

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a summary of the Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 Mixed-Use Project (Mission Rock Project or proposed project), outlines the purpose of this Environmental Impact Report (EIR), summarizes the environmental review process, and describes the organization of the EIR.

A. PROJECT SUMMARY

The project sponsor (Seawall Lot 337 Associates, LLC) for the Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 Mixed-Use Project (Mission Rock Project or proposed project) proposes a mixed-use, multi-phase development at 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 8.0 acres of open space on the project site.¹In addition, approximately 1.1 million gross square feet (gsf) of parking would be provided in two public parking garages, one above grade and one underground. The proposed project would also include public access areas, assembly areas, and an internal grid of public streets, shared streets, and utilities infrastructure. Overall, the proposed project would involve construction of up to 2.7 to 2.8 million gsf of residential, commercial, production, active/retail, and parking uses on 11 proposed development blocks on Seawall Lot 337 plus rehabilitation of approximately 261,000 gsf of Pier 48. The Port of San Francisco (Port) owns the entire project site.

On Seawall Lot 337, the project sponsor proposes a mix of residential, commercial, active/retail, production, and parking uses. The 11 proposed development blocks would be divided into "zones" that would define permitted uses on the lower floors as active/retail,² production, commercial, or residential. Above the lower-floor space, the project sponsor proposes primarily residential uses on four blocks, primarily commercial uses on four blocks, a parking structure on one block³, and flexible zoning controls that would allow for development of either commercial or residential as the predominant use on the three other blocks. The 11 blocks on Seawall Lot 337 would be developed to include the following mix of uses: approximately 1.1 to 1.6 million gsf of residential uses (estimated at 1,000 to 1,600 units), consisting of both market-

¹ Acreages and square footages used herein are approximate.

² For purposes of this document, *commercial* uses include office, research and development (R&D)/biotech, labs, institutional, medical, and other similar nonretail uses. *Active/retail* uses are included under their own use category and include shops, restaurants, entertainment venue uses, and any other uses that by their nature do not require non-transparent walls facing a public street or involve the storage of goods or vehicles. Production uses are those uses that support the production or fabrication of goods, such as handicrafts, art, consumable goods, clothing, or furniture. These definitions are different from those found in the San Francisco Planning Code.

³ The garage would be included within a residential use block.

rate and affordable housing; approximately 972,000 to 1.4 million gsf of commercial uses; approximately 241,000 to 244,800 gsf of active/retail and production uses on the lower floors of the blocks; and enclosed parking. As noted above, total development on Seawall Lot 337 would not exceed 2.7 to 2.8 million gsf, not including the parking garages.

In total, the proposed project would provide approximately 3,100 parking spaces, 2,300 spaces within the above-grade parking structure, 700 spaces in an underground parking garage below Mission Rock Square, and up to 100 spaces below grade, at grade, or above grade within the proposed buildings (up to 10 spaces per block). The 11 blocks on Seawall Lot 337 could be developed with building heights ranging from 90 feet (approximately seven stories) to a maximum of 240 feet (approximately 23 stories) for the tallest building, excluding the mechanical and other accessory penthouse roof enclosures, which could extend up to 20 feet (40 feet on Block F) above the roofline.

Pier 48 is proposed to be rehabilitated and reused as an industrial use, specifically analyzed as a proposed brewery, under an interim lease with the Port. The rehabilitation and reuse of Pier 48 would include approximately 242,500 gsf⁴ of industrial, restaurant, active/retail, tour, and exhibition uses as well as meeting space within the existing structures and valley. Public access would be provided on the rehabilitated aprons, with the potential for expanded maritime uses for recreational/boat launch and other Port maritime tenants. Prior to being developed, Pier 48 would continue to be used on an interim basis for storage, exhibit, and event parking uses. Existing maritime uses on the aprons could also continue prior to rehabilitation of Pier 48.

B. PURPOSE OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This Draft EIR for the project has been prepared by the project's lead agency, the City and County of San Francisco (City), in conformance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) statute and CEQA Guidelines. The lead agency is the public agency with principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project.

This Draft EIR assesses potentially significant impacts that could result from the proposed project. As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15382, a "significant effect on the environment" is:

. . . a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.

⁴ The increase in square footage compared to existing conditions (261,000 gsf) is due to construction of a mezzanine in Shed A.

As stated in the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR is an “informational document.” It is intended to inform public agency decision-makers and the public of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to a project. Similarly, the purpose of this Draft EIR is to provide the City, responsible and trustee agencies, other public agencies, and the public with detailed information about the environmental effects that could result from implementing the proposed project; examine and set forth feasible methods of mitigating any adverse environmental impacts should the proposed project be approved; and consider feasible alternatives to the project. The City will use the EIR, along with other information in the public record, to determine whether to approve, modify, or deny the proposed project and specify any applicable environmental conditions or mitigation measures as part of the project approvals.

C. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The San Francisco Planning Department, serving as lead agency responsible for administering the environmental review for the proposed project, determined that preparation of an EIR was required.

CEQA requires that, before a decision can be made to approve a project that could result in adverse physical effects, an EIR must be prepared that fully describes the environmental effects of the project. The EIR is a public information document for use by governmental agencies and the public that identifies and evaluates the potential environmental impacts of a project, recommends mitigation measures to lessen or eliminate significant adverse impacts, and examines feasible alternatives to a project. The information contained in the EIR must be reviewed and considered by the Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors, and other approving bodies prior to a decision to approve, disapprove, or modify a project.

CEQA requires that agencies shall neither approve nor implement a project unless the project’s significant environmental effects have been reduced to a less-than-significant level, essentially “eliminating, avoiding, or substantially lessening” the potentially significant impacts, except when certain findings are made. If an agency approves a project that will result in the occurrence of significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant levels, the agency must state the reasons for its action in writing, demonstrate that its action is based on the EIR or other information in the record, and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

NOTICE OF PREPARATION

An environmental evaluation (EE) application was submitted to the Planning Department on May 31, 2013. The filing of the EE application initiated the environmental review process. The City released a notice of preparation (NOP) (included as Appendix 1 of this document) to notify the public that it intended to prepare an EIR for the proposed project on December 11, 2013. In

addition to providing a project description, a map with the project location, and a summary of potential environmental issues related to project implementation, the NOP provided information about the public scoping meeting, which was held on January 13, 2014, in the Bayside Room at the Port of San Francisco, Pier 1, The Embarcadero. The purpose of this meeting and publication of the NOP was to solicit comments regarding the scope of the EIR.

The NOP requested agencies and other interested parties to comment on environmental issues that should be addressed in the EIR. The comment letters received in response to the NOP are available for review as part of Case File No. 2013.0208E at the Planning Department offices at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco. In general, comments on the NOP and comments received at the public scoping meeting requested that the EIR analyze the following issues, which are addressed in the EIR sections identified in parentheses:

- Consistency of the proposed project with Mission Bay Plan, the San Francisco Waterfront Plan, and the Mission Bay development guidelines (Chapter 3, *Plans and Policies*, and Section 4.A, *Land Use and Land Use Planning*).
- Potential impacts along specific viewpoints, the waterfront, and surrounding areas. The scale of the proposed project, height of the project, and the future use of Parcel P20 (Section 4.B, *Aesthetics*).
- Provision of affordable housing and population density (Section 4.C, *Population and Housing*).
- Potential impacts on submerged cultural resources in the project area (Section 4.D, *Cultural Resources*).
- Increases in traffic and traffic congestion, connections to the city's transportation network, lack of public transportation in the area, pedestrian safety, traffic during game days, fair-share contributions, and potential impacts of increased traffic on emergency vehicle delay (Section 4.E, *Transportation and Circulation*).
- Potential noise impacts from additional residents (Section 4.F, *Noise*).
- Potential greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts, adequate mitigation measures, and inclusion of a GHG emissions analysis consistent with Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act (Section 4.H, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*).
- Potential shadow impacts along the waterfront, China Basin Park, and Mission Rock Square (Section 4.I, *Wind and Shadow*).
- Potential impacts on loss of green space, and preservation of public lands for public and recreational use (Sections 4.E, *Transportation and Circulation* and 4.J, *Public Services and Recreation*).
- Adequacy of water and sewer systems with the addition of the proposed project, including a Water Supply Assessment (Section 4.K, *Utilities and Service Systems*).

- Potential impacts on the marine environment, as well as state- and federally listed species, and pile-driving impacts on fish, birds, and mammals (Section 4.L, *Biological Resources*).

DRAFT EIR IMPACT ANALYSIS

This Draft EIR analyzes significant effects that could result from the proposed project. As explained in Section 15002(g) of the CEQA Guidelines, a significant effect on the environment is defined as a substantial adverse change in the physical conditions that exist in the area affected by a project. Pre-project environmental conditions (the environmental baseline) are considered in determining impact significance. The impact significance thresholds for each environmental resource area presented in this Draft EIR are based on guidance from the San Francisco Planning Department's Environmental Planning Division and generally based on CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Environmental Checklist Form. In addition, this Draft EIR uses City-adopted significance criteria for traffic, energy, and wind and shadow impacts. Where significant impacts are identified, the Draft EIR recommends feasible mitigation measures to reduce, eliminate, or avoid the significant impacts and identifies which significant impacts are unavoidable. Cumulative impacts (i.e., two or more individual effects that, when considered together, compound or increase other related environmental impacts) are discussed for each environmental resource area. This document also discusses variants and alternatives to the proposed project in Chapter 6, *Variants*, and Chapter 7, *Alternatives*.

In accordance with Section 15143 of the CEQA Guidelines, this Draft EIR provides an analysis of the significant effects on the environment that could result from construction and operation of the proposed project. Section 15131 of the CEQA Guidelines specifies that “the intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes.” Therefore, this Draft EIR does not treat the economic or social effects of the proposed project as significant effects on the environment, unless they result in physical changes to the environment. In addition, if it is determined that a potential impact is too speculative for evaluation, this condition is noted, and further discussion of the impact is not necessary.

D. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

PUBLIC REVIEW OF DRAFT EIR

The CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code encourage public participation in the planning and environmental review processes. The City will provide opportunities for the public to present comments and concerns regarding the CEQA and planning processes. These opportunities will occur during the Draft EIR public review and comment period and the public hearings before the San Francisco Planning Commission.

The Draft EIR and notice of availability (NOA) are posted electronically on the City's website (<http://sf-planning.org/environmental-impact-reports-negative-declarations>), and hard copies are available for public review by request at the Planning Information Center, 1650 Mission Street, San Francisco. Written public comments may be submitted to the Planning Department during the specified public review and comment period (indicated on the cover of this EIR), and oral comments may be presented at the Draft EIR public hearing before the Planning Commission.

Written comments should be submitted to Tania Sheyner, Senior Environmental Planner, San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103. Comments may also be submitted by email to tania.sheyner@sfgov.org. Comments must be received by 5:00 p.m. on June 12, 2017.

Commenters are not required to provide personal identifying information. All written and 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.

Only commenters on the Draft EIR will be permitted to file an appeal regarding certification of the Final EIR to the Board of Supervisors.

FINAL EIR AND PROJECT APPROVAL

Following the close of the public review period, the City will prepare responses to all substantive comments that relate to potential physical changes to the environment. The Draft EIR, along with the responses to written and oral substantive comments received during the review period, will make up the Final EIR and will be considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in making the decision whether to certify the Final EIR and approve or deny the project.

If the Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors, or other City entity approves the project as described in the Final EIR, it would be required to adopt CEQA findings and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) to ensure proper implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15097, the MMRP is designed to ensure implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and adopted by decision-makers to mitigate or avoid the proposed project's significant environmental effects. CEQA also requires the adoption of findings prior to approval of a project for which a certified EIR identifies significant environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15092). Because this EIR identifies significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant levels, the findings must include a Statement of Overriding Considerations for those impacts (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093[b]) in order for the proposed project to be approved. The project sponsor would be required to implement the MMRP as a condition of project approval.

E. INTENDED USES OF THIS EIR

As described by CEQA and in the CEQA Guidelines, public agencies are charged with the duty to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects, where feasible. In undertaking this duty, a public agency has an obligation to balance a project's significant effects on the environment with its benefits, including economic, social, technological, legal, and other non-environmental characteristics.

This EIR is an informational document that evaluates the proposed project and the potential for significant impacts on the environment, examines methods of reducing adverse environmental impacts, identifies any significant and unavoidable adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated, and identifies reasonable and feasible alternatives to the project that would eliminate any significant adverse environmental effects or reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. The lead agency is required to consider the information in the EIR, along with any other relevant information, in making its decisions on the proposed project. This analysis, in and of itself, does not determine whether a project will be approved but aids the planning and decision-making process by disclosing the potential for significant and adverse impacts.

In conformance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR provides objective information that addresses the environmental consequences of the proposed project and identifies possible means of reducing or avoiding significant impacts, through either mitigation measures or feasible project alternatives. The City must certify the Final EIR prior to acting on the project approval application for the proposed project. Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15161, this is a project-level EIR. This most common type of EIR examines the environmental impacts of a project and focuses primarily on changes in the environment that would result from project development. This type of EIR examines all phases of a project, including planning, construction, and operation.

The CEQA Guidelines help define the role and standards of this EIR, as follows:

- **Informational Document.** An EIR is an informational document that informs public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect(s) of a project, identifies possible ways to minimize significant effects, and describes reasonable alternatives to the project. The public agency shall consider the information in the EIR along with other information that may be presented to the agency (CEQA Guidelines Section 15121(a)).
- **Degree of Specificity.** The degree of specificity required in an EIR will correspond to the degree of specificity involved in the underlying activity, which is described in the EIR. An EIR on a development project will necessarily be more detailed in its discussion of specific effects of the project than an EIR on the adoption of a local general plan or comprehensive zoning ordinance because the effects of the construction can be predicted with greater accuracy (CEQA Guidelines Section 15146(a)).

- **Standards for Adequacy of an EIR.** An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information that enables them to make a decision that intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good-faith effort at full disclosure (CEQA Guidelines Section 15151).

Section 15382 of the CEQA Guidelines defines a significant effect on the environment as “a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project...” Therefore, in identifying the significant impacts of the proposed project, this EIR focuses on the substantial physical effects and mitigation measures to avoid, reduce, or otherwise alleviate those effects.

F. REPORT ORGANIZATION

This Draft EIR is organized into the following sections:

- *Executive Summary:* This chapter summarizes the EIR by providing a concise overview of the proposed project, including associated approvals, environmental impacts that would result from the project, mitigation measures identified to reduce or eliminate these impacts, and project alternatives.
- *Chapter 1—Introduction:* This chapter includes a discussion of the environmental review process, a summary of the comments received on the scope of the EIR, and the organization of the EIR.
- *Chapter 2—Project Description:* This chapter discusses the background and objectives of the proposed project, provides background data on the project location, describes the operational and physical characteristics of the project, and identifies project approvals.
- *Chapter 3—Plans and Policies:* This chapter provides a summary of the plans, policies, and regulations of the City and County of San Francisco that are applicable to the proposed project.
- *Chapter 4—Environmental Setting and Impacts:* This chapter describes the existing setting, environmental project-level impacts, cumulative impacts, and mitigation measures and improvement measures (if applicable). Each environmental topic is discussed in a separate section within this chapter, as follows:

4.A	Land Use and Land Use Planning	4.I	Wind and Shadow
4.B	Aesthetics	4.J	Public Services and Recreation
4.C	Population and Housing	4.K	Utilities and Service Systems
4.D	Cultural Resources	4.L	Biological Resources
4.E	Transportation and Circulation	4.M	Geology and Soils
4.F	Noise	4.N	Hydrology and Water Quality
4.G	Air Quality	4.O	Hazards and Hazardous Materials
4.H	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		

- *Chapter 5—Other CEQA Considerations:* This chapter provides additional, specifically required analyses of the proposed project’s effects, growth-inducing impacts, significant unavoidable impacts, areas of known controversy, and issues to be resolved.
- *Chapter 6 – Variants:* Describes and analyzes the four variants to the proposed project, including the District Energy/Bay-Source Heating and Cooling Variant, Entertainment Venue Variant, Reconfigured Parking Variant, and Hotel Use Variant.
- *Chapter 7—Alternatives:* Evaluates two alternatives to the proposed project, in addition to the No-Project Alternative, and explains why various other alternatives that were considered were not carried forward for detailed evaluation. The alternatives evaluated in this section include the No-Project Alternative, the Reduced Intensity Alternative, and the No Change to Pier 48 Alternative.
- *Chapter 8—Report Preparers:* This chapter lists the authors who contributed to the EIR, including the City staff, EIR authors, and EIR consultants.
- *Appendices:* The following appendices are included as part of this document:
 - Appendix 1: Notice of Preparation and Comments Received
 - Appendix 2: Draft Design Controls
 - Appendix 3-1: Historic Resources Evaluation
 - Appendix 3-2: Historic Resources Evaluation Response
 - Appendix 3-3: Geoarcheological Assessment
 - Appendix 3-4: Preliminary Archeological Review
 - Appendix 4-1: Transportation Impact Analysis and Technical Appendices
 - Appendix 4-2: Transit Line Capacity Calculations
 - Appendix 4-3: Trip Generation Rates for Each Land Use
 - Appendix 4-4: Travel Demand Memo

- Appendix 4-5: Draft Transportation Demand Management Plan
- Appendix 5: Noise Technical Memorandum
- Appendix 6-1: CO Screening Memorandum
- Appendix 6-2: Air Quality Technical Report and Technical Appendices
- Appendix 7-1: Wind Study
- Appendix 7-2: Shadow Study
- Appendix 8-1: Water Supply Assessment
- Appendix 8-2: Draft Mission Rock Infrastructure Plan
- Appendix 9: Biological Resources
- Appendix 10: Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Appendix 11: Variants Technical Data
- Appendix 12: Alternatives Technical Data