

1. INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1, Introduction, presents a summary of the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District 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 Pier 70 area (Pier 70) encompasses approximately 69 acres of historic shipyard property along San Francisco's Central Waterfront. Most of Pier 70 is listed on the National Register of Historic Places as the Union Iron Works Historic District (UIW Historic District or Historic District). Pier 70 is owned by the City and County of San Francisco through the Port of San Francisco (Port). The Port intends to rehabilitate and redevelop Pier 70, and has selected Forest City Development California, Inc. (Forest City) to act as master developer for 28 acres of the Pier 70 site, and initiate rezoning and development of design standards and controls for a multi-phased, mixed-use development on that site and two adjacent parcels. Together, the Port and Forest City are the project sponsors for the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project (Proposed Project).

The project site is an approximately 35-acre area bounded by Illinois Street to the west, 20th Street to the north, San Francisco Bay to the east, and 22nd Street to the south. The site is divided into two development areas, the 28-Acre Site and the Illinois Parcels (the 20th/Illinois Parcel and the Hoedown Yard), which contain approximately 351,800 gross square feet (gsf) of deteriorating buildings and facilities. The majority of the project site is located within the UIW Historic District. The 28-Acre Site includes 12 of the 44 contributing historic resources and one of the ten non-contributing resources to the Historic District. All current uses on the site are temporary.

The Proposed Project would include market-rate and affordable residential uses, commercial use, retail/arts/light-industrial (RALI) uses, parking, shoreline improvements, infrastructure development and street improvements, and public open space. Project implementation would require amendments to the *San Francisco General Plan* and San Francisco Planning Code, adding a new Pier 70 Special Use District (SUD), changes to the Zoning Maps, and Planning Code text amendments to modify existing height limits and amendments to the Port's *Waterfront Land Use Plan*. The land use program under the SUD would be flexible, allowing for the development of certain parcels with either primarily commercial-office or residential uses, or, for two parcels on the project site (Parcels C1 and C2), structured parking. The Proposed Project would be implemented in up to five phases and would encompass between 4,179,300 to 4,212,230 gsf of new and rehabilitated development at build-out. Three contributing features to the UIW Historic District on the 28-Acre Site would be rehabilitated, consistent with the

Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties, and adaptively reused. The Proposed Project would demolish seven contributing sheds, structures, and features on the site.¹

B. PURPOSE OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This EIR has been prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department (Planning Department) in the City and County of San Francisco, the Lead Agency for the Proposed Project, in compliance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., and California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 15000 et seq., “CEQA Guidelines”), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The lead agency is the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15161, this is a project-level EIR, defined as an EIR that examines the physical environmental impacts of a specific development project. This EIR assesses potentially significant impacts in the areas of land use and land use planning, population and housing, cultural resources (archeological resources and historic architectural resources), transportation and circulation, noise and vibration, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, wind and shadow, recreation, utilities and service systems, public services, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral and energy resources, and agriculture and forest resources. 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.

On September 27, 2013, Governor Brown signed Senate Bill (SB) 743, which became effective on January 1, 2014. Among other things, SB 743 added Section 21099 to the California Public Resources Code, which removes requirements for the analysis of aesthetics and parking impacts for certain urban infill projects from CEQA. The Proposed Project meets the definition of a mixed-use residential project on an infill site located within a transit priority area as specified by California Public Resources Code Section 21099.² Accordingly, this EIR does not contain a

¹ An additional building located on the project site, Building 117, is proposed by the Port to be demolished prior to approval of the Proposed Project to allow the adjacent building (Building 116) located on the 20th Street Historic Core site to be rehabilitated to meet fire code. San Francisco Planning Department, Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review, Illinois and 20th Streets/Pier 70 (“20th Street Historic Core”), Case No. 2016-000346ENV, September 8, 2016.

² San Francisco Planning Department, *Transit-Oriented Infill Project Eligibility Checklist*, Pier 70 Mixed Use Project, Case No. 2014-001272ENV, dated November 18, 2015.

separate discussion of the topic of aesthetics, which can no longer be considered in determining the Proposed Project’s physical environmental effects under CEQA. The EIR nonetheless provides visual simulations for informational purposes as part of Chapter 2, Project Description. In addition, parking is discussed for informational purposes in Section 4.C, Transportation and Circulation. (See Section 4.A, Introduction to Chapter 4, pp. 4.A.3-4.A.5, for further discussion of SB 743 and California Public Resources Code Section 21099.)

This EIR assesses potentially significant impacts of the Proposed Project. As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15121(a), an EIR is an informational document 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 the project. CEQA requires that public agencies not approve projects until all feasible means available have been employed to substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects.

Before any discretionary project approvals may be granted for the Proposed Project, the San Francisco Planning Commission (Planning Commission) must certify the EIR as adequate, accurate, and objective. EIR adequacy is defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15151, Standards for Adequacy of an EIR, which states:

An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the 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.

The degree of specificity required in an EIR should “correspond to the degree of specificity involved in the underlying activity which is described in the EIR” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15146).

City decision-makers will use the certified EIR, along with other information and public processes, to determine whether to approve, modify, or disapprove the Proposed Project, and to require any feasible mitigation measures as conditions of project approval.

C. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

On November 5, 2014, the project sponsors, the Port and Forest City, submitted an Environmental Evaluation Application for the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project to the Planning

Department.³ The environmental review process for the Proposed Project includes a number of steps: publication and circulation for public comment of a Notice of Preparation (NOP), publication of a Draft EIR for public review and comment, preparation and publication of responses to public and agency comments on the Draft EIR, and certification of the Final EIR. These steps are described below.

Notice of Preparation

The Planning Department published an NOP of an EIR on May 6, 2015, announcing its intent to prepare and distribute an EIR on the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project (Appendix A to this EIR).

PUBLIC REVIEW OF AND COMMENTS ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION

Publication of the NOP initiated a 30-day public review and comment period that ended on June 5, 2015. Pursuant to the California Public Resources Code Section 21083.9 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15206, a public scoping meeting was held on May 28, 2015, to receive oral comments concerning the scope of the EIR. Four commenters spoke at the meeting. In addition to these comments, the Planning Department received five comment letters from interested parties during the public review and comment period. The comment letters received in response to the NOP and a copy of the transcript from the public scoping meeting are available for review at the Planning Department offices as part of Case File No. 2014-001272ENV. The Planning Department has considered the comments made by the public in preparation of the Draft EIR for the Proposed Project. Comments on the NOP that relate to environmental issues are summarized below and are addressed in this EIR, as noted.

Comments on the NOP raised the following issues:

Plans and Policies: Comments raised issues concerning the need for the EIR to evaluate conflicts between the Proposed Project and the goals of the *Central Waterfront Area Plan*. The Proposed Project's compatibility with applicable plans and policies is discussed in Chapter 3, Plans and Policies.

Land Use and Land Use Planning: A comment noted that the EIR should evaluate physical land use impacts from the Proposed Project and other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects. Project-specific and cumulative land use impacts are discussed in Section 4.B, Land Use and Land Use Planning, pp. 4.B.17-4.B.28.

³ Environmental Evaluation Application for the Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project, dated November 5, 2014.

Cultural Resources: Comments raised issues concerning impacts of the Proposed Project on the historic and existing industrial land uses of the area. The Proposed Project's impacts on historical resources are evaluated in Section 4.D, Cultural Resources (Historic Architectural Resources), pp. 4.D.33-4.D.115, and land use compatibility is addressed in Section 4.B, Land Use and Land Use Planning, pp. 4.B.24-4.B.28.

Transportation and Circulation: Comments raised issues concerning the Proposed Project's connectivity with the rest of San Francisco, particularly by way of 20th and 22nd streets; traffic and pedestrian safety impacts, specifically at the Illinois Parcels; traffic conflicts between the Proposed Project and the trucking route along Illinois Street, as well as noise, air quality, and pedestrian safety impacts created by trucks; the Transportation Impact Study prepared for the EIR; a Transportation Demand Management Plan that would reduce vehicle trips; mitigation measures to be included in the EIR; transportation impact fees; and consistency with the Waterfront Transportation Assessment.

The Proposed Project's Transportation Demand Management Plan is described in Chapter 2, Project Description, on pp. 2.51. The proposed roadway network is also described in Chapter 2 on pp. 2.49-2.50. Section 4.E, Transportation and Circulation, addresses applicable regulatory compliance, and the construction and operation impacts that the Proposed Project's transportation and land use changes would have on traffic, transit, pedestrian, and circulation conditions. Section 4.E summarizes the information in the Transportation Impact Study prepared for the Proposed Project. Mitigation measures are presented as part of the impact evaluation in Section 4.E. Proposed roadway improvements are discussed in Chapter 2 on pp. 2.49-2.50, and analyzed in Section 4.E, pp. 4.E.84-4.E.126. The Proposed Project's noise and air quality impacts are analyzed in Section 4.F, Noise and Vibration, and Section 4.G, Air Quality, respectively.

Noise: A comment asserted that the EIR should evaluate the noise impacts from nearby industrial uses (e.g., BAE Systems Ship Repair facility, the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) Potrero Substation, and American Industrial Center) on future residents and employees. Section 4.F, Noise, describes the existing noise environment in the project area and evaluates the potential noise impacts on future residents and employees.

Air Quality: A comment asserted that the EIR should evaluate the air quality and odor impacts from nearby industrial uses on future residents and employees. Section 4.G, Air Quality, discusses the existing air quality conditions in the project area and evaluates the Proposed Project's potential air quality impacts during construction and operation. The section includes an assessment of potential odor impacts.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Comments raised concerns about serpentine soils, potential soil/groundwater contamination from underground tanks, and contaminated soil from past industrial uses on the project site, and the risks to future residents and employees. One comment recommended that a full environmental remediation of the project site be considered, in accordance with Proposition D. Existing conditions at the project site and impacts of the Proposed Project in regard to hazards and hazardous materials are described in Section 4.P, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Recreation: A comment stated that the EIR should consider the Bay Area Water Trail, and that storage, access, and landing areas remain available for non-motorized small watercraft (e.g., kayaks and canoes) who wish to use San Francisco Bay. The *Enhanced Water Trail Plan* is discussed in Section 4.J, Recreation, pp. 4.J.20.

Utilities: Comments raised issues concerning the need for the EIR to include a discussion of City of San Francisco Ordinances regarding irrigation, use of non-potable water during construction, and water efficiency; stormwater management requirements and system configuration; the proposed recycled water system; updates to the Water Supply Assessment; and the design of proposed utility systems, including the water distribution, wastewater, stormwater, and sewer/storm drain systems. The utilities and service system design for the Proposed Project is described in Chapter 2, Project Description, pp. 2.55-2.67. Section 4.K, Utilities and Service Systems, addresses the potential effects of the Proposed Project on existing public utilities and service systems, including water supply, wastewater, and stormwater, as well as applicable regulatory compliance and the design of proposed systems.

Cumulative Impacts: A comment noted several projects that should be considered in the cumulative analysis, including the adjacent PG&E Site (potential for redevelopment), water taxis, a second BART tunnel, and any other miscellaneous projects in the adjacent Dogpatch neighborhood. Applicable cumulative projects considered in the EIR are presented in Section 4.A, Introduction to Chapter 4, pp. 4.A.12-4.A.18, and analyzed in applicable sections throughout Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts.

Alternatives: Comments suggested two alternatives to be considered in the EIR: a Reduced Parking Alternative and a Maximum Housing Alternative. EIR Chapter 7, Alternatives, presents and analyzes a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the Proposed Project. Alternatives are presented and analyzed in this EIR for the purpose of fostering informed decision-making by presenting a range of alternatives that could lessen the significant and less-than-significant impacts identified for the Proposed Project while feasibly attaining most of the basic project objectives.

General: A comment stated that the EIR should incorporate factual, direct statements as opposed to vague terminology. Terms are defined in text or in footnotes in each of the chapters. A list of acronyms and abbreviations used in the EIR is presented on pp. x-xiii.

Draft Environmental Impact Report

This Draft EIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. It provides an analysis of the project-specific physical environmental impacts of construction and operation of the Proposed Project, and the project's contribution to the environmental impacts from foreseeable cumulative development in the project site vicinity and the City as a whole.

Copies of the Draft EIR are available at the Planning Information Counter, San Francisco Planning Department, 1660 Mission Street, 1st Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103. The Draft EIR is also available for viewing or downloading at the Planning Department website, <http://tinyurl.com/sfceqadocs>, by choosing the link for Negative Declarations and EIRs under "Current Documents for Public Review" and searching for Case File No. 2014-001272ENV. You may also request that a copy be sent to you by calling (415) 575-9041 or emailing the EIR Coordinator, Melinda Hue, at melinda.hue@sfgov.org.

All documents referenced in this Draft EIR, and the distribution list for the Draft EIR, are available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103, as part of Case File No. 2014-001272ENV.

How to Comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report

This Draft EIR was published on December 21, 2016. There will be a public hearing before the Planning Commission during the 60-day public review and comment period for this EIR to solicit public comment on the adequacy and accuracy of information presented in this Draft EIR. The public comment period for this EIR is December 22, 2016, to February 21, 2017. The public hearing on this Draft EIR has been scheduled before the Planning Commission for February 9, 2017, in Room 400, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place beginning at 10:00 a.m. or later. Please call (415) 558-6422 the week of the hearing for a recorded message giving a more specific time. In addition, during the public review and comment period, members of the public are invited to submit written comments on the adequacy of the document, that is, whether this Draft EIR identifies and analyzes the possible environmental impacts and identifies appropriate mitigation measures.

Written comments should be submitted to:

Lisa Gibson, Acting Environmental Review Officer
Re: Pier 70 Mixed-Use District Project Draft EIR
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Comments may also be submitted by email to lisa.gibson@sfgov.org. Comments must be received by 5:00 p.m. on February 21, 2017.

Commenters are not required to provide personal identifying information. 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.

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

Final Environmental Impact Report

Following the close of the Draft EIR public review and comment period, the Planning Department will prepare and publish a document entitled "Responses to Comments," which will contain a copy of all comments on this Draft EIR and the City's responses to those comments and any necessary changes to the text, along with copies of the letters received and a transcript of the Planning Commission public hearing on the Draft EIR. This Draft EIR, together with the Responses to Comments document, will be considered by the Planning Commission in an advertised public meeting, and then certified as a Final EIR, if deemed adequate.

The Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors will use the information in the Final EIR in their deliberations on whether to approve, modify, or deny the Proposed Project or aspects of the Proposed Project. If the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors decide to approve the Proposed Project, their approval action must include findings that identify significant project-related impacts that would result; discuss mitigation measures or alternatives that have been adopted to reduce significant impacts to less-than-significant levels; determine whether mitigation measures or alternatives are within the jurisdiction of other public agencies; and explain reasons for rejecting mitigation measures or alternatives if any are infeasible for legal, social, economic, technological, or other reasons.

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) must be adopted by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors as part of the adoption of the CEQA findings and project approvals by those bodies to the extent that mitigation measures are made part of the

Proposed Project. The MMRP identifies the measures included in the Proposed Project or imposed by the decision-makers as conditions of approval, the entities responsible for carrying out the measures, and the timing of implementation. If significant unavoidable impacts would remain after all feasible mitigation measures are implemented, the approving body, if it elects to approve the Proposed Project, must adopt a statement of overriding considerations explaining how the benefits of the Proposed Project would outweigh the significant impacts.

D. ORGANIZATION OF THIS EIR

This EIR is organized into eight chapters, as described below.

The Summary chapter provides a concise overview of the Proposed Project and the necessary approvals; the environmental impacts that would result from the Proposed Project; mitigation measures identified to reduce or eliminate these impacts; project alternatives; and areas of known controversy and issues to be resolved.

Chapter 1, Introduction, provides a summary of the Proposed Project and describes the type, purpose, and function of the EIR; the environmental review process and comments received on the NOP; and the organization of the EIR.

Chapter 2, Project Description, presents details about the Proposed Project and the approvals required to implement it.

Chapter 3, Plans and Policies, describes inconsistencies of the Proposed Project with applicable State, regional, and local plans and policies.

Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts, addresses the following topics:

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

Each topic section presents the environmental setting; regulatory framework; approach to analysis; project features that are relevant to the topic; project-specific and cumulative impacts; and mitigation measures and improvement measures, when appropriate.

Chapter 5, Other CEQA Issues, addresses potential growth-inducing impacts of the Proposed Project and identifies significant effects that cannot be avoided if the Proposed Project is implemented, as well as significant irreversible impacts of the project, and areas of known controversy and project-related issues that have not been resolved.

Chapter 6, Project Variants, presents one proposed construction-related and three proposed operational-related variants on infrastructure features of the Proposed Project that focus on sustainability. The variants modify one limited feature or aspect of the Proposed Project. The four variants considered are a Reduced Off-Haul Variant, a District Energy System Variant, a Wastewater Treatment and Reuse System Variant, and an Automated Waste Collection System Variant.

Chapter 7, Alternatives, presents and analyzes a range of alternatives to the Proposed Project. Three alternatives are described and evaluated: a No Project Alternative, which is required by CEQA; a Code Compliant Alternative; and a 2010 Pier 70 Master Plan Alternative. This chapter also identifies the environmentally superior alternative. It discusses any alternatives that were considered for analysis in the EIR but rejected, and gives the reasons for their rejection.

Chapter 8, Report Preparers, identifies the EIR authors and the agencies, organizations, and individuals consulted during preparation of the Draft EIR. In addition, the project sponsors, their attorneys, and any consultants working on their behalf are listed.

The EIR has six appendices:

- Appendix A: Notice of Preparation
- Appendix B: Transportation Impact Study
- Appendix C: Noise Technical Memorandum
- Appendix D: Air Quality Technical Report
- Appendix E: Biological Resources
- Appendix F: Hazards and Hazardous Materials