uses and other special events at China Basin Park (for approximately 5,000 people) and at Mission Rock Square (for approximately 2,000 people).

COMPATIBILITY WITH EXISTING ZONING AND PLANS

The EIR will discuss the Project’s potential conflicts relating to physical environmental effects with the San Francisco General Plan and its relevant elements. The EIR will also analyze the Project’s potential conflicts with the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan (an element of BCDC’s Bay Plan), the BCDC and Metropolitan Transportation
Commission’s San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan, and the Port of San Francisco Waterfront Land Use Plan (as noted below, under Approvals Required, amendments to these plans would also be required). Other applicable planning documents will be discussed for context, including the Bicycle Plan, Sustainability Plan, Climate Action Plan, and Better Streets Plan, as well as the City’s Transit First policy.

The EIR will also discuss the conformance of the Project with the San Francisco Planning Code. Inconsistencies with relevant plans or zoning that could result in physical effects on the environment will be analyzed in the applicable environmental topic sections, such as noise and air quality.

APPROVALS REQUIRED

In addition to zoning approvals, implementation of the Project would require numerous federal, state, and local reviews, permits and approvals. The Project Sponsor and the Port would apply jointly to secure state and regional approvals, as necessary. Existing state, regional, and local plans that would require amendments include:

- BCDC’s San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan;
- BCDC and Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan; and
- Port of San Francisco Waterfront Land Use Plan.

Project reviews, permits or approvals from the following agencies are anticipated at this time:

- San Francisco Planning Commission
- San Francisco Port Commission
- San Francisco Board of Supervisors
- San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
- San Francisco Department of Public Health
- San Francisco Department of Public Works
- San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
- State Lands Commission
- San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
- California Department of Toxic Substance Control
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission
- San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board
- California Department of Finance
- Oversight Board of the San Francisco Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII)
- OCII Commission
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District
- National Park Service
- State Historic Preservation Office
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- National Marine Fisheries Service

SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

The Project may result in significant environmental effects. As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be prepared and will examine these effects, identify mitigation measures for potentially significant impacts, and analyze whether proposed mitigation measures would reduce the environmental effects to less-than-significant levels. The EIR will analyze the potential effects of the Project with respect to the environmental topics listed below. Cumulative impacts will also be discussed under each of the environmental topic sections in the EIR. The
EIR will also analyze alternatives to the Project that could substantially reduce or eliminate one of more significant impacts of the Project, but could still feasibly attain most of the major Project objectives.

- Land Use and Land Use Planning
- Aesthetics
- Population, Housing, and Employment
- Cultural and Paleontological Resources
- Transportation and Circulation
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Wind and Shadow
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Public Services and Recreation
- Biological Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Sea Level Rise
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral and Energy Resources
- Agriculture and Forest Resources

OTHER CEQA ISSUES

The EIR will also include a discussion of topics required by CEQA, including the Project's growth-inducing impacts, significant unavoidable impacts, significant irreversible impacts, any known controversy associated with the Project and its environmental effects and issues to be resolved by decision-makers.

FINDING

This Project may have a significant effect on the environment and an Environmental Impact Report is required. This determination is based upon the criteria of the State CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15063 (Initial Study), 15064 (Determining Significant Effect), and 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance).

PUBLIC SCOPING PROCESS

Pursuant to the State of California Public Resources Code Section 21083.9 and California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15206, a public scoping meeting will be held to receive oral comments concerning the scope of the EIR. The meeting will be held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on January 13, 2014 in the Bayside Room at the Port of San Francisco, Pier 1, The Embarcadero. To request a language interpreter or accommodations for persons with disabilities at the scoping meeting, please contact the staff contact listed above at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. Written comments will also be accepted at this meeting and until 5:00 p.m. on January 31, 2014. Written comments should be sent to Sarah B. Jones, Environmental Review Officer, San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103 or sent by email to Tania Sheyner, the EIR Coordinator for this Project, at Tania.Sheyner@sfgov.org.

If you work for a responsible State agency, we need to know the views of your agency regarding the scope and content of the environmental information that is germane to your agency’s statutory responsibilities in connection with the Project. Your agency may need to use the EIR when considering a permit or other approval for this Project. Please include the name of a contact person in your agency.
Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Commission and Department. All written or oral communications, including submitted personal contact information, may be made available to the public for inspection and copying upon request and may appear on the Planning Department's website or in other public documents.

Date

December 11th, 2013

Sarah B. Jones
Environmental Review Officer
Comments Received on the NOP
Notice of Preparation

December 11, 2013

To: Reviewing Agencies

Re: Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 Mixed Use Project
SCH# 2013122024

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 Mixed Use Project draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Tania Sheyner
City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Attachments
cc: Lead Agency
Document Details Report  
State Clearinghouse Data Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCH#</th>
<th>2013122024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 Mixed Use Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>San Francisco, City and County of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>NOP Notice of Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The project would include ~750,000 gsf to 1.3 million gsf of residential uses, 1.25 million to 1.6 million gsf of commercial/office/R&amp;D uses, and 150,000 to 250,000 gsf of retail/entertainment/ancillary uses within 11 development parcels. Project Sponsor proposes flexible zoning on three parcels in order to respond to future market demands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lead Agency Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tania Sheyner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>City and County of San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>(415) 575-9127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>1650 Mission Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Zip</td>
<td>CA 94103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Streets</td>
<td>Third Street/Terry A. Francois Blvd./Mission Rock Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat/Long</td>
<td>37° 46' 29&quot; N / 122° 23' 19&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel No.</td>
<td>8719/002,9900/048,8719/002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>2S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>5W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proximity to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highways</th>
<th>I-280, I-80, US 101</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airports</td>
<td>Caltrain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterways</td>
<td>San Francisco Bay, Mission Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Several</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Seawall Lot 337: MB-OS (Mission Bay, Open Space), OS Height &amp; Bulk Dist; Pier 48: M-2 (Heavy Industrial), 40-X Height &amp; Bulk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Issues

Aesthetic/Visual; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Drainage/Absorption; Economics/Jobs; Flood Plain/Flooding; Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Cumulative Effects; Other Issues

Reviewing Agencies

Resources Agency; California Coastal Commission; Department of Parks and Recreation; San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 3; Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission; State Lands Commission; California Highway Patrol; Department of Housing and Community Development; Caltrans, District 4; Air Resources Board; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 2

Date Received | 12/11/2013 |
Start of Review | 12/11/2013 |
End of Review | 01/09/2014 |

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
January 9, 2014

Ms. Tania Sheyner
Planning Department
City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Ms. Sheyner:

Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 Mix Use Project – Notice of Preparation

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 Mix Use project. The following comments are based on the Notice of Preparation. As lead agency, the City and County of San Francisco (City) is responsible for all project mitigation, including any needed improvements to State highways. The project’s fair share contribution, financing, scheduling, and implementation responsibilities as well as lead agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures and the project’s traffic mitigation fees should be specifically identified in the environmental document. Any required roadway improvements should be completed prior to issuance of project occupancy permits.

Traffic Impact Study
The environmental document should include an analysis of the impacts of the proposed project on State highway facilities in the vicinity of the project including on and off-ramps, and mainline operations on Interstates 80 and 280. Please ensure that a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) is prepared providing the information detailed below:

1. Information on the project’s traffic impacts in terms of trip generation, distribution, and assignment. The assumptions and methodologies used in compiling this information should be addressed. The study should clearly show the percentage of project trips assigned to State facilities. A comparison table of trip generation between ITE’s trip generation methodology and SF-CHAMP model is also desired.

2. Current Average Daily Traffic (ADT) and AM, Midday, PM, Saturday and Sunday peak hour volumes on all significantly affected streets, highway segments and intersections.

3. Schematic illustration and level of service (LOS) analysis for the following scenarios: 1) existing, 2) existing plus project, 3) cumulative and 4) cumulative plus project for the roadways and intersections in the project area.
4. A timeline of foreseeable development projects within the vicinity of the proposed project and traffic generation.

5. Calculation of cumulative traffic volumes should consider all traffic-generating developments, both existing and future, that would affect the State highway facilities being evaluated.

6. Transportation Demand Management strategies along with an implementation schedule to accommodate the phasing of the proposed project.

7. Proposed and planned regional and local transportation capital and operational improvements information to accommodate growth within the project area. This may include references to transportation studies/assessments and neighborhood/community plans including the Waterfront Transportation Assessment and Railyard Boulevard Feasibility Study.

8. The procedures contained in the 2010 update of the Highway Capacity Manual should be used as a guide for the analysis. We also recommend using the Department’s “Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies”; it is available on the following web site: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/developserv/operationalsystems/reports/tisguide.pdf.

9. Mitigation measures should be identified where plan implementation is expected to have a significant impact. Mitigation measures proposed should be fully discussed, including financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities, and lead agency monitoring.

We encourage the City to coordinate preparation of the study with our office, and we would appreciate the opportunity to review the scope of work.

We look forward to reviewing the TIS, including Technical Appendices, and environmental document for this project. Please send two copies to the address at the top of this letterhead, marked ATTN: Yatman Kwan, Mail Stop #10D.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please call Yatman Kwan, AICP of my staff at (510) 622-1670.

Sincerely,

ERIK ALM, AICP
District Branch Chief
Local Development - Intergovernmental Review

c: State Clearinghouse
Tania Sheyner
City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject: Notice of Preparation (NOP) for an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 Mixed Use Project, San Francisco County

Dear Ms. Tania Sheyner:

The California State Lands Commission (CSLC) staff has reviewed the subject NOP for an EIR for the Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 Mixed Use Project (Project), which is being prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department (Department). The Department, as a public agency with principal responsibility for authorizing the Project, is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.). The CSLC is a trustee agency because of its trust responsibility for projects that could directly or indirectly affect sovereign lands, their accompanying Public Trust resources or uses, and the public easement in navigable waters.

**CSLC Jurisdiction and Public Trust Lands**

The CSLC has jurisdiction and management authority over all ungranted tidelands, submerged lands, and the beds of navigable lakes and waterways. The CSLC also has certain residual and review authority for tidelands and submerged lands legislatively granted in trust to local jurisdictions (Pub. Resources Code, §§ 6301, 6306). All tidelands and submerged lands, granted or ungranted, as well as navigable lakes and waterways, are subject to the protections of the Common Law Public Trust.

As general background, the State of California acquired sovereign ownership of all tidelands and submerged lands and beds of navigable lakes and waterways upon its admission to the United States in 1850. The State holds these lands for the benefit of all people of the State for statewide Public Trust purposes, which include but are not limited to waterborne commerce, navigation, fisheries, water-related recreation, habitat preservation, and open space. On tidal waterways, the State's sovereign fee ownership extends landward to the mean high tide line, except for areas of fill or artificial accretion or where the boundary has been fixed by agreement or a court. Such boundaries may not be readily apparent from present day site inspections.
Based on the information provided, and review of in-house records and maps, the proposed Project appears to be located within lands granted to the City and County of San Francisco pursuant to Chapter 1333, Statutes of 1968 and as amended with minerals reserved to the State. Day to day administration of these lands is managed by the Port of San Francisco and authorization from the CSLC will not be required for this Project. This determination is without prejudice to any future assertion of state ownership or public rights, should circumstances change, or should additional information come to the attention of CSLC. In addition, this letter is not intended, nor should it be construed as, a waiver or limitation of any right, title, or interest of the State of California in any lands under its jurisdiction.

**Project Description**

The Project sponsor, Seawall Lot 337 Associates, LLC, proposes to develop a mixed-use multi-phase waterfront development including residential, commercial, retail, parking and open space. In addition, Pier 48 is proposed to be developed by Anchor Brewing and Distilling Company under an interim lease with the Port of San Francisco.

From the Project Description, CSLC staff understands that the Project would include the following components:

- **Flexible Zoning.** Three of the 11 parcels on Seawall Lot 337 are proposed for flexible zoning, which would allow for either commercial or residential development in order to respond to future market demands. However the total development would not exceed 3.7 million gross square feet (gsf);
- **Residential.** Between 750,000 and 1.3 million gsf of residential space would be developed, including residential units at both market rate and affordable housing;
- **Commercial.** Between 1.25 million and 1.6 million gsf of commercial, office and research facilities;
- **Retail.** Between 1.25 and 1.6 million gsf of retail, entertainment, enclosed parking and ancillary uses on the lower floors of buildings;
- **Parking.** 3,100 parking spaces; and
- **Light Industrial.** The rehabilitation and reuse of Pier 48 as a brewery would create roughly 212,500 gsf of light industrial, restaurant, retail, maritime and exhibition uses on the pier.

**Environmental Review**

CSLC staff requests that the following potential impacts be analyzed in the EIR.

**General Comments**

1. **Project Description:** A thorough and complete Project Description should be included in the EIR in order to facilitate meaningful environmental review of potential impacts, mitigation measures, and alternatives. The Project Description should be as precise as possible in describing the details of all allowable activities (e.g., methods and equipment that may be used, maximum area of impact or volume of sediment disturbed, seasonal work windows, locations for material disposal, etc.), as well as the details of the timing and length of activities. Thorough descriptions will make for a
more robust analysis of the work that may be performed, and minimize the potential for subsequent environmental analysis to be required.

**Biological Resources**

2. **Construction Noise**: The EIR should evaluate noise and vibration impacts on fish and birds, including special status species, from construction activities on the pier. Mitigation measures could include species-specific work windows as defined by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s Fisheries Service. CSLC staff recommends early consultation with these agencies to minimize the impacts of the Project on sensitive species.

**Climate Change**

3. **Greenhouse Gas (GHG)**: A GHG emissions analysis consistent with the California Global Warming Solutions Act (Assembly Bill [AB] 32) and required by the State CEQA Guidelines should be included in the EIR. This analysis should identify a threshold for significance for GHG emissions, calculate the level of GHGs that will be emitted as a result of construction and ultimate build-out of the Project, determine the significance of the impacts of those emissions, and, if impacts are significant, identify mitigation measures that would reduce them to less than significant.

4. **Sea Level Rise**: The EIR should consider the effects of sea level rise on all resource categories potentially affected by the proposed Project. At its meeting on December 17, 2009, the CSLC approved the recommendations made in a previously requested staff report, “A Report on Sea Level Rise Preparedness” (Report), which assessed the degree to which the CSLC’s grantees and lessees have considered the eventual effects of sea level rise on facilities located within the CSLC’s jurisdiction. (The Report can be found on the CSLC’s website, www.slc.ca.gov.) One of the Report’s recommendations directs CSLC staff to consider the effects of sea level rise on hydrology, soils, geology, transportation, recreation, and other resource categories in all environmental determinations associated with CSLC leases.

The NOP mentions that development on Seawall Lot 337 would be designed to prevent 100-year flood inundation under the rising tide levels projected for 2100, however no mention is made of plans to decommission or prevent inundation of development on Pier 48. Please determine whether development on Pier 48 would be designed to prevent 100-year flood inundation under rising tide levels projected for 2100. If the design does not prevent inundation, determine the lifespan of the development, its vulnerability to sea level rise, and the impacts to the environment if the development was inundated. If significant impacts are determined, develop mitigation measures that would reduce the impacts to less than significant.

**Cultural Resources**

5. **Submerged Resources**: The EIR should evaluate potential impacts to submerged cultural resources in the Project area. Many ships were historically abandoned around the shore of San Francisco Bay, often in areas that were later filled, such as
the Project site. The CSLC maintains a shipwrecks database that can assist with an analysis of impacts to historical shipwrecks. CSLC staff requests that the Department contact Senior Staff Counsel Pam Griggs (see contact information below) to obtain shipwrecks data from the database and CSLC records for the Project site. The database includes known and potential vessels located on the State's tide and submerged lands; however, the locations of many shipwrecks remain unknown. Please note that any submerged archaeological site or submerged historic resource that has remained in State waters for more than 50 years is presumed to be significant.

Additional Review

6. Deferred Mitigation: In order to avoid the improper deferral of mitigation, mitigation measures should either be presented as specific, feasible, enforceable obligations, or should be presented as formulas containing “performance standards which would mitigate the significant effect of the project and which may be accomplished in more than one specified way” (State CEQA Guidelines, §15126.4, subd. (b)).

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the NOP for the Project. As a trustee agency, we request that you consider our comments while drafting the EIR. Please send additional information on the Project to the CSLC as plans become finalized.

Please send copies of future Project-related documents, including electronic copies of the Draft EIR, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), when they become available, and refer questions concerning environmental review to Holly Wyer, Environmental Scientist, at (916) 574-2399 or via e-mail at holly.wyer@slc.ca.gov. For questions concerning archaeological or historic resources under CSLC jurisdiction, please contact Senior Staff Counsel Pam Griggs at (916) 574-1854 or via email at pamela.griggs@slc.ca.gov. If you have any questions regarding the legislative grant to the City and County of San Francisco, please contact Sheri Pemberton at (916) 574-1800 or via email at sheri.pemberton@slc.ca.gov. For all other questions, please contact Grace Kato at (916) 574-1227 or via email at grace.kato@slc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Cy R. Ogilby, Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
and Management

cc: Office of Planning and Research
    Grace Kato, LMD, CSLC
    Holly Wyer, DEPM, CSLC
    Jessica Rader, Legal, CSLC
Hello Tania,

My name is Arn Aarreberg. I am an Environmental Scientist with the California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife Marine Region. I work on environmental project review for projects that may have impacts to the marine environment in San Francisco Bay.

I see that the Port of SF has issued an NOP for the Seawall lot 337 and Pier 48 project. From the information within the NOP, there seems that there is potential for this project to have impacts to the marine environment, a state managed fishery, and state and federally listed species. I would appreciate it if you could add me to your mailing list for all future documents that are issued for this project as I will be the CDFW Marine Region contact.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. I look forward to working with the Port on this Project.

Arn Aarreberg  
Environmental Scientist  
Marine Environmental Review and Water Quality Project  
California Department of Fish and Wildlife - Marine Region  
5355 Skylane Blvd. Suite B, Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
Office: (707) 576-2889  Fax: (707) 576-7132  
Arn.Aarreberg@wildlife.ca.gov  
www.wildlife.ca.gov
Comments relative to scale, proposed layout and building heights of the project
Seawall lot 337 & pier 48 Mixed-Use project, (case # 2013.0208E) EIR

The scale of the development is in total contrast to the character of the rest of Mission Bay. The current plan build a walled enclave (Virtually all building tower are at heights well above the rest of Mission Bay, and wall in a central square), that will feed poorly into an already overly congested road system.

Voters in the early 1980s turned down a plan (by I M Pei) that had tall towers, and a lot more green space. The current plan return to something (worse) that was voted down. Putting tall buildings on the waterfront of SF, in what was originally the bay is ill advised. The design of such tall buildings is a bad idea at this location.

The whole Mission Bay Architectural Plan is founded around the concept of taller buildings next to the freeway, and shorter buildings next to the bay. The Port land is SF land, not a private ownership, and the proposed project seems disconnected to the wants of citizen. This development ignores all rules set for Mission Bay, as well as advisory rules for the waterfront. Let us not forget that while the current waterfront is where it is today, this land is all reclaimed over the bay, and as such could be considered prime land to reclaim for the bay!

The Giant stadium required a special variation to the height limitation on the water front. Now they want more variations to put a mini Manhattan with a huge monolith of a parking facility for 2300 cars, while they had pledged to support transit only usage, as well as 3 towers well in excess of the 160 ft Mission Bay allowance, (plus 2 topping at 190 ft, right at water edge), all this South of the China Basin channel.

Furthermore the parking as presented creates a wall, separating the rest of the development from the rest of Mission Bay, and channeling cars into what will create monstrous traffic jams, as few roads allow car exit, except into already highly congested bottlenecks, or into dead ends. If you are going to put more parking, spread it around the whole area, and break this monstrous structure, and open up the roadway.

Please reject the plan unless it limits heights to those of the rest of Mission bay, i.e. approximately 8 stories to a max of 16, with parking under most of the buildings, and with enhanced street side access for local businesses, and amenities for residents.

Please note that my objection is not just building height, but creating a consistent city environment with a living street for resident, not a deserted suburban mall, open to the adjacent areas. The new design is not providing it, as it seeks too much freedom to build commercial space, vs residential space!

So I will register my strong objection to the current design and ask that it be replaced by one that is integrated with the rest of Mission Bay. Otherwise it is an enclave, and yet it will impact dramatically the rest of Mission bay, from traffic flow, to blocked views, to unnecessary parking.

Ralph Anavy
Comments relative to traffic flow and traffic congestion caused by the current project
Seawall lot 337 & pier 48 Mixed-Use project, (case # 2013.0208E)  EIR

The issue of traffic flow and parking are extremely poorly conceived.
First the Parking structure.  This is meant to serve the Giants, but they pledged no commuter parking, and a transit first policy when they got approval to the stadium.  As a parking for the buildings of the project, it is also ill conceived, as impractical for residents, by being too remote.  Same applies to Parking for Tower G (a bad idea in itself).  It is out of scale with the commercial needs proposed, given public transit nearby.
If the developer wants to incorporate some parking structures into the design, height, location and size of such structures are critical.
They should not provide a wall to the neighborhood, as the current plan offers.  This huge facility should be broken up into 2, or better yet 3 separate facilities, with manageable traffic flow in and out spread across the area, and not jammed at one end.  Better yet, consider incorporating all parking into the building structures, under the green spaces, and even under the roadways!
They should be scaled down to serve the local needs of the (down sized) project, not as a parking facility for the stadium nearby.

The plan should be integrate with the rest of Mission bay, not separate itself from it.  Critical choke points for traffic have already been document by the SF waterfront traffic studies.
Bottlenecks on 3rd and 4th as well as on Mariposa Street and 16th Streets are already well documented. They are already considered critical.  A new UCSF hospital complex will add to the current burden.
And yet, the proposed project creates an enclave, with limited through traffic, roads that dead end either internally or into blocked intersections (like for Bosque and exposition streets, on 3rd Street which has a blocked center lane). Add a huge additional commuter parking lot (2300 cars!..why more commuter parking here, when the T line and the train station are near by), and no solution to what is essentially a traffic nightmare, an "island' feeding all traffic into the existing overtaxed road system.
The only streets within the area feeding in and out are Terry Francois, and Third street.  Bosque dead ends on 3rd. Vans dead ends. Vara dead ends. Exposition butts on third, and Mission Rock as well.
It is all wrong from a traffic stand point.  Current proposed density is not considering this, unless a new escape route (another bridge from Terry Francois to the Embarcadero ) alleviates it, and this is unlikely, and even undesirable.  There are no other avenues to the traffic congestion than reducing the scope of the project.

So I recommend **down-scaling the development, and designing a better roadway and distributed parking approach**, which roads that allow the added traffic burden to be absorbed in the already over-taxed road system in place, or the addition of a new road system (bridge or tunnel) from Terry Francois across the waterway channel North.

Ralph Anavy
420 Mission Bay Blvd N.
# 1503
San Francisco, CA 94158
Comments relative to Residential/Commercial Mix and the Open Space for the current project
Seawall lot 337 & pier 48 Mixed-Use project, (case # 2013.0208E) EIR

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94104

January 30, 2014

emailed to Tania Sheyner
By mail to Sarah B. Jones

The scale of the lot 337 development is in total conflict to the character of the rest of Mission Bay, which is uncalled for, especially on public Port land belonging to SF.

Look at the plans (Buildings H, I J) on the water side, on the south east side...a row of over-sized buildings fronting the bay, that could be anything, Commercial, Residential or mixed, whatever they want. Too tall, too much freedom, to design a traffic and density coherent project. This ought to be fixed in the design of the project before authorization. Too much latitude to "to stick it to us later".

Worse yet, a wall of 160 and 190 feet buildings on the waterfront is unconscionable! (include Building K as well). All waterfront buildings should top under 90 feet, with set backs.

The current plans create shading virtually all the way to the water. There is no continuation of a green belt all around the water front. And no road way exit around the North end, to facilitate traffic flow.

If you want to preserve a park and promenade at the North end, bury a road underneath, which will provide some additional traffic flow in and out!

It is a bad idea to design a wall of tall buildings on the periphery of the bay, especially since the issue of traffic and parking are so poorly conceived, and SF voters have already indicated their opposition to a walled waterfront.

The Mission bay concept of "Taller near the freeway shorter near the water" and keeping some open vistas towards the water for all should not be suddenly waved. There should be no skyscrapers South of the China Basin Channel. Also, buildings A, F G and K will cast shadows on the current water front promenade and China Basin park as they sit due South of it!

Also, why is G a proposed commercial tower building? This has some of the best views of the bay, and should be zoned residential, and brought to the scale of the rest of Mission Bay. Try to stay within the primary use concept of MB: 100% residential, under 100 ft tall, to the North of Mission bay Blvd, to the China Basin channel, except for limited approved use (parking, hotel, safety building, school) or height variation (under 160ft).

Noted before, the project is out of sink with the rest of MB. Design should integrate with the rest not separate itself from. Mission Rock Square is the perfect demonstration of this enclave mentality. It is blocked on all sides by tall buildings, it has no through road access, as most streets there will dead end.

I suggest removing it from this location, putting a moderate height parking structure (or building) in its place, and replacing the "lost" green space by spreading it in a more significant open space pathway along the waterfront promenade to the east of Buildings H I J K, in order to continue a meaningful greenbelt all the way around the pier 48/pier 50 water frontage, and along Terry Francois. Keep it unbroken, all the way to pier 70. (look at Mission Creek park, and continue it around Lot 337).
Splitting the proposed Parking structure D, into 2 becomes now possible (it is already desirable). Part of D could now also be an open space, serving the new SF Safety building on Mission Rock, and it is not sitting in shadows. Put the other parking where the Mission Rock square is, or put parking under the proposed streets, and China Basin park!

Building height: The rest of MB is at a max of ~80-160 ft or 8-16th stories. Conform to the rest and to the SF waterfront plan (no exception), which thus help reduce the shadows on all the open spaces. Shadows, as currently designed impact all parks, and most significantly Mission Rock Square which is walled in.

From a Mission bay building height design viewpoint, many buildings, and buildings A and F in particular, don't belong. They also don't belong on the water front at 320-380 feet in height (G and K are also too tall for water front buildings).

I recommend a significant downsizing to the whole project, freeing all open space from shadows, and maintaining a green belt around the waterfront. From an EIR standpoint, the current plans are untenable.

Ralph Anavy
420 Mission Bay Blvd. N.
#1503
SF CA 94158
415 647-8093
Dear San Francisco Planning Department:

I am writing regarding the environmental impact for Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 Mixed-Use project.

In evaluation of the plan, please consider the following items:

- With the closure of Terry Francois at Third, the proposed traffic flow will be onto streets currently designated as low traffic areas. The day-to-day traffic will put a tremendous burden on Terry Francois and Mission Rock Street. The loss of access to Third Street with the reconfigured Terry Francois will further add burden to these streets as they now need to accommodate the added traffic to Pier 48 and the existing traffic to Pier 50 as well.

  Additionally, this could increase the traffic through the easement between Mission Bay Blvd North and China Basin Street.

  It should be noted also that emergency vehicles leaving the Public Safety Building will exit onto Mission Rock, further adding to the traffic demand on Mission Rock. With potential increase congestion in the area as there will be only one route out of the area, delay of emergency vehicles should be evaluated.

- The proposed design is still too vague as to the type use intended for the buildings. The impact on local resources could differ significantly. The issues surrounding parking and traffic flow do not appear to have been thought through.

- There is limited public transportation currently to support the growing area and with an influx that could double the neighborhoods population this should be evaluated as well. Furthermore, the new plan reduces available street parking significantly.

- Although this is Port land for development why would the City of San Francisco exempt them from the height restrictions required elsewhere.

Thank you,
Stephani Berger
slb36333@yahoo.com
Tania,

Thank you for this opportunity,

Comments and photo attached.

Bill Brase
Hello Tania,

Please find attached my comments on the above-listed project. I have also forwarded, by mail, a copy of this to Sarah Jones. Thank you for your efforts on this.

Regards,

Jackson Fahnestock
fahnestk@sbcglobal.net
January 14, 2014
Dear Planning Board.

I love San Francisco: I am business founder that has benefitted from the San Francisco ecosystem, a condo owner in Mission Bay, my son and family live here, and own a business as well. I know of and read the recent NYTimes article on the housing crunch in San Francisco's precious 7 square miles. I am not a NIMBY and appreciate development as an engine of growth. I also understand the trade offs between taller buildings leaving more green space and vice versa.

However....I have to voice my concerns. The current plan I have seen is very preliminary, and I would think it is easier to impact now, rather then a year from now when more finalized versions are issued.

First concern...what about traffic patterns, congestion and parking? The plans I see do not appear to have been well thought out, but rather the plan is a wish list for developers wanting to sell units. In fact their plans DO not seem to address crucial transportation issues at all.
Second concern is one of preserving the very unique views of the Bridges and East Bay...the original concept of the Mission Bay neighborhood....for all to enjoy. Aren't there enough very high skyscrapers already on the other side of the Channel that can satisfy those who need and want to pay for an unobstructed luxury view and live that very different lifestyle? Design that creates a walled enclave divides not unites the Mission Bay/China Bay neighborhood. Keep skyscrapers on the other side of the China Basin Channel, or near the freeways and adhere to the longstanding SF waterfront goals, as well as the Mission Bay plan that required gradually lower heights towards the water.

We have the opportunity to make this growing area something special not just another congested metropolitan. Lets keep that in mind as we refine these plans and find the perfect compromise.

Diana Frazier
Good morning Miss Sheyner,
I’m in receipt of an email notice that this Document is ready.
It was suggested we contact you directly. I’m doing several studies in various areas of the City, including the Citizens Advisory Board for the Central Market Street and the Tenderloin Areas, with the Board of Supervisors and the Mayors Office. Miss. Sheyner both hard copy and CD’s for this Project can be sent to the above address. If convenient I can pick them up at 1650 Mission on the 4th floor. At present we do not have the ability to down load this document. Please let me know which is most convenient. We would like to be on the distribution list for this Project.
My Email is: dennisj.gov88@yahoo.com

Regards,
Dennis Hong
To Tania Sheyner, EIR coordinator

I am writing to express two of my concerns on the proposed project.

(1) Traffic. The proposed reconfiguration of Terry A Francoise Boulevard by the elimination of the connection to Third Street will increase the traffic flow into the neighborhood streets. The added truck traffic to Pier 48, plus the existing traffic to Pier 50 will no longer be able to exit from Terry Francois westward directly to Third Street. Adding to this truck traffic will be the day-to-day traffic from the commercial/retail/residential buildings from the proposed parking structure (parcel D). This traffic will utilize Mission Rock Street and potentially other neighborhood streets and I have the following concerns:

a. Since the entrance to the Fire Equipment at the Public Safety Building (PSB) is from Mission Rock Street, this added truck traffic will negatively impact the flow of emergency fire equipment out of the Public Safety Building. The impact will be exacerbated on event days at the AT&T Ballpark with the additional traffic from event parking.

b. Control for traffic going south bound on Vara Street heading towards Bridgeway Way (to which Vara Street is aligned) must be designed so that it diverts traffic away from entering Bridgeway Way. If southbound traffic from Vara Street is allowed to continue on Bridgeview Way past Mission Rock Street, it will need to make a westerly or easterly direction turn as it approaches China Basin Street. It cannot continue southbound and allowed to enter into the private easement area between the Madrone Residences and the Radiance Residences, as this area serves as the entrances to the parking garages for these two communities. Furthermore, since the entrance to the garage in the PSB is on China Basin Street, any added westbound traffic originating from the parking structure D will create congestion around this entrance used by police vehicles in and out of the PSB.

The design proposal must clear state specific traffic control designs to minimize this impact to an acceptable level.

(2) Height of the buildings. The height of all the structures are tall and are generally not in keeping with the rest of Mission Bay. In addition, structures in parcels J, I, H are higher than K, A, and B, giving the project area the feel of having a “wall” right by the waters edge. The height of these 3 structures (J,I,H) creates huge shadow along the water front on Terry Francois, adds population density to the project area, and increases traffic to an area with limited solutions to traffic control.

The design proposal must consider the maximum height of the various structures to be in keeping with the overall look of the other buildings in the Mission Bay Area.

Respectfully submitted,

Alfred Kwok

435 China Basin Street #633
San Francisco, CA 94158
Hello Mrs Sheyner,

I am writing to express my deep concern with the proposed plan for Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 development. First of all let me say that I think it's great that the project is under review and a mixed use development seems like the right approach. My concern is more on the heights of the proposed buildings, in particular residential areas labeled F and A.

After having rented at the Infinity at 301 Main St, I chose to purchase a condo at the Madrone because of the comparative neighborhood feel of Mission Bay. One of the big differences between Mission Bay and SOMA is the height restriction of the buildings. I am very concerned that the proposal would have buildings go much higher than the 16 stories of the Madrone (which is the maximum height for all of Mission Bay.) I feel this would very negatively impact both the neighborhood feel of the area as well as the value of my particular unit. My unit is North facing and the view is its greatest feature, having a tall tower blocking the view will result in a drop in the value of my property.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration as the project goes into review.

Mathilde Pignol  
Owner at the Madrone  
480 Mission Bay Blvd North Unit 1605  
San Francisco CA 94158  
650-380-6619
Dear Ms. Sheyner,

I write as a resident of Mission Bay with my concerns about the proposed development plans for seawall lot 337 and pier 48. I am quite alarmed at the potential implications on health and quality of life, including air quality and traffic congestion, from such a massive development and the loss of public space along the Bay. Some of my main concerns are as follows:

First, the plans falsely claim to add substantial green space and access to the Bay while, in fact, the amount of green space is minimal (and exaggerated in the illustrations by visual illusions from the perspectives used). The dense buildings, and resulting shade and chill from blocking out the sunshine, will create a major physical and psychological barrier to public access to the bay shore on the north and east. At the very least the size of the green space in the plans along McCovey Cove to the north should be doubled or more. This should continue along piers 48 and 50. These are public lands and should be reserved for public use and recreation. Most optimal is to revert to the plan to make the entire Seawall 337 area into green space park for use of the public. I hope that will be considered as a superior alternative.

Second, if development does go forward in the Seawall 337 lot (versus a public park as suggested above) the proposed building heights are grossly out of proportion to everything else in Mission Bay and do not follow the usual pattern of lower building heights as they approach the Bay. It is my understanding that Mission Bay has a height restriction. The tallest buildings should be no taller than the other buildings in Mission Bay and should be required to further reduce in height as they approach the bay on the north and east, so as to be no taller than the existing buildings on the piers. As noted above, the proposed building heights will block the sun and make bay access along the north and east terribly inhospitable. A wall of tall buildings adjacent to the bay does not serve the interests of the public in any conceivable way.

Third, the proposed development adds tremendous congestion to an already overtaxed transportation infrastructure. Even without the Seawall project, the forthcoming UCSF hospitals and research campus will overwhelm the streets of the Mission Bay area and access to the 280 freeway and access to the Bay Bridge through south beach. Third, Fourth and Terry Francios will become gridlocked parking lots, spewing pollutants into the air and into the runoff to the bay. Even now, with only a small fraction of Mission Bay development completed, this is already the case with third street during the morning and afternoon commute times. Adding the dense proposed Seawall Lot 337 development on top of this will make congestion unbearable.

In sum. The proposed seawall lot 337 development appears to be a huge giveaway of public lands to private developers with minimal potential public benefits and great public costs. The best use of Seawall lot 337 to promote the health and quality of life of San Franciscans and our local environmental sustainability is to make it entirely into a green public park and recreation area, to preserve this public access to the Bay. However, if development is inevitable it should, at a minimum, double or more the proposed green space along the north and east, and building heights should be no taller than the rest of Mission Bay and slope (grow shorter) as they approach the bay. Finally, both transportation infrastructure needs to be drastically improved and the size of the development needs to be drastically shrunk to prevent the terrible congestion that will inevitably occur with any additional development in this area.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Thomas Robinson
San Francisco Resident
Tom.tomr@gmail.com
From: Esther Stearns <estherstearns@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 8:27 PM
To: Sheyner, Tania
Subject: Comments on Seawall 337 Proposal Case No 2013.0208E

Thank you for your work on the EIR for Giants Parking Lot A. As a resident of the Madrone, I am sorry I missed the meeting. I have reviewed the plan and hope to attend future meetings. It is my understanding that I should simply email you my comments. If there is some other process I should use, please let me know.

I own a Madrone unit where I live with partner and our three young teen agers.

My comments

1) Building height, of course, is an important but not the only issue. As proposed the buildings seem quite oversized for the area. The two 30+ story towers seem way out of proportion particularly.

2) I see the proposed pedestrian path over the Lefty O'Doul Bridge but I do not think that will mitigate safety and volume issues. That bridge is closed in one direction for all home games. How will that work for all the office workers? Have you considered a separate bike pedestrian “fly over” bridge linking the new park with the rear of AT&T park

3) Mix of commercial seems much higher than I expected or than is good for neighborhood. I think that commercial should not be more than 25% of the space

4) I thought that there was going to be an innovative transit center. That is what we heard at SFMTA meeting. Looks like just parking to me. Where is the new thinking?

5) I do not understand the inclusion of lot P20. Do the Giants own it?

6) This would be a great project to pioneer a new plan for homeless in the parks. As a parent I can say that mentally ill and drug addicted homeless in city parks render them all but useless. Can a more compassionate outreach meet their needs better?

7) What is the plan for affordable housing and schools?

8) Mission Rock should be bigger than 1.3 acres

9) Priority should be give in the timeline to developing open spaces earlier

10) What is the plan for resident parking which is already a conflict with the park? Having dinner guests is impossible due to limitations

11) What are the rules regarding noise. With more residents there will be more noise conflict.

12) In my humble opinion, the theme of the entire retail development should be a tribute to science and spirit. I have a whole idea. Glad to discuss
Thank you again. I look forward to future meetings. Is there anything more I should do to submit these ideas

--
Best Wishes, Esther Stearns
420 Mission Bay Blvd North
Unit 1601
San Francisco, CA 94158
Hello

I live in the Madrone building in Mission Bay.  I have a few concerns and comments:

I think the building heights are too tall.  A building height of 8 stories would be acceptable

I am very concerned about the bottleneck at 3rd street and mission creek.  Will there be a fly over bridge for bikes and pedestrians?  How will the traffic flow be streamlined?

I also worry about cars needing to go south.  I think too many cars will cut thru the driveway for Madrone and Strata.

Lastly where is the plan for a transit center.  I believe Mission Bay is a transit first community.

Thank you for the opportunity to add my comments to the public dialogue.

Jan

Sent from my iPhone
Tania,

I have attached my comments regarding the scope of the Seawall Lot 337 EIR.

Neal Ushman