




FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Glen Park Community Plan

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
CASE NO. 2005.1004E

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2009072013



**SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING
DEPARTMENT**

Draft EIR Publication Date:	April 27, 2011
Draft EIR Public Hearing Date:	June 2, 2011
Draft EIR Public Comment Period:	April 27, 2011 through June 13, 2011
Final EIR Public Certification Date:	November 10, 2011



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Motion No. 18490

HEARING DATE: November 10, 2011

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Hearing Date: November 10, 2011
Case No.: **2005.1004E**
Project Address: **Glen Park Community Plan Area**
Zoning: Various
Block/Lot: Various
Project Sponsor: San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 7th Fl.
San Francisco, CA 94103

Staff Contact: Lisa Gibson – (415) 575-9032
Lisa.Gibson@sfgov.org

ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATED TO THE CERTIFICATION OF A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN.


MOVED, that the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") hereby CERTIFIES the Final Environmental Impact Report identified as Case No. 2005.1004E, Glen Park Community Plan (hereinafter "Project"), based upon the following findings:

1. The City and County of San Francisco, acting through the Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") fulfilled all procedural requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code Section 21000 *et seq.*, hereinafter "CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Admin. Code Title 14, Section 15000 *et seq.*) (hereinafter "CEQA Guidelines") and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (hereinafter "Chapter 31").
 - A. The Department determined that an Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "EIR") was required and provided public notice of that determination by publication in a newspaper of general circulation on July 1, 2009.
 - B. On April 27, 2011, the Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "DEIR") and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning Commission public hearing on the DEIR; this notice was mailed to the Department's list of persons requesting such notice.
 - C. Notices of availability of the DEIR and of the date and time of the public hearing were posted near the project site by Department staff on April 27, 2011.

- D. On April 27, 2011, copies of the DEIR were mailed or otherwise delivered to a list of persons requesting it, to those noted on the distribution list in the Department's files, to adjacent property owners, and to government agencies, the latter both directly and through the State Clearinghouse.
- E. Notice of Completion was filed with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on April 27, 2011.
2. The Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on said DEIR on June 2, 2011 at which opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the DEIR. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on June 13, 2011.
 3. The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the 47-day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected errors in the DEIR. This material was presented in a Comments and Responses document, published on October 27, 2011, distributed to the Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR, and made available to others upon request at the Department.
 4. A Final Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "FEIR") has been prepared by the Department, consisting of the DEIR, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, and the Comments and Responses document, all as required by law.
 5. Project EIR files have been made available for review by the Commission and the public. These files are available for public review at the Department at 1650 Mission Street, and are part of the record before the Commission.
 6. On November 10, 2011, the Commission reviewed and considered the FEIR and hereby does find that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
 7. The Planning Commission hereby does find that the FEIR concerning File No. 2005.1004E reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City and County of San Francisco, is adequate, accurate and objective, and that the Comments and Responses document contains no significant revisions to the DEIR, and hereby does CERTIFY THE COMPLETION of said FEIR in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.
 8. The Planning Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR prior to approving the Project.
 9. The Commission, in certifying the completion of said FEIR, hereby does find that the project described in the EIR would have the following unavoidable significant environmental impacts that could not be mitigated to a level of non-significance:

- A. An unavoidable significant impact related to transportation and circulation due to unacceptable level of service (LOS) at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection during the AM and PM peak hours under project and cumulative conditions;
- B. An unavoidable significant impact related to air quality due to construction activities with respect to criteria air pollutant and ozone precursors under project and cumulative conditions; and
- C. An unavoidable significant impact related to air quality due to construction and operational activities that would emit toxic air contaminants (TACs) that would exceed Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) significance thresholds under project and cumulative conditions.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting of November 10, 2011.


Linda Avery
Commission Secretary

AYES: Antonini, Borden, Fong, Miguel, Moore
NOES: None
ABSENT: Olague
RECUSED: Suguya
ADOPTED: November 10, 2011

City and County of San Francisco
Planning Department

Glen Park Community Plan

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Planning Department Case No. 2005.1004E

State Clearinghouse No. 2009072013

Draft EIR Publication Date:	April 27, 2011
Draft EIR Public Hearing Date:	June 2, 2011
Draft EIR Public Comment Period:	April 27, 2011 through June 13, 2011
Final EIR Certification Date:	November 10, 2011

Changes from the Draft EIR text are indicated by a (●) in the left margin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GLOSSARY	v
LIST OF ACRONYMS	xi
SUMMARY	S-1
A. Project Synopsis.....	S-1
B. Project-Level and Program-Level of Analysis	S-8
C. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	S-9
D. Summary of Project Alternatives.....	S-40
Alternative A: No Project.....	S-47
Alternative B: Reduced Development - High Residential/ Low Retail Development	S-48
Alternative C: Reduced Development- Hybrid Mix	S-51
Environmentally Superior Alternative	S-53
E. Other Alternatives and Physical Improvements Considered but Rejected	S-53
Infill Site Alternative	S-53
Reduced Development Alternatives	S-54
Transportation Alternatives	S-55
F. Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved	S-56
I. INTRODUCTION	I-1
A. Purpose of This Environmental Impact Report.....	I-1
B. Environmental Review Process	I-4
II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION	II-1
A. Introduction.....	II-1
B. Project Objectives	II-4
C. Project Overview.....	II-5
D. Project Location.....	II-6
E. Project Characteristics	II-9
F. Intended Uses of the EIR.....	II-35
III. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS	
A. Introduction	III.A-1
B. Land Use	III.B-1
C. Aesthetics	III.C-1
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources	III.D-1
E. Transportation and Circulation	III.E-1
F. Noise and Vibration.....	III.F-1
G. Air Quality	III.G-1
H. Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	III.H-1

IV.	OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS.....	IV-1
A.	Growth Inducement	IV-1
B.	Significant Unavoidable Impacts.....	IV-2
C.	Significant Irreversible Impacts	IV-6
D.	Areas of Known Controversy and Issues to Be Resolved	IV-7
V.	ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT	V-1
A.	Alternative A: No Project.....	V-1
B.	Alternative B: Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development	V-3
C.	Alternative C: Reduced Development- Hybrid Mix	V-11
D.	Environmentally Superior Alternative	V-25
E.	Other Alternatives and Physical Improvements Considered but Rejected	V-26
	Infill Site Alternative	V-26
	Reduced Development Alternatives	V-27
	Transportation Alternatives	V-28
● VI.	COMMENT AND RESPONSES.....	VI-1
A.	Introduction	VI-1
	Purpose of the Comments and Responses Document.....	VI-1
	Environmental Review Process	VI-1
	Organization of Comments and Responses	VI-1
B.	List of Persons Commenting	VI-4
	State, Regional, and Local Agencies.....	VI-4
	Organizations	VI-4
	Individuals	VI-4
C.	Plan Refinements	VI-5
D.	Comments and Responses.....	VI-18
	General Comments	VI-18
	Initial Study	VI-29
	Project Description.....	VI-32
	Land Use	VI-37
	Aesthetics	VI-39
	Cultural and Paleontological Resources.....	VI-44
	Transportation.....	VI-60
	Air Quality	VI-74
E.	Draft EIR Revisions.....	VI-76
	Text Changes in Response To Comments	VI-76
	Staff-Initiated Text Changes	VI-86
● VI.	REPORT PREPARERS.....	VI-1

Appendices

- Appendix A: Notice of Preparation and Initial Study
- Appendix B: 2010 Glen Park Community Plan
- Appendix C: Glen Park Community Plan Text Changes
- Appendix D: Comment Letters
- Appendix E: Transcript of Draft EIR Public Hearing
- Appendix F: Glen Park Community Plan Refinements Subsequent to DEIR Publication

Tables

Table S-1	Summary of Maximum Development Potential	S-5
Table S-2	Proposed Transportation Improvements and Variants	S-7
Table S-3	Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures Identified in the EIR.....	S-11
Table S-4	Summary of Significant Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures Identified in the Initial Study	S-38
Table S-5	Comparison of Impacts of the Project to Alternatives B and C.....	S-41
Table II-1	Comparison of 2003 and 2010 Community Plans	II-3
Table II-2	Summary of Maximum Development Potential	II-19
Table II-3	Proposed Transportation Improvements and Variants	II-22
Table III.E-1	Intersection Level of Service – Existing Conditions.....	III.E-9
Table III.E-2	BART Service at Glen park Station – Existing Conditions.....	III.E-11
Table III.E-3	BART Capacity and Ridership – Existing Weekday Conditions	III.E-13
Table III.E-4	Muni Lines and Frequencies – Existing Conditions	III.E-15
Table III.E-5	Muni Ridership and Capacity - Existing Conditions (Weekday AM & PM Peak Hour).....	III.E-16
Table III.E-6	Person-Trip Generation for Plan Area Buildout	III.E-28
Table III.E-7	Project Peak Hour (AM and PM) Person-Trips by Mode	III.E-32
Table III.E-8	Person-Trip Distribution.....	III.E-33
Table III.E-9	Intersection Level of Service – Existing plus Plan Area Buildout.....	III.E-35
Table III.E-10	Project-Generated Transit Ridership and Corresponding Transit Lines ...	III.E-47
Table III.E-11	Intersection Level of Service – 2030 Cumulative Conditions without Project.....	III.E-72
Table III.E-12	Intersection Level of Service – 2030 Cumulative Infill Development Conditions	III.E-74
Table III.E-13	Intersection Level of Service – 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions.....	III.E-75
Table III.E-14	Intersection Level of Service – 2030 Cumulative plus Variant Conditions.....	III.E-77
Table III.F-1	Representative Environmental Noise Levels.....	III.F-3
Table III.F-2	Existing Peak-Hour Traffic Noise Measurements (Leq)	III.F-7
Table III.F-3	Summary of Noise Levels Identified as Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety	III.F-11

Table III.F-4	Federal Transit Administration Impact Criteria for Noise-Sensitive Uses	III.F-12
Table III.F-5	Groundborne Vibration Impact Criteria for General Assessment.....	III.F-13
Table III.F-6	Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment	III.F-21
Table III.F-7	Modeled Traffic Noise Levels along Major Access Roads	III.F-26
Table III.F-8	Modeled Cumulative Traffic Noise Levels along Major Access Roads	III.F-28
Table III.G-1	State and Federal Criteria Air Pollutant Standards, Health Effects, and Sources	III.G-4
Table III.G-2	San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin and San Francisco County Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions Inventory and Projections, 2008 (Tons/Day – Annual Average)	III.G-7
Table III.G-3	Summary of Local Ambient Air Quality in the Project Vicinity	III.G-9
Table III.G-4	Annual Average Ambient Concentrations of Carcinogenic TACs Measured at BAAQMD Monitoring Station, 10 Arkansas Street, San Francisco	III.G-10
Table III.G-5	2010 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Thresholds of Significance	III.G-17
Table III.G-6	Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions.....	III.G-25
Table III.G-7	Project Daily Operational Air Pollutant Emissions	III.G-29
Table III.G-8	Carbon Monoxide Concentrations at Selected Intersections	III.G-31
Table III.G-9	Stationary and Roadway Toxic Air Contaminant Sources	III.G-36
Table III.H-1	GHG Reductions from the AB 32 Scoping Plan Sectors.....	III.H-7
Table III.H-2	Glen Park Community Plan Policies that Address Climate Change.....	III.H-19
Table III.H-3	Regulations Applicable to the Transportation Improvements.....	III.H-28
Table V-1	Comparison of Significant Impacts of the Project to Alternatives B and C....	V-19

Figures

● Figure II-1	Regional and City Project Location.....	II-7
● Figure II-2	Existing Use Districts and Height Limits	II-10
● Figure II-3	Use Districts and Height Limits under the Proposed Project	II-14
● Figure II-4	Transportation Improvement Locations	II-23
Figure II-5	Proposed Improvements to Bosworth Street.....	II-25
Figure II-6	Proposed Improvements to Monterey Boulevard/ Joost Avenue and Arlington Street/Wilder Street Intersections	II-26
Figure II-7	Proposed Improvements to Bosworth Street and Diamond Street Intersection.....	II-28
Figure II-8	Proposed Pedestrian Improvements for the Muni Metro J-Church Line	II-31
Figure II-9	Proposed Transit Improvements	II-33
● Figure III.B-1	Cumulative Projects for Glen Park Community Plan	III.B-16
Figure III.C-1	Visual Setting Photographs	III.C-3
Figure III.C-2	Visual Setting Photographs	III.C-4
Figure III.C-3	Viewpoint Location Map	III.C-9
Figure III.C-4	Viewpoint 1, View of Northwest Corner Infill Site Looking Northeast from Intersection of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street.....	III.C-10

Figure III.C-5	Viewpoint 2, View of BART Parking Lot Infill Site Looking East from Bosworth Street at Glen Park BART Station	III.C-11
Figure III.C-6	Viewpoint 3, View of Infill Sites Looking West from Bosworth Street at I-280 South On-ramp.....	III.C-12
Figure III.C-7	Viewpoint 4, View of BART Parking Lot Infill Site Looking East from Diamond Street at Kern Street.....	III.C-13
● Figure III.D-1	Existing Historical Resources within the Plan Area	III.D-13
Figure III.D-2	Historical Resource Photographs	III.D-14
Figure III.D-3	Historical Resource Photographs	III.D-15
Figure III.D-4	Historical Resource Photographs	III.D-16
Figure III.E-1	Community Plan Area and Study Intersections.....	III.E-7
● Figure III.E-2	Existing Transit Network	III.E-10
● Figure III.E-3	Existing Bicycle Conditions.....	III.E-19
● Figure III.F-1	Noise Monitoring Locations.....	III.F-8
Figure III.F-2	Long-Term Noise Measurement, BART Parking Lot	III.F-9
Figure VI-1	Existing Zoning in Glen Park.....	VI-6
Figure VI-2	Proposed Zoning under the 2010 Community Plan.....	VI-7
Figure VI-3	Existing Height Limits in Glen Park	VI-9
Figure VI-4	Proposed Height Limits under the 2010 Community Plan	VI-10
Figure VI-5	(Revised Figure II-1) Regional and City Project Location.....	VI-112
Figure VI-6	(Revised Figure II-2) Existing Use Districts and Height Limits	VI-113
Figure VI-7	(Revised Figure II-3) Use Districts and Height Limits Under the Proposed Project.....	VI-114
Figure VI-8	(Revised Figure II-4) Transportation Improvement Locations	VI-115
Figure VI-9	(Revised Figure III.B-1) Cumulative Projects for Glen Park Community Plan	VI-116
Figure VI-10	(Revised Figure III.D-1) Existing Historical Resources with the Plan Area	VI-117
Figure VI-11	(Revised Figure III.E-2) Existing Transit Network.....	VI-118
Figure VI-12	(Revised Figure III.E-3) Existing Bicycle Conditions.....	VI-119
Figure VI-13	(Revised Figure III.F-1) Noise Monitoring Locations.....	VI-120

GLOSSARY

A-Weighted Decibel Scale: Provides a compensation by discriminating against frequencies in a manner approximating the sensitivity of the human ear.

Acoustics: A branch of physics that studies sound.

Aerosol: A suspension of fine solid particles or liquid droplets in a gas. Examples are smoke, oceanic haze, air pollution, smog.

Ambient: The lowest sound level repeating itself during a minimum 10-minute period as measured with a type 1, precision sound level meter, set on slow response and A-weighting.

Ambient Air Quality: The chemical characteristics of air as it exists in the environment; measures pollutant concentrations in the air.

Amplitude: Air pressure waves we experience as a sound's loudness.

AM Peak Period (weekday): Operating conditions for the peak hour (hour of the day with the highest traffic volumes) of the weekday AM peak period (7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.).

Better Neighborhoods 2002 Program: The goal of the Better Neighborhoods program is to create plans that improve the neighborhood where possible, while supporting what is already working well. The Better Neighborhoods program embraces the benefits of change to build more balanced and livable places in San Francisco. The Better Neighborhoods program is two-tiered. Citywide, it aims to encourage housing where it makes sense and to strengthen neighborhoods. Locally, the program uses intensive community-based planning to refine citywide goals to the needs of the specific neighborhood. Additionally, the program builds on the positive aspects of San Francisco's quality as an urban place.

Biodiversity: The variety of all forms of life, from genes to species, through to the broad scale of ecosystems.

C-Weighted Decibel Scale: The actual average sound amplitude without application of the A-weighting factors.

California Register of Historic Resources: A California state government program for use by state and local agencies, private groups and citizens to identify, evaluate, register and protect California's historical resources. The Register is the authoritative guide to the state's significant historical and archeological resources.

Carbon Monoxide: A colorless, odorless gas produced by the incomplete combustion of fuels.

Chert: Fine-grained silica-rich microcrystalline, cryptocrystalline sedimentary rock that may contain small fossils. It varies greatly in color (from white to black), but most often manifests as gray, brown, grayish brown and light green to rusty red; its color is an expression of trace elements present in the rock, and both red and green are most often related to traces of iron.

Chlorofluorocarbons: A family of chemical compounds developed back in the 1930's as safe, non-toxic, non-flammable alternative to dangerous substances like ammonia for purposes of refrigeration and spray can propellants.

Climate: Encompasses the statistics of temperature, humidity, atmospheric pressure, wind, rainfall, atmospheric particle count and other meteorological elements in a given region over a long period of time.

Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL): A 24-hour average L_{eq} with a 5 dBA “weighting” during the hours of 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. and a 10 dBA “weighting” added to noise during the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. to account for noise sensitivity in the evening and nighttime, respectively.

Decibel (dB): The standard unit of sound amplitude. It is a measure of the physical magnitude of the pressure variations relative to the human threshold of perception.

Duration: An amount of time or a particular time interval.

Easement: The right to use the real property of another for a specific purpose. The easement is itself a real property interest, but legal title to the underlying land is retained by the original owner for all other purposes.

Ecosystem: A biological environment consisting of all the organisms living in a particular area, as well as all the nonliving, physical components of the environment with which the organisms interact, such as air, soil, water, and sunlight.

Ethnography: A branch of anthropology dealing with the scientific description of individual cultures.

Façade: The front of a building, especially an imposing or decorative one.

Fine Particulate Matter: Extremely small, suspended particles or droplets 2.5 microns or smaller in diameter.

Frequency: The number of occurrences of a repeating event per unit.

Fugitive Dust: A type of nonpoint source air pollution - small airborne particles that do not originate from a specific point such as a gravel quarry or grain mill. Fugitive dust originates in small quantities over large areas. Significant sources include unpaved roads, agricultural cropland and construction sites.

Glen Park Community Plan (2010): An update of the November 2003 *Glen Park Community Plan Summary* which is a product of a sustained community process that addresses the issues and opportunities facing the neighborhood. The *2010 Community Plan* introduces goals, objectives, and policies aimed at preserving and enhancing the unique character of Glen Park.

Glen Park Community Plan Summary (2003): First developed through coordination among the San Francisco Planning Department (Planning Department), the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) District, and other agencies, with extensive involvement from the Glen Park community.

Glen Park NCT: A new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit (Glen Park NCT) District to reflect the area’s proximity to abundant transit service introduced with implementation of the *2010 Community Plan*.

Glen Park Village Parklets: Parklets involve conversion of parking stalls into small open space areas with seating, tables, planters, and/or bicycle parking.

Global Climate Change: A broad term used to describe any worldwide, long-term change in the earth's climate. This change could be, for example, an increase or decrease in temperatures, the start or end of an ice age, or a shift in precipitation patterns.

Global Warming: A more specific type of global climate change and refers to a general increase in temperatures across the earth. Global warming does not necessarily imply that all locations would be warmer. Some specific, unique locations may be cooler even though the world, on average, is warmer.

Global Warming Potential: The effect that each of the greenhouse gases can have on global warming is a combination of the mass of their emissions.

Greenhouse Gas: A gas in the atmosphere that absorbs and emits radiation within the thermal infrared range. This process is the fundamental cause of the greenhouse effect, known as global warming. The primary greenhouse gases in the Earth's atmosphere are water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and ozone.

Greenstone: A name given to several different types of minerals and rocks.

Hydrofluorocarbons: Man-made compounds consisting of hydrogen, fluorine, and carbon. The HFCs are a class of replacements for chlorofluorocarbons.

Infill Development: Development on vacant or under-used parcels within existing urban areas that are already largely developed.

Infill Development Site 1: Consists of six parcels on the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street.

Infill Development Site 2: Consists of the BART parking lot on the north side of Bosworth Street and Arlington Street (east of Diamond Street) extending northward to Wilder Street.

Lead: Occurs in the atmosphere as particulate matter. Sources of lead include the manufacturing and recycling of batteries, paint, ink, ceramics, ammunition, and secondary lead smelters.

Level of Service: The operating characteristics of signalized and unsignalized intersections.

L_{max}: Maximum Noise Level; the highest A/B/C weighted integrated noise level occurring during a specific period of time.

L_{min}: Minimum Noise Level; the lowest A/B/C weighted integrated noise level during a specific period of time.

Meteorology: The interdisciplinary scientific study of the atmosphere that focuses on weather processes and short-term forecasting.

Methane (CH₄): A colorless, odorless gas with a wide distribution in nature. It is the principal component of natural gas.

Midden: A mound or deposit containing shells, animal bones, and other refuse that indicates the site of a human settlement.

National Historic Preservation Act: Act to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the nation.

Neighborhood Commercial (NC-2): The NC-2 District is intended to serve as the City's Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial District. These districts are linear shopping streets which provide convenience goods and services to the surrounding neighborhoods as well as limited comparison shopping goods for a wider market. The range of comparison goods and services offered is varied and often includes specialty retail stores, restaurants, and neighborhood-serving offices. NC-2 Districts are commonly located along both collector and arterial streets which have transit routes.

Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂): A criteria air pollutant regulated by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards under the Federal Clean Air Act. High levels of nitrogen dioxide are primarily associated with major roadways and are attributable to a number of respiratory and other health risks.

Nitrous Oxide (N₂O): A naturally occurring greenhouse gas.

Non-Acoustic: Material, surface or environment that inhibits the reflection of sound waves.

Open Space: Generally refers to undeveloped land or water area.

Ozone (O₃): A gas that is formed when reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x)—both byproducts of internal combustion engine exhaust—undergo slow photochemical reactions in the presence of sunlight.

Pavement to Parks Program: San Francisco's new "Pavement to Parks" projects seek to temporarily reclaim the wasted space associated with the City's streets and public rights-of-way to quickly and inexpensively turn them into new public plazas and parks.

Perfluorocarbons (PFCs): A type of air pollutant that primarily results from aluminum production and semiconductor manufacturing. PFCs are extremely stable and are largely immune to the chemical processes in the lower atmosphere that break down most atmospheric pollutants. Therefore, PFCs tend to accumulate in the atmosphere and remain there for several thousand years. As such, PFCs have a high global warming potential.

PM Peak Period (weekday): The peak hour (hour of the day with the highest traffic volumes) of the weekday PM peak period (4:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.).

Public (P): A designated use district that applies to land that is owned by a governmental agency and that is in some form of public use, including open space.

Reactive Organic Gases (ROG): A photochemically reactive chemical gas, composed of non-methane hydrocarbons that is a common ozone precursor. When combined with nitrous oxides and sunlight they form ozone (O₃).

Residential, House Districts, One, Two, and Three Family Zoning (RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3, respectively): The RH-1 zoning district allows one dwelling unit per 3,000 gross square feet (gsf) of lot area. RH-2 and RH-3 zoning districts allow up to two dwelling units per 1,500 gsf of lot area and up to three dwelling units per 1,000 gsf of lot area, respectively, with conditional use approval.

Respirable Particulate Matter: Extremely small, suspended particles or droplets 10 microns or smaller in diameter.

San Francisco Bicycle Plan: The San Francisco Bicycle Plan involves the adoption of a citywide bicycle transportation plan and phasing of implementation of near-term, long-term, and other improvements to the bicycle route network, as well as amendments to the General Plan, the Planning Code, and the San Francisco Traffic Code.

San Francisco General Plan: The San Francisco General Plan, adopted by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, is both a strategic and long-term document, broad in scope, and specific in nature. The General Plan is the embodiment of the City's collective vision for the future of San Francisco, and is composed of a series of elements, each of which deals with a particular topic, that applies citywide. The General Plan contains the following elements: Air Quality, Arts, Commerce and Industry, Community Facilities, Community Safety, Environmental Protection, Housing, Recreation and Open Space, Transportation, and Urban Design.

Scenic Vista: Refers to a specific location that offers an important or aesthetically pleasing view.

Shale or Mudstone: A fine-grained sedimentary rock, usually formed from clay minerals compacted together by pressure.

Statistical Sound Levels (L_n): A term used to express the variability of sound levels over time where n is the percentage of time these levels are exceeded during the measurement period. For example, L_{10} , L_{50} , and L_{90} are descriptors that represent the sound level exceeded 10 percent of the time, 50 percent of the time, and 90 percent of the time, respectively, during a measurement, while L_{min} and L_{max} represent the minimum and maximum sound levels during the measurement period.

Sulfur Dioxide: A colorless, extremely irritating gas or liquid.

Sulfur Hexafluoride: A man-made inorganic, colorless, odorless, non-toxic and non-flammable gas.

Topography: A geographical term referring to the features on the surface of an area of land, including natural features such as mountains and rivers and constructed features such as highways and railroads.

Toxic: Concentration of a substance that would be lethal or produce other adverse responses detrimental to the health of an organism.

Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs): A diverse group of air pollutants with the potential to adversely affect human health. There are over 244 designated TACs, none of which have established ambient air quality standards for a variety of reasons including insufficient data on toxicity, association with particular workplace exposures rather than general environmental exposure, etc. An important and particularly harmful group of TACs are contained in the exhaust from both diesel and gasoline engines in motor vehicles.

Traffic Calming: Transportation system design measures intended to lower transit travel times, improve intersection level of service, reduce traffic speeds, shorten crossing distances for pedestrians, and increase pedestrian visibility.

Urban Land: Per United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) soil taxonomy, Urban Land is soil that has been modified by disturbance of the natural layers with additions of fill material several feet thick to accommodate large industrial and housing installations.

Urban Open Space: Open space areas for parks, green spaces, and other open areas. The landscape of urban open spaces can range from playing fields to highly maintained environments to relatively natural landscapes. They are commonly open to public access; however, urban open spaces may be privately owned.

Vibration Decibels (VdB): Vibration magnitude is measured in vibration decibels (VdB) relative to a 1 micro-inch-per-second reference level.

View Corridor: A three dimensional area extending out from a viewpoint.

Volatile Organic Compound (VOC): An organic chemical that readily evaporates at temperatures normally found at the ground surface and at shallow depths.

Water Vapor: The gaseous state of water.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ARB	California Air Resources Board
B20	biodiesel
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BACT	Best Available Control Technology
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit
BCDC	San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
BGM	BAAQMD Greenhouse Gas Model
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CAT	California Climate Action Team
CCAR	California Climate Action Registry
CCR	<i>California Code of Regulations</i>
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFCs	chlorofluorocarbons
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CH ₄	methane
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CO	carbon monoxide
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	CO ₂ equivalents
CRA	California Resources Agency
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
dBA	A-weighted decibel scale
dBC	C-weighted decibels
DPH	San Francisco Department of Public Health
DPW	San Francisco Department of Public Works
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EPA	US Environmental Protection Agency
ERO	Environmental Review Officer
FARR	Final Archeological Resources Report
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GHG	greenhouse gas
GWP	global warming potential
HCP	Historic Preservation Commission
HFCs	hydrofluorocarbons
HRER	Historic Resource Evaluation Response
HVAC	heating and ventilation units
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

LEED®	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
Ln	statistical sound levels
MEA	San Francisco Planning Department Major Environmental Analysis
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
MPOs	Metropolitan Planning Organizations
MTC	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
N ₂ O	nitrous oxide
NAHC	California Native American Heritage Commission
NCT	Neighborhood Commercial Transit District
NOA	Notice of Availability
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NWIC	California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center
OAL	Office of Administrative Law
OHP	Office of Historic Preservation
OPR	Governor's Office of Planning and Research
PFCs	perfluorocarbons
PM ₁₀	respirable particulate matter
PM _{2.5}	particulate matter
RPP	Residential Permit Parking
RTPs	regional transportation plans
SF ₆	sulfur hexafluoride
SFBAAB	San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin
SFCAP	San Francisco Climate Action Plan
SFMTA	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
SFPUC	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
SO ₂	sulfur dioxide
TACs	toxic air contaminants
TCMs	transportation control measures
TRPs	traffic-related pollutants
URBEMIS	Urban Emissions Model
VdB	vibration decibels
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
WHO	World Health Organization

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

SUMMARY

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) chapter provides a brief summary of the findings of the EIR regarding the *Glen Park Community Plan – Working Draft for Community Discussion*¹ (2010 *Community Plan*) and its potential environmental consequences. The chapter includes a summary of the project description, the level of environmental analysis, the environmental impacts and mitigation measures identified in this EIR, the significant environmental impacts and mitigation measures identified in the previously published Initial Study, alternatives to the proposed project and their comparative environmental effects, and areas of controversy and issues to be resolved.

This summary should not be relied upon for a thorough understanding of the proposed project, individual impacts, and mitigation measures. Please refer to Chapter I for a more complete description of the level of environmental analysis, Chapter II for a more complete description of the proposed project, Chapter III for a more complete description of associated impacts and mitigation measures, and Chapter V for a more complete description of identified alternatives to the proposed project and the comparative impacts.

A. PROJECT SYNOPSIS

The proposed project is the 2010 *Community Plan*, a product of a sustained community process that addresses the issues and opportunities facing the Glen Park neighborhood. The 2010 *Community Plan* introduces goals, objectives, and policies aimed at preserving and enhancing the unique character of Glen Park. The plan contains three elements: Land Use and Urban Design, Transportation, and Open Space. Each element presents policies that, collectively, encourage local business vitality, strengthen neighborhood identity, improve transportation conditions, calm traffic, and promote pedestrian safety. The 2010 *Community Plan* aims at directing the City to implement near-term projects as well as pursue larger future visions.

The 2010 *Community Plan* is an update of the November 2003 *Glen Park Community Plan Summary*² (2003 *Community Plan Summary*), which was first developed through coordination among the San Francisco Planning Department (Planning Department), the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) District, and other agencies, with extensive involvement from the

¹ City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Glen Park Community Plan, Working Draft for Community Discussion*, September 2010. Available at: http://www.sflanning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Glen_Park/Glen_Park_Community_Plan_091310.pdf

² City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Glen Park Community Plan Summary*, November 2003, available at: <http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/planning/citywide/pdf/gpdplowres.pdf>.

Glen Park community. After completion of the *2003 Community Plan Summary*, the project was postponed until additional funding was identified to carry the plan forward. In 2009, the Planning Department re-initiated the community planning process and in September 2010, the Planning Department released an updated working draft, the *2010 Community Plan*.

Upon adoption by the San Francisco Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, the *2010 Community Plan* would be incorporated into the *San Francisco General Plan* (General Plan) as an area plan. Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would potentially result in a number of physical improvements, including street network changes, transportation and infrastructure changes, potential infill development, and open space improvements. In addition, the *2010 Community Plan* would modify existing land use and zoning controls, but would not alter the land use pattern in the plan area.

PROJECT LOCATION

The plan area is located in the center of the Glen Park neighborhood in the City and County of San Francisco. Glen Park is located south of the Diamond Heights and Noe Valley neighborhoods, west of the Bernal Heights neighborhood, and east of Glen Canyon Park. Surrounding residential neighborhoods are relatively built out under existing zoning. The commercial core is within a valley in Glen Canyon. Houses on the surrounding hillsides frame the views along Diamond Street and create a sense of enclosure in the downtown area.

The plan area is bounded generally by Chenery Street to the north; Roanoke Street to the east; San Jose Avenue and Bosworth Street to the south; and Elk Street to the west. The plan area is generally consistent with the area known as “the village” or “downtown” that encompasses Glen Park’s commercial district, the Glen Park BART Station, and nearby public open spaces. The center of the plan area and the area that would be most altered as a result of the proposed project is the neighborhood commercial core at the intersection of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street.

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The *2010 Community Plan* contains policies intended to implement a number of physical improvements, including street network changes, transportation and infrastructure changes, potential infill development, and open space improvements. In addition, the *2010 Community Plan* would modify existing land use and zoning controls. Not all of the features of the *2010 Community Plan* would be expected to alter the physical environment. Although this EIR provides an overview of the *2010 Community Plan*’s features, the analysis focuses on features that would potentially result in environmental impacts.

Community Plan Element 1 – Land Use and Urban Design

The Land Use and Urban Design Element of the *2010 Community Plan* would provide long-term guidance to decision makers and public agencies to ensure future infrastructure projects and land use changes in the Glen Park neighborhood are carried out with sensitivity to the neighborhood's concerns, needs, and desires. The objectives of the Land Use and Urban Design Element are to protect and strengthen the qualities that make downtown Glen Park special, ensure the compatibility of new development with the form and character of Glen Park, and recognize the contribution of historic buildings to neighborhood identity.

The *2010 Community Plan's* land use policies would support small local retailers and service businesses by concentrating development within the traditional commercial core. By restricting retail and commercial development to the commercial core, the *2010 Community Plan* would prevent retail development on the fringes of this district that would not be economically supported by pedestrian traffic and which could increase the need for local parking. Although development potential in Glen Park is limited, the *2010 Community Plan* would support development of additional housing, maintaining the neighborhood's diversity, and taking advantage of its close proximity to shops, restaurants, services, and transit. Together these policies are intended to preserve and enhance the existing character of the Glen Park neighborhood. Future infill projects under the proposed land use and Planning Code amendments would be subject to independent environmental review.

Proposed Planning Code Amendments

Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would involve modification of Planning Code land use controls. A new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit (Glen Park NCT) District would incorporate parcels along Diamond Street, Chenery Street, Joost Avenue, and Wilder Street currently zoned NC-2 (Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial) and RH-3 (Residential House, Three Family). In addition, 605 Chenery Street and 3121-25 Castro Street would be rezoned from RH-2 (Residential House, Two Family) to Glen Park NCT. The Glen Park NCT District rezoning would permit new physical changes such as modifications to density controls, increased heights, setbacks, façade treatments, and minimization of curb cuts. This EIR recognizes that physical impacts could occur as a result of subsequent development resulting from rezoning, and considers such impacts within this EIR.

While most of the plan area would retain the prevailing height limit of 40-X, the height limit would be increased to 45 feet in areas rezoned to Glen Park NCT to encourage active ground-

floor uses. An increase in five feet would allow for storefronts with more space and provide easy access for pedestrians, but would not allow for an additional floor of development.

The *2010 Community Plan* does not propose rezoning the BART parking lot. This EIR, however, analyzes the potential environmental effects that would result from infill development on this site under a potential future rezoning scenario, described below.

Anticipated Buildout

This EIR provides a program-level analysis of the environmental impacts associated with potential development of two infill sites and the broader plan area to present a conservative analysis of the maximum buildout potential.

Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street. The first infill site is the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street site, which includes five privately owned parcels and one P-zoned parcel on both sides of Kern Street, between Diamond Street, Bosworth Street, and Brompton Avenue (Assessor's Block 6744; Lots 013, 025, 027, 030, 031, 032). These parcels have a total area of approximately 22,859 gsf. This site is currently within the Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial (NC-2) and Residential - Two family (RH-2) districts and extends northward across Kern Street (bounded by Brompton Avenue to the west). The portions of the site zoned NC-2 would be rezoned to the proposed Glen Park NCT District; parcels zoned RH-2 would remain as such. As permitted by the new NCT controls, future infill development at the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street site would consist of mixed-use development, including residential and commercial uses. This infill site is within the 40-X Height and Bulk District and would be rezoned to 45-X Height and Bulk District under the *2010 Community Plan*.

BART Parking Lot. The second site is the BART parking lot on the north side of Bosworth Street and Arlington Street (east of Diamond Street), extending northward to Wilder Street (Assessor's Block 6745; Lots 042, 048, 053, 057, 066, 067, 068, and 069). This site is within the P (Public) District and the 40-X Height and Bulk District. This 27,400-gsf site is owned by BART and contains a 54-space surface parking lot and a small single-story building housing a BART transformer and ventilation system. The *2010 Community Plan* does not propose rezoning this site, but identifies it as a potential location for future residential and commercial infill development. A proposal for the rezoning of the BART parking lot to allow housing or commercial uses may be forthcoming at the completion of BART's upcoming planning process for this site. Although the *2010 Community Plan* does not itself propose development or rezoning of the site, this EIR analyzes the environmental effects that would result if the BART parking lot infill site were developed with a mixed residential and commercial project. The EIR assumes for analytical purposes that the site potentially could be rezoned to a Glen Park NCT District and a 65-X Height and Bulk District. Thus, the EIR analyzes the potential environmental effects that

would result from the maximum building envelope at the site under a potential future rezoning scenario.

By presenting the potential physical impacts associated with development of the two infill sites, this EIR discusses potential foreseeable environmental impacts; however, the *2010 Community Plan* would not result in development of these sites. Consideration of potential development at these sites is not intended to convey an endorsement of a particular development strategy or design by the Planning Department or any other department or agency of the City and County of San Francisco. It is not yet known if the BART parking lot is suitable for development given the constraints of the site; however, the site is within the plan area and has the potential for development in the future and, this potential development is evaluated in this EIR.

Other Development Potential. With the exception of the infill sites discussed above, the Glen Park neighborhood is largely built out. The intensity of the development in the residential neighborhoods surrounding the downtown area would not be expected to change with implementation of the *2010 Community Plan*. However, it is expected that over the life of the *2010 Community Plan* development of additional parcels within the proposed Glen Park NCT District and 45-X Height and Bulk District could occur.

Maximum Development Potential

The EIR estimates the maximum development potential at each infill site and in the broader plan area to provide a conservative (greatest) estimate of impacts that could result from future development. These estimates, summarized in Table S-1, below, do not necessarily reflect a feasible or desirable development scenario. It is unlikely that buildout would occur at the maximum development potential because the infill sites might not have the capacity to support the maximum development potential for all uses. In order to accommodate the maximum development potential of one use, another use would have to be reduced. Nonetheless, the EIR evaluates the high range of development potential.

**TABLE S-1
SUMMARY OF MAXIMUM DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL**

	Residential	Commercial	Parking
Diamond Street/ Bosworth Street	47	8,582	26
BART Parking Lot	90	14,913	123
Other Development	13	5,250	0
Total	150	28,745	149

Preservation of Historic Buildings within the Plan Area

The *2010 Community Plan* encourages preservation and protection of existing historic buildings in the neighborhood. Specifically, the plan proposes to present a survey of Glen Park's historic resources for adoption to the Historic Preservation Commission; apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties for projects involving historic resources; protect the historic buildings in Glen Park from demolition or adverse alteration; and nominate properties that were found eligible to the San Francisco, California, or National Registers of Historical Places.

Community Plan Element 2 – Transportation

The objectives of the Transportation Element of the *2010 Community Plan* are to establish Glen Park's streets as comfortable and attractive places for walking and public life, improve access for bicyclists to Glen Park and the BART Station, sustain Glen Park's role as an important intermodal transit center for the City and region, improve access to public transit in Glen Park, seek improvements that relieve traffic congestion while minimizing impacts on other transportation modes, restore the local importance of streets in the area, and optimize use of existing on-street parking spaces in Glen Park.

The *2010 Community Plan* envisions implementation of a number of transportation improvements, including improvements for pedestrian, transit, and bicycle circulation and accessibility. The transportation improvements analyzed in this EIR are a result of a study commissioned by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to examine the improvements identified in the *2003 Community Plan Summary*.³ Transportation-related stakeholders, such as SFMTA, SF Planning, Caltrans, and BART, rated the effectiveness of the different improvements at achieving the intended objectives and affirmed the findings regarding feasibility. For purposes of this environmental review, the feasible improvements constitute the transportation improvements that are evaluated as part of the proposed project. Table S-2, p. S-7, summarizes the proposed transportation improvements and variants. While the proposed transportation improvements and their variants are evaluated collectively as part

³ PBS&J. *Alternative Analysis Report, Glen Park Community Plan Environmental Impact Analysis and Transportation Feasibility Study*, prepared on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco, Municipal Transportation Agency, 2010. This report is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

**TABLE S-2
PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS AND VARIANTS**

Type of Improvement	Proposed Improvement	Variant
Traffic Calming		
Bosworth Street Improvements	Speed table, ^a lane narrowing east of Arlington Street, and two new crosswalks with in-pavement warning lights.	Roundabout at Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/I-280 on-ramp with signal at Lyell Street; improve existing pedestrian crossing; new traffic signal with crosswalks at Bosworth Street and Lyell Street.
Monterey Boulevard/Joost Avenue and Arlington Street/Wilder Street Intersection Improvements	Pedestrian bulbout treatments and expanded traffic island at the Monterey Boulevard/Joost Avenue intersection. Pedestrian bulbouts at the Arlington Street/Wilder Street intersection. Extended curb between Arlington Street and San Jose Avenue off-ramp.	No variants
Bosworth Street/ Diamond Street Intersection Improvements	Modified signalization with restriping ^b and scramble phase. ^c Widen sidewalk and add pedestrian bulbout on Diamond Street.	Widening of Diamond Street to add right-turn lane; add scramble phase; modify BART entry plaza.
Bicycle Networks		
Bicycle Lanes	Bicycle lane improvements and installation of bicycle racks in the commercial area.	No variants
Pedestrian Access		
Pedestrian Connectivity between Muni Metro J-Church Light Rail Platform and Glen Park BART Station	New pedestrian bridge from existing Muni Metro J-Church light rail platform to the intersection of San Jose Avenue off-ramp, Diamond Street, and Monterey Boulevard. ^d	New at-grade ramp (with or without bus loop)
BART Station Plaza Improvements	Plaza alterations to improve pedestrian access and access for persons with disabilities in the BART Station plaza.	No variants
Pedestrian Improvements under Overpasses	Improvement of pedestrian experience under I-280 and San Jose Avenue.	No variants
Transit Improvements		
BART Access	Bus loop with BART concourse entry.	No bus loop with BART concourse entry; move Muni transit stop (inbound 23) to Bosworth Street.

Sources: SFMTA , PBS&J, 2010.

Notes:

- A speed table is a wide speed hump with a flat section in the middle.
- Restriping refers to replacing old pavement markings.
- Scramble phase refers to intersection signalization that allows pedestrians to cross the intersection from different directions simultaneously.
- The existing pedestrian bridge would be demolished under the proposed project.

of the proposed project, whether or not they are ultimately implemented would depend upon decision-makers, funding, community interests and priorities, and other factors. The improvements may be implemented individually, in various combinations, or conceivably not at all. The 2010 Community Plan suggests various methods to better utilize available on-street parking spaces within the neighborhood. These methods include expanding the Residential Permit Parking Program, providing parking enforcement to ensure appropriate use of spaces and parking availability, and considering on-street parking strategies that utilize variable pricing to increase parking availability.

Community Plan Element 3 – Open Space

The objective of the Open Space Element is to maintain and improve the area's mix of public open spaces. The *2010 Community Plan* includes policies that support open space and recreation within Glen Park, including the possibility of a greenway link between Glen Park and Glen Canyon. Specifically, the plan suggests the potential for “daylighting” a portion of Islais Creek to redirect the creek into above-ground channels. The *2010 Community Plan* suggests conducting further studies to assess the feasibility of the Islais Creek daylighting and linear greenway. The plan also encourages the conversion of a block along Kern Street into a downtown public space. Modification could include special pavement, street trees, and shared street treatments. Additionally, the plan suggests the potential of Kern Street to function as the entrance to the greenway linking downtown to Glen Canyon.

B. PROJECT-LEVEL AND PROGRAM-LEVEL OF ANALYSIS

This EIR provides both project-level and program-level environmental review of components in the *2010 Community Plan*. A programmatic-level review is a high-level review that covers general aspects of the 2010 Community Plan and then uses those findings as a guide for the more specific, subsequent project-level review. The project-specific level review focuses on the details of all environmental impacts associated with certain elements of the 2010 Community Plan. Components in the *2010 Community Plan* have been classified in the following categories for the purpose of the environmental review:

- *Components analyzed at the program level:* Land use and zoning controls that involve changes to the Planning Code and the *San Francisco General Plan* (General Plan); evaluation of the potential infill sites at the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street and the BART parking lot; preservation of historical resources; and open space improvements.

- *Components analyzed at the project level:* Traffic calming improvements (with the exception of San Jose Avenue), bicycle network improvements, pedestrian access improvements; and transit improvements.
- *Components not analyzed in the EIR:* Improvements considered speculative in nature, for which no financing mechanism has been identified, or which would occur beyond 2030. These include the Glen Park Village parklets,⁴ traffic calming improvements along San Jose Avenue, and redesign of San Jose Avenue.

C. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

This EIR analyzes the potential effects of the *2010 Community Plan*, as determined in the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (NOP), issued July 1, 2009 (Appendix A of this EIR). On January 6, 2010, the Planning Department distributed an Initial Study (also in Appendix A), which found that the proposed project would have potential significant effects on land use, visual quality, cultural resources (historic architectural, archaeological, and paleontological), transportation and circulation, noise and vibration, and air quality. It also found that the project effects on other environmental topics would not be significant adverse impacts, or would be less-than significant-effects with implementation of mitigation measures listed in the Initial Study.

Since publication of the Initial Study on January 6, 2010, the *CEQA Guidelines* have been amended to reflect additional threshold analysis criteria. The newly updated CEQA checklist questions for “Agricultural Resources” (now the “Agriculture and Forestry Resources”) and the “Transportation and Traffic” sections and analysis are reflected in this EIR. In addition, The *CEQA Guidelines* Amendments also added a new analysis topic, “Greenhouse Gases.” See Chapter III, Environmental Analysis, for the updated analysis.

The EIR uses the following terms to describe the level of significance of impacts identified during the course of the environmental analysis:

- No Impact—No adverse changes (or impacts) to the environment are expected.
- Less-Than-Significant Impact—Impact that does not exceed the defined significance criteria or would be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with existing local, State, and federal laws and regulations.
- Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation—Impact that is reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of the identified mitigation measures.

⁴ Parklets involve conversion of parking stalls into small open space areas with seating, tables, planters, and/or bicycle parking.

- Significant and Unavoidable Impact—Impact that exceeds the defined significance criteria and cannot be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with existing local, State, and federal laws and regulations and for which there are no feasible mitigation measures.
- Significant and Unavoidable Impact with Mitigation—Impact that exceeds the defined significance criteria and can be reduced through compliance with existing local, State, and federal laws and regulations and/or implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, but cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Table S-3, p. S-11, summarizes each of the environmental effects and mitigation measures identified in the EIR. Table S-4, p. S-38, summarizes the significant environmental effects and mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study for the topics that are not included in the EIR.

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Land Use	LU-1 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not conflict with land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	LU-2 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	C-LU The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not contribute to significant cumulative land use impacts.	LTS	None required.	LTS
Aesthetics	AE-1 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	C-AE The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts to aesthetic resources.	LTS	None required.	LTS
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	CP-1 Operation and design associated with the <i>2010 Community Plan's</i> Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement at the BART Station would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource.	S	<i>M-CP-1 Verification of Compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.</i> San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), in cooperation with BART and any other agency that may have jurisdiction, will prepare materials describing and depicting the widening of Diamond Street variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement at the BART Station, including but not limited to plans, drawings, and photographs of existing conditions.	LTS/MM

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			Prepared materials will be submitted to the Planning Department for review by staff who meet the Secretary of Interior's professional qualification standards. Such staff will review and the Historic Preservation Commission shall approve the project for compliance with the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> . If any aspect of the design of the widening of Diamond Street variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, or bus loop improvement at the BART Station is determined to be inconsistent with the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> , SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall pursue and implement a redesign of those elements, consistent with the goals and objectives of the project, such that consistency with the standards is achieved.	
	CP-2 Construction activities resulting from the pedestrian access and bus loop improvements at the BART Station would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource.	S	<i>M-CP-2A Protection of Historical Resource During Construction.</i> To protect the Glen Park BART Station from direct or indirect impacts during construction activities (e.g., due to damage from operation of construction equipment, vibration, staging, and material storage), SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall, prior to any construction activities, including any ground-disturbing work, prepare a plan establishing procedures to protect these resources. SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have	LTS/MM

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			jurisdiction, shall ensure that the contractor follows this plan while working near these resources. The plan shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian who meets the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards. At a minimum, the plan shall include: • A requirement for the placement of perimeter fencing and/or signs around the historical resource to identify it as a sensitive resource; • Guidelines for operation of construction equipment adjacent to the historical resource; • Guidelines for storage of construction materials away from the resource; • Requirements for monitoring and documenting compliance with the plan; and • Education/training of construction workers about the significance of the historical resource around which they would be working. <i>M-CP-2B Historical Resource Documentation and Protection.</i> Prior to construction, a historic preservation architect and a structural engineer shall undertake an existing condition study of the Glen Park BART Station. The purpose of the study would be to establish the baseline condition of the building and plazas prior to construction. The documentation shall take the form of written descriptions and visual	

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			illustrations, including those physical characteristics of the resource that convey its historic significance and that justify its inclusion on, or eligibility for inclusion on, the California Register. The documentation shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department. The structural engineer shall make periodic site visits to monitor the condition of the resource, including monitoring of any instruments such as crack gauges. The structural engineer shall consult with the historic preservation architect, to ensure that character-defining features are protected, especially if any problems with character-defining features of the historic resource are discovered. If in the opinion of the structural engineer, in consultation with the historic preservation architect, substantial adverse impacts to the historic resource related to construction activities are found during construction, the monitoring team shall so inform the SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction, or designated representative responsible for construction activities. The SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction, shall adhere to the monitoring team's recommendations for corrective measures, including halting construction in situations where construction activities would imminently endanger the historic resource. The monitoring team shall prepare site visit reports and submit them for review by the Planning	

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than
SignificantLTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation
MeasureSU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation
Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			Department. All documentation shall be made available to the public by request. <i>M-CP-2C Verification of Historic Preservation.</i> Upon completion of construction activities at the Glen Park BART Station, a qualified architectural historian shall document (e.g., with photographs and other appropriate means) the level of success in meeting the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> and in preserving the character-defining features of the BART Station. The SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall ensure repairs occur if any damage has occurred to the Glen Park BART Station during construction. Repair work shall occur in conformance with the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> and shall restore the character-defining features in a manner that does not affect the eligibility of the historic property for the California Register. The architectural historian shall prepare a verification report for review and approval by the Planning Department.	

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than
SignificantLTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation
MeasureSU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation
Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
CP-3	Future construction activities associated with the the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> area would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.	S	<i>M-CP-3 Accidental Discovery of Archaeological Resources.</i> The SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall distribute the Planning Department archaeological resource “ALERT” sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); or utilities firm involved in soil-disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soil-disturbing activities being undertaken, each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the “ALERT” sheet is circulated to all field personnel, including machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the Alert Sheet. Should any indication of an archaeological resource be encountered during any soil-disturbing activity of the project, the project Head Foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soil-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken. If the ERO determines that an archaeological resource may be present within the project site, the	LTS/MM

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant as provided by the Planning Department's List of Qualified Archeological Consultants. The archaeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archaeological resource, retains sufficient integrity, and is of potential scientific/historical/cultural significance. If an archaeological resource is present, the archaeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archaeological resource. The archaeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the project sponsor. Measures might include preservation in situ of the archaeological resource; an archaeological monitoring program; or an archaeological testing program. If an archaeological monitoring program or archaeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Major Environmental Analysis (MEA) division guidelines for such programs. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archaeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions. The project archaeological consultant shall submit a Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any	

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than
SignificantLTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation
MeasureSU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation
Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			discovered archaeological resource and describe the archaeological and historical research methods employed in the archaeological monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archaeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report. Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department shall receive three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.	
	CP-4 Future construction activities associated with the 2010 Community Plan would destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	S	<i>M-CP-4 Paleontological Resources Monitoring Plan.</i> The SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall retain the services of a qualified paleontological consultant having expertise in California paleontology to design and implement a monitoring and mitigation program. The program	LTS/MM

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			shall include a description of when and where construction monitoring would be required; emergency discovery procedures; sampling and data recovery procedures; procedures for the preparation, identification, analysis, and curation of fossil specimens and data recovered; preconstruction coordination procedures; and procedures for reporting the results of the monitoring program. If potential paleontological resources (fossilized invertebrate, vertebrate, plant, or micro-fossil) are encountered during excavation, work shall cease within 25 feet of the feature, the ERO shall be notified, and the paleontologist shall identify and evaluate the significance of the potential resource, documenting the findings in an advisory memorandum to the ERO. If it is determined that avoidance of effect to a significant paleontological resource is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan that may include curation of the paleontological resource in a permanent retrieval paleontological research collections facility such as the University of California Museum of Paleontology or California Academy of Sciences. The MEA division of the Planning Department shall receive two copies of a final paleontological excavation and recovery report. The paleontologist's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure and at the direction of the ERO. Plans and reports prepared by the	

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than
SignificantLTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation
MeasureSU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation
Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			paleontologist shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Paleontological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction for a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction could be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less-than-significant level potential effects on a significant paleontological resource as previously defined.	
	CP-5 Future construction activities associated with the 2010 Community Plan would substantially disturb human remains.	S	<i>M-CP-5 Treatment of Human Remains.</i> The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the NAHC who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Public Resource Code Section 5097.98). The SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall direct the archaeological consultant, in coordination with the MLD, to make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA	LTS/MM

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			Guidelines Section 15064.5(d)). <i>The</i> agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.	
	C-CP The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> , in combination with other foreseeable development, would result in potentially significant cumulative impacts to cultural and paleontological resources.	S	See Mitigation Measures M-CP-3, M-CP-4, and M-CP-5.	LTS/MM
Transportation and Circulation	TR-1 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would cause the level of service (LOS) at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM and PM peak hours.	S	See Mitigation Measures M-TR-1A and M-TR-1B below.	SU/MM
	TR-1A The infill development would cause the LOS at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to degrade to unacceptable levels.	S	<i>M-TR-1A Signal Timing Modifications at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection without Transportation Improvements.</i> SFMTA shall monitor intersection operations at this location as the plan area builds out. Once the intersection LOS deteriorates to LOS E, SFMTA shall optimize the signal and increase the cycle length from 80 to 90 seconds. This signal timing modification would improve the intersection operations to acceptable conditions (LOS D) during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours under Existing plus Infill Development Conditions, and would therefore reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.	LTS/MM

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			No secondary impacts would occur as a result of this increase in cycle length, because this intersection is not coordinated with an adjacent signalized intersection.	
	TR-1B The addition of the proposed pedestrian scramble phase to the infill development would cause the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels.	S	<i>M-TR-1B Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection Signal Timing Modifications with Transportation Improvements.</i> SFMTA shall monitor intersection operations at this location as the plan area builds out and transportation improvements occur. Once the intersection LOS deteriorates to LOS E, if feasible, SFMTA shall re-optimize the signal and increase the cycle length to 140 seconds (compared to 90 seconds as recommended by M-TR-1A if the transportation improvements are not implemented). This measure would improve traffic operations during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours under Project Conditions, but the intersection would continue to operate at unacceptable conditions, and therefore the project's impact at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection during both AM and PM weekday peak hours would remain significant and unavoidable. A secondary effect of this mitigation, although less than significant, would be that lengthening the cycle would cause pedestrians and vehicles to wait longer before being able to cross and access the intersection. Given the undesirable consequences of a signal cycle length increase of this magnitude, SFMTA has expressed strong reservations about the feasibility of	SU/MM

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			this mitigation measure. For this reason, implementation of this mitigation measure is considered uncertain.	
	TR-1C The implementation of the transportation improvement variants, together with the infill development, would not result in unacceptable service levels at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	TR-1D The 2010 Community Plan includes policies that encourage open space improvements and would not introduce new sources of traffic.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	TR-2 The 2010 Community Plan would cause the LOS at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection to deteriorate from acceptable levels to unacceptable levels during the AM peak hour.	S	See Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A below.	LTS/MM
	TR-2A The infill development plus transportation improvements or transportation improvement variants would cause the LOS at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM peak hour.	S	M-TR-2A Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps Intersection Signal Timing Modifications. SFMTA shall monitor intersection operations at this location as the potential infill development builds out and transportation improvements occur. Once intersection LOS deteriorates to LOS E, SFMTA shall increase the cycle length to 90 seconds. This signal timing modification would improve the intersection operations to acceptable conditions (LOS D) during	LTS/MM

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			the weekday AM peak hour. No secondary impacts would occur as a result of this increase in cycle length, because this intersection is not coordinated with an adjacent signalized intersection.	
	TR-2B The 2010 Community Plan includes policies that encourage open space improvements and would not introduce new sources of traffic.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	TR-3 The 2010 Community Plan would not contribute significantly to the existing unacceptable operating conditions at the Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street, Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue, and Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersections. The transportation improvement variants would improve conditions to acceptable levels at Bosworth Street/Lyell Street.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	TR-4 The 2010 Community Plan would alter traffic at 13 other study intersections in the plan area; however, the intersection LOS would continue to operate at acceptable levels.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	TR-5 The 2010 Community Plan would increase transit demand, but that demand could be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity.	LTS	None required.	LTS

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	TR-6 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not cause a substantial increase in transit travel times or conflict with transit operations.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	TR-7 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks, create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians, or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the plan area and adjoining areas.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	TR-8 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not create substantially hazardous conditions for bicyclists or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the plan area and adjoining areas.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	TR-9 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not substantially increase commercial loading and unloading activity and would not create potentially hazardous conditions related to commercial loading activities.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	TR-10 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not substantially increase or affect existing passenger loading and unloading activity.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	TR-11 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not result in inadequate emergency access.	LTS	None required.	LTS

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	TR-12 Implementation of the 2010 <i>Community Plan</i> could result in construction activities that interfere with local circulation and access over extended periods of time.	S	See Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A below.	LTS/MM
	TR-12A A simultaneous construction of two or more major components (bus loop, roundabout, or widening of northbound approach of Diamond Street) of the transportation improvements or transportation improvement variants would interfere with local circulation and access as a result of construction activities over extended periods of time.	S	<i>M-TR-12A Construction Transportation Management Plan.</i> In the event that two or more major proposed transportation improvements (specifically the bus loop, roundabout, or widening of the northbound approach of Diamond Street) are constructed simultaneously, SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall develop and implement a Construction Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to anticipate and minimize impacts of potentially overlapping construction activities. The TMP would coordinate construction activities to minimize disruptions and ensure that overall circulation is maintained to the extent possible, with particular focus on ensuring pedestrian, transit and bicycle connectivity. The TMP would supplement and expand, rather than modify or supersede, any existing regulations and requirements. The TMP shall be submitted to SFMTA Traffic Engineering Division, the Department of Public Works (DPW) and presented as part of review by the Transportation Advisory Staff Committee.	LTS/MM
	TR-12B Implementation of the open space improvements would not result in construction activities that interfere with local circulation and access over extended periods of time.	LTS	None required.	LTS

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	C-TR-13 The 2010 Community Plan in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the LOS at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM and PM peak hours.	S	See Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A, above, and M-C-TR-13B below.	SU/MM
	C-TR-13A The infill development in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to degrade to unacceptable levels during the PM peak hour and significantly contribute to unacceptable operating conditions in the AM peak hour.	S	Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A above.	SU/MM
	C-TR-13B The addition of the proposed transportation improvements to the infill development, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would cause the intersection level of service at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the PM peak hour and significantly contribute to unacceptable operating conditions in the AM peak hour.	S	<i>M-C-TR-13B Intersection #10 Signal Timing Modifications.</i> MTA shall monitor intersection operations at this location as the plan area infill development and transportation improvements occur. Once the transportation improvements are complete and/or the intersection LOS deteriorates to LOS E, if feasible, SFMTA shall re-optimize the signal and increase the cycle length to 150 seconds. This measure would be expected to improve traffic operations during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours under 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions, but the intersection would likely continue to operate at unacceptable conditions, and therefore the project's impact at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection during both AM and PM weekday	SU/MM

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			peak hours would remain significant and unavoidable. A secondary effect of this mitigation, although less than significant, would be that lengthening the cycle would cause pedestrians and vehicles to wait longer before being able to cross and access the intersection. Given the undesirable consequences of a signal cycle length increase of this magnitude, SFMTA has expressed strong reservations about the feasibility of this mitigation measure. For this reason, implementation of this mitigation measure is considered uncertain.	
	C-TR-13C The implementation of the transportation improvement variants, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not contribute to cumulative traffic conditions at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection.	S	See Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A above.	LTS/MM
	C-TR-13D The 2010 Community Plan includes policies that encourage open space improvements and would not introduce new sources of traffic.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	C-TR-14 The proposed project in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps during the AM peak hour.	S	See Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A above.	LTS/MM

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	C-TR-14A The infill development plus transportation improvements or transportation improvement variants in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps during the AM peak hour.	S	See Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A above.	LTS/MM
	C-TR-14B The open space improvements in combination with other foreseeable projects would not cause the LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps during the AM peak hour.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	C-TR-15 The 2010 Community Plan in combination with other foreseeable projects would not substantially increase traffic at the following intersections operating unacceptably under 2030 Cumulative Conditions: the Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street intersection; the Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue intersection; the Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/SB I-280 On-Ramp intersection; the Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersection; and the Monterey Boulevard/Acadia Street intersection. The transportation improvement variants would improve	LTS	None required.	LTS

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	conditions to acceptable levels at the Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersection.			
	C-TR-16 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> in combination with other foreseeable projects would alter traffic at 11 other study intersections in the plan area; however, the intersection LOS would continue to operate at acceptable levels.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	C-TR-17 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> (with either the transportation improvements or the transportation improvement variants) in combination with other foreseeable projects would not cause a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity, resulting in unacceptable levels of transit service.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	C-TR-18 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> (with either the transportation improvements or the transportation improvement variants) in combination with other foreseeable development would not cause a substantial increase in transit travel times or conflict with transit operations.	LTS	None required.	LTS
Noise and Vibration	NO-1 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels during construction.	LTS	None required.	LTS

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	NO-2 Construction activities would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive vibration levels.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	NO-3 Operation of the proposed project, including the use of mechanical equipment or the delivery of goods, would not expose noise-sensitive land uses on or off site to noise levels that exceed the standards established by the City.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	NO-4 Operation of the proposed project would expose residents of the BART parking lot infill development to excessive groundborne vibration.	S	<i>M-NO-4 BART Infill Site Vibration Assessment.</i> Prior to the submittal of a building permit application for the infill site, BART or BART's developer shall obtain a qualified vibration consultant to complete a site-specific vibration assessment. The vibration assessment shall measure the vibration levels at the existing BART parking lot within 200 feet of the underground BART alignment. If vibration levels exceed the FTA 72 VdB criteria for "frequent" vibration events impacting a residential use (i.e., more than 70 vibration events from the same source per day, which is typical of most rail rapid transit vibration sources), the vibration assessment shall recommend measures to reduce vibration levels to 72 VdB or less. Examples of such measures that have been very successfully used, separately or in combination, to avoid vibration impacts to other residential projects located near rail transit vibration sources include:	LTS/MM

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			• Building Foundation Mats – the use of increased mass in the foundation of the building to increase the effective vibration reduction that occurs at the boundary between the soil and the building foundation structure. • Vibration Isolation – after provision of a break or gap in the structure between the first floor concrete slab and the top of the basement walls/columns, isolation would be achieved by placing rubber pads between the top of the basement walls/columns and the first floor structure. Recommended vibration reduction measures provided by the site-specific assessment shall be incorporated into the design and construction of the proposed infill development project and their effectiveness shall be verified by vibration monitoring measurements after construction. BART or BART's developer shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) documentation demonstrating compliance with this measure for review and approval once construction has been completed, but prior to occupancy of the building(s).	

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	NO-5 Operation of land uses identified in the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in existing residential areas along the major access routes to the plan area.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	C-NO The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not result in significant cumulative noise and vibration impacts.	LTS	None required.	LTS
Air Quality	AQ-1 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not conflict or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	AQ-2 Fugitive dust from construction activities associated with the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not result in short-term violations of particulate matter ambient air quality standards.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	AQ-3 Equipment used for construction activities associated with the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would result in short-term emission increases of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria.	S	<i>M-AQ-3A Construction Vehicle Emissions Minimization.</i> To reduce the potential health risk resulting from project construction activities, the project sponsor shall include in contract specifications a requirement for the following measures: • Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to two minutes; • The project shall develop a construction plan	SU/MM

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			demonstrating that the off-road equipment (more than 50 horsepower) to be used in the construction project (i.e., owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles) would achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOX reduction and 45 percent PM reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average (as specified in California Code of Regulations Article 4.8, Section 2449 General Requirements for In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets). Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on devices such as particulate filters, and/or other options as such become available; • All construction equipment, diesel trucks, and generators shall be equipped with Best Available Control Technology for emission reductions of NOx and PM; • Use of Interim Tier 4 or equivalent equipment for all uses where such equipment is available; • Use of Tier 3 equipment with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) or alternative fuel vehicles for applications where Tier 4 Interim engines are not available; and	

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			Prohibition of diesel generators for construction purposes where feasible alternative sources of power are available. <i>M-AQ-3B Construction Phasing.</i> Prior to construction of development at the infill sites, any transportation improvements, or any open space improvements, the project sponsor shall coordinate with the Planning Department to determine: (1) whether any concurrent construction activities identified in the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> is occurring, (2) whether concurrent construction activities could exceed the BAAQMD's criteria air pollutant thresholds, and (3) whether project phasing could reduce criteria air pollutant to below BAAQMD's significance thresholds. The Planning Department may require additional criteria air pollutant analysis that includes implementation of the mitigation measures described in M-AQ-3A or more refined construction details.	
	AQ-4 Operational emissions associated with the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not emit criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that exceed 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria.	LTS	None required.	LTS

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	AQ-5 Operational emissions from motor vehicles trips associated with the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would not cause local concentrations of CO to exceed State and federal ambient air quality standards.	LTS	None required.	LTS
	AQ-6 Construction equipment associated with the proposed development under the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would emit PM _{2.5} and other TACs that exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria.	S	See Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A above.	SU/MM
	AQ-7 Motor vehicles and stationary sources operating in and near the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> area would emit PM _{2.5} and other TACs. Given that project implementation would introduce new residential sensitive receptors in locations exposed to high levels of PM _{2.5} and other TACs, resultant health risks would exceed the 1999 and the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria.	S	<i>M-AQ-7 Health Risk Review for Future Sensitive Receptors.</i> To reduce the potential health risk to new sensitive receptors within the plan area, new residential or open space development proposed under the 2010 Community Plan that is within 500 feet of Bosworth Street, San Jose Avenue, or I-280 shall, as part of its CEQA review, include an analysis of toxic air contaminants, including PM _{2.5} , diesel particulate matter (DPM), and total organic gases (TOGs), and shall, if warranted based on the results, develop a plan to minimize exposure of future sensitive receptors to TACs (which includes PM _{2.5} , DPM, and TOGs). The analysis shall employ either site-specific modeling of TAC concentrations or BAAQMD methodology to determine whether the average annual concentration of PM _{2.5} from the roadway sources within 500 feet would exceed the threshold, or action level of 0.3 µg/m ³ , or if the TAC exposure of PM _{2.5} , DPM, and TOGs would result in	SU/MM

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			an increased cancer risk greater than 10 in a million or a hazard index greater than 1.0. The health risk analysis shall be submitted to the Planning Department and shall identify measures to reduce exposure of new sensitive receptors in the plan area. These measures may include redesigning the project site plan to provide greater separation between the sensitive receptors and pollutant sources, installation of a filtered air supply system for residential uses, or placement of air intakes for the ventilation system at greater horizontal and/or vertical distances from pollutant sources.	
	C-AQ-1 Construction activity associated with the proposed development under the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> and with other development in the area would generate criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that would exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria.	S	See Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B above.	SU/MM
	C-AQ-2 Construction and operational activities associated with the proposed development under the 2010 Community Plan and with other development in the area would emit PM _{2.5} and other TACs. Although construction emissions would be temporary for each separate project, given the close proximity of sensitive receptors in the 2010 Community Plan area to the project and other development sites, resultant cumulative health risks would be significant.	S	See Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A above.	SU/MM

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

**TABLE S-3
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN EIR**

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	C-AQ-3 Development anticipated under the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would result in operation activities that emit TACs and PM _{2.5} and would introduce new sensitive receptors to an area exposed to TACs from cumulative motor vehicle sources on roadways in and near the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> area, but would not exceed the 2010 BAAQMD cumulative significance thresholds.	LTS	None required.	LTS
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	C-GG The proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, but not at levels that would result in a significant impact on the environment or conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.	LTS	None required.	LTS

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than
SignificantLTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation
MeasureSU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation
Measure

TABLE S-4
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL STUDY

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources	Implementation of the draft Community Plan would potentially result in the destruction or disturbance of the nesting habitat for migratory bird species.	S	<i>M-BI-1 Pre-Construction Nesting Bird Survey.</i> Any construction pursuant to the draft Community Plan, including development of the infill sites, transportation improvements, and creek daylighting, shall avoid the February 1 through August 31 bird nesting period to the extent feasible. If it is not feasible to avoid the nesting period, a survey for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist no earlier than 14 days prior to the construction. The area surveyed shall include all clearing/construction areas, as well as areas within 150 feet of the boundaries of these areas, or as otherwise determined by the biologist. In the event that an active nest is discovered, clearing/construction shall be postponed within 1 feet of the nest until a wildlife biologist has determined the nesting avian species and consulted on further measures with the California Department of Fish and Game. If the avian species present is protected under the MBTA, further mitigation could entail postponement of clearing or construction activities within 150 feet of the active nest until the young have fledged (left the nest), the nest is vacated, and there is no evidence of second nesting attempts. If the avian species is not protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), no further action is required and construction activities may proceed.	LTS/MM
Hydrology and Water Quality	The daylighting of Islais Creek under the draft Community Plan would potentially result in substantial creek bed and bank erosion impacts.	S	<i>M-HY-1 Daylighted Streambed and Bank Stabilization.</i> Prior to daylighting Islais Creek, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission shall prepare a Hydraulics and Hydrology Study to determine the expected flow rates for the daylighted creek, for up to the 200-year storm event. The daylighted portion shall be designed by a qualified engineer, erosion control	LTS/MM

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

TABLE S-4
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN THE INITIAL STUDY

Topic	Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Construction under the draft Community Plan would potentially expose construction workers to hazardous building materials such as PCB-containing electrical equipment or fluorescent lights if not properly disposed.	S	specialist, or stream restoration specialist to effectively convey the highest expected flow-through rate without causing or contributing to bed or bank erosion. This can be accomplished by off-site detention of peak flows, by-passing peak flow rates in excess of stable velocity, channel configuration (e.g., longitudinal slope, side slopes, check dams, and others) to reduce flow rates, and bed and bank stabilizing structures. It is recommended that bio-engineering processes be maximized and that hard engineering structures, if used, be vegetated (e.g., vegetated gabion, riprap, GEOWEB™, or geogrid structures) to comply with other design principles. <i>M-HZ-1 Hazardous Building Materials.</i> The City shall condition future development approvals to require that the subsequent project sponsors ensure that any equipment containing PCBs or Di-Ethylhexyl Phthalate (DEPH), such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, State, and local laws prior to the start of demolition, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during construction, shall be abated according to applicable federal, State, and local laws.	LTS/MM

Source: PBS&J, 2011.

S = Significant

LTS = Less Than Significant

LTS/MM = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure

SU/MM = Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure

D. SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

As stated in Section 15126.6(a) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, “an EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.”

The alternatives described below were crafted with the goal of avoiding significant impacts associated with the *2010 Community Plan*. This section summarizes feasible alternatives to the *2010 Community Plan* (proposed project) and discusses potential environmental impacts associated with these alternatives. Project decision makers could approve an alternative instead of the proposed project, if that alternative would reduce or eliminate significant impacts of the project, is determined to be feasible, and would meet most of the project objectives. The determination of feasibility will be made by project decision makers on the basis of substantial evidence in the record, which shall include, but not be limited to, information presented in the EIR and in comments received on the EIR.

Three alternatives are evaluated in this EIR: Alternative A - No Project; Alternative B - Reduced Development (High Residential/Low Retail Development); and Alternative C - Reduced Development (Hybrid Mix). Alternatives B and C were formulated to reduce residential and commercial development in the *2010 Community Plan* area. Table S-5, p. S-41 summarizes the comparison of significant effects of the project and project alternatives. The three alternatives and their potential environmental effects compared to the proposed project are summarized below and are described in detail in Chapter V, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, of this EIR.

**TABLE S-5
COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT TO ALTERNATIVES B AND C**

	Proposed Project	Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development	Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix
Description	Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street Up to 47 residential units Up to 8,582 gsf ground-floor commercial Up to 26 private parking spaces BART Parking Lot Up to 90 residential units 0 to 14,913 gsf commercial uses Up to 123 private parking spaces Other Development 13 residential units 5,250 gsf ground-floor commercial Proposed Transportation Improvements Traffic Calming Bicycle Networks Pedestrian Access Transit Improvements	Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street Up to 10 residential units Up to 1,000 gsf ground-floor commercial Up to 11 private parking spaces BART Parking Lot Up to 31 residential units Up to 2,000 gsf commercial uses Up to 33 private parking spaces Other Development 13 residential units 5,250 gsf ground-floor commercial Proposed Transportation Improvements Traffic Calming Bicycle Networks Pedestrian Access Transit Improvements	Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street Up to 15 residential units No ground-floor commercial Up to 15 private parking spaces BART Parking Lot 19 residential units Up to 5,000 gsf commercial uses Up to 22 private parking spaces Other Development 13 residential units 5,250 gsf ground-floor commercial Proposed Transportation Improvements Traffic Calming Bicycle Networks Pedestrian Access Transit Improvements
Impacts			
Land Use	No significant effects.	No significant effects.	No significant effects.
Aesthetics	No significant effects.	No significant effects.	No significant effects.
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	CP-1 Operation and design associated with the <i>2010 Community Plan's</i> Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement at the BART Station would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-1. CP-2 Construction activities resulting from the pedestrian access and bus loop improvements at the BART Station would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource. Less than significant with Mitigation Measures M-CP-2 A, M-CP-2B, and M-CP-2C.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-1. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A, M-CP-2B, and M-CP-2C.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-1. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures M-CP-2 A, M-CP-2B, and M-CP-2C.

**TABLE S-5
COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT TO ALTERNATIVES B AND C**

	Proposed Project	Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development	Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix
	CP-3 Future construction activities associated with the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> area would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-3.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-3.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-3.
	CP-4 Future construction activities associated with the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-4.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-4.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-4.
	CP-5 Future construction activities associated with the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would substantially disturb human remains. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-5.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-5.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-5.
	C-CP The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> , in combination with other foreseeable development, would result in potentially significant cumulative impacts to cultural and paleontological resources. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures M-CP-3, M-CP-4, and M-CP-5.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures M-CP-3, M-CP-4, and M-CP-5.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures M-CP-3, M-CP-4, and M-CP-5.
Transportation and Circulation	TR-1 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would cause the level of service (LOS) at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM and PM peak hours. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A and M-TR-1B.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
	TR-1A The infill development would cause the LOS at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to degrade to unacceptable levels. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
	TR-1B The addition of the proposed pedestrian scramble phase to the infill development would cause the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-TR-1B.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.

**TABLE S-5
COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT TO ALTERNATIVES B AND C**

Proposed Project	Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development	Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix
TR-2 The 2010 <i>Community Plan</i> would cause the LOS at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection to deteriorate from acceptable levels to unacceptable levels during the AM peak hour. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
TR-2A The infill development plus transportation improvements or transportation improvement variants would cause the LOS at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM peak hour. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
TR-12 Implementation of the 2010 <i>Community Plan</i> could result in construction activities that interfere with local circulation and access over extended periods of time. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A.
TR-12A A simultaneous construction of two or more major components (bus loop, roundabout, or widening of northbound approach of Diamond Street) of the transportation improvements or transportation improvement variants would interfere with local circulation and access as a result of construction activities over extended periods of time. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A.
C-TR-13 The 2010 <i>Community Plan</i> in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the LOS at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM and PM peak hours. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A and M-TR-13B.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
C-TR-13A The infill development in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to degrade to unacceptable levels	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.

**TABLE S-5
COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT TO ALTERNATIVES B AND C**

Proposed Project	Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development	Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix
during the PM peak hours and significantly contribute to unacceptable operating conditions in the AM peak hour. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A.		
C-TR-13B The addition of the proposed transportation improvements to the infill development, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would cause the intersection level of service at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the PM peak hour and significantly contribute to unacceptable operating conditions in the AM peak hour. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-TR-13B.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
C-TR-13C The implementation of the transportation improvement variants, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not contribute to cumulative traffic conditions at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
C-TR-14 The proposed project in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps during the AM peak hour. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
C-TR-14A The infill development plus transportation improvements or transportation improvement variants in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps during the AM peak hour. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.

**TABLE S-5
COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT TO ALTERNATIVES B AND C**

	Proposed Project	Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development	Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix
Noise and Vibration	NO-4 Operation of the proposed project would expose residents of the BART parking lot infill development to excessive groundborne vibration. Less than significant with Mitigation Measure M-NO-4.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-NO-4.	Less than significant with Mitigation Measure M-NO-4.
Air Quality	AQ-3 Equipment used for construction activities associated with the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would result in short-term emission increases of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B.
	AQ-6 Construction equipment associated with the proposed development under the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would emit PM _{2.5} and other TACs that exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A.
	AQ-7 Motor vehicles and stationary sources operating in and near the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> area would emit PM _{2.5} and other TACs. Given that project implementation would introduce new residential sensitive receptors in locations exposed to high levels of PM _{2.5} and other TACs, resultant health risks would exceed the 1999 and the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7.
	C-AQ-1 Construction activity associated with the proposed development under the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> and with other development in the area would generate criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that would exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A, and M-AQ-3B.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A, and M-AQ-3B.
	C-AQ-2 Construction and operational activities associated with the proposed development under the	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A.

TABLE S-5
COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT TO ALTERNATIVES B AND C

	Proposed Project	Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development	Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix
	<i>2010 Community Plan</i> and with other development in the area would emit PM2.5 and other TACs. Although construction emissions would be temporary for each separate project, given the close proximity of sensitive receptors in the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> area to the project and other development sites, resultant cumulative health risks would be significant. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A.		
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	No significant effects.	No significant effects.	No significant effects.

Source: PBS&J, 2011.

ALTERNATIVE A: NO PROJECT

Description

The No Project Alternative would entail no *2010 Community Plan* for the Glen Park community, including no new guiding policies proposals for the community character. Specifically, the No Project Alternative would entail no specific changes to existing land use policies or Planning Code amendments (no new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit [NCT] District or rezoning of parcels in the plan area); no policies for infill development on the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street or at the BART parking lot; and no transportation and open space improvements. For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that the existing land use policies, zoning, height, and bulk district, as well as structures in the plan area would not change.

This alternative would not preclude future proposals for development at the two infill sites or elsewhere in the plan area or proposals for other transportation and open space improvements.

Impacts

If the No Project Alternative were implemented, none of the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with transportation would occur.

The No Project Alternative would not avoid the significant air quality impacts since new residential uses could be constructed within the plan area near Bosworth Street, San Jose Avenue, and I-280, similar to the proposed project. These new residential uses could be exposed to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants and particulate matter associated with the identified roadways. However, the amount of residential uses that could be constructed within this area would likely be less than under the *2010 Community Plan*. In addition, any construction activities that would occur within the plan area under the No Project Alternative could expose existing sensitive uses to significant health risks and significant cumulative health risks from construction emissions. However, new residential uses developed within the plan area under the No Project Alternative would not be exposed to significant cumulative health risks in excess of Bay Area Air Quality Management District cumulative project thresholds, for the same reasons described for the proposed project.

In addition, the No Project Alternative would not include any of the transportation improvements that are part of the proposed project. As a result, two of the study intersections would experience higher vehicle delay under the No Project Alternative as compared with the proposed project: Intersection #3 Chenery Street/Natick Street, and Intersection #5 Wilder

Street/Carrie Street. Although the vehicle delay at these intersections would be higher, the overall intersection level of service would remain at acceptable levels of LOS. Additionally, conditions for non-motorized transportation (i.e., pedestrians, bicyclists) in the plan area under the No Project Alternative would be worse than with the proposed project, due to the fact that many of the proposed project's transportation improvements would slow vehicular traffic and reduce potential vehicle conflicts with pedestrians and bicyclists throughout the plan area.

Similarly, the *2010 Community Plan's* significant impacts associated with cultural and paleontological resources and noise and vibration would not occur; no mitigation measures would be needed. The project's less-than-significant aesthetic, land use, and greenhouse gas emissions impacts would also not occur under this alternative.

In addition, the significant effects in the areas of biological resources, hydrology and water quality, and hazards and hazardous materials associated with the *2003 Community Plan Summary* described in the Initial Study (see Appendix A) would not occur with this alternative; no mitigation measures would be required. Other less-than-significant effects would not occur including: population and housing; wind and shadow; recreation; utilities and service systems; public services; geology and soils; mineral and energy resources; and agricultural resources.

ALTERNATIVE B: REDUCED DEVELOPMENT - HIGH RESIDENTIAL/LOW RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

Description

Alternative B proposes a reduced development scenario, with fewer residential units and commercial space at both the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street infill site and the BART parking lot infill site (fewer than the proposed project). All of the other aspects of the proposed projects, such as the land use and zoning controls (including the Glen Park NCT District and the height increases), and transportation and open space improvements would be the same as under the proposed project.

Alternative B proposes to reduce infill development at the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street (to a maximum of 10 residential units and up to 1,000 gsf of ground-floor commercial space) and the BART parking lot (to a maximum of 31 residential units and up to 2,000 gsf of ground-floor commercial space). Up to 11 off-street parking spaces would be included at the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street infill site and up to 33 off-street parking spaces would be included at the BART parking lot. In areas zoned Glen Park NCT there would be a height limit increase from 40-X to 45-X to encourage active ground-floor uses. In addition, there would be a height limit increase from 40-X to 65-X uniformly across the BART parking lot infill site.

Additionally, all of the transportation improvements included under the proposed project would be included in Alternative B. These include traffic calming measures at the Bosworth Street and Diamond Street intersection; bicycle networks improvements; pedestrian access improvement measures including the connection to the Muni Metro J-Church Line; transit improvements such as the proposed BART Station bus loop improvement; and parking management strategies.

As described under the proposed project, other development potential within the Glen Park NCT District would be expected to occur over the life of the *2010 Community Plan*. The maximum development potential in the plan area, excluding development potential associated with the two infill sites, would be 13 residential units and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses, the same as under the proposed project.

In summary, the development at the infill sites under Alternative B would be reduced to 54 residential units compared to 150 under the proposed project. In addition, the total commercial space would be limited to 3,000 gsf compared to approximately 28,745 gsf proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*.

Impacts

This alternative would have environmental effects similar to those of the proposed project, as described in Section III, Environmental Setting and Impacts, of the EIR and the Initial Study (Appendix A) with the exception of transportation and circulation.

The significant and unavoidable impacts associated with transportation and circulation for Intersection #10 Bosworth Street / Diamond Street (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM and PM Peak Hour) would likely not occur with Alternative B, as the project contributions to these affected intersections would be less than with the proposed project. In addition, the impacts identified for Intersection #16 Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM Peak Hour), would also likely not occur with Alternative B. Thus, Mitigation Measures M-TR-1A, M-TR-1B, and M-TR-2A would not be necessary. Furthermore, transportation impacts from construction activities associated with the transportation improvements would occur if the bus loop element were constructed at the same time as the variant roundabout improvement, or widening of northbound approach of Diamond Street, also a variant improvement. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A would reduce construction impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The significant and unavoidable impacts associated with air quality would remain. Alternative B would allow for fewer residential units and less retail space at the infill sites than the proposed project; however, the level of construction activities on the most active days of construction would be comparable for this alternative and the proposed project. Thus, Alternative B would still have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD construction significance thresholds for daily emissions of criteria air pollutants (reactive organic gases [ROG] and NO_x) and expose sensitive receptors to PM_{2.5} TACs, even with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B. Alternative B would allow for fewer residential units at the infill sites than the proposed project; however, the placement of residential units within this area would result in significant and unavoidable impacts with mitigation, similar to the proposed project. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7 would reduce exposure of residents to TACs from mobile sources; however, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7, it may not be feasible to reduce exposure at the sites to below the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds for cancer risks.

Cumulative air quality impacts would be significant and unavoidable under Alternative B for construction emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors, similar to the proposed project. Alternative B would also result significant and avoidable impacts associated with cumulative health risks from construction activities. However, new residential uses developed within the plan area under Alternative B would not be exposed significant cumulative health risks, for the same reasons described for the proposed project.

The *2010 Community Plan's* significant impacts associated with cultural and paleontological resources and noise and vibration would still occur under Alternative B; implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CP-1, M-CP-2A, M-CP-2B, M-CP-2C, and M-NO-4 would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, the less-than-significant aesthetics, land use, and greenhouse gas emissions impacts would occur under this alternative, similar to the proposed project.

The significant effects in the areas of biological resources, hydrology and water quality, and hazards and hazardous materials associated with the *2003 Community Plan* Summary described in the Initial Study (see Appendix A) would still occur with this alternative and would be reduced to less than significant by implementing Mitigation Measures M-BI-1, M-HY-1, and M-HZ-1. Other less-than-significant effects would still occur including: population and housing; wind and shadow; recreation; utilities and service systems; public services; geology and soils; mineral and energy resources; and agricultural resources.

ALTERNATIVE C: REDUCED DEVELOPMENT- HYBRID MIX

Description

Like Alternative B, Alternative C proposes a reduced development scenario (different from Alternative B), with fewer residential units and commercial space at both the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street infill sites (fewer than the proposed project). All of the other aspects of the proposed projects, such as the land use and zoning controls (including the Glen Park NCT District and the height increases), and transportation and open space improvements would be the same as under the proposed project.

As with Alternative B, Alternative C was crafted to reduce any potential impacts associated with transportation and circulation (vehicle trip generation) from the high development potential at both of the infill sites (see Section II, Project Description, p. II-15). It was also designed to provide, the opportunity for mixed-use development near the Glen Park BART Station.

Alternative C proposes to reduce near-term infill development at the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street to a maximum of 15 residential units and no commercial space and the BART parking lot to a maximum of 19 residential units and up to 5,000 gsf of ground-floor commercial space. Up to 15 off-street parking spaces would be included at the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street infill site and up to 22 off-street parking spaces would be included at the BART parking lot. In areas zoned Glen Park NCT there would be a height limit increase from 40-X to 45-X to encourage active ground-floor uses. In addition, there would be a height limit increase from 40-X to 65-X uniformly across the BART parking lot infill site.

In addition, all of the transportation improvements included under the proposed project would be included under this alternative. These include traffic calming measures at the Bosworth Street and Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection; bicycle networks improvements; pedestrian access improvement measures including the connection to the Muni Metro J-Church Line; transit improvements such as the proposed BART Station bus loop improvement; and parking management strategies.

Other development potential within the Glen Park NCT District would be expected to occur over the life of the *2010 Community Plan*. The maximum development potential in the plan area, excluding development potential associated with the two infill development sites would be 13 residential units and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses, the same as under the proposed project.

In summary, the development at the infill sites would be reduced to 47 residential units compared to 150 under the proposed project. In addition, the total commercial space would be limited to 5,000 gsf compared to approximately 28,745 gsf proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*.

Impacts

This alternative would have characteristics and potential environmental effects similar to those of the proposed project, as described in Section III, Environmental Setting and Impacts, of the EIR and the Initial Study (Appendix A) with the exception of transportation and circulation.

The significant and unavoidable impacts associated with transportation and circulation for Intersection #10 Bosworth Street/Diamond Street (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM and PM Peak Hour) would likely not occur with Alternative C, as the project contributions to these affected intersections would be less than with the proposed project. In addition, the impacts identified for Intersection #16 Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM Peak Hour), would also likely not occur with Alternative C. Thus, Mitigation Measures M-TR-1A, M-TR-1B, and M-TR-2A would not be necessary. Furthermore, transportation impacts from construction activities associated with the transportation improvements would occur if the bus loop element were constructed at the same time as the variant roundabout improvement, or widening of northbound approach of Diamond Street, also a variant improvement. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A would reduce construction impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The significant and unavoidable impacts associated with air quality would remain. Alternative B would allow for fewer residential units and less retail space at the infill sites than the proposed project; however, the level of construction activities on the most active days of construction would be comparable for this alternative and the proposed project. Thus, Alternative B would still have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD construction significance thresholds for daily emissions of criteria air pollutants (ROG and NO_x) and expose sensitive receptors to PM_{2.5} TACs, even with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B. Alternative B would allow for fewer residential units at the infill sites than the proposed project; however, the placement of residential units within this area would result in significant and unavoidable impacts with mitigation, similar to the proposed project. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7, would reduce exposure of residents to TACs from mobile sources; however, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7, it may not be feasible to reduce exposure at the sites to below the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds for cancer risks.

Cumulative air quality impacts would be significant and unavoidable under Alternative C for construction emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors, similar to the proposed project. Alternative C would also result significant and avoidable impacts associated with cumulative health risks from construction activities. However, new residential uses developed within the plan area under Alternative C would not be exposed significant cumulative health risks, for the same reasons described for the proposed project.

The *2010 Community Plan's* significant impacts associated with cultural and paleontological resources and noise and vibration would still occur; implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CP-1, M-CP-2A, M-CP-2B, M-CP-2C, and M-NO-4 would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, the project's less-than-significant aesthetic, land use, and greenhouse gas emissions impacts would occur under this alternative.

The significant effects in the areas of biological resources, hydrology and water quality, and hazards and hazardous materials associated with the *2003 Community Plan* Summary described in the Initial Study (see Appendix A) would still occur with this alternative and would be reduced to less than significant by implementing Mitigation Measures M-BI-1, M-HY-1, and M-HZ-1. Other less-than-significant effects would still occur including: population and housing; wind and shadow; recreation; utilities and service systems; public services; geology and soils; mineral and energy resources; and agricultural resources.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Alternative B: Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development would have the least environmental impacts and would best meet the project objectives, as set forth by the *2010 Community Plan*. As a result, the environmentally superior alternative is Alternative B: Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development.

E. OTHER ALTERNATIVES AND PHYSICAL IMPROVEMENTS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

Prior to finalizing the physical improvements described in Chapter II, Project Description, a range of other physical improvements were examined to address the objectives of the *2010 Community Plan*. This section focuses specifically on the infill sites and the transportation improvement measures that were considered and rejected.

INFILL SITE ALTERNATIVE

One of the alternatives initially considered included developing the infill sites with only commercial uses, as opposed to a mix of both commercial and residential uses. This alternative

was developed and designed to avoid the significant and unavoidable impact associated with transportation and air quality. The distribution of the commercial space would be as follows:

- 5,700 gsf at the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street intersection infill site; and
- 10,000 gsf at the BART parking lot infill site.

This alternative would provide a total of 15,700 gsf of commercial space within the plan area.

The all-commercial space scenario alternative would reduce two significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project. The significant and unavoidable impact identified for Intersection #10 Bosworth Street/Diamond Street (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM and PM Peak Hour) would be reduced to a less-than-significant level due to the decrease of population density and, therefore, vehicular trips associated with an all-commercial space development at the infill sites. In addition, significant and unavoidable impacts associated with Intersection #16 Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM Peak Hour), would also be reduced to a less-than-significant level due to the decrease of population density. In addition, the significant and unavoidable air quality impact associated with residential receptors would be reduced to a less-than-significant level because no residential dwelling units would be constructed (only commercial space).

However, while this alternative would reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts identified under air quality and transportation analysis, it fails to meet basic project objectives regarding encouraging the development of mixed use infill projects that take advantage of proximity to transit. This alternative only considers commercial opportunities and excludes the potential for residential development. As such, this alternative was not considered for further analysis.

REDUCED DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES

In addition to the infill site alternatives described above, other reduced development alternatives were considered but rejected because they did not achieve the basic project objective of providing mixed-use development. The alternatives listed below did not provide a balanced mix of housing and commercial space. Additionally, they failed to mitigate any impacts. Therefore, these alternatives were not considered for further analysis.

The alternatives considered but eliminated from further analysis in this EIR include:

Maximum Residential

- The development at the infill site at the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street would include 15 residential units and no ground-floor commercial space.
- The development at the infill site at the BART parking lot would include a maximum of 38 residential units and no ground floor commercial space.

High Retail/Low Residential Mix

- The development at the infill site at the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street would include one residential unit and up to 3,000 gsf of ground floor commercial space.
- The development at the infill site at the BART parking lot would include six residential units and up to 8,000 gsf of ground floor commercial space.

"50/50" Residential /Retail Mix

- The development at the infill site at the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street would include 2 residential units and up to 2,800 gsf of ground floor commercial space.
- The development at the infill site at the BART parking lot would include 19 residential units and up to 5,000 gsf of ground floor commercial space.

TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

The transportation improvement measures considered but rejected were rejected based on engineering feasibility criteria, or because they did not meet the basic project objectives. All of the transportation measures improvements listed below did not move forward either because they were not feasible or did not meet the plan's objective.

Traffic Calming

- A roundabout at Lyell Street

Bosworth/Diamond Intersection Improvements

- Widening of Diamond Street with restriping and no protected turn phases

Pedestrian Access

- Pedestrian Bridge from Muni Metro J-Church Platform to Concourse-Level Plaza
- Pedestrian Bridge from Muni Metro J-Church Platform to BART Entry above Concourse-Level
- Pedestrian Bridge from Muni Metro J-Church Platform to Concourse-Level Plaza and Extended Ramp
- Pedestrian Bridge connecting Muni Metro J-Church Platform Using Existing BART Entry Plaza
- Pedestrian Bridge connecting Muni Metro J-Church Platform with Elevated San Jose Avenue Crossing
- Pedestrian Tunnel connecting Muni Metro J-Church Platform under San Jose Avenue
- Pedestrian Tunnel connecting Muni Metro J-Church Platform under San Jose Avenue with Concourse-Level BART Entry
- Retrofit of Existing Pedestrian Bridge with Elevators or Ramps

F. AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

This EIR evaluates the potential impacts of the proposed project with respect to land use, visual quality, cultural resources (historic architectural, archaeological, and paleontological), transportation and circulation, noise and vibration, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions. The Initial Study found that all other environmental effects would be less than significant, with mitigation measures identified.

On July 1, 2009, the Planning Department issued the NOP for the proposed project. Individuals and agencies that received these notices included owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site, tenants of properties adjacent to the project site, and other potentially interested parties, including various regional and state agencies.

On the basis of public comments on the NOP and the Initial Study and at the scoping meeting, potential areas of controversy and unresolved issues for this project include: future development potential (locations, land use type, intensity, and bulk and mass); adequacy of parking supply to accommodate growth; increased traffic resulting from future growth, and potential increase of air pollution. Some of these issues, including traffic and parking, are discussed in this EIR.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared by the City and County of San Francisco Planning Department (Planning Department), the Lead Agency for the proposed project, in conformance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (*CEQA Guidelines*) as amended.¹ The lead agency is the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project. This EIR assesses potentially significant impacts including, but not limited to, those concerning land use and land use planning, aesthetics, cultural and paleontological resources, transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions. As defined in the *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.

USE OF THE EIR

This EIR is prepared in accordance with CEQA, as amended, and the *CEQA Guidelines*. As stated in the *CEQA Guidelines*, 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. Although this EIR does not control the ultimate decision on the proposed project, the Planning Department must consider the information in this EIR and respond to each significant effect identified in this EIR. The Planning Department 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 specify any applicable environmental conditions as part of project approvals. CEQA provides that public agencies should not approve projects until all feasible means available have been employed to substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects. “Feasible” means capable of being accomplished in a

¹ Governor's Office of Planning Research, *California Environmental Quality Act*, Statutes and Guidelines, Guidelines as amended, Public Resolutions Code Sections 21000 et seq, California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq, March 18, 2010.

successful manner within a reasonable period of time taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.²

PROJECT-LEVEL AND PROGRAM-LEVEL ANALYSIS

This EIR includes both project-level and program-level review of components in the *Glen Park Community Plan – Working Draft for Community Discussion*³ (2010 Community Plan). CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 (Program EIR) explains that a "program EIR" is a type of first-tier environmental document prepared for an agency program or series of actions that can be characterized as one large project. Program EIRs are typically prepared for agency plans, policies or regulatory programs, and generally analyze broad environmental effects of the program with the acknowledgement that site-specific environmental review may be required for particular aspects of the program when those aspects are proposed for implementation. CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, subsection (a), states that a state or local agency should prepare a program EIR, rather than a project EIR, when the agency proposes a program or series of related actions that are linked geographically, are logical parts of a chain of contemplated events, rules, regulations, or plans that govern the conduct of a continuing program, or are individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects that can be mitigated in similar ways.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15161 (Project EIR) explains that the "project EIR" is the most common type of EIR, examining in detail the site-specific and cumulative environmental impacts of a specific development project. To meet CEQA requirements, this EIR has been prepared as program and project EIR for the proposed project components identified in Chapter II, Project Description, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15161. Components analyzed at the program level in this EIR include the policies of the 2010 Community Plan and land use and zoning controls that involve changes to the Planning Code and zoning maps. In addition, the program-level analysis includes evaluation of the potential infill sites at the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street and at the BART parking lot, as well as open space improvements. Specific projects, such as potential future rezoning of the BART parking lot and future development at the infill sites, would be subject to market factors, private development proposals, additional zoning modifications, and future environmental review and approval, as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15152(b). Because the infill development, rezoning of the BART parking lot, and open space improvements are not currently proposed, specific design details are not known

² Public Resources Code Section 21061.1.

³ City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Glen Park Community Plan, Working Draft for Community Discussion*, September 2010. Available at: http://www.sflanning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Glen_Park/Glen_Park_Community_Plan_091310.pdf.

and these components are analyzed at a program level. Components analyzed at the project level from the *2010 Community Plan* include transportation improvements associated with traffic calming, bicycle network, pedestrian access, and transit.

For the purpose of this EIR, the proposed project includes the land use and zoning controls, potential infill development, and transportation improvements introduced in the *2010 Community Plan*. The potential future rezoning of the BART parking lot is not included in the *2010 Community Plan*, but the EIR analyzes the environmental effects of potential infill development at that site at a program level. In order to succinctly describe all the components of the proposed project, this EIR primarily refers to the proposed project as the *2010 Community Plan*. This EIR addresses the changes in the environment that would result from the proposed project.

PROJECT SUMMARY

The *2010 Community Plan*, once adopted, would be incorporated into the *San Francisco General Plan* (General Plan) as an area plan; identifying specific localized goals and objectives. Once implemented, it would result in a number of physical improvements, including street network changes, transportation and infrastructure changes, infill development, and open space improvements. In addition, the *2010 Community Plan* would modify existing land use and zoning controls, including modification of zoning districts and height and bulk controls in the *San Francisco Planning Code* (Planning Code). A new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit District (NCT) would be created and applied in the plan area's commercial core to reflect the area's proximity to abundant transit service. This district would incorporate parcels currently zoned as Neighborhood Commercial (small-scale NC-2) and a lot on Kern Avenue (currently zoned for Residential - Two Family [RH-2]). Although the *2010 Community Plan* zoning proposal does not identify zoning changes to the BART parking lot, this EIR analyzes the potential environmental effects that would result from infill development on this site under a potential future rezoning scenario.

Transportation improvements envisioned in the *2010 Community Plan* and analyzed in this EIR include the following:

- Improved access between the Glen Park BART Station and the Muni Metro J-Church stop;
- Improved Muni access to the Glen Park BART Station via a bus loop and new concourse entry on the south side of the station;
- Better access to the Glen Park BART Station plaza near the intersection of Bosworth Street and Diamond Street;

- Improved pedestrian linkages to infill development (at the Glen Park BART Station parking lot);
- Roundabout along Bosworth Street and Arlington Street;
- Traffic calming on Bosworth Street from Diamond Street to Lyell Street; and
- Other traffic calming, streetscape, and pedestrian improvements throughout the plan area.

The potential infill development includes two sites: 1) six parcels on the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street, and 2) the Glen Park BART Station parking lot on the north side of Bosworth Street and Arlington Street. The infill sites would consist of mixed-used development, including residential and commercial uses. In total, the two infill sites could accommodate a maximum of 137 residential units, approximately 23,495 square feet of commercial space, and 148 off-street parking spaces.

The *2010 Community Plan* also includes policies that support open space and recreation within Glen Park, including the possibility of a greenway link between Glen Park and Glen Canyon. In addition, the plan encourages the conversion of a block along Kern Street into a downtown public space. Modification could include special pavement, street trees, and shared street treatments. Further, the plan suggests the potential of Kern Street to function as the entrance to the greenway linking downtown to Glen Canyon.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

An Environmental Evaluation Application (EE Application) for the proposed project was submitted to the Planning Department on October 27, 2005. The filing of the EE Application initiated the environmental review process as outlined below.

NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND INITIAL STUDY

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR was issued on July 1, 2009 and one scoping meeting was held on July 16, 2009. The scoping meeting provided the public and affected governmental agencies with an opportunity to present their environmental concerns regarding the proposed project. CEQA-related concerns raised at that meeting and in written comments addressed topics include aesthetics, land use, population and housing, transportation, noise, biological resources, hazardous materials, air quality, wind and shadow, public services, and hydrology and water quality. Based on the comments received, the Planning Department determined that preparation of an Initial Study would be appropriate to “focus” the scope of the EIR.

The Planning Department distributed a Notice of Availability (NOA) and an Initial Study on January 6, 2010. The Initial Study is a preliminary analysis prepared by the Planning Department to determine whether an EIR is needed. The Initial Study concluded that the project could have a significant effect on the environment and, thus, an EIR is required. In response to the NOA and the Initial Study, approximately a dozen individuals submitted comment letters to the Planning Department. The primary issues raised were in regards to impacts of development on what residents describe as an already stressed traffic and parking climate. Specifically, some commentors expressed concern regarding stressed traffic conditions, including the existing lack of space for vehicles and people, and congested streets and sidewalks. In addition, some commentors raised the issue of lack of parking in Glen Park, specifically street parking at the BART parking lot. Other comments concerned the issue of the type of housing at the infill sites being too dense, and possibly serving as transitional housing. These comments are addressed in Section III.B, Land Use, p. III.B-1, and Section III.E, Transportation and Circulation, p. III.E-1. No comments were received from public agencies. Copies of the NOP and the Initial Study are included in this EIR as Appendix A.

The Initial Study determined that the proposed project would have no effect, a less-than-significant effect, or a less-than-significant effect with implementation of mitigation measures on the following environmental factors:

- Population and Housing
- Wind and Shadow
- Recreation
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Public Services
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral and Energy Resources
- Agricultural Resources
- Biological Resources
- Hydrology and Water Quality

The Initial Study also determined that the proposed project may have a potentially significant effect on the following environmental factors:

- Land Use and Planning
- Aesthetics
- Cultural and Paleontological Resources
- Transportation and Circulation
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions

In light of the potential for the proposed project to result in significant effects on the environment, the Initial Study concluded that an EIR would be required.

Accordingly, the environmental effects of implementing the proposed project are analyzed in this EIR under each major topic as listed above in accordance with *CEQA Guidelines*. The *CEQA Guidelines* define the effects of a project as changes from the environmental setting (existing conditions) that are attributable to the project. Short-term construction impacts as well as the long-term operational impacts are analyzed as appropriate for the various topics as listed.

CEQA AMENDMENTS SINCE PUBLICATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY

On December 30, 2009, the Natural Resources Agency adopted *CEQA Guidelines* Amendments described in the Notice of Proposed Action dated July 3, 2009, and Notice of Proposed Changes dated October 23, 2009, in response to public comments. The amendments are effective as of March 18, 2010. The amended *CEQA Guidelines* include newly updated checklist questions for the “Agriculture and Forestry Resources” analysis (formerly Agricultural Resources) and the “Transportation/Traffic” analysis. The *CEQA Guidelines* Amendments also added a new analysis topic, “Greenhouse Gases”, which is included in the EIR (Section III.H, Greenhouse Gas Emissions). Section III.A, Environmental Setting and Impacts, Introduction, p. III.A-2, includes the additional analysis regarding forest resources, and Section III.E, Transportation and Circulation, includes the newly updated analysis regarding Transportation and Traffic. These modifications reflect the newly updated 2010 *CEQA Guidelines* Amendments.

DRAFT EIR

This Draft EIR is prepared in accordance with CEQA, as amended, and the *CEQA Guidelines*. The EIR is a public informational document intended to disclose to public agency decision-makers and the general public the significant environmental effects of a project and to present

mitigation measures and feasible alternatives to avoid or reduce the significant environmental effects of that project. This Draft EIR provides a physical impact analysis for construction and operation of the proposed project.

All documents referenced in this Draft EIR are available for review at the City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA, 94103. The distribution list for the Draft EIR is also available for review by appointment at the Planning Department.

Following publication of this Draft EIR, there will be a public hearing before the Planning Commission during an approximately 45-day public review and comment period to solicit public comment on the adequacy and accuracy of information presented in this Draft EIR. The public hearing on this Draft EIR has been scheduled by the San Francisco Planning Commission for June 2, 2011 in Room 400 City Hall, Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, beginning at 12:00 p.m. (call 558-6422 the week of the hearing for a recorded message giving a more specific time).

In addition, readers 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. Comments are most helpful when they suggest specific alternatives and/or additional measures that would better mitigate significant environmental effects. *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15096(d) calls for responsible agencies to provide comments on those project activities within those agencies' areas of expertise and to support those comments with either oral or written documentation.⁴

Written comments should be submitted to: Bill Wycko, Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

FINAL EIR

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

⁴ CEQA Section 21069 defines a responsible agency as a public agency, other than the lead agency, that has responsibility for carrying out or approving a project.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. INTRODUCTION

The *Glen Park Community Plan – Working Draft for Community Discussion* (September 2010)¹ (*2010 Community Plan*) is a product of a sustained community process that addresses the issues and opportunities facing the neighborhood. The *2010 Community Plan* introduces goals, objectives, and policies aimed at preserving and enhancing the unique character of Glen Park. The *2010 Community Plan* contains three elements: Land Use and Urban Design, Transportation, and Open Space. Each element presents policies that, collectively, encourage local business vitality, strengthen neighborhood identity, improve transportation conditions, calm traffic, and promote pedestrian safety. The *2010 Community Plan* aims at directing the City to implement near-term projects as well as pursue larger future visions.

The *2010 Community Plan* is an update of the November 2003 *Glen Park Community Plan Summary*² (*2003 Community Plan Summary*) and reflects a collaborative effort with the Glen Park community. The *2003 Community Plan Summary* was first developed through coordination among the San Francisco Planning Department (Planning Department), the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) District, and other agencies, with extensive involvement from the Glen Park community. This planning process emerged as part of the Planning Department's Better Neighborhoods 2002 program. The intent of the Better Neighborhoods program is to help make San Francisco's urban neighborhoods the best places they can be for those who live in them. The Better Neighborhoods program embraces the benefits of change to build more balanced and livable places in San Francisco. The City has adopted plans for Market & Octavia, the Eastern Neighborhoods, and the Balboa Park Station.

The *2003 Community Plan Summary* presented an overall concept for enhancing the positive existing features of the neighborhood, as well as for improving the circulation and transit needs of the community. Policies in the *2003 Community Plan Summary* addressed pedestrian safety, traffic flow, access to transit, parking, and other transportation improvements. The *2003 Community Plan Summary* also presented improvements and proposed redesign of the Glen Park BART Station plaza and proposed policies that supported open space and recreation within

¹ City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Glen Park Community Plan, Working Draft for Community Discussion*, September 2010. Available at: http://www.sflanning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Glen_Park/Glen_Park_Community_Plan_091310.pdf.

² City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Glen Park Community Plan Summary*, November 2003. Available at: <http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/planning/citywide/pdf/gpdplowres.pdf>.

Glen Park. After completion of the 2003 *Community Plan Summary*, the project was postponed until additional funding was identified to carry the plan forward. In 2009, the Planning Department re-initiated the community planning process to revise and update the 2003 *Community Plan Summary*, and in September 2010, the Planning Department released an updated working draft of the 2010 *Community Plan*.

The 2010 *Community Plan* removed several components of the 2003 *Community Plan Summary* that were analyzed in the Initial Study. With the exception of historic preservation policies, no new components were added to the 2010 *Community Plan*. The analysis and conclusions in the Initial Study remain valid for components of the 2010 *Community Plan* that were unchanged or that were revised to be addressed at a policy level. For example, specific open space improvements included in the 2003 *Community Plan Summary* were revised to include policies that encourage such improvements. Table II-1, p. II-3, presents the differences in components of the 2003 *Community Plan Summary* compared to the 2010 *Community Plan*.

The 2010 *Community Plan* includes a draft implementation program that outlines follow up actions that are recommended to take place in order to make the plan's vision a reality. Actions include updating the Planning Code to reflect the zoning change of Neighborhood Commercial (NC-2), Residential House, Three Family (RH-3), and Residential House, Two Family (RH-2) zoned properties 605 Chenery Street and 3121-25 Castro Street to Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT) District; considering rezoning the BART parking lot; preserving historic resources by the Historic Preservation Commission (HCP) and nominating eligible properties to the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register); developing a greenway design for greenway path; conducting technical studies of daylighting portion of Islais Creek through Glen Park; and promoting other open space in the area.

Upon adoption by the San Francisco Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, the 2010 *Community Plan* would be incorporated into the *San Francisco General Plan* (General Plan) as an area plan. The area plans identify specific localized goals and objectives for a neighborhood or district which cover their respective geographic areas of the city.

Future development projects in the 2010 *Community Plan* area could be exempt from further environmental review if they substantially conform with the zoning controls established in the plan area and studied in this EIR, and there is no substantial new information showing that there may be new or more severe impacts.

**TABLE II-1
COMPARISON OF 2003 AND 2010 COMMUNITY PLANS**

Plan Component	2003 Community Plan Summary^a	2010 Community Plan^{b, c}
Land Use Policies and Planning Code Amendments		
Revised Land Use Districts	Rezoning of small-scale Neighborhood Commercial (NC-2) zoning to Glen Park NCT zoning.	Same, except for the additional rezoning of Residential House, Three Family (RH-3) and Residential House, Two Family (RH-2) zoned properties at 605 Chenery Street and 3121-25 Castro Street to Glen Park NCT zoning.
	Rezoning of BART parking lot infill site, Public (P) zoning to Glen Park NCT and Residential, Two Family (RH-2) zoning.	Removed. BART parking lot site is not proposed to be rezoned as part of the Community Plan process.
	Rezoning of Diamond/Bosworth infill site from NC-2/RH-2 to Glen Park NCT zoning.	Same
Revisions to Height and Bulk Controls	Rezoning of parcels to Glen Park NCT to increase height from 40 to 45 feet.	Same, except for portions of Wilder Street, Diamond Street, and Chenery Street which would decrease in height from a range of 40 to 45 feet to a range of 30 to 35 feet under the Glen Park NCT zoning.
	Rezoning of parcels to Glen Park NCT, at the BART parking lot site, to increase height from 40 to 65 feet.	Removed
Historic Preservation Policies	Not included	Policies encouraging the preservation of historic resources in the Glen Park neighborhood.
Design Guidelines		
Public Realm (Streetscape) Guidelines	Streetscape design guidelines for public realm improvements.	Removed
Architectural Design Guidelines	Architectural design guidelines for the commercial core.	Removed
Infill Site Design Guidelines	Site-specific design guidelines for infill sites.	Removed
Transportation Improvements		
Traffic Calming	Traffic calming improvements along Bosworth Street and at the intersection of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street.	Same
Bicycle Networks	San Francisco Bicycle Plan improvements 5-7a and 5-7b.	Same
Pedestrian Access	Pedestrian connection to the Muni Metro J-Church stop.	Same
Transit Improvements	Connection between Muni bus service and the Glen Park BART Station.	Same
Parking	Suggested methods to better utilize on-street parking.	Same
Greenway Improvements		
Linear greenway	Development of linear greenway connecting Glen Canyon Park to Downtown Glen Park.	Policies encouraging the greenway connection of Glen Canyon Park to Downtown Glen Park.
Daylighting of Islais Creek	Strategies and design measures for daylighting of Islais Creek.	Policies encouraging the daylighting of Islais Creek.

II. Project Description

Sources: SFMTA, City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, PBS&J, 2011.

- a. City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Glen Park Community Plan Summary*, November 2003. Available at: <http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/planning/citywide/pdf/gdpdplowres.pdf>.
 - b. City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Glen Park Community Plan, Working Draft for Community Discussion*, (Appendix B), September 2010. Available at: http://www.sflanning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Glen_Park/Glen_Park_Community_Plan_091310.pdf
 - c. City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Glen Park Community Plan (2010) Text Changes, Memo from Jon Swae to Lisa Gibson*, March 22, 2011. See Appendix C.
 - d. City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Glen Park Community Plan Refinements Subsequent to Draft EIR Publication, Memorandum from Jon Swae to Lisa Gibson*, September 23, 2011. See Appendix F.
-

B. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The Planning Department, on behalf of the City, is the project sponsor of the *2010 Community Plan*, while the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) is the sponsor of the proposed transportation improvements. According to the *2010 Community Plan*, the overall objective of the project is to realize the main vision articulated in the 2003 planning process for Glen Park:

*The Glen Park community's special character is created by the unique combination of eclectic building styles, pedestrian scale, the layering of green space and buildings climbing into the canyon, public spaces, walkable streets, a compact village, and proximity to transit and the canyon. Every new development project, whether public or private, must incorporate these features based on principles of good design and human scale.*³

The *2010 Community Plan* is a planning effort that aims to enhance the positive existing features of the neighborhood by implementing a set of land use and zoning controls, transportation systems, and open space and streetscape improvements that would help enrich the vibrant transit-oriented community. The controls encourage new infill development and enhance the urban environment in a variety of ways. The *2010 Community Plan* strives to achieve the following goals:

- Protect and strengthen the character of Glen Park's vibrant walkable neighborhood commercial district;
- Balance the use of streets for pedestrians, bicycles, transit and automobiles in a way that satisfies circulation needs and enhances the livability of Glen Park; and
- Minimize the impacts of past large-scale infrastructure projects on the community.⁴

As a part of its goal to support and strengthen the character of the area's neighborhood commercial district, the plan supports the development of new mixed use infill projects that are compatible with the scale and character of the neighborhood and that take advantage of the area's privileged position in proximity to transit. In addition to the above-listed goals, the *2010 Community Plan* has 11 objectives described further below starting on p. II-12.

³ City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Glen Park Community Plan, Working Draft for Community Discussion*, September 2010, available at: http://www.sflanning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Glen_Park/Glen_Park_Community_Plan_091310.pdf, p. 6.

⁴ City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Glen Park Community Plan, Working Draft for Community Discussion*, September 2010, available at: http://www.sflanning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Glen_Park/Glen_Park_Community_Plan_091310.pdf, p. 6.

C. PROJECT OVERVIEW

The *2010 Community Plan* would govern future development and public improvements in the Glen Park community by proposing new land use and zoning controls as defined in the Land Use and Urban Design Element of the *2010 Community Plan*. Specifically, the *2010 Community Plan* introduces a new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT) zoning district in the village center. In addition, the *2010 Community Plan* identifies two potential infill sites as: 1) six parcels on the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street, and 2) the Glen Park BART Station parking lot on the north side of Bosworth Street and Arlington Street. While the *2010 Community Plan* does not specifically call out any parcels for infill development, this EIR considers six parcels (013, 025, 027, 030, 031, 032) on the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street to present a conservative analysis of maximum buildout potential. Policies in the *2010 Community Plan* identify that infill development possibilities would most likely consist of new residential and commercial uses, as described in further detail below. The *2010 Community Plan* does not propose development of these sites, nor would it rezone the BART parking lot. Although the *2010 Community Plan* zoning proposal does not identify zoning changes to the BART parking lot, this EIR analyzes the potential environmental effects that would result from infill development on this site under a potential future rezoning scenario, described on p. II-17. Lastly, the *2010 Community Plan* includes policies that support open space within Glen Park, including the possibility of a greenway link between Glen Park and Glen Canyon, the potential for “daylighting” a portion of Islais Creek, and encouraging downtown public spaces. This EIR analyzes the land use, the proposed zoning controls, and potential infill development at a program level.

This EIR also analyzes a number of transportation improvements at a project level, including improvements for pedestrian, transit, and bicycle circulation and accessibility. The transportation improvements analyzed in this document are a result of a study commissioned by the SFMTA to examine the improvements identified in the *2003 Community Plan Summary*.⁵ Transportation-related stakeholders, such as SFMTA, SF Planning, Caltrans, and BART, rated the effectiveness of the different improvements at achieving the intended objectives, affirmed the findings regarding feasibility, and recommended a set of feasible improvements for consideration in this EIR. These are explained further below on p. II-20. Improvements that are considered speculative in nature, for which no financing mechanism has been identified, or

⁵ PBS&J. *Alternative Analysis Report, Glen Park Community Plan Environmental Impact Analysis*, prepared on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, February 22, 2010. This report is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

which would occur beyond 2030 (e.g., converting San Jose Avenue from a “freeway” to a City street) are not included as part of the proposed project evaluated in this EIR. See p. II-11 for further discussion of this topic.

For the purpose of this EIR, the proposed project includes the land use and zoning controls, potential infill development, and transportation improvements introduced in the *2010 Community Plan*. As described above, the potential future rezoning of the BART parking lot is not included in the *2010 Community Plan*, but the EIR analyzes the environmental effects of potential infill development at that site at a program level. In order to succinctly describe all the components of the proposed project, this EIR primarily refers to the proposed project as the *2010 Community Plan*.


All of the program-level and project-level components mentioned above and further described below constitute the proposed project.

D. PROJECT LOCATION

The area analyzed in this EIR is in the center of Glen Park neighborhood and is bounded generally by Chenery Street to the north; Roanoke Street to the east; San Jose Avenue and Bosworth Street to the south; and Elk Street to the west. This area is defined as the “plan area” and is shown in Figure II-1, p. II-7. The plan area is located in the center of the Glen Park neighborhood in the City of San Francisco. Glen Park is located south of the Diamond Heights and Noe Valley neighborhoods, west of the Bernal Heights neighborhood, and east of Glen Canyon Park. Existing development in this area is a mix of small-scale commercial/retail and residential uses (predominantly single-family residences).

The plan area is generally consistent with the area known as “the village” or “downtown” that encompasses Glen Park’s commercial district, the Glen Park BART Station, and nearby public open spaces. The center of the plan area and the area that would be most altered as a result of the proposed project is the neighborhood commercial core at the intersection of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street. Surrounding residential neighborhoods are relatively built out under existing zoning, and the *2010 Community Plan* does not propose to alter the land use pattern within these neighborhoods.⁶ The commercial core is within a valley in Glen Canyon. Houses on the surrounding hillsides frame the views along Diamond Street and create a sense of enclosure in the downtown area.

⁶ City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Glen Park Community Plan, Working Draft for Community Discussion*, September 2010, available at: http://www.sflanning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Glen_Park/Glen_Park_Community_Plan_091310.pdf



SOURCE: PBS&J, 2009.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE II-1: REGIONAL AND CITY PROJECT LOCATION

Land uses in Glen Park include a mix of residential, institutional (school, library), transit, retail, office, and recreational uses. Downtown Glen Park is a small-scale, mixed-use district characterized by two- to three-story buildings with ground-floor retail uses and mostly residential uses above. Some office and commercial uses can be found on the second floor of buildings. In addition, a variety of neighborhood-serving stores can be found in the downtown area. The Glen Park BART Station is located on a triangular parcel between Diamond Street, Bosworth Street, and the I-280 on-ramp. The station is set back from the street on all sides, with plazas fronting Diamond Street and Bosworth Street and low-lying ground cover between the station and I-280. The station sits at an elevation below the intersection of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street, and below the San Jose Avenue and I-280 overpasses.

The primary public open space in the Glen Park neighborhood is Glen Canyon Park, a 70-acre natural and recreational area. The park provides both active and passive recreation opportunities for residents such as hiking trails, a baseball diamond, tennis courts, a recreation center, and Islais Creek, one of the only free-flowing creeks in San Francisco. Glen Canyon Park is not part of the plan area. Islais Creek is free flowing through the canyon, prior to flowing into an underground culvert just north of the Glen Park Recreation Center, at Elk Street. The creek flows beneath an east-west vegetated easement under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). The easement runs parallel to Bosworth Street through downtown Glen Park between Lippard Avenue and the BART parking lot, and is located within the plan boundary. The creek eventually discharges to the San Francisco Bay in the Bayview/Hunters Point neighborhood, in southeastern San Francisco.

Glen Park is served by BART; San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) bus lines 23, 35, 36, 44, and 52; and the Muni Metro J-Church light rail line. The neighborhood has immediate access to U.S. 101 and I-280. The proximity to I-280, BART, and U.S. 101 provides direct access to downtown San Francisco, the East Bay, the Peninsula, and South Bay regions.


The local street system in Glen Park has a significant influence on the character and accessibility of the neighborhood. Three major roadways define the area of the proposed project: San Jose Avenue, I-280, and Bosworth Street. Downtown Glen Park is located to the north of San Jose Avenue and I-280, east of Bosworth Avenue. The intersection of the three major roadways and the associated infrastructure at the heart of the neighborhood splits Glen Park into four distinct areas: north of San Jose Avenue; northwest of I-280; south of I-280; and between San Jose Avenue and I-280. These four areas created by the roadways define the larger Glen Park community and extend beyond the plan area evaluated in this EIR. Beyond the immediate area

of the freeway overpasses, ramps, and other infrastructure, neighborhood streets are local serving and form the backbone of the residential and commercial neighborhoods.

There are five existing zoning use districts within the plan area, as shown in Figure II-2, p. II-10. Existing zoning in downtown Glen Park includes small-scale Neighborhood Commercial (NC-2) on parcels facing Diamond Street, Chenery Street, Joost Avenue, and Wilder Street; Residential, House Districts, One, Two, and Three Family zoning (RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3, respectively); and Public (P) along lots just north of Bosworth Street, Glen Park Elementary School, the BART Station, and areas adjacent to San Jose Avenue and the I-280 freeway entrances. The majority of the plan area falls within the Residential - One Family (RH-1) District, particularly between Bosworth Street and Chenery Street. This zoning district allows one dwelling unit per 3,000 gross square feet (gsf) of lot area. The plan area also includes several Residential-Two Family (RH-2) and Residential - Three Family (RH-3) zoned parcels that allow up to two dwelling units per 1,500 gsf of lot area and up to three dwelling units per 1,000 gsf of lot area, respectively, with conditional use approval. A number of parcels on Diamond Street, Chenery Street, Joost Avenue, and Wilder Street are zoned small-scale Neighborhood Commercial (NC-2), a district that allows public/institutional uses up to 9,999 gsf; commercial uses over 10,000 gsf; and residential uses at a density of one unit per 800 gsf of lot area. This district is designed to preserve small-scale shopping districts that provide goods and services to surrounding neighborhoods. Finally, several parcels are zoned for Public (P) uses within the plan area, including the existing BART parking lot and the SFPUC public easement. All height limits within the plan area are 40-X with the exception of the SFPUC easement, which is designated OS (no limits apply).

E. PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The *2010 Community Plan* contains policies that are intended to implement a number of physical improvements, including street network changes, transportation and infrastructure changes, potential infill development, and open space improvements. In addition, the *2010 Community Plan* would modify existing land use and zoning controls. Not all of the features of the *2010 Community Plan* would be expected to alter the physical environment. Although this EIR provides an overview of the *2010 Community Plan's* features, the analysis focuses on those features that would have the potential to result in environmental impacts.



SOURCE: PBS&J, 2009.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE II-2: EXISTING USE DISTRICTS AND HEIGHT LIMITS

Components in the *2010 Community Plan* have been classified in the following categories for the purpose of the environmental review:

- Components analyzed at the program level in this EIR include the policies of the *2010 Community Plan* and land use and zoning controls that involve changes to the planning code, zoning and land use districts. In addition, the program-level analysis includes evaluation of the potential infill sites at the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street and the BART parking lot, preservation of historic resources, and open space improvements. Specific projects, such as future infill development, would be subject to market factors, private development proposals, additional zoning modifications, and future environmental review and approval. The details of these improvements are discussed further below.
- Components analyzed at the project level from the *2010 Community Plan* include the following transportation and public street improvements:
 - Traffic Calming Improvements;
 - Bicycle Networks Improvements;
 - Pedestrian Access Improvements; and
 - Transit Improvements
- Improvements considered speculative in nature, for which no financing mechanism has been identified, or that would occur beyond 2030 are not included as part of the proposed project evaluated in this EIR. Components identified in the *2010 Community Plan* but not evaluated in this EIR include the Glen Park Village parklets,⁷ traffic calming improvements along San Jose Avenue, and the redesign of San Jose Avenue. Implementation of parklets could occur in the Glen Park neighborhood in the future under the City's Pavement to Parks Program. The Pavement to Parks Program does not currently propose any parklets in the Glen Park neighborhood. Traffic calming and redesign of San Jose Avenue are not proposed at this time, and if they were proposed in the future, they would require feasibility and environmental studies with additional review and approval by SFMTA, Caltrans, and the Planning Department.

⁷ Parklets involve conversion of parking stalls into small open space areas with seating, tables, planters, and/or bicycle parking.

COMMUNITY PLAN ELEMENTS

Individual elements of the *2010 Community Plan* are described below with the primary objectives of each element. The components of each element are also presented by the type of environmental review presented in this EIR (i.e., program level or project level).

Element 1 – Land Use and Urban Design

Objectives

Objectives of the Land Use and Urban Design Element include:

Objective 1: Protect and strengthen the qualities that make downtown Glen Park special

Objective 2: Ensure the compatibility of new development with the form and character of Glen Park

Objective 3: Recognize the contribution of historic buildings to neighborhood identity

Program Level

The Land Use and Urban Design Element of the *2010 Community Plan* is evaluated at a program level in this EIR. The *2010 Community Plan* would provide long-term guidance to decision makers and public agencies to ensure future infrastructure projects and land use changes in the Glen Park neighborhood are carried out with sensitivity to the neighborhood's concerns, needs, and desires. The *2010 Community Plan's* land use policies would support small local retailers and service businesses by concentrating development within the traditional commercial core. By restricting retail and commercial development to the commercial core, the *2010 Community Plan* would prevent retail development on the fringes of this district that would not be economically supported by pedestrian traffic and which could increase the need for local parking. Although development potential in Glen Park is limited, the *2010 Community Plan* would support development of additional housing, maintaining the neighborhood's diversity, and taking advantage of its close proximity to shops, restaurants, services, and transit. Together these policies are intended to preserve and enhance the existing character of the Glen Park neighborhood. Future infill projects under the proposed land use and planning code amendments would be subject to independent environmental review.

Proposed Land Use and Planning Code Amendments

Revisions to Use Districts

Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would introduce a new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit (Glen Park NCT) District to reflect the area's proximity to abundant transit service. The new Glen Park NCT District would incorporate parcels along Diamond Street, Chenery Street, Joost Avenue, and Wilder Street currently zoned NC-2 and RH-3, and 605 Chenery Street and 3121-25 Castro Street currently zoned RH-2, as shown in Figure II-3, p. II-14. The *2010 Community Plan* does not propose rezoning the BART parking lot, which currently is in the Public (P) District. This EIR, however, analyzes the potential environmental effects that would result from infill development on this site under a potential future rezoning scenario, described on p. II-17.

The Glen Park NCT District rezoning would permit new physical changes such as modifications to density controls, increased heights, setbacks, façade treatments, and minimization of curb cuts. This EIR recognizes that physical impacts could occur as a result of subsequent development resulting from rezoning, and considers such impacts within this EIR.

Revisions to Height and Bulk Districts


Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would involve modification of height and bulk controls in the San Francisco Planning Code. While most of the plan area would retain the prevailing height limit of 40-X, the height limit would be increased to 45 feet in areas rezoned to Glen Park NCT to encourage active ground-floor uses.⁸ An increase in five feet would allow for storefronts with more space and provide easy access for pedestrians. The increase, however, does not allow for an additional floor of development. The *2010 Community Plan* does not propose rezoning the BART parking lot, which would remain in the 40-X Height and Bulk District.

⁸ Subsequent to the publication of the DEIR, height districts in the *2010 Community Plan* were revised to more closely reflect the heights of existing development in the Glen Park village core. The height district refinement would reduce the maximum height of new construction along portions of Wilder Street, Diamond Street, Castro Street, and Chenery Street in the Glen Park NCT district from a range of 40 to 45 feet to a range of 30 to 35 feet. A map showing the proposed height district revision is contained in Appendix F. However, for the purpose of this EIR, a height limit of 45 feet in areas rezoned to Glen Park NCT is still being analyzed to present a conservative estimate of impacts.

Anticipated Buildout under the Proposed Glen Park NCT District

Infill Development

This EIR provides a program-level analysis of the environmental impacts associated with potential development of two infill sites (shown in Figure II-3, p. II-14). This EIR considers infill development at these sites to present a conservative analysis of the maximum buildout potential. One potential infill site identified in the *2010 Community Plan* consists of six parcels on the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street. This site is currently within the Neighborhood Commercial (NC-2) and Residential - Two family (RH-2) districts and extends northward across Kern Street (bounded by Brompton Avenue to the west). The



SOURCE: PBS&J, 2009.

FIGURE II-3: USE DISTRICTS AND HEIGHT LIMITS UNDER THE PROPOSED PROJECT

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN

portions of the site zoned NC-2 would be rezoned to the proposed Glen Park NCT District; parcels zoned RH-2 would remain as such. As permitted by the new NCT controls, infill development at the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street site would consist of mixed-use development, including residential and commercial uses.

The second site is at the BART parking lot on the north side of Bosworth Street and Arlington Street (east of Diamond Street) extending northward to Wilder Street. This site is within the P District and is owned by BART. No changes are proposed for the P-zoned parcels under the *2010 Community Plan*. The *2010 Community Plan* recognizes other possible uses for the BART parking lot, including a mix of commercial and residential uses. However, land use changes at this site would require rezoning. A proposal for the rezoning of the BART parking lot to allow housing or commercial uses may be forthcoming at the completion of BART's upcoming planning process for this site.⁹ This EIR analyzes the potential environmental effects that would result from infill development on this site under a potential future rezoning scenario, described on p. II-17.

These sites were recognized in the *2003 Community Plan Summary* as the two sites most likely to be developed in the near term because: (1) individuals or organizations with property interests in these parcels have expressed a desire to implement transit-oriented development projects at these sites, and (2) during preparation of the *2003 Community Plan Summary*, neighborhood residents indicated that these sites could be better utilized.¹⁰ By presenting the potential physical impacts associated with development of these two infill sites, this EIR discusses potential foreseeable environmental impacts; however, the *2010 Community Plan* would not result in development of these sites. The maximum development potential is used for the environmental analysis to provide a conservative (greatest) estimate of impacts that could occur from these developments and does not necessarily reflect a feasible or desirable development scenario. Consideration of potential development at these sites is not intended to convey an endorsement of a particular development strategy or design by the Planning Department or any other department or agency of the City and County of San Francisco.

⁹ In December 2008, BART issued a request for qualifications for developers interested in working with the City, BART, and the Glen Park community to determine the feasibility of a new transit-oriented development at the Glen Park BART Station parking lot. BART has selected a development team and has indicated that it intends to initiate a separate planning process and community discussion to determine development feasibility and alternatives for the parking lot site.

¹⁰ City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Glen Park Community Plan Summary*, November 2003. Available at: <http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/planning/citywide/pdf/gpdplowres.pdf>, p. 9.

The *2010 Community Plan* includes policies for potential infill development for new housing and commercial uses in the commercial area of downtown Glen Park. The northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street and the BART parking lot were identified in the *2003 Community Plan Summary* as areas of potential development and, thus, it is reasonable to assume that development could occur there. A description of anticipated maximum development at each infill site is presented below.

Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street. The Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site includes five privately owned parcels and one P-zoned parcel on both sides of Kern Street, between Diamond Street, Bosworth Street, and Brompton Avenue (Assessor's Block 6744; Lots 013, 025, 027, 030, 031, and 032). These parcels have a total area of approximately 22,859 gsf. The site is occupied by three residential properties (zoned RH-1) on Lots 030 and 013, fronting onto Brompton Avenue; two mixed-use buildings (zoned NC-2) on Lots 025 and 027, fronting onto Diamond Street; and a gravel parking lot on Lots 031 (zoned RH-2); and a steeply sloped underdeveloped area (zoned P) on Lot 032.

The *2010 Community Plan* identifies the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site as a potential location for infill development under the proposed Glen Park NCT District and a 45-X Height and Bulk District. The Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site could potentially be developed as three-story residential-only and mixed-use (ground-floor commercial and upper-floor residential) buildings. Redevelopment of this infill site could include two mixed-use buildings facing onto Diamond Street and two residential-only buildings fronting onto Brompton Avenue. The parcels facing onto Diamond Street would be rezoned NCT and the parcels facing onto Brompton Avenue would retain their current RH zoning. Assuming full buildout of this site under the proposed zoning, infill development could include:

- 39 to 47 residential units (including two residential-only buildings);
- Between 0 and 8,582 gsf of ground-floor commercial space; and
- 13 to 26 private, off-street parking spaces.

The maximum development potential at the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site would be 47 residential units, approximately 8,582 gsf of commercial space, and 26 off-street parking spaces. However, it is unlikely that full buildout would occur at the maximum development potential because the infill sites do not have the capacity to support the maximum development potential for all uses. In order to accommodate the maximum development potential of one use, another use would have to be reduced. Nonetheless, the high range of potential infill development is evaluated in this EIR. Section 152 of the Planning Code does not require off-street loading spaces for residential buildings with less than 100,000 gsf of floor area or for

buildings with less than 10,000 gsf of floor area devoted to retail/non-profit use. Therefore, pursuant to Section 152 of the Planning Code, the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site would not be required to include off-street loading spaces.

BART Parking Lot. The *2010 Community Plan* includes policies that propose alternative uses at the BART parking lot (Assessor's Block 6745; Lots 042, 048, 053, 057, 066, 067, 068, and 069) including a mix of commercial and residential uses. It is not yet known if the BART parking lot is suitable for development given the constraints of the site; however, the site is within the plan area and has the potential for development in the future and, thus, is included in this discussion. The parking lot is located on the north side of Bosworth Street and Arlington Street, south of Wilder Street, east of Diamond Street, and west of Natick Street. These parcels have a total area of 27,400 gsf and are zoned Public (P). This site is currently a 54-space surface parking lot with disabled parking, carshare parking, and five-hour limited parking for BART patrons. The site also contains a small single-story building housing a BART transformer and ventilation system.

The *2010 Community Plan* identifies the BART parking lot as a potential location for future residential and commercial infill development. Although the *2010 Community Plan* does not itself propose development or rezoning of the site, given its location on the edge of the Glen Park village center and across the street from the Glen Park BART Station, this EIR analyzes the environmental effects that would result if the BART parking lot infill site were developed with a mixed residential and commercial project. The EIR assumes the site potentially could be rezoned to a Glen Park NCT District, as this use district would reflect the existing pattern in the area of mixed-use, walkability, and transit access, and would be consistent with the proposal for the adjacent neighborhood commercial district. Absent any specific proposal, a building height of 65 feet (65-X Height and Bulk District) is assumed for analytical purposes to assess the impacts of what might be considered a reasonable scenario for the maximum building envelope at the site.

Buildout of the BART parking lot as a transit-oriented mixed-use development could include:

- Mixed use, three- to six-story building with 45 to 90 residential units;
- Between 0 and 14,913 gsf of commercial uses; and
- Parking ranging from 2 to 123 off-street parking spaces.

The maximum development potential at the BART parking lot infill site could be 90 residential units, 14,913 gsf of commercial space, and 123 off-street parking spaces. The maximum development potential of a site was calculated by assuming a 65-X height district uniformly across the site to assess the greatest potential impact of development on this site if in the future

the site were rezoned to a 65-X Height and Bulk District. This does not reflect any actual development proposal. The *2010 Community Plan* retains the existing 40-foot height limit for the BART site. Commercial space was estimated by assuming that ground-floor development along the Arlington Street frontage would be entirely devoted to commercial uses. However, it is unlikely that full buildout would occur at the maximum development potential because the infill sites might not have the capacity to support the maximum development potential. In order to accommodate the maximum development potential of one use, another use would have to be reduced. Nonetheless, the high range of potential infill development is evaluated in this EIR.

Section 152 of the Planning Code does not require off-street loading spaces for residential buildings with less than 100,000 gsf of floor area, but requires one loading space for buildings with between 10,000 to 100,000 gsf of floor area devoted to retail/non-profit use. Therefore, pursuant to Section 152 of the Planning Code, any future proposal for development at the BART parking lot infill site would be required to include one off-street loading space if the commercial space exceeds 10,000 gsf.

Other Development Potential

With the exception of the infill sites discussed above, the Glen Park neighborhood is largely built out. The intensity of the development in the residential neighborhoods surrounding the downtown area would not be expected to change with implementation of the *2010 Community Plan*. However, it is expected that over the life of the *2010 Community Plan* development of additional parcels within the proposed Glen Park NCT District could occur. As a result of such development, new structures conforming to the standards of the proposed Glen Park NCT District could be built. Such structures would likely be larger in size than existing development. While the majority of the plan area would retain an existing height limit of 40 feet in the residential districts, heights of up to 45 feet in the Glen Park NCT District would be considered to encourage active ground-floor uses.

The maximum development potential in the plan area, excluding development potential associated with the two infill sites discussed above, is estimated to be 13 residential units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses at 2928-2958 Diamond Street. The exact location of the 13 units is unknown at this time. Therefore, they are not shown in Figure II-3, p. II-14. No increase parking is anticipated.

An increase in commercial floor area could potentially occur on six residentially zoned parcels on Diamond Street (2928-2958) that are proposed to be rezoned from RH-3 to Glen Park NCT.

The proposed rezoning would increase the development potential within the plan area. Given the existing residential uses, it is not yet known at this time if commercial development would occur on these six parcels. However, for the purpose of this EIR, it is expected that over the life of the 2010 Community Plan commercial development could occur. The rezoning of the parcels on Diamond Street to Glen Park NCT could potentially allow the conversion of ground-floor garages into commercial spaces at some future time while allowing existing residential units to remain. Assuming that half of the garages would redevelop by 2030 in response to the zoning change, the amount of commercial space that could be created is approximately 5,250 sf.¹¹

¹¹ Atkins, *Glen Park Community Plan EIR – Additional Retail Space on Diamond Street Associated with Plan Refinements Subsequent to DEIR Publication*, memorandum from Gui Shearin to Lisa Gibson, September 28, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004!. Based on an aerial photograph, the buildings are approximately 25 feet wide and 65 to 70 feet deep. The total ground floor area of the six residential properties may be as much as 10,500 sf, depending upon the depth of the buildings. For this analysis, it was estimated that up to half, or 5,250 sf, of the properties ground-floor garages could be developed into commercial space.

Summary of Development Potential

The maximum development potential of 150 units and 23,495 gsf of commercial space, as well as 149 parking spaces, is used for the environmental analysis to provide a conservative (greatest) estimate of the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* and does not necessarily reflect a feasible or desirable development scenario. The *2010 Community Plan* does not propose development, but includes policies for consideration of future mixed-use development. It is unlikely that buildout would occur at the maximum development potential because the infill sites might not have the capacity to support the maximum development potential for all uses. In order to accommodate the maximum development potential of one use, another use would have to be reduced. Table II-2, below, provides a summary of the development potential used for the environmental analysis.

**TABLE II-2
SUMMARY OF MAXIMUM DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL**

	Residential	Commercial	Parking
Diamond Street/ Bosworth Street	47	8,582	26
BART Parking Lot	90	14,913	123
Other Development	13	5,250	0
Total	150	28,745	149

Preservation of Historic Buildings within the Plan Area

The *2010 Community Plan* encourages preservation and protection of existing historic buildings in the neighborhood. Specifically, the plan proposes to:

- Present survey of Glen Park's historic resources for adoption to the Historic Preservation Commission. (Policy 3.1)
- Apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties for projects involving historic resources. (Policy 3.2)
- Protect the historic buildings in Glen Park from demolition or adverse alteration. (Policy 3.3)
- Nominate properties that were found eligible to the San Francisco, California, or National Registers of Historical Places. (Policy 3.4)¹²

¹² City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Glen Park Community Plan (2010) Text Changes*, Memo from Jon Swae to Lisa Gibson, March 22, 2011. See Appendix C.

Project Level

There are no aspects of the Land Use and Urban Design Element that will be analyzed at a project level.

Element 2 – Transportation

Objectives

Objectives of the Transportation Element include:

Objective 4: Establish Glen Park's streets as comfortable and attractive places for walking and public life

Objective 5: Improve access for bicyclists to Glen Park and the BART Station

Objective 6: Sustain Glen Park's role as an important intermodal transit center for the City and region

Objective 7: Improve access to public transit in Glen Park

Objective 8: Seek improvements that relieve traffic congestion while minimizing impacts on other transportation modes

Objective 9: Restore the local importance of streets in the area

Objective 10: Optimize use of existing on-street parking spaces in Glen Park

Program Level

There are no aspects of the Transportation Element that will be analyzed at a program level. Refer to the project-level description below for a more detailed explanation of the proposed transportation improvements.

Project Level

Specific transportation improvements are evaluated at a project level in this EIR. The 2010 *Community Plan* envisions implementation of a number of transportation improvements, including improvements for pedestrian, transit, and bicycle circulation and accessibility.

In 2009, a number of meetings and discussions were held with the Glen Park community and a series of transportation improvements were identified and included in the 2010 *Community Plan*. SFMTA commissioned a study to examine the transportation improvements identified in the 2003 *Community Plan Summary*, consider different ways of accomplishing the intended

objectives of those improvements, and then evaluate their engineering feasibility.¹³ Transportation-related stakeholders, such as SFMTA, SF Planning, Caltrans, and BART, reviewed the effectiveness of the different improvements at achieving the intended objectives and affirmed the findings regarding feasibility.


The transportation improvements were further assessed and refined and a set of feasible improvements identified as best responding to the intent of the 2003 *Community Plan Summary* with respect to traffic calming, bicycle service, pedestrian circulation, and transit connectivity. In addition, the stakeholders identified several variants, or options, to the proposed transportation improvements from the transportation feasibility study that they also considered worthy of environmental review. For purposes of this environmental review, this set of improvements and variants constitutes the proposed transportation improvements that are evaluated as part of the proposed project. The set of transportation improvements included in the proposed project illustrates a possible, logical combination of street, sidewalk, bicycle circulation, and transit modifications, and, collectively, for the purpose of analyzing the maximum environmental impact of any possible combination of improvements. Table II-3, p. II-22, summarizes the proposed transportation improvements and variants. Figure II-4, p. II-23, presents the location of the improvements in the plan area, which are identified by their EIR figure numbers. Figures II-5 (p. II-25), II-6 (p. II-26), II-7 (p. II-28), II-8 (p. II-31), and II-9 (p. II-33) are described in greater detail below.

While the proposed transportation improvements and their variants are evaluated collectively as part of the proposed project, whether or not they are ultimately implemented would depend upon decision-makers, funding, community interests and priorities, and other factors. The improvements may be implemented individually, in various combinations, or conceivably not at all. Notably, each improvement has independent utility, meaning that each can be implemented separate from the other improvements and still provide transportation benefit. Importantly, the combination of improvements that could be implemented that would result in the maximum environmental impact of any possible combination of improvements is evaluated in this EIR to provide a conservative analysis for the environmental analysis. Finally, the transportation effects of each improvement are highly localized and, thus, the combined effects of the full complement of the proposed transportation improvements would be virtually the same as the sum of the effects of each individual improvement.

¹³ PBS&J, *Alternative Analysis Report, Glen Park Community Plan Environmental Impact Analysis and Transportation Feasibility Study*, prepared on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco, Municipal Transportation Agency, 2010. This report is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

**TABLE II-3
PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS AND VARIANTS**

Type of Improvement	Proposed Improvement	Variant
Traffic Calming		
Bosworth Street Improvements	Speed table, ^a lane narrowing east of Arlington Street, and two new crosswalks with in-pavement warning lights.	Roundabout at Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/I-280 on-ramp with signal at Lyell Street; improve existing pedestrian crossing; new traffic signal with crosswalks at Bosworth Street and Lyell Street.
Monterey Boulevard/Joost Avenue and Arlington Street/Wilder Street Intersection Improvements	Pedestrian bulbout treatments and expanded traffic island at the Monterey Boulevard/Joost Avenue intersection. Pedestrian bulbouts at the Arlington Street/Wilder Street intersection. Extended curb between Arlington Street and San Jose Avenue off-ramp.	No variants
Bosworth Street/ Diamond Street Intersection Improvements	Modified signalization with restriping ^b and scramble phase. ^c widen sidewalk and add pedestrian bulbout on Diamond Street.	Widening of Diamond Street to add right-turn lane; add scramble phase; modify BART entry plaza.
Bicycle Networks		
Bicycle Lanes	Bicycle lane improvements and installation of bicycle racks in the commercial area.	No variants
Pedestrian Access		
Pedestrian Connectivity between Muni Metro J-Church Light Rail Platform and Glen Park BART Station	New pedestrian bridge from existing Muni Metro J-Church light rail platform to the intersection of San Jose Avenue off-ramp, Diamond Street, and Monterey Boulevard. ^d	New at-grade ramp (with or without bus loop)
BART Station Plaza Improvements	Plaza alterations to improve pedestrian access and access for persons with disabilities in the BART Station plaza.	No variants
Pedestrian Improvements under Overpasses	Improvement of pedestrian experience under I-280 and San Jose Avenue.	No variants
Transit Improvements		
BART Access	Bus loop with BART concourse entry.	No bus loop with BART concourse entry; move Muni transit stop (inbound 23) to Bosworth Street.
<i>Sources:</i> SFMTA, PBS&J, 2010. <i>Notes:</i> a. A speed table is a wide speed hump with a flat section in the middle. b. Restriping refers to replacing old pavement markings. c. Scramble phase refers to intersection signalization that allows pedestrians to cross the intersection from different directions simultaneously. d. The existing pedestrian bridge would be demolished under the proposed project.		



SOURCE: PBS&J, 2010.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE II-4: TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT LOCATIONS


Traffic Calming

Bosworth Street Improvements. The *2010 Community Plan* includes policies to implement traffic calming measures along Bosworth Street to slow vehicular speeds. Stakeholders indicated a preference for a solution that included a speed table and lane narrowing of Arlington Street. The group also agreed that a variant should be examined to install a roundabout at the intersection of Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/I-280 on-ramp. Either the proposed improvement or the variant could be implemented following further design and review; thus, both are considered in this EIR. See Figure II-5, p. II-25, for a depiction of the proposed improvement and variant.

- **Proposed Traffic Calming Improvements.** Traffic calming measures and pedestrian improvements along Bosworth Street east of Arlington Street to Lyell Street would include a speed table (no lanes would be removed), lane narrowing east of Arlington Street to Lyell Street, and two new crosswalks with in-pavement warning lights.
- **Roundabout Variant.** In lieu of the traffic calming measures listed above, this variant includes installation of a roundabout at the intersection of Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/I-280 on-ramp. The roundabout would be designed to meet Caltrans and SFMTA design standards. This variant would also include the signalization of the Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersection. Although several roundabout sizes are under consideration, this EIR assumes that the maximum roundabout size of 110 feet in diameter would be implemented, as this provides the most conservative assessment of potential footprint impacts.


Monterey Boulevard/Joost Avenue and Arlington Street/Wilder Street Intersection Improvements. The *2010 Community Plan* includes policies to implement traffic calming measures at the Monterey Boulevard/Joost Avenue and Arlington Street/Wilder Street intersection, as described below. No variants are associated with these improvements. See Figure II-6, p. II-26, for a depiction of the proposed improvements.

- Four pedestrian bulbouts and an expanded traffic island would be located at the intersection of Joost Avenue and Monterey Boulevard.
- Four pedestrian bulbouts would be located at the intersection of Arlington Street and Wilder Street intersection. The curb between Arlington Street and San Jose Avenue off-ramp would be extended approximately 15 feet.



SOURCE: PBS&J, 2009.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE II-5: PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS TO BOSWORTH STREET



SOURCE: PBS&J, 2009.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN


FIGURE II-6: PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS TO MONTEREY BOULEVARD/JOOST AVENUE AND ARLINGTON STREET/WILDER STREET INTERSECTIONS

Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection Improvements. The *2010 Community Plan* includes policies to implement traffic calming measures at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection, as described below. See Figure II-7, p. II-28, for a depiction of the proposed improvements and variant.

- Proposed Modified Signalization, Lane Striping, and Pedestrian Scramble.** Modified signalization and lane striping would be implemented at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to improve traffic conditions. Improvements would include protected left-turn lanes (northbound and southbound left-turn lanes) and modified signal phases¹⁴ on Diamond Street. Currently the signalization has the following three phases: 1) a leading protected westbound left-turn/through/right-turn phase on Bosworth Street, 2) Bosworth Street east and westbound movements, and 3) Diamond Street north and southbound movements. The proposed improvements would include: 1) a pedestrian scramble phase, which would allow pedestrians to cross the intersection from different directions simultaneously, 2) a leading protected westbound left-turn/through/right-turn phase on Bosworth Street, 3) Bosworth Street eastbound and westbound movements, 4) leading Diamond Street northbound and southbound left turns on Diamond Street, and 5) Diamond Street northbound and southbound movements. The Diamond Street/Bosworth Street intersection improvement would require removal of six on-street parking spaces (four of them designated spaces, three on the west side of Diamond Street north of Bosworth Street and one on the south side of Bosworth Street west of Diamond Street; the other two would come from prohibiting residents from parking in front of their driveways on the south side of Bosworth Street west of Diamond Street). The three metered spaces on Diamond Street would be replaced by a permanent (24-hour) southbound through/right-turn lane. The Bosworth Street parking restriction could be either peak-period or 24-hour.
- Widening of Diamond Street Variant.** In addition to modified signalization with scramble phase and striping, the northbound approach of Diamond Street could be widened to add a northbound right-turn lane on Diamond Street. The Glen Park BART Station entry plaza would be modified to include a sloped landscaped area,¹⁵ a ramp (in compliance with the American Disabilities Act [ADA]), an elevator connecting the street level to the plaza level, stairs down to plaza from the sidewalk, bench seating, a bicycle lockers, bicycle parking, bicycle ramp, and ticket machines.

¹⁴ A signal phase is a time period during which a particular movement, or combination of movements, at a traffic control signal is allowed to proceed.

¹⁵ The Glen Park BART Station entry plaza would also have to be reconfigured in order to accommodate the widening of northbound Diamond Street.



SOURCE: PBS&J, 2009.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE II-7: PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS TO BOSWORTH STREET AND DIAMOND STREET INTERSECTION

Bicycle Networks

The *2010 Community Plan* includes policies proposed in the San Francisco Bicycle Plan to implement bicycle network improvements for the Glen Park neighborhood. These improvements include:

- Bike lanes on Lyell Street;
- Bike lanes on Bosworth Street between Diamond Street and Rotteck Street;
- Bike lanes on Monterey Boulevard on- and off-ramps from San Jose Avenue; and
- Arlington Street shared lane bike markings.

The bicycle lane improvements proposed in the San Francisco Bicycle Plan, approved in June 2009, are more comprehensive than the bicycle improvements proposed in the *2010 Community Plan* and were planned in the context of a citywide bicycle network. Thus, it is assumed for the purposes of this document that the San Francisco Bicycle Plan lane improvements would supersede the bicycle lane improvements identified in the *2010 Community Plan*. The San Francisco Bicycle Plan lane improvements for the Glen Park neighborhood have already undergone environmental review.¹⁶ For informational purposes, the bicycle lane improvements in the Glen Park area that are proposed in the San Francisco Bicycle Plan include:

- Project 5-7(a) is the installation of Class II and Class III bicycle facilities along portions of existing Bicycle Route 45 (from O'Shaughnessy Boulevard, through Bosworth Street, and terminating at San Jose Avenue) and existing Bicycle Route 55 (from Chenery Street, across San Jose Avenue, to Alemany Boulevard) to close a gap between the existing bicycle lanes on San Jose Avenue and Alemany Boulevard on both sides of I-280 and to provide a better connection for bicyclists to the Glen Park BART Station.
- Project 5-7(b) is the installation of Class I, Class II, and Class III bicycle facilities to close a gap between the existing bicycle lanes on San Jose Avenue, existing Bicycle Route 45, and the existing Class III bicycle Route 70 on Circular Avenue.

The *2010 Community Plan* also recommends installation of additional bicycle racks in the commercial core and inside the paid area of the BART Station. Finally, the traffic calming features discussed for Bosworth Street, p. II-24, would also help to increase bicycle safety and accessibility throughout the plan area.

¹⁶ City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, Major Environmental Analysis. *San Francisco San Francisco Bicycle Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, 2009. This report is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.


Pedestrian Access

● **BART Station Plaza Improvements.** The *2010 Community Plan* suggests alterations to the BART Station plaza that could improve the pedestrian experience between transit services, the commercial district, and the BART Station. The improvements include removing walls and fences, expanding at-grade access, and linking Muni passenger areas.

Pedestrian Connection to Muni Metro J-Church Line. The *2010 Community Plan* proposes to improve connectivity between the BART Station and the Muni Metro J-Church stop on San Jose Avenue. The stakeholders indicated a preference for reconstruction of the existing pedestrian bridge from the existing Muni Metro J-Church line platform to the intersection of San Jose Avenue off-ramp, Diamond Street, and Monterey Boulevard. However, an at-grade crossing variant across San Jose Avenue was also determined to be feasible in the transportation feasibility study and worth exploring further.¹⁷ Either the proposed improvement or the variant could be implemented following further design and review; thus, both are considered in this EIR. See Figure II-8, p. II-31, for a depiction of the proposed improvement and variant.

- **Proposed Muni Metro J-Church Pedestrian Bridge Improvements.** The existing pedestrian bridge connecting the Muni Metro J-Church line platform to the intersection of the San Jose Avenue off-ramp, Diamond Street, and Monterey Boulevard would be demolished. A new ADA-compliant pedestrian bridge would be constructed to provide access to the BART Station. The new pedestrian bridge would include an accessible ramp at the Muni Metro J-Church platform, a half-level elevator between Diamond Street and the BART Station plaza, and improved cross walks across the San Jose Avenue off-ramp.
- **Muni Metro J-Church At-Grade Crossing Variant.** Instead of rebuilding the existing pedestrian bridge, a new pedestrian ramp would be built between the Muni Metro J-Church platform and the BART Station that would cross the Muni Metro J-Church tracks, westbound San Jose Avenue, and the I-280 southbound on-ramp at grade (the existing bridge would be demolished). Proposed changes to San Jose Avenue to improve pedestrian safety would include a reduction in the speed limit to 35 mph from 45 mph, narrowed lanes, and / or wider median or shoulders to change the character of the street, as well as warning signage. The pedestrian ramp could be configured to be compatible with other proposed improvements and variants, such as the “bus loop improvement” or the “no bus loop variant” (see description below under Transit Improvements), providing access to either the new south side BART concourse-level entry or the existing BART entry plaza.

¹⁷ PBS&J. *Package Compatibility Technical Memorandum, Glen Park Community Plan Environmental Impact Analysis and Transportation Feasibility Study*, prepared on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco, Municipal Transportation Agency, 2009. This report is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.



SOURCE: PBS&J, 2010.


GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE II-8: PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN CONNECTION IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE MUNI METRO J-CHURCH LINE

Pedestrian Improvements under Overpasses. The *2010 Community Plan* discusses improving the pedestrian experience on Bosworth Street under the I-280 and San Jose Avenue overpasses. The plan considers installation of high-intensity lighting, ornamental street lamps, wall-mounted art, or other treatments as aesthetic and safety improvements at this location.

Transit Improvements

To enhance transit connections between Muni bus service and the Glen Park BART Station, the *2010 Community Plan* proposes a bus loop, which would be a dedicated busway, accommodating several bus lines, connecting to a new entry to the BART Station. The stakeholders indicated a preference for this solution. However, it was also recommended that a variant without a bus loop that still enhanced bus connectivity be examined. Either the proposed improvement or the variant could be implemented following further design and review; thus, both are considered in this EIR. See Figure II-9, p. II-33, for a depiction of the proposed transit improvements.

- **Proposed BART Station Bus Loop Improvement.** The *2010 Community Plan* proposes a bus loop, providing dedicated access for Muni bus lines around the existing BART Station, to minimize existing transit delays. The *2010 Community Plan* considers construction of a bus loop around the Glen Park BART Station with a new concourse-level entry to BART from the south side of the station, with stops for three rerouted bus lines: 35-Eureka, southbound 36-Teresita, and outbound 23-Monterey. There would be a bus-only left turn lane from the westbound lane of Bosworth Street. The concourse-level entry would include a walk-through bridge through the BART Station over the down escalator that would provide access from the bus platform to the current BART entry plaza. As part of the proposed rerouting of the southbound 36-Teresita to the bus loop, the one-way northbound direction of Natick Street would be reversed in a southbound direction and Carrie Street would be reversed from southbound to northbound. The inbound 23-Monterey stop would also be relocated from Diamond Street to Bosworth Street. Additionally, the I-280 on-ramp would be realigned to accommodate the proposed bus loop.
- **No Bus Loop Variant.** In the absence of a bus loop, the inbound 23-Monterey stop would be relocated from Diamond Street to Bosworth Street and the two existing passenger loading zone areas on Bosworth Street and on Diamond Street would be consolidated onto Diamond Street.



SOURCE: PBS&J, 2009.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE II-9: PROPOSED TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS

Parking

The 2010 *Community Plan* proposes to optimize the use of existing on-street parking spaces in Glen Park. A study of existing on-street parking prepared for the 2003 *Community Plan Summary* revealed that there are approximately 200 free, unregulated all-day parking spaces that are within 1,500 feet of the Glen Park BART Station and downtown core but are not in front of a business or home.¹⁸ Up to 48 of these spaces, particularly those along Bosworth Street, would be removed with implementation of the San Francisco Bicycle Plan.¹⁹

The 2010 *Community Plan* suggests various methods to better utilize available on-street parking spaces within the neighborhood. These methods include:

- Expand the Residential Permit Parking (RPP) Program – reduce on-street parking demand by expanding areas of RPP;
- Provide parking enforcement to ensure appropriate use of spaces and parking availability – enforcement is necessary to ensure the availability of parking spaces; and
- Consider on-street parking strategies that utilize variable pricing to increase parking availability – Glen Park may want to consider experimenting with this strategy to determine its usefulness in increasing parking availability in the commercial area.

Element 3 – Open Space

Objectives

The objective of the Open Space Element is:

Objective 11: Maintain and improve the area’s mix of public open spaces

Program Level

The Open Space Element of the 2010 *Community Plan* is evaluated at a program-level in this EIR. The 2010 *Community Plan* includes policies that support open space and recreation within Glen Park, including the possibility of a greenway link between Glen Park and Glen Canyon. Specifically, the plan suggests the potential for “daylighting” a portion of Islais Creek. Creek “daylighting” is the redirection of a stream into above-ground channels. The 2010 *Community*

¹⁸ City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Glen Park Community Plan Summary*, November 2003. Available at: <http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/planning/citywide/pdf/gpdplowres.pdf>, p. 18.

¹⁹ City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, Major Environmental Analysis, *San Francisco San Francisco Bicycle Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, 2009. This report is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

Plan suggests conducting further studies to assess the feasibility of the Islais Creek daylighting and linear greenway.

The plan also encourages the conversion of a block along Kern Street into a downtown public space. Modification could include special pavement, street trees, and shared street treatments. Additionally, the plan suggests the potential of Kern Street to function as the entrance to the greenway linking downtown to Glen Canyon.

Project Level

There are no aspects of the Open Space Element that will be analyzed at a project level.

F. INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

This EIR analyzes the potential effects of the 2010 *Community Plan* project, as determined in the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR, issued July 1, 2009. The Initial Study, Appendix A of this EIR, found that the proposed project would have potential significant effects on land use and land use planning, aesthetics, cultural and paleontological resources, transportation and circulation, noise, and air quality. The Natural Resources Agency *CEQA Guidelines* Amendments (effective as of March 18, 2010) also added a new analysis topic, "Greenhouse Gases", which is included in this EIR. The Initial Study found that the proposed project's effects on other environmental topics would not be significant adverse impacts, or would be less-than-significant effects with implementation of the mitigation measures adopted by the project sponsor and listed in the Initial Study.

Long-term improvements are evaluated in this EIR at a program level. Impacts of these improvements are evaluated with regard to the proposed project footprint, and may require further project-level analysis in separate environmental review processes once specific projects are proposed. Likewise, infill development on the BART parking lot site would require further environmental review and subsequent approvals from the Planning Department, BART, and other agencies. BART may use this EIR as a basis for environmental clearance for its project; however, it may possibly need more. Near-term improvements analyzed at a project level would not require further environmental analysis.

PROJECT APPROVALS

Should the Planning Commission certify the EIR and adopt findings under the CEQA, this EIR would be used for consideration of other required approvals identified below. It is anticipated that the *2010 Community Plan* would require the following project approvals, with acting bodies shown in italics:

- Certification of the *Glen Park Community Plan EIR*. *San Francisco Planning Commission*.
- Adoption of the *Glen Park Community Plan* and its incorporation into the General Plan. *San Francisco Planning Commission and San Francisco Board of Supervisors*.
- Amendment of Planning Code Article 7. *San Francisco Planning Commission and San Francisco Board of Supervisors*.
- Amendment of Planning Code Zoning Map ZNII. *San Francisco Planning Commission and San Francisco Board of Supervisors*.
- Approval of transportation improvement projects. *San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency and Board of Supervisors*.
- Adoption of CEQA Findings. *San Francisco Planning Commission, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, and Board of Supervisors*.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

III. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS

A. INTRODUCTION

On the basis of an Initial Study published on January 6, 2010, the Planning Department determined that an EIR was required. The Initial Study determined that for certain topics, the effects of the *Glen Park Community Plan Summary (2003 Community Plan Summary)* would either be insignificant or would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of recommended mitigation measures. These topics include: population and housing; wind and shadow; recreation; utilities and service systems; public services; geology and soils; hazards and hazardous materials; mineral and energy resources; agricultural resources; biological resources; and hydrology and water quality. Therefore, the EIR does not discuss these topics (see Appendix A of this EIR for the Initial Study).

The Initial Study found program or project-specific effects and/or cumulative impacts related to land use, aesthetics, cultural resources, transportation and circulation, noise, and air quality, to be potentially significant. Accordingly, these effects are analyzed in this EIR. As required under CEQA, this EIR and the Initial Study assess construction, operational, and cumulative impacts.

The analysis in the Initial Study was based on the *2003 Community Plan Summary*. Since publication of the Initial Study, the *Glen Park Community Plan – Working Draft for Community Discussion (2010 Community Plan)* was released in September 2010 as an update to the *2003 Community Plan Summary*. For additional information on the differences between the plans, please refer to the Project Description, p. II-2, and Table II-1, p. II-3.

NEW AMENDMENTS TO THE CEQA GUIDELINES

On December 30, 2009 the Natural Resources Agency adopted *CEQA Guideline Amendments* to Appendix G recommended by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research.¹ The amendments became effective on March 18, 2010, subsequent to the publication of the Initial Study. The amendments include updates to the sample questions in the Environmental Checklist Form, which is included as Appendix G in the *CEQA Guidelines*. This section summarizes the updates.

¹ California Natural Resources Agency. Adopted Text of the *CEQA Guidelines Amendments*, adopted December 30, 2009, effective March 18, 2010. Available at: <http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/guidelines/>

Forest Resources

The Agriculture Resources section has been renamed to include Forest Resources. The checklist questions under this impact category have been amended to consider environmental impacts related to conflicts with zoning of forest or timber land, and the loss or conversion of forest resources.

The area covered by the *2010 Community Plan* does not include any lands zoned or managed for forest or timber uses. Implementation of this project would not affect any large tracts of land with a high density of trees. No further consideration of this topic is required in this EIR.

Greenhouse Gases

The CEQA amendments include a new section called, “Greenhouse Gases.” The checklist questions under this new impact category consider whether the project would generate significant direct or indirect greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

A detailed analysis of GHGs, including consideration of the new checklist questions, is included in this EIR in Section III.H. Please refer to Section III.H for an analysis of GHG emissions associated with the proposed project.

Transportation/Circulation

The CEQA checklist questions under this impact category have been amended to emphasize consideration of an existing applicable plan, ordinance, or policy that establishes measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system when evaluating transportation and traffic impacts. The amendments include consideration of congestion management programs as well as policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Amendments under this impact category also include removal of consideration of parking capacity impacts and clarification of alternative modes of transportation.

A complete analysis regarding transportation and traffic, including consideration of the new checklist questions, is included in this EIR in Section III.E. Please refer to this section for a detailed and quantitative analysis of the impacts of the proposed project.

FORMAT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

For each environmental topic in Section III.B through Section III.H of this EIR, the document presents both program-level and project-level analysis of the proposed project’s direct and indirect environmental impacts on the environment. Each section includes an introduction, a

description of the environmental setting, the regulatory framework, impact analysis and proposed mitigation measures, and cumulative impact analysis. The impact sections include both program-level and project-level analysis of *2010 Community Plan* components as outlined in Chapter II, Project Description.

For the purpose of this EIR, the proposed project includes the land use and zoning controls, potential infill development, and transportation improvements introduced in the *2010 Community Plan*. As described above, the potential future rezoning of the BART parking lot is not included in the *2010 Community Plan*, but the EIR analyzes the environmental effects of potential infill development at that site at a program level. In order to succinctly describe all the components of the proposed project, this EIR primarily refers to the proposed project as the *2010 Community Plan*. The organization of Section III.B through Section III.H follows the outline below.

Introduction

The Introduction provides a brief description of the types of impacts that are analyzed in the section.

Environmental Setting

As required by Section 15125(a) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, the Environmental Setting includes a description of the existing conditions at the proposed project site and/or in the vicinity of the proposed project site that provide the “baseline condition” against which program- and project-related impacts are compared. While the baseline condition is generally the physical conditions that existed at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published, which was issued on July 1, 2009, there may be reasons why a different baseline condition should be used for the analysis. For example, the baseline condition for transportation/traffic, air quality, and noise is the date(s) the traffic counts were taken. Each section describes the baseline condition for that particular analysis.

Regulatory Framework

The regulatory framework provides a discussion of federal, state, and local regulations, plans, policies, and/or laws that are directly relevant to the environmental topic being analyzed.

Impacts and Mitigation

The impacts and mitigation discussion is divided into the subsections described below.

Significance Criteria

The impact significance criteria used in this EIR are based on San Francisco Planning Department Major Environmental Analysis (MEA) guidance regarding the environmental effects to be considered significant. This guidance is, in turn, based upon Appendix G to the *CEQA Guidelines* and MEA's Initial Study checklist, with some modifications. The significance criteria used for each environmental topic/resource are presented at the beginning of the impact discussion in each section of Chapter III of this EIR.

Approach to Analysis

This subsection identifies the methodology used to analyze potential environmental impacts for each environmental topic under the identified significance criteria. Some evaluations (such as for air quality, traffic, and noise) are quantitative, while others, such as for visual quality and urban design, are qualitative.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This subsection describes the potential direct and/or indirect environmental impacts of the 2010 *Community Plan* and, based on the significance criteria, determines the significance of each environmental impact.

Each impact is summarized in an "impact statement" that is separately numbered, corresponds with the significance criterion, and is followed by a detailed discussion. The impact statement also identifies the level of significance after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. This format is designed to assist the reader in quickly identifying the subject and conclusion of the impact analyses.

The impact numbering for each section is depicted by the letter prefix that corresponds to the section, and the impact number (i.e. the first impact under Land Use is LU-1, and so on). One exception to this general format is in Section III.E, Transportation and Circulation, where project impacts have sub-impact numbers, such as TR-2A, which indicate specificity to a certain project element. For Cumulative analysis, the letter prefix includes the letter C to depict cumulative analysis, then the letter prefix for the section being discussed and the number of the impact. For example, the first cumulative impact under Air Quality is C-AQ-1. However, if there is only one cumulative impact statement, then the corresponding numbering is C-LU (for Land Use).

The geographic scope of the impact analyses varies depending upon the specific environmental issue being analyzed. Where the impact analysis identifies significant adverse environmental effects that could be reduced or avoided through implementation of a mitigation measure, the

measure is presented after the relevant impact discussion. Mitigation measures identify specific and measurable actions that could be taken to reduce potentially significant environmental impacts. Impacts are also assessed in light of existing regulatory requirements that could serve to avoid potential impacts.

Mitigation measures identify the parties responsible for implementation, a timeframe for implementation, and any applicable public agency approval, oversight, or monitoring that may be required. Mitigation measures would usually be implemented by the project sponsor or applicant, with oversight by one or more public agencies, unless indicated otherwise.

This subsection concludes with a statement regarding whether the impact, after implementation of the mitigation measures and/or compliance with existing local, State, and federal laws and regulations, would remain significant or be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

A “significant effect” is defined by Section 15382 of the *CEQA Guidelines* as “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 ... [but] may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.” The EIR uses the following terms to describe the level of significance of impacts identified during the course of the environmental analysis:

- **No Impact**—No adverse changes (or impacts) to the environment are expected.
- **Less-Than-Significant Impact**—Impact that does not exceed the defined significance criteria or would be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with existing local, State, and federal laws and regulations.
- **Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation**—Impact that is reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of the identified mitigation measures.
- **Significant and Unavoidable Impact**—Impact that exceeds the defined significance criteria and cannot be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with existing local, State, and federal laws and regulations and for which there are no feasible mitigation measures.
- **Significant and Unavoidable Impact with Mitigation**—Impact that exceeds the defined significance criteria and can be reduced through compliance with existing local, State, and federal laws and regulations and/or implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, but cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

III. Environmental Setting and Impacts
A. Introduction to the Analysis

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

B. LAND USE

INTRODUCTION

This section describes the existing land uses in the plan area and vicinity and discusses the potential for the *2010 Community Plan* to (1) conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the proposed project (including, but not limited to the City's General Plan or Planning Code) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or (2) have a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the Glen Park neighborhood. As discussed in the Initial Study, Section D.1, p. 40 (see Appendix A of this EIR), the proposed project would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, this topic is not discussed in this EIR. Cumulative land use impacts are also evaluated in this section. Plans and policies applicable to the proposed project are presented in the Initial Study, pp. 33-37 (see Appendix A). The potential for the project to contribute to secondary land use effects is discussed in Chapter IV (Other CEQA Considerations).

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

REGIONAL

Figure II-1, on p. II-7, indicates the location of the Glen Park neighborhood within the City and County of San Francisco. As shown, the Glen Park neighborhood is in the southern portion of the City, approximately four miles southwest of the City's downtown. The plan area is located in the center of the Glen Park neighborhood. East and south of Glen Park, major transportation corridors include I-280, U.S. 101, San Jose Avenue, and Mission Street.

LOCAL

Glen Park is located south of the Diamond Heights and Noe Valley neighborhoods, west of the Bernal Heights neighborhood, and east of Glen Canyon Park and the Sunnyside neighborhood. The Outer Mission neighborhood is south of Glen Park on the south side of I-280. The plan area is bounded generally by Chenery Street to the north; Roanoke Street to the east; San Jose Avenue and Bosworth Street to the south; and Elk Street to the west.

PLAN AREA - EXISTING LAND USES

The plan area is part of the larger Glen Park community, an area characterized by established residential neighborhoods with a mix of commercial, transit, and recreational uses.

The plan area includes commercial and retail uses in the neighborhood commercial core at the intersection of Diamond Street and Chenery Street, with businesses extending east on Chenery Street from Diamond Street. Businesses include neighborhood-serving retail, such as restaurants and cafes, a hardware store, bank, small grocery stores, and personal service establishments. Some office and commercial uses can be found on the second floor of buildings. Businesses in the plan area are also located on Wilder Street, Joost Avenue, and at the intersection of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street.

Two- to three-story buildings with ground-floor retail uses and generally residential uses above characterize the commercial core. Land uses in the plan area become primarily residential as they extend out from the core. The west portion of the plan area between Chenery Street and Bosworth Street extending to Elk Street generally consists of two- to three-story residential buildings. The plan area includes residential uses south Bosworth Street between Diamond Street and Lippard Avenue. Residential uses also border the commercial core to the north within the plan area.

Several civic and institutional uses are also located in the plan area. These uses include Glen Park Elementary School, Saint John of San Francisco Orthodox Academy, Glen Park Montessori Preschool, and the Glen Park Branch Library.

The Glen Park BART Station is located on a triangular parcel between Diamond Street, Bosworth Street, and the I-280 on-ramp. The station is set back from the street on all sides, with plazas fronting Diamond Street and Bosworth Street and low-lying ground cover between the station and I-280. The station sits at an elevation below the intersection of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street, and below the San Jose Avenue and I-280 overpasses.

Open spaces in the plan area include a greenway on the north side of Bosworth Street from Brompton Avenue to Elk Street and Glen Canyon Park. A San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) easement runs the length of this area along Bosworth Street. Other open spaces in the plan area include a vegetated area between San Jose Avenue and Arlington Street, playgrounds on the Glen Park Elementary School and St. John's Academy school property, and the plazas at the BART Station.

Infill Sites. Two infill sites are recognized in the *2010 Community Plan* as the sites most likely to be developed in the plan area. The potential infill site on the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street consists of six parcels. The two parcels fronting onto Diamond Street each contain two-story wood-frame buildings with commercial uses on the ground floor and residential uses above. The parcel to the south of Kern Street is a gravel parking lot. The

parcels to the north of Kern Street fronting on Brompton Avenue contain three residential buildings, ranging from two to three stories.

The potential infill site at the BART parking lot on the north side of Bosworth Street across from the Glen Park BART Station consists of a 54-space surface parking lot with disabled parking, carshare parking, and five-hour limited parking for BART patrons. The site also contains a single-story building housing a BART transformer and ventilation system. The parking lot is bordered by residential and mixed-use buildings, generally one, and two to three stories in height fronting onto Bosworth Street, Diamond Street, and Wilder Street.

SURROUNDING LAND USES

The majority of the Glen Park neighborhood surrounding the plan area and commercial core consists of residential uses. Most residential buildings surrounding the plan area are one- to two-stories tall with typical heights from 15 to 25 feet. Some three-story residential structures are also in the vicinity with heights of approximately 30 to 35 feet. Houses on the surrounding hillsides frame the views along Diamond Street and create a sense of enclosure in the downtown area. Glen Canyon Park borders the plan area to the west. San Jose Avenue and I-280 separate Glen Park from the Outer Mission neighborhood to the south.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO REGULATIONS

General Plan

The *City of San Francisco General Plan* (General Plan),¹ adopted by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, is both a strategic and long-term document, broad in scope, and specific in nature. The General Plan is the embodiment of the City's collective vision for the future of San Francisco, and is composed of a series of elements, each of which deals with a particular topic, that applies citywide. The General Plan contains the following elements: Air Quality, Arts, Commerce and Industry, Community Facilities, Community Safety, Environmental Protection, Housing, Recreation and Open Space, Transportation, and Urban Design. Objectives and policies from these General Plan elements are discussed in the respective sections of the EIR that deal with the related topics.

¹ City and County of San Francisco, *San Francisco General Plan*, adopted 1996. Available at: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/index.htm. Accessed February 3, 2010.

In addition, the General Plan contains area plans, which cover specific geographic areas of the city. The area plans include Downtown, Civic Center, Western Shoreline, Northeastern Waterfront, Central Waterfront, South Bayshore, Rincon Hill, Chinatown, Van Ness Avenue, and South of Market. The more general policies in the General Plan elements are made more precise in the area plans as they relate to specific parts of the city. Once adopted, the Glen Park 2010 *Community Plan* will be incorporated in the citywide General Plan.

The General Plan contains land use policies that are dispersed throughout the other elements and area plans. In addition, it contains a Land Use Index to guide the reader to access the policies.

PLANNING CODE AND ZONING

There are five applicable zoning districts within the plan area. These districts are Neighborhood Commercial (NC-2) on parcels facing Diamond Street, Chenery Street, Joost Street, and Wilder Street; Residential, House Districts, One, Two, and Three Family zoning (RH-1, RH-2, and RH-3, respectively); and Public (P) along lots just north of Bosworth Street, Glen Park Elementary School, the BART Station, and areas adjacent to San Jose Avenue and the I-280 freeway entrances (Figure II-2, p. II-10). The majority of the plan area falls within the Residential - One Family (RH-1) District, particularly between Bosworth Street and Chenery Street. This zoning district allows one dwelling unit per 3,000 gross square feet (gsf) of lot area. The plan area also includes several RH-2 and RH-3 zoned parcels that allow up to two dwelling units per 1,500 gsf of lot area and up to three dwelling units per 1,000 gsf of lot area, respectively, with conditional use approval. A number of parcels on Diamond Street are zoned NC-2, a district that allows public/institutional uses up to 9,999 gsf; commercial uses over 10,000 gsf; and residential uses at a density of one unit per 800 gsf of lot area. This district is designed to preserve small-scale shopping districts that provide goods and services to surrounding neighborhoods. Other streets in the NC-2 zoning district include Wilder Street, Kern Street, Bosworth Street, and Joost Avenue. Finally, several parcels are zoned for P uses within the plan area: the existing BART parking lot and the SFPUC public easement, mainly along Bosworth Street. The entire plan area is within the 40-X height and bulk district, with the exception of the SFPUC easement along Bosworth Street, which is designated OS (no limits apply).

Accountable Planning Initiative

In November 1986, the voters of San Francisco approved Proposition M, the Accountable Planning Initiative, which added Section 101.1 to the Planning Code to establish eight Priority Policies. These policies call for: (1) preservation and enhancement of neighborhood-serving

retail uses; (2) protection of neighborhood character; (3) preservation and enhancement of affordable housing; (4) discouragement of commuter automobiles; (5) protection of industrial and service land uses from commercial office development and enhancement of resident employment and business ownership; (6) maximization of earthquake preparedness; (7) landmark and historic building preservation; and (8) protection of open space.

Prior to issuing a permit for any project that requires an Initial Study under CEQA, issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion, or change of use, or taking any action that requires a finding of consistency with the General Plan, Section 101.1 requires that the City find that the proposed project or legislation would be consistent with the Priority Policies.

BETTER NEIGHBORHOODS PROGRAM

The Planning Department established the Better Neighborhoods 2002 program to help make San Francisco's urban neighborhoods the best places they can be for those who live in them.² The goal of the Better Neighborhoods program is to create plans that improve the neighborhood where possible, while supporting what is already working well. The Better Neighborhoods program embraces the benefits of change to build more balanced and livable places in San Francisco. The Better Neighborhoods program is two-tiered. Citywide, it aims to encourage housing where it makes sense and to strengthen neighborhoods. Locally, the program uses intensive community-based planning to refine citywide goals to the needs of the specific neighborhood. Additionally, the program builds on the positive aspects of San Francisco's quality as an urban place. The Glen Park *2010 Community Plan* emerged as part of the Better Neighborhoods program.

SUSTAINABILITY PLAN

In 1993, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors established the Commission on San Francisco's Environment, charged with, among other things, drafting and implementing a plan for San Francisco's long-term environmental sustainability. The notion of sustainability is based on the United Nations definition that "a sustainable society meets the needs of the present without sacrificing the ability of future generations and non-human forms of life to meet their own needs." The *Sustainability Plan for the City of San Francisco* (Sustainability Plan)³ was a result of

² San Francisco Planning Department, *Better Neighborhoods 2002*. Available at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1699>. Accessed February 3, 2010.

³ City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Department of the Environment. *Sustainability Plan for the City of San Francisco*, July 1997. Available at: <http://www.sfenvironment.org/downloads/library/sustainabilityplan.pdf>. Accessed February 3, 2010.

community collaboration to establish sustainable development as a fundamental goal of municipal public policy.

The Sustainability Plan is divided into 15 topic areas, ten of which address specific environmental issues (air quality; biodiversity; energy, climate change and ozone depletion; food and agriculture; hazardous materials; human health; parks, open spaces, and streetscapes; solid waste; transportation; and water and wastewater), and five of which are broader in scope and cover many issues (economy and economic development, environmental justice, municipal expenditures, public information and education, and risk management). Additionally, the Sustainability Plan contains indicators designed to create a base of objective information on local conditions and to illustrate trends toward or away from sustainability. Although the Sustainability Plan became official City policy in July 1997, the Board of Supervisors has not committed the City to perform all of the actions addressed in the plan. The Sustainability Plan serves as a blueprint, with many of its individual proposals requiring further development and public comment.

CLIMATE ACTION PLAN

In September 2004, the San Francisco Department of the Environment and the SFPUC published the *Climate Action Plan for San Francisco: Local Actions to Reduce Greenhouse Emissions* (Climate Action Plan).⁴ The Climate Action Plan examines the causes of global climate change and human activities that contribute to global warming and provides projections from recent scientific reports of climate change impacts on California and San Francisco; presents estimates of San Francisco's baseline greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions inventory and reduction targets; describes recommended emissions reduction actions in the key target sectors – transportation, energy efficiency, renewable energy, and solid waste management – to meet stated goals by 2012; and presents next steps required over the near term to implement the Climate Action Plan. Although the Board of Supervisors has not formally committed the City to perform the actions addressed in the Plan, and many of the actions require further development and commitment of resources, the Plan serves as a blueprint for GHG emission reductions, and several actions are now in progress.

⁴ City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Department of the Environment, and San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. *Climate Action Plan for San Francisco: Local Actions to Reduce Greenhouse Emissions*, September 2004. Available at: <http://www.sfenvironment.org/downloads/library/climateactionplan.pdf>. Accessed February 3, 2010.

BICYCLE PLAN

The San Francisco Bicycle Plan⁵ involves the adoption of a citywide bicycle transportation plan and phasing of implementation of near-term, long-term, and other improvements to the bicycle route network, as well as amendments to the General Plan, the Planning Code, and the San Francisco Traffic Code.

The San Francisco Bicycle Plan, which was approved by the SFMTA Board of Directors in June 2009, is an update of the 1997 San Francisco Bicycle Plan. By maintaining an approved Bicycle Plan, the City and County of San Francisco is eligible for selected State and regional funds to develop bikeways and related facilities. Additionally, San Francisco City Charter Sections 16.102 and 8A.113 state that San Francisco should develop “a safe, interconnected bicycle circulation network; travel...by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile” and “bicycling shall be promoted by encouraging safe streets for riding, convenient access to transit, bicycle lanes, and secure bicycle parking.” The bicycle lane improvements proposed in the *2010 Community Plan* follow the recommendations of the San Francisco Bicycle Plan as they relate to the plan area. Thus, bicycle improvements proposed in the *2010 Community Plan* have largely already undergone environmental review in the San Francisco Bicycle Plan EIR⁶ and been approved by the City.

BETTER STREETS PLAN

The *San Francisco Better Streets Plan* (Better Streets Plan)⁷ creates a unified set of standards, guidelines, and implementation strategies to govern how the City designs, builds, and maintains its pedestrian environment. The Better Streets Plan seeks to balance the needs of all street users, with a particular focus on pedestrians and how streets can be used as public space. The Better Streets Plan reflects the understanding that the pedestrian environment is about more than just transportation; that streets serve a multitude of social, recreational, and ecological needs. The Better Streets Plan includes goals such as prioritizing the needs of walking, bicycling, transit use, and the use of streets as public spaces for social interaction and community life; creating streets where people walk and spend time out of choice, not just necessity; establishing a green network that enhances the City’s long-term ecological function

⁵ SFMTA, *San Francisco Bicycle Plan*, June 2009. Available at: <http://www.sfmta.com/cms/bproj/bikeplan.htm>. Accessed February 3, 2010.

⁶ SFMTA, *San Francisco Bicycle Plan Environmental Impact Report*, adopted June 25, 2009.

⁷ San Francisco Planning Department, *San Francisco Better Streets Plan*, adopted December 7, 2010. Available at: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/BetterStreets/proposals.htm#Final_Plan. Accessed January 24, 2011.

and people's connection to the natural environment; and improving street-based social opportunities, community life, access, and mobility for all residents.

Major concepts covered in the Better Streets Plan include: (1) pedestrian safety and accessibility features, such as enhanced pedestrian crossings, corner or mid-block curb extensions, pedestrian countdown and priority signals, and traffic calming features; (2) universal pedestrian design incorporating street trees, sidewalk planting, furnishings, lighting, efficient utility location, shared single-surface for small streets/alleys, sidewalk and median pocket parks, and temporary and permanent street closures to vehicles; (3) integrated pedestrian/transit functions using bulbouts and boarding islands; (4) enhanced usability of streetscapes for social purposes with reuse of excess street area, creative use of parking lanes, and outdoor restaurant seating; and (5) improved ecological performance of streets and streetscape greening with incorporation of stormwater management techniques and urban forest maintenance.

The Better Streets Plan carries out the intent of San Francisco's Better Streets Policy (Administrative Code Chapter 98), adopted by the Board of Supervisors on February 6, 2006. The Better Streets Plan was adopted by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors on December 7, 2010.

IMPACTS

SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

The proposed project would result in significant adverse land use impacts if it would:

- Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the General Plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or
- Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity.

APPROACH TO ANALYSIS

The analysis compares land use conditions at projected potential buildout of the 2010 *Community Plan* against the existing land use environment, on the ground, as of the date of publication of the NOP on July 1, 2009. The analysis of the proposed project's effect on existing land use character considers the character of potential infill development relative to the existing land use context. An adverse effect would occur if a new use were "incompatible" with the nearby existing uses, such that the basic function of either the existing use or the new use would

be impaired. For example, if a residential use were located next to a factory with toxic air emissions, either or both uses would be unable to function as intended.

The analysis also discusses whether the proposed project would be consistent with applicable land use plans and policies that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact. A conflict between the *2010 Community Plan* and a General Plan policy or Planning Code regulation does not, in itself, indicate a significant effect on the environment within the context of CEQA. Land use policies are policies that pertain to the type, location, and physical form of new development. Consistency of the *2010 Community Plan* with plans and policies adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect relating to visual quality, cultural resources, transportation, noise, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions are discussed in the respective sections of this EIR.

The Initial Study published January 6, 2010 concluded that the *2003 Community Plan Summary* would not physically divide an established community. Similar to the *2003 Community Plan Summary*, the *2010 Community Plan* does not propose any elements or features that would introduce obstruction to circulation or access or create a new physical barrier. Because this topic was scoped out in the Initial Study; it is not discussed in this EIR. Please refer to the Initial Study, p. 40 (see Appendix A).

IMPACT EVALUATION

LU-1 *The 2010 Community Plan would not conflict with land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. As discussed in the Initial Study, Appendix A, p. 33, the *2003 Community Plan Summary* would be consistent with most applicable City policies, plans, and regulations. The *2003 Community Plan Summary*, and then the *2010 Community Plan* that followed were developed based on General Plan policies that encourage development of housing; integration of transportation and land use planning; reduction of automobile use; and promotion of alternative modes of travel. The *2010 Community Plan's* policy emphasis on encouraging mixed uses near transportation hubs and improving bicycle and pedestrian networks is also consistent with the transportation goals outlined in the San Francisco Sustainability Plan and the Climate Action Plan. The *2010 Community Plan* contains bicycle policies that encourage implementation of the San Francisco Bicycle Plan, and the potential greenway improvements would help to promote the Better Streets Plan.

The *2010 Community Plan* was developed by the Planning Department through a collaborative planning process with the neighborhood community, BART, and the SFPUC. Through this process, the *2010 Community Plan* has addressed many issues raised by concerned parties and has incorporated strategies and policies that are consistent with the planning efforts of these agencies. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will review the *2010 Community Plan* to make findings of consistency with the objectives, policies, and principles of the General Plan.

Consistency of the *2010 Community Plan* with plans, policies, or regulations adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect relating to visual quality, cultural resources, transportation, noise, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions are discussed in the respective sections of this EIR (III.C Aesthetics, III.D Cultural Resources and Paleontological Resources, III.E Transportation and Circulation, III.F Noise, III.G Air Quality, and III.H Greenhouse Gas Emissions). Overall, the *2010 Community Plan* does not conflict with plans, policies, and regulations adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect. A conflict between the *2010 Community Plan* and General Plan policy, however, does not necessarily indicate a significant impact under CEQA.

Infill Development. The *2010 Community Plan* includes policies recognizing the potential for mixed-use development at two sites within the plan area, including the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street and the BART parking lot. In addition, it is expected that over the life of the *2010 Community Plan*, development of an additional 13 residential units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses within the proposed Glen Park NCT District could occur. Changes in land use at the two infill sites and for the 13 additional units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses would be consistent with goals of the General Plan related to increased housing and neighborhood services within walking distance to transit centers (the Glen Park BART Station). Consistency with other aspects of the General Plan, and other adopted plans, policies and regulations, would be addressed when detailed development proposals and improvements are subsequently considered for approval. Overall, future development of the two infill sites and the additional 13 units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses would not conflict with General Plan land use policies.

Transportation Improvements. Transportation improvements including traffic calming measures and changes to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit circulation would be generally consistent with goals and policies of the Transportation Element of the General Plan, the Better Streets Plan, and the San Francisco Bicycle Plan.

Overall, the proposed transportation improvements do not conflict with such policies.

Open Space. The *2010 Community Plan* includes policies that encourage open space improvements in the plan area. In addition, the proposed greenway and Islais Creek daylighting would be consistent with furthering the goals and objectives of the General Plan, Open Space Element.

Consistency of potential open space improvements with plans, policies, or regulations adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect relating to visual quality, cultural resources, transportation, noise, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions issues are discussed in the respective sections of this EIR. Overall, the potential open space policies and improvements from the *2010 Community Plan* would not conflict with open space policies listed in the other plans such as the General Plan and Better Streets Plan.

In addition, future open space improvements would be subject to future studies, environmental review, and approvals including review for consistency with adopted plans, policies, and regulations.

LU-2 *The 2010 Community Plan would not have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development, but would establish land use controls, a policy framework, and an implementation program to encourage new residential, retail, and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements.

The *2010 Community Plan* would not substantially alter the existing land use character of the Glen Park neighborhood. One of the primary goals of the *2010 Community Plan* is to preserve the character of the Glen Park neighborhood. The *2010 Community Plan* is intended to encourage development that would not alter existing land use character by encouraging infill development near transit, and promoting active ground-level retail. The plan also proposes bicycle, pedestrian, and transit improvements, increasing opportunities for alternative modes of travel (see detailed discussion of transportation improvements below). The *2010*

Community Plan also includes policies to encourage open space improvements throughout the plan area. As such, changes in land use would be expected to occur but would not substantially alter the character of the community.

Implementation of the 2010 *Community Plan* would involve revisions to the existing Planning Code use and height districts in the plan area, as described in Chapter II, Project Description, p. II-13. The proposed zoning changes would occur in the commercial core area where active ground-floor retail would be encouraged and would modify parking regulations and residential densities. Existing and proposed zoning districts are illustrated in Figure II-2, p. II-10, and Figure II-3, p. II-14. Overall, implementation of the 2010 *Community Plan* would increase height limits. While most of the plan area would retain the prevailing height limit of 40 feet, the height limit for areas rezoned to Glen Park NCT would be increased to up to 45 feet,⁸ and the height limit at the BART parking lot is assumed to be increased to 65 feet.

Future development in the plan area would likely be higher in density and scale than the low-density, single-family housing surrounding the plan area; however, the scale and character of those neighborhoods would remain intact because future development would be focused in the commercial core. Further, the 2010 *Community Plan* includes land use and urban design policies to ensure that new development in the plan area would be appropriately scaled and designed to consider the established pattern of the community of the Glen Park neighborhood.

⁸ As described in the Project Description, p. II-13, the height district refinement would reduce the maximum height of new construction along portions of Wilder Street, Diamond Street, Castro Street, and Chenery Street in the Glen Park NCT district from a range of 40 to 45 feet to a range of 30 to 35 feet. A map showing the proposed height district revision is contained in Appendix C. However, for the purpose of this EIR, a height limit of 45 feet in areas rezoned to Glen Park NCT is still being analyzed to present a conservative estimate of impacts.

Most buildings in the plan area are two and three stories tall with typical heights of 25 to 35 feet. Existing buildings not constructed to the 40-foot height limit could be modified or reconstructed to 40 feet under existing controls. Under the proposed Glen Park NCT District, existing buildings could be modified to up to 45 feet in height, a 5-foot increase from existing height limits. Although the increased height allowable under the proposed NCT rezoning could indirectly create greater development pressures at the existing buildings, any change resulting from this development incentive would be incremental and insubstantial. Notably, the additional development that could occur would be similar to the existing uses nearby and thus would not create conditions that would impair the function or activities at either the new or existing uses. Therefore, the additional five feet permitted under the revised height and bulk controls would result in a modest increase over existing buildout potential. Revisions to the height and bulk controls are intended to encourage active ground-floor uses and would not allow for an

additional floor of development. Thus, these zoning changes would not substantially alter the neighborhood character.

At the BART parking lot site, the maximum building height is assumed to be 65 feet. Accordingly, the site could be developed with three- to six-story mixed-use residential and commercial buildings. Development of this infill site could include development of residential buildings fronting on Bosworth Street, residential and commercial mixed-use building fronting on Arlington Street, and residential buildings fronting on Wilder Street. A 25-foot height increase would be a substantial change; however, for the reasons discussed in further detail below under “Infill Development,” this increase in height would not be incompatible with the existing character of the area.

The *2010 Community Plan* builds on established land use patterns in the Glen Park neighborhood, and would not have a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity. The *2010 Community Plan* would establish urban design policies to maintain and enhance the lively, pedestrian-oriented neighborhood commercial core. Therefore, the scale of new development would be compatible with the surrounding uses. These changes would not substantially alter the neighborhood character and scale of the Glen Park community. For the reasons discussed above, implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would result in less-than-significant impacts to the existing character of the vicinity.

Infill Development. The 2010 Community Plan contains policies recommending consideration of new development on two infill sites and development of 13 residential units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses near existing transit, and would not propose changes to established residential neighborhoods surrounding the plan area. Figure II-3, p. II-14, identifies the two infill sites in the plan area. The additional 13 residential units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses at 2928-2958 Diamond Street could be developed within the Glen Park NCT District; however, the exact location of the 13 units is unknown at this time. Therefore, these units are not shown in Figure II-3, p. II-14.

The potential infill site on the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street would consist of mixed-use development, including residential and commercial uses. The maximum building height at this site would be up to 45 feet.

Accordingly, the site could be developed with three- to four-story mixed-use residential and commercial (ground-floor commercial and upper-floor residential) buildings.

The potential infill site at the BART parking lot would consist of mixed-use development, including residential and commercial uses. The maximum building height at this site is assumed to be 65 feet. Accordingly, the site could be developed with three- to six-story mixed-use residential and commercial development.

In total, the two infill sites would accommodate a maximum of 137 residential units, approximately 23,495 gsf of commercial space, and 148 off-street parking spaces. The maximum development potential is used for the environmental analysis to provide a conservative (greatest) estimate of impacts that would occur from this development and does not necessarily reflect a feasible or desirable development scenario. Both sites could introduce ground-floor retail uses with up to five stories at the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street infill site, and up to six stories at the BART parking lot. The scale of developments at these sites would be greater than the typical one- to three-story commercial and residential uses adjacent to the sites.

At the northwest corner of the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street infill site, the maximum building height would be 45 feet, whereas at the BART parking lot the maximum building height is assumed to be 65 feet. The five-foot increase in height at the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street would be modest and insubstantial. A 25-foot height increase at the BART parking lot would be a noticeable and substantial change, relative to the height and bulk of adjacent development. Nonetheless, the proposed and potential future height and bulk would be consistent with the character of the vicinity, which, because of its central location in the plan area near the commercial core, the Glen Park BART Station, and the freeway structure has higher intensity uses and densities than the surrounding residential neighborhoods. Also, the potential infill development that could occur would be similar to the existing residential and commercial uses nearby and thus would not create conditions that would impair the function or activities at either the new or existing uses.

Further, the *2010 Community Plan* includes land use and urban design policies to ensure that new development in the plan area would preserve and enhance the distinct character of the commercial core and the Glen Park neighborhood. Overall, the infill development anticipated in the plan area would result in less-than-significant impacts on the land use character of the plan area.

Transportation Improvements. The *2010 Community Plan* envisions implementation of a number of transportation improvements, including traffic calming measures, and changes to enhance pedestrian, bicycle, and transit circulation and accessibility. The transportation improvements are presented in detail in Chapter II, Project Description, p. II-20.


Overall, the transportation improvements proposed in the *2010 Community Plan* would be consistent with the existing urban character of the plan area and vicinity. The majority of the transportation improvements would occur within existing right-of-way that is already dedicated to transportation and circulation uses in the public realm. The improvements would not result in significant adverse changes to the character of such uses, nor would it result in substantial adverse impacts to the character, functioning, or activities of adjacent residential and non-residential uses. For these reasons, implementation of transportation improvements proposed in the *2010 Community Plan* would result in less-than-significant impacts to the existing character of the vicinity.

Open Space. Future open space improvements in the plan area, including the possibility of a greenway link between Glen Park and Glen Canyon, improvements to Kern Street, and changes to the BART Station plaza, would have beneficial effects on the land use character of the plan area. These projects would enhance community connection, improve existing open spaces, and create new public open space on underutilized properties, and would not be out of character with the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore, future open space improvements in the plan area would result in less-than-significant impacts on the land use character of the plan area.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Cumulative impacts occur when significant impacts from a proposed project combine with similar impacts from other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects in a similar geographic area. The following projects, shown in Figure III.B-1, p. III.B-16, are within the plan area or vicinity, and have been approved, proposed, and/or are reasonably foreseeable:

- **San Francisco Bicycle Plan (SFMTA).** The San Francisco Bicycle Plan will provide for the implementation of near-term bicycle route improvement projects (near-term improvements), long-term bicycle route network improvement projects (long-term improvements), and minor improvements such as signage and pavement marking



SOURCE: PBS&J, 2009.



GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE III.B-1: CUMULATIVE PROJECTS FOR GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN

changes. It will also adopt policy goals, objectives, and actions to support the implementation of these and related changes, at this time and in the future. Projects in Glen Park include Project 5-7(a), a connection between Alemany Boulevard and San Jose Avenue and Project 5-7(b), a connection between Monterey Boulevard and San Jose Avenue.

- **Traffic Calming Projects – Sunnyside Projects (SFMTA).** The Sunnyside Traffic Calming Projects primarily include speed humps along Mangels Avenue, Joost Avenue, Hearst Avenue, and Staples Avenue. These speed humps have been approved and will be constructed in the near future. Sunnyside Traffic Calming Projects also include traffic circles along Hearst Avenue and Joost Avenue, and a pedestrian traffic island and perpendicular parking at the intersection of Joost Avenue and Lippard Avenue. These project elements are pending approval.

C-LU *The 2010 Community Plan would not contribute to significant cumulative land use impacts. (Less than Significant)*

The majority of cumulative projects in the vicinity of the plan area involve transportation improvements including implementing traffic calming measures, making San Francisco Bicycle Plan lane improvements, addressing pedestrian connectivity, and enhancing transit connections. Those projects would primarily result in physical changes to the public right-of-way and changes to public facilities with minimal effects on surrounding land uses. The proposed project would also result in physical changes within the public right-of-way and changes in land use at the infill sites. However, the transportation and streetscape improvements would improve automobile, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation in the plan area and adjacent land uses would not be affected. The proposed land use at the infill sites would not result in adverse effects to the land use character of the vicinity. Therefore, the *2010 Community Plan* and individual plan components would not result in a significant adverse change in the area's land use character and would not contribute to significant cumulative land use impacts.

C. AESTHETICS

INTRODUCTION

This section examines the potential impacts of the *2010 Community Plan* on the aesthetic character of the plan area and the vicinity. Items considered in assessing potential aesthetic impacts include the massing and design of the two potential infill developments and proposed traffic improvement measures. The impact assessment for this topic is based on site reconnaissance, review of massing diagrams and *2010 Community Plan* urban design policies, and comparison of the development that could occur against the existing visual setting.

Potential effects associated with obstruction of a scenic vista or view corridor, destruction of scenic resources, including rock outcroppings and groups of trees, and new sources of light or glare which could adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area were evaluated in the Initial Study, pp. 42-45 (see Appendix A), and were found to be less than significant; therefore, these issues are not discussed in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

VISUAL CHARACTER OF PLAN AREA AND VICINITY

The Glen Park neighborhood is visually defined by a small-scale commercial area, the Glen Park “downtown,” located in a valley with housing on the surrounding hillsides. To the west is Glen Canyon Park, with 70+ acres of undeveloped open space in a steep canyon. The plan area’s hilly topography, open space system, informal greenways, eclectic architectural styles, and small-scale buildings and street grid contribute to Glen Park’s distinct visual character.

Three major roadways, Bosworth Street, San Jose Avenue, and I-280, define the southern edge of the plan area. The section of Bosworth Street from Glen Canyon Park to San Jose Avenue is a four-lane road bordered on much of its northern edge by an informal greenway. The portion of San Jose Avenue that passes through Glen Park is a four-lane divided roadway with the Muni Metro J-Church line running down the center. I-280 is an eight-lane freeway south of San Jose Avenue. Both San Jose Avenue and I-280 have large concrete overpasses and on- and off-ramps within the plan area that reinforce the visual prominence of transportation infrastructure in this portion of the Glen Park neighborhood.

The commercial core of Glen Park centers around the intersection of Diamond Street and Chenery Street, and has a distinctive urban design character. Diamond Street, the primary north-south arterial, follows a winding course from the northern hills into the downtown core. Building massing along Diamond Street and Chenery Street is small and uniform, with one-, two-, and three-story buildings spaced closely together. The downtown core also contains a number of mature street trees that create shade on sidewalks and reduce the visual impact of building massing. Buildings in the downtown core are generally mixed use, with retail and commercial uses on the ground floor and residential uses above. Most buildings follow the 25- to 50-foot streetfront articulation typical of small-scale commercial districts in San Francisco. Buildings are primarily of wood siding, shingles, or stucco. One exception is the Glen Park Marketplace, a mixed-use brick and stone structure at Diamond Street and Wilder Street constructed in 2006, with a grocery store, upper-floor residential space, and the Glen Park public library. A view of a winding, hilly residential portion of Diamond Street is depicted in Figure III.C-1(A), p. III.C-3. A view of a typical mixed-use block in downtown Glen Park is depicted in Figure III.C-1(B), p. III.C-3.

Buildings in the area generally adjoin one another with no side setbacks, forming a continuous facade along most blocks. Most ground-floor uses are at a pedestrian scale, with transparent windows creating pedestrian-oriented views from the sidewalk. The buildings display a variety of rooflines, window patterns, and building materials and colors. However, the scale of the buildings and the way they front onto the street and pedestrians create a general sense of continuity amid the differences in architectural details. The topography, scale, building massing, and landscaping in this area create a sense of enclosure.

The visual character of the downtown core contrasts with the character of transportation infrastructure near the intersection at Diamond Street and Bosworth Street, and in the southeastern portion of the plan area. As a four-lane arterial, Bosworth Street is much wider than the neighborhood streets in the northern portion of the plan area, creating a sense of openness and exposure. The Glen Park BART Station and the San Jose Avenue on- and off-ramps, located south of Bosworth Street, are the largest structural elements in the plan area, as depicted in Figure III.C-2 (C), p. III.C-4.



A. Diamond Street. Diamond Street, the primary north-south arterial, follows a winding course from the northern hills into the downtown core.



B. Downtown Glen Park. Buildings in the downtown core are generally mixed-use, with retail and commercial uses on the ground floor and residential uses above.

SOURCE: Merrill Morris Partners, 2010.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE III.C-1: VISUAL SETTING PHOTOGRAPHS



C. Glen Park BART Station. The Glen Park BART Station and the San Jose Avenue on- and off-ramps located south of Bosworth Street are the largest structural elements in the plan area, with solid concrete massing.



D. Informal Greenway. The east side of Bosworth Street from Diamond Street to Elk Street is a San Francisco Department of Public Works (SFPUC) easement that serves as an informal greenway leading from downtown Glen Park to the entrance of Glen Canyon Park.

SOURCE: Merrill Morris Partners, 2010.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE III.C-2: VISUAL SETTING PHOTOGRAPHS

Diamond Street/Bosworth Street Intersection Infill Site

Six parcels make up the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site. The two parcels fronting onto Diamond Street each contain a two-story wood-frame building with commercial use on the ground floor and residential use above. Behind these buildings, the parcel to the west/south of Kern Street is a gravel parking lot. The parcels to the east/north of Kern Street contain three residential buildings, ranging from two to three stories tall. Two of the buildings front onto Brompton Avenue and the third is a backyard infill structure accessible from Kern Street.

Glen Park BART Station Parking Lot Infill Site

The Glen Park BART Station parking lot is an irregularly-shaped, asphalt-paved lot with a single entrance off Bosworth Street. Adjacent to the parking lot is a BART transformer, a one-story concrete structure that fronts onto Wilder Street. The parking lot is bordered by residential and mixed-use buildings fronting onto Bosworth Street, Diamond Street, and Wilder Street. Some mature trees and shrubs provide partial screening between the buildings and the parking lot.

Open Space

The Glen Park neighborhood includes a mix of natural and urban open space areas that provide public gathering spaces and recreational opportunities. The primary public open space in the Glen Park neighborhood is Glen Canyon Park, a 70-acre natural and recreational area. Glen Canyon Park is not part of the plan area but it helps to define and frame the plan area. An informal greenway connects downtown Glen Park to Glen Canyon Park. The greenway extends parallel to Bosworth Street between Elk Street and Diamond Street and contains large, mature trees including Monterey pine, eucalyptus, and other vegetation. Islais Creek flows beneath this area in a San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) easement. A well-worn informal path leads through the greenway from Burnside Avenue to Brompton Avenue, as shown in Figure III.C-2(D), p. III.C-4. The Glen Park BART Station plaza is located on the busiest corner of the plan area and fronts onto Diamond Street and Bosworth Street. Access to the plaza is underutilized because of walls and fencing that inhibit connections from the surrounding streets and make the plaza uninviting. The plaza is lower in elevation than Bosworth Street, which also limits accessibility to the plaza. The BART plaza is presented in Figure III.C-2(C), p. III.C-4.

REGULATORY SETTING

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO REGULATIONS

General Plan Urban Design Element

The Urban Design Element of the General Plan addresses San Francisco's physical character and environment with respect to development and preservation. Urban design policies require proposed projects to take into account the surrounding urban context through building design and placement. Policies strive to integrate proposed buildings with existing buildings by designing building height and bulk that respects adjacent buildings, establishing and protecting visual relationships and transitions, and respecting older or historic structures. Policies emphasize visual amenities, including landscaping and pedestrian areas that are human scale.

Height and Bulk Districts

The entire plan area is within the 40-X height and bulk district, with the exception of the SFPUC easement along Bosworth Street, which is designated OS (no limits apply).

IMPACTS

SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

The proposed project would result in significant adverse visual quality impacts if it would:

- Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

APPROACH TO ANALYSIS

The assessment of aesthetic/visual changes is based on field reconnaissance, review of photographs, review of the *2010 Community Plan* urban design policies, and a comparison of proposed improvements and the existing visual setting. Aesthetics may be defined as visual qualities within a given field of view, and may include such considerations as size, shape, color, textual and general composition, and the relationships between these elements. It is recognized in performing this analysis that changes to visual resources are subjective and based on the interpretation of individual viewers.

IMPACT EVALUATION

AE-1 *The 2010 Community Plan would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. The Initial Study for the 2003 *Community Plan Summary* concludes that the proposed zoning modifications could have a potentially significant impact on existing visual resources due to the increase in building height limits (see Appendix A, pp. 43-44). The 2010 *Community Plan* proposes modifications to existing zoning but does not include any specific development proposals. The proposed zoning modifications would introduce a new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit (Glen Park NCT) District for parcels along Diamond Street, Wilder Street, Joost Avenue, and Chenery Street currently zoned NC-2 and RH-3, and 605 Chenery Street and 3121-25 Castro Street currently zoned RH-2. As described previously, the NCT District would introduce a new 45-X height limit, which would moderately raise the prevailing height limit by five feet and encourage active ground-floor uses. Currently, structures in the plan area range from one to four stories with some structures approaching the existing 40-foot height limit. Future development under the NCT District has the potential to include structures five feet higher; however, it is anticipated this additional height would be added to the ground floor and would not allow for another floor of development. This would allow for storefronts with more space and provide easy access for pedestrians. Thus, the continuity of the existing streetscapes would be maintained and the visual character would remain consistent with existing uses.

Although the 2010 *Community Plan* does not propose development or rezoning of the BART parking lot site, the site could potentially be rezoned from a Public (P) District to Glen Park NCT if an appropriate transit-oriented development project were proposed for this site. If the site were rezoned in the future, the NCT District would introduce a new 65-X height limit, which would raise the prevailing height limit by 25 feet. Structures in the plan area range from two to four stories with some structures approaching the existing 40-foot height limit. The parking lot site has a lower elevation than the surrounding area and buildings constructed to a height of 65 feet on the lower portion of the site would not substantially exceed the heights of surrounding structures. Additionally, new structures would be designed to be consistent with the neighborhood's existing development pattern. Thus, the continuity of the existing visual character would be maintained and the visual character would remain consistent with existing uses, particularly those along


Bosworth Street, Diamond Street, and Wilder Street that define much of the visual setting for the infill site.

As presented in Chapter II, Project Description, an objective of the *2010 Community Plan* is to ensure compatibility of new development with the existing form and character of the neighborhood. *2010 Community Plan* policies supporting this objective address compatibility of scale for future development and design of new structures consistent with neighborhood's existing pattern. Although development potential in Glen Park is limited, the *2010 Community Plan* would support development of additional housing, maintaining the neighborhood's diversity, and taking advantage of its close proximity to shops, restaurants, services, and transit. Together these policies are intended to preserve and enhance the existing character of the Glen Park neighborhood. In addition, the Urban Design Element in the General Plan includes policies to ensure that structures are compatible with existing buildings.

The revised land use controls are intended to ensure that potential development opportunities in the plan area are maximized, but appropriately scaled with the surrounding low-rise scale of the neighborhood. Additionally, the revised land use controls would introduce land uses that are consistent with the existing uses and, thus, would remain consistent with the existing visual character. Therefore, impacts of the *2010 Community Plan* on visual character and quality would be less than significant. In addition, future infill development projects under the proposed land use and planning code amendments would be subject to independent environmental review and would be evaluated for consistency with *2010 Community Plan* and General Plan policies.

Infill Development. The *2010 Community Plan* includes policies for potential mixed-use development at two sites within the plan area, including the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street and the BART parking lot. In addition, it is expected that over the life of the *2010 Community Plan*, development of an additional 13 residential units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses within the proposed Glen Park NCT District could occur. Figure III.C-3, p. III.C-9, depicts four viewpoint locations within the plan area. Figure III.C-4 through Figure III.C-7, pp. III.C-10 to III.C-13, depict visual simulations showing existing conditions and potential building envelopes under the revised land

use controls from each of the four viewpoint locations, respectively. These viewpoints were chosen because they best represent the character of the



SOURCE: Merrill Morris Partners, 2010.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE III.C-3: VIEWPOINT LOCATION MAP

Existing View



View with Potential Bulk & Mass



SOURCE: Merrill Morris Partners, 2010.


GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN

FIGURE III.C-4: VIEWPOINT 1, VIEW OF NORTHWEST CORNER INFILL SITE LOOKING NORTHEAST FROM INTERSECTION OF DIAMOND STREET AND BOSWORTH STREET



SOURCE: Merrill Morris Partners, 2010.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
 FIGURE III.C-5: VIEWPOINT 2, VIEW OF INFILL SITES LOOKING WEST
 FROM BOSWORTH STREET AT I-280 SOUTH ON-RAMP



SOURCE: Merrill Morris Partners, 2010.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
 FIGURE III.C-6: VIEWPOINT 3, VIEW OF BART PARKING LOT INFILL SITE LOOKING EAST
 FROM BOSWORTH STREET AT GLEN PARK BART STATION

Existing View



View with Potential Bulk & Mass



SOURCE: Merrill Morris Partners, 2010.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
**FIGURE III.C-7: VIEWPOINT 4, VIEW OF BART PARKING LOT INFILL SITE
LOOKING EAST FROM DIAMOND STREET AT KERN STREET**

neighborhood in relation to the potential infill sites. The figures illustrating the infill sites with revised land use controls are a depiction and do not represent actual development proposals. These figures show only the potential bulk and mass (details such as setbacks, building articulation, and facade materials are not known at this time). For this reason, the figures indicate more box-like structures than would be the case with actual development, which would need to respond to the design policies in the *2010 Community Plan* and the Urban Design Element. Furthermore, the visual simulations do not include the transportation improvements, although these would be visible in some of the viewpoints. The visual effects of the transportation improvements are discussed under “Transportation Improvements,” on p. III.C-17 through III.C-18.

Diamond Street/Bosworth Street Infill Site. Views of the potential infill development at the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street intersection are shown in Figure III.C-4, p. III.C-10, and Figure III.C-5, p. III.C-11. The proposed revisions to the height and bulk controls would allow a modest increase in permitted height to 45 feet on the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site. As described in the Project Description, p. II-18, this infill site could potentially be developed with a three-story structure.

Figure III.C-4, p. III.C-10, is a view of the northwest corner of the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street intersection as it exists today and as it would with infill development reflecting the proposed land use controls. As shown in the figure, the existing street trees obstruct the view of the building directly to the west (left) of the intersection. To the north (right), there is a street tree in front of a two-story building. From this viewpoint, the buildings are noticeable but not visually prominent; they do not dominate the viewshed and there is a considerable view of the sky above, relative to the amount of the view occupied by structures. In addition, limited views of the developed hillside and ridgeline in the distance are available from this viewpoint. In the visual simulation of Figure III.C-4 depicting the potential bulk and mass at the infill site, structures are shown to be four stories and would be considerably taller (approximately 20 feet taller) than existing buildings at the northwest corner of Diamond Street/Bosworth Street. The existing street trees would help reduce the bulk and mass of the infill development, especially along the southern elevation facing Bosworth Street. However, the mass and bulk of the eastern elevation facing Diamond Street would be highly visible. Portions of the limited ridgeline views would be obstructed by the potential infill development.

While the height, bulk, and mass of the potential infill development would be greater than those of the existing buildings, the design guidelines of the *2010 Community Plan* and the policies of the Urban Design Element that stress integration of proposed buildings with existing buildings, protection of visual relationships and transitions, and maintenance of the streetscape would reduce the mass and bulk and reduce the visual differences with the adjacent structures. As a result, the visual setting would change with the infill development at this site, but such development would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Accordingly, this visual effect would be less than significant.

Figure III.C-5, p. III.C-11, is a view looking west on Bosworth Street from the I-280 south on-ramp. The visual simulation depicts the existing view and the view of the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site with potential development reflecting the proposed land use controls. As shown in Figure III.C-5, there are currently several large street trees in the median that divides Bosworth Street as well as additional trees on the sidewalk on the north side of Bosworth Street. These trees obstruct the views of the BART parking lot and of most of the buildings beyond that on the north side of Bosworth Street. Aside from the trees that dominate the viewshed from this viewpoint, other prominent visual features of this view are the Glen Park BART Station to the south and the variation in architectural styles. In the visual simulation of Figure III.C-5, which depicts the potential bulk and mass at the infill site, the infill development at the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street would replace the existing two-story building with new buildings that could be substantially taller and of greater bulk and mass. While the scale and height differences could be noticeable, the street trees would continue to mask the mass of the southern elevation facing Bosworth Street. Moreover, the design guidelines of the *2010 Community Plan* and the policies of the Urban Design Element that stress integration of proposed buildings with existing buildings, protection of visual relationships and transitions, and maintenance of the streetscape would reduce the visual differences and further reduce the apparent mass of the building(s). As a result, the visual setting around the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site would change with the infill development at this site, but it would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Accordingly, this visual effect would be less than significant.

BART Parking Lot Infill Site. Views of the potential infill development at the BART parking lot are shown in Figure III.C-5, Figure III.C-6, and Figure III.C-7, on pp.

III.C-11 to III.C-13. The project description assumes that future infill development at the BART parking lot could have heights of up to 65 feet to account for proximity to transit and on-site grade changes. Pursuant to the policies and goals of the *2010 Community Plan* and General Plan's Urban Design Element, new development would still be appropriately scaled for the surrounding low- to mid-rise context of the plan area. As described above, Figure III.C-5, p. III.C-11, is a view looking west on Bosworth Street from the I-280 south on-ramp. The visual simulation depicts both the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site northwest of the trees and the BART parking lot north of the trees, directly across from the BART Station. As shown in Figure III.C-5 in the existing view, the trees obstruct the views of the BART parking lot. In the visual simulation which depicts the potential bulk and mass at the infill site, the infill development at the BART parking lot would replace an undeveloped paved area with a new building that could be substantially taller and of greater bulk and mass. The existing street trees would help reduce the bulk and mass of the infill development facing Bosworth Street. Furthermore, as described above, the design guidelines of the *2010 Community Plan* and the policies of the Urban Design Element that stress integration of proposed buildings with existing buildings, protection of visual relationships and transitions, and maintenance of the streetscape would reduce the visual differences and further reduce the apparent mass of the building(s). Thus, future development would remain consistent with the existing visual character and would result in a less-than-significant impact on visual character.

As shown in Figure III.C-6, p. III.C-12, in the existing view, structures directly to the west (left) of the BART parking lot range from two to three stories in height. There are currently several large street trees in the median that divide Bosworth Street, as well as additional trees on the sidewalk on the north side of Bosworth Street. These trees obstruct the views of the BART parking lot and of most of the buildings beyond that front onto Wilder Street. Aside from the trees that dominate the viewshed from this viewpoint, other prominent visual features of this view are the bulk of the San Jose Avenue overcrossing, the variation in architectural styles, and a sense of openness due the extensive amount of sky. In the visual simulation which depicts the potential bulk and mass at the infill site, the infill development at the BART parking lot would replace the undeveloped paved area with new buildings that could be substantially taller and of greater bulk and mass than the adjacent building to the west. However, the parking lot site has a lower elevation than the

surrounding area and buildings constructed to a height of 65 feet on the lower portion of the site would not substantially exceed the heights of surrounding structures and the street trees would continue to mask the mass of the southern elevation facing Bosworth Street. Furthermore, future development would be designed in accordance with the policies and goals of the *2010 Community Plan* and the General Plan's Urban Design Element, which would ensure that new development is consistent with the neighborhood's existing pattern. As shown in the visual simulation, the relationship of the built environment and the sky would change from existing conditions, but the amount of sky in the viewshed would continue to be a significant component of these easterly views. As a result, the visual setting around the BART parking lot would change with the infill development at this site, but it would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Accordingly, this visual effect would be less than significant.

Figure III.C-7, p. III.C-13, is a view from Diamond Street looking east towards the BART parking lot. The visual simulation depicts the view as it exists today and a view of the site with potential infill development reflecting the proposed land use controls. As shown in the figure, there is a narrow, channeled view of an existing fenced parking lot in the foreground with two-story buildings on either side. Trees that landscape the BART parking lot are visible at the end of view. In the visual simulation which depicts the potential bulk and mass at the BART parking lot, the view of the tree would be replaced by structures up to 65 feet in height. The height and mass of this potential infill development would not be particularly visible from Diamond Street because direct views of the development would be limited and the new structures would largely be screened by the buildings fronting onto Diamond Street. As discussed above, future development would be designed to be consistent with the neighborhood's existing character and would comply with policies and goals set forth in the *2010 Community Plan* and the General Plan's Urban Design Element. Thus, potential infill development at the BART parking lot would remain consistent with the existing visual character of the plan area and would, therefore, result in a less-than-significant impact.

Transportation Improvements. The *2010 Community Plan* proposes transportation improvements that include traffic-calming measures, bicycle network improvements, pedestrian access, and transit improvements. New facilities could include a roundabout at Bosworth Street and Arlington Street, a pedestrian bridge

linking the Glen Park Muni Metro J-Church stop to the BART Station, traffic bulbouts at several locations, a speed table, and a redesigned BART entry plaza. These improvements were not included in the visual simulations on pp. III.C-10 to III.C-13; however, they would be visible from the viewpoints presented. The appearance of these improvements would be consistent with the other transportation facilities in the plan area and would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project area or vicinity. The improvements would be expected to adhere to the Urban Design Element policies of the General Plan with regard to recognition and protection of existing street patterns. Overall, the transportation improvements proposed in the *2010 Community Plan* would be consistent with the existing visual character of the plan area and vicinity. The impact of the proposed transportation improvements on the visual character would be less than significant.

Open Space. The *2010 Community Plan* includes policies that support open space and recreation within Glen Park. Future open space improvements would generally occur on vacant and underutilized parcels in the plan area. The improvements would enhance the visual character in the plan area by transforming underutilized sites into new green space and public gathering areas. Potential greenway improvements and the daylighting of Islais Creek would provide visually enhanced views from the existing informal pedestrian path and greenway linking downtown Glen Park to Glen Canyon. Improvements to the BART Station plaza would make the site more visually inviting. Overall, future open space improvements in the plan area would have a less-than-significant effect on the visual character of Glen Park.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

C-AE The 2010 Community Plan would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts to aesthetic resources. (Less than Significant)

The cumulative impact analysis below includes the following projects within the plan area or vicinity (see Section III.B Land Use, p. III.B-15 to III.B-17, for descriptions of these projects):

- San Francisco Bicycle Plan
- Traffic Calming Projects – Sunnyside Projects

Cumulative projects in the vicinity of the plan area involve transportation improvements, including implementing traffic calming measures, making *San*

Francisco Bicycle Plan lane improvements, addressing pedestrian connectivity, and enhancing transit connections. Those projects would primarily result in physical changes to the public right-of-way, consistent with existing transportation infrastructure. The improvements would have minimal effects on visual character of the plan area because they would not introduce new vertical elements and the continuity of existing streetscapes would be maintained. These projects would not introduce new structures that would block existing view corridors or that would adversely affect the visual character of the plan area and vicinity. Future development associated with the *2010 Community Plan* in association with other projects that would occur independent of the plan would not result in degradation of the visual character of the plan area and vicinity. Cumulative impacts to visual character would therefore be less than significant.

D. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

INTRODUCTION

This section examines the potential impacts of the *2010 Community Plan* on cultural and paleontological resources in light of the standards of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA); the National Register of Historic Places (National Register); *CEQA Guidelines* and the California Register of Historic Resources (California Register); and San Francisco Planning Department (Planning Department) CEQA procedures and *San Francisco Planning Code* Article 10, Preservation of Historical, Architectural and Aesthetic Landmarks. Cultural resources are defined as prehistoric and historical archaeological resources (subsurface resources) and historic-period buildings, structures, and districts. Paleontological resources are the fossilized remains or impressions of prehistoric plants and animals. As discussed in the Initial Study, pp. 49-51 (see Appendix A of this EIR), the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts to historic architectural resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains. Therefore, all of these topics are discussed in this section of the EIR.

The impact assessment for this topic is based on a Historic Resources Evaluation (HRE) report prepared by Carey & Co, Inc.,¹ a HRE report conducted by the Planning Department,² a Historic Resource Evaluation Response (HRER) prepared by the Planning Department,³ and an Archaeological Survey Report prepared by PBS&J.⁴ In addition, PBS&J and Carey and Co. conducted archival research, site reconnaissance, interviews with public agency staff and other informed contacts, and extensive professional review and analysis.

¹ Carey & Co., Inc., *Historic Resources Evaluation, Draft Glen Park Community Plan, San Francisco, California*, December 21, 2010. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

² San Francisco Planning Department, *San Francisco Glen Park Area Plan HRE: West of Lippard and NCT*, January 12, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400.

³ San Francisco Planning Department *Historic Resource Evaluation Response Various-Glen Park Area Plan*, March 24, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400.

⁴ PBS&J, *Archaeological Survey Report Glen Park Community Plan, San Francisco County, California*. Prepared for the San Francisco Planning Department, April 2010.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

ENVIRONMENT

Islais Creek, the largest body of water in San Francisco, flows down from Glen Canyon and empties into the bay at the Islais Creek Channel located between Potrero Hill and Hunter's Point. The extensive estuary it once fed was largely filled in with debris from the 1906 earthquake. Today, Islais Creek runs through the project area along Bosworth Street and is now largely channelized underground. Areas around freshwater creeks, such as Islais Creek, were favorable locations for both prehistoric and historical period settlement. Several Ohlone settlements are known to have existed in the area where the creek drained into San Francisco Bay. Modern landforms in the Glen Park vicinity are largely the result of tectonic movements and global sea-level fluctuations, as well as erosion and alluvial deposition. Geologically, the majority of the project area is underlain by chert, greenstone, sandstone, and shale of the Franciscan Formation. A section of the northeastern corner of the CEQA Area of Potential Effect (C-APE)⁵ may also lie on top of Holocene landslide deposits. Earthquakes resulting from movements in the San Andreas Fault system are the most likely cause of such deposits.

ETHNOGRAPHY

Ethnographically the project area lies within the traditional territory of the Costanoan people, also known by the name Ohlone. The term "Ohlone" or "Costanoan" refers to a language subfamily that was composed of speakers of at least eight different languages. Although there is some disagreement when Ohlone speakers first arrived in the San Francisco Bay Area, prior to their arrival, speakers of a language of completely different origin, Hokan, occupied this area at least since the Middle Holocene period. Ohlone peoples recognized several ethnic groups, generally based on a common language and/or geography. Dialects of five mutually unintelligible languages were spoken in the Bay Area: Costanoan/Ohlone, Bay Miwok, Plains Miwok, Patwin, and Wappo; Costanoan/Ohlone was the most widespread.

The Ohlone inhabited the South Coast Ranges between San Pablo Bay to the north and Monterey to the south, and extending east to the Mount Diablo mountain range. The Ohlone political organization consisted of a tribal group leader (often referred to in older literature as a

⁵ A CEQA Area of Potential Effect (C-APE) was used to assess the potential impacts on cultural resources that could result from the proposed project. Area of potential effect means the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist. The C-APE measures approximately one-half square miles, encompasses roughly 361 acres, and includes the surface and subsurface areas that would be directly or indirectly affected by ground disturbance and by project activities.

chief), a secondary level of male and female leaders, and a council of elders. Within a tribelet's territory, parties would engage in seasonal forays to hunt, fish, and gather plant resources. Fish and shellfish were the primary food source of the Ohlone who lived near the sea, with terrestrial resources increasing in importance as one moved inland. Terrestrial resources included elk, deer, pronghorn, lagomorphs, waterfowl, a variety of rodents, and other bird species. Other plants gathered for consumption included seeds from the tarweed, chia, pine, holly-leaf cherry, a variety of berries, greens, and roots. In addition to manufacturing a range of flaked and ground stone tools, the Ohlone also constructed tule balsas propelled by a paddle, cordage from the fibers of various plants, and twined basketry. Important resources that could not be obtained locally, such as obsidian and shell beads, were available via an intrinsic and extensive trade network.

At the time of European contact, the Bay Area appears to have been the most densely populated area north of Mexico, with an average of six persons per square mile. It has been estimated that the Ohlone occupied approximately 50 separate, distinct multiple-settlement communities or tribelets, each maintaining resources privileges within territories measuring as much as 8 to 12 miles across. It has been suggested that each tribelet averaged 200 individuals, but populations likely ranged from 50 to 500. The Ohlone Remaytush-speaking tribelet, known as the Yelamu, occupied the northern San Francisco Peninsula at the time of initial missionnization. The Yelamu territory encompassed at least the settlement sites that were occupied seasonally. Four main villages are associated with the Yelamu: Chutchui and Sitlintac on Mission Creek, and Amuctac and Tubsinte in the Visitacion Valley. During part of the year, it was common for tribelet families to share a single village location, while at other times they lived in a more dispersed pattern within their territory.

The arrival of the Spanish in the San Francisco Bay area in 1775 led to a rapid and significant reduction in local indigenous populations. Introduced diseases, declining birth rates, and the effects of the mission system substantially disrupted aboriginal lifeways. It is calculated that the Ohlone population dropped from 10,000 in 1770 to less than 2,000 in 1882. Brought into the missions, the surviving Ohlone, along with former neighboring groups of Esselen, Yokuts, and Coastal Miwok, were transformed from hunters and gatherers into agricultural laborers. Following secularization of the missions in the 1830s, the surviving Ohlone served as laborers or domestics within the rancho system that came to dominate Mexican period California. Today, many of the Ohlone descendants continue to live and work in the Bay Area, striving to rejuvenate their culture that was once considered extinct.

PREHISTORY

Cultural Chronology

The following is a generalized outline of the prehistoric cultural sequence for the Bay Area in general, and known San Francisco sites specifically. All dates given are based on calibrated radiocarbon determinations unless otherwise mentioned; B.P. refers to “before present.”

Terminal Pleistocene, 13,500 – 11,600 B.P.

During this time period, sea levels were 300 feet lower than today. No evidence for occupation during this period has yet been discovered in the Bay Area. It is assumed that mobile hunter gatherers lived or ranged through the area during this time and that their occupational residues have been lost under sedimentation and sea-level rise.

Early Holocene (Lower Archaic), 11,600 – 7,700 B.P.

As the sea level began to rise, the bays of San Pablo and San Francisco started to form. By 6000 B.C. the present shoreline of the Bay Area was fairly well established. The once narrow and discontinuous bay marshes became filled with sediments. Large shallow estuaries and extensive mudflats began to develop creating a favorable environment for a larger and more diverse number of plants and animals. The hunter and gatherers who came to occupy this new thriving environment moved seasonally between coastal and inland resources. Cultural remains of this period are dominated by millingslab equipment, namely millingslabs and handstones, as well as large wide-stemmed and leaf-shaped projectile points. Burials during this period tend to be flexed, sometimes found beneath cairns of millingslabs.

Middle Holocene, 7,700 – 3,800 B.P.

Only one site dating to the terminus of this period has been discovered in San Francisco, CA-SFR-28, the “BART skeleton.” This human skeleton was found at a depth of 22.9 meters below the surface. The location of the find was at the Civic Center BART Station located on Market Street between 7th and 8th Streets. Radiocarbon dating of an organic mud sample associated with the remains returned a date range of 3200 to 2700 B.C. This find remains the earliest evidence of human occupation in San Francisco.

Late Holocene, 3,800 – 170 B.P.

Early Period (Middle Archaic), 3,800 – 2,450 B.P. As the biotic landscape settled and matured, the seasonal and resource-based mobility patterns developed in the previous period by Bay Area inhabitants appear to become more restricted. Indicative of this period are the appearance of substantial shellmounds, such as the West Berkeley mound (ALA-307), the Emeryville

mound (ALA-309), and the Ellis Landing mound (CCo-295). These great mounds came to dot the coastline rising above the flat marshes, providing higher ground for habitation and burial of the dead. Characteristic cultural remains for the Early Period include large convex and concave projectile points produced from Napa locale obsidian sources and rectangular shaped Haliotis and Olivella shell beads. Mortars and pestles replace the millingslabs and handstones of the previous period. Burials continue to be in a flexed position, but now ornamental grave goods, such as shell beads, grooved and perforated charmstones, and red ochre are included. Some burials also display preinterment burning.

Based on the research available, no archaeological sites dating to this time period have been discovered within San Francisco.

Middle Period (Upper Archaic), 2,050 – 900 B.P. During the Middle Period, settlement patterns reflect those of the previous period until approximately 430 A.D. At this time, occupation shifts away from the coast by as much as three to five kilometers inland and a general abandonment of most shellmound sites is inferred.

Deposits containing Middle Period components appear to be the most common archaeological sites encountered in San Francisco. Sites dating to this time period include CA-SFR-4 (1550 B.C. to 1450 A.D.), an extensive occupation site with burials located on Yerba Buena Island; CA-SFR-148 (350 B.C. to 40 A.D.), a small shell midden located west of Mission Bay; CA-SFR-113, the Market Street Shellmound (180 B.C. to 325 A.D.), another extensive occupation site located at the corner of Fifth Street and Market Street; CA-SFR-112, the Stevenson Mound (80-980 A.D.), a thick shellmound site located north of Mission Bay between First Street and Second Street west of Rincon Hill; and CA-SFR-17/H (100 B.C. to 1100 A.D.), an extensive shellmound with burials. CA-SFR-17/H is the closest prehistoric archaeological resource to the project area, located on the south bank of Islais Creek at 100 Rickard Street under the Alemany Caltrans Maintenance Facility.

Late Period (Lower Emergent), 700 – 170 B.P. Settlement patterns during the Late Period once again shift to include more coastal sites, but large permanent occupations inland still appear to outnumber those located on the coast. The level of sedentism, as well as the population, appears to have increased during this period. Despite this, the large amounts of migratory bird remains found in shellmound sites seems to indicate some winter occupation was taking place at coastal locations.

Fewer archaeological sites dating to this time period have been uncovered in San Francisco. The Surprise Shellmound, CA-SFR-114 (52-1154 A.D.) is a very thick shellmound deposit dating to the transition between the Middle and Late Periods. Located on Howard Street between Third

Street and Fourth Street under the Yerba Buena/Moscone Convention Center, CA-SFR-114 represents an extensively occupied village and cemetery site, which included structural features and numerous stone, bone, and shell artifacts, and 11 burials, all with grave goods. CA-SFR-129, the Crissy Field Site (1322 to 1646 A.D.), is a shellmound deposit located under the former airstrip of Crissy Airfield. Described as a relatively thin band of midden, the deposit showed evidence of being disturbed and dispersed. Evidence from further testing and faunal analysis concluded that the site represents a specialized fishing, shellfish, and sea mammal acquisition site occupied repeatedly over a short period of time.

The Mission Period

On June 29, 1776, Mission San Francisco de Asís, commonly known as Mission Dolores, was founded on the bank of a little lake called Laguna de Manatíal by Father Francisco Palou. The first Native American conversions were recorded on June 24, 1777, and by the end of 1787, the conversion of the majority of the San Francisco Villages was essentially complete.

The majority of the food and material goods needed for the Spanish to survive were supplied by the Missions and their Native American work force, many of whom would become trained vaqueros (cow and horse handlers), domestic servants, and field workers as well as a few skilled craftsmen. Typically, converts moved to the mission and joined the community of neophytes living in designated housing. Disease was a common cause of death at the mission and burial records document more than 5,000 deaths at Mission Dolores. In 1813, 1,252 Native American neophytes were registered as belonging to the mission, but by 1827, there were only 241 Native American men, women, and children reported as living at the mission. When Mission Dolores was secularized in 1834, many of the remnant Native American neophytes may have left to work on the local ranchos as vaqueros or as household servants.

Spanish/Mexican Era, 1769-1848

In 1821, Mexico achieved its independence from Spain and California came under control of the Mexican government. Mexican rule brought significant political changes to Alta (Upper) California. Military and religious power was transferred to secular administration. A governor was appointed from Mexico and municipal governments were established. Mission secularization began in 1822 but did not occur in Alta California until 1833. At that time, mission lands and properties were either taken over by the State, sold, or granted to loyal Mexican citizens and native born inhabitants of Spanish descent known as Californios. This was done despite initial Mexican intentions to turn the land over to the Mission Indians. In many ways left to fend for themselves, most of the Mission Indians, including those of Ohlone descent, continued their lives of labor, going to work, sometimes freely and sometimes not, as

vaqueros, field hands, and/or household servants on the vast ranchos that began to be established.

These land grants, or ranchos, focused on horse and cattle raising, not agriculture or the production of commercial goods. The resulting hide and tallow trade made many Californios quite wealthy. Yet, without localized industry, the increasing Californio population's reliance on trade grew, especially on trade with Yankee ships from Boston, and particularly for basic household amenities, such as tableware and furniture.

The 2010 *Community Plan* project area is located within the boundaries of the Rancho San Miguel. Situated within the geographic center of San Francisco, this 4,443-acre rancho encompassed approximately one-sixth of the current city. It was granted in 1839 to Jose de Jesus Noe, the last mayor of the city while under Mexican jurisdiction. Noe used the vast acreage to graze his cattle. The rancho included today's Noe Valley, Castro, Glen Park, Twin Peaks, Diamond Heights, Midtown Terrace, West Portal, St. Francis Wood, and Forest Hill.

The Early American Era, 1848-1860s

In 1850, California became the nation's 31st state. During the same time, the Gold Rush fever had transformed the Bay Area. As the Gold Rush died down, many of the newcomers realized California offered other opportunities for wealth. San Francisco saw an influx of people, many of whom were prepared to start new businesses or farming operations upon their return from the gold fields. Retail and commercial space, and land in general, became a premium commodity within the area. Skilled workers and industry was in particularly high demand.

By the 1860s, Rancho San Miguel had already changed hands several times and been divided into several different parcels. Residential and commercial development had already occurred on certain parts of the rancho, such as Noe Valley and the Fairmount Tract. However, the western part of what would eventually become known as Glen Park was still mainly home to dairy and vegetable farmers and light industry.

The Giant Powder Company leased property in the unpopulated area of Glen Canyon from Rancho San Miguel resident L.L. Robinson. The factory began manufacturing dynamite in March 1868, two months before the official patent for dynamite was granted to Nobel. Production at the one-acre Giant mill in Glen Canyon lasted 15 months until November 1869, when an explosion destroyed the facilities, killed two people, and injured nine others. Newspaper accounts of the explosion place it near the base of a large hill and near the old county road to San Jose (now I-280) and nearly half way between St. Mary's College and the Industrial School (now St. Mary's Park of Mission and City College). In *History of the Explosives*

Industry in America first published in 1927, the factory is located at the current Glen Park Recreation Center and playground, in the vicinity of the baseball field. State Registered Landmark number 1002, located in Glen Canyon Park, commemorates this historic event.

Adolph Sutro became owner of the rancho lands and in 1889 he sold much of Glen Park to the Crocker Estate; the Crocker Estate was the San Francisco's largest landholder. Owning most of what became Glen Park, the estate started the Mission Park and Zoo. The city's first electric streetcar line was founded, running from Market Street all the way to Daly City via Chenery Street and San Jose Avenue. Despite these efforts, only a small neighborhood became established in the area, and for the last decade of the nineteenth century, Glen Park remained "Little Switzerland": a hilly, scenic area inhabited by farmers, perfect for day trips and picnics in the canyon, but too remote for most to live there.

TWENTIETH CENTURY

Residential Development and Transportation Growth

On April 18, 1906, San Francisco suffered a major earthquake and resultant fire that leveled much of the city. Soon after, the army erected a refugee camp in Glen Canyon. Many of the people who sought refuge there found the setting idyllic and decided to stay. Housing lots priced at \$300 to \$550 each also appealed to many displaced immigrant working class. Residents and businesses streamed in and Glen Park soon boasted an elementary school, a public library, a nickelodeon theater as well as a market and bar on virtually every corner. Not long after this initial growth spurt, the roads became paved, telephone lines were erected, and underground sewer and water systems were installed. Arlington Street, Bosworth Street, Chenery Street, and Diamond Street became the main arteries through the neighborhood. The intersection at Chenery Street and Diamond Street became the commercial center of town.

As the 1910s drew to a close, transportation needs began to change across the nation, from foot traffic and trolleys to automobiles and buses. Consequently, a second period of frenzied building and growth occurred in Glen Park focused on improving urban access. This trend commenced with the construction of San Jose Avenue along the right-of-way of the Southern Pacific Railroad Bernal Cut. Formerly known as the San Francisco to San Jose Railroad, the railway line traveled from downtown San Francisco to San Jose through Bernal Cut from 1864 until the main line was re-rerouted along the Bay shore in 1907. The line running through the Bernal Cut, sometimes called the Ocean View line, saw limited service until 1928. In 1929, the tracks were removed. New water and sewer mains were also laid under the road at this time. Glen Park was easily accessible by surface streets from the east, but it was isolated from the western parts of San Francisco until O'Shaughnessy Boulevard was completed in 1940.

After World War II, postwar residential buildings were constructed on infill lots but the major changes to Glen Park involved the construction of I-280 during the late 1960s and BART, with a station at Glen Park, during the early 1970s. Both necessitated the removal of many homes and streets.

HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

A historic context statement identifying important themes, geographic area, and time periods in the history of Glen Park was prepared in a Historic Resources Evaluation (HRE) by Carey & Co., Inc.⁶ This document includes the results of historical resources archival research, including consultation of the Sanborn Fire Insurance maps 1899-1900, 1913-1915, and 1950; a history of Glen Park; a field survey; and documentation of 161 parcels located within the plan area conducted by Carey and Co. in June 2009 and by the Planning Department in March 2010.

The plan area contains 160 parcels with structures over 45 years old. In addition, two parcels contain the Glen Park BART Station (BART Station) and power station constructed in 1970 (162 parcels total). Although not over 45 years old, the BART Station is recognized for its architectural significance. Of the 162 parcels, Carey & Co. surveyed 110 parcels east of Lippard Avenue, while the Planning Department surveyed 51 parcels west of Lippard Avenue and 1 parcel east of Lippard Avenue.^{7,8} Each structure over 45 years old and the BART Station and power station were recorded on State of California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Primary Record (523A) forms. The forms from the Carey & Co. survey are located in Appendix C of the Carey & Co. HRE;⁹ the forms from the Planning Department survey are located in Appendix A of the HRE completed by the Planning Department;¹⁰ and the form from the Planning Department evaluation of the one property east of Lippard Avenue is attached to the Planning Department

⁶ Carey & Co., Inc., *Historic Resources Evaluation, Draft Glen Park Community Plan, San Francisco, California*, December 21, 2010. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

⁷ San Francisco Planning Department, *San Francisco Glen Park Area Plan HRE: West of Lippard and NCT*, January 12, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

⁸ San Francisco Planning Department, *Historic Resources Evaluation Response, Glen Park Community Plan – July 2011 Refinements*. August 16, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

⁹ Carey & Co., Inc., *Historic Resources Evaluation, Draft Glen Park Community Plan, San Francisco, California*, December 21, 2010. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

¹⁰ San Francisco Planning Department, *San Francisco Glen Park Area Plan HRE: West of Lippard and NCT*, January 12, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

Historic Resource Evaluation Response.¹¹ These background documents are available for review by the public at the Planning Department.

¹¹ San Francisco Planning Department, *Historic Resources Evaluation Response, Glen Park Community Plan – July 2011 Refinements*. August 16, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

Evaluations of Properties

Of the 110 parcels surveyed by Carey & Co.,¹² 7 properties were selected for intensive survey as directed by the Planning Department. All properties with a direct effect by the *2010 Community Plan* were evaluated. Additional evaluations were directed where a resource was likely identified. These properties were evaluated for eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), or as City Landmarks. The criteria for listing on the registers are outlined in the “Regulatory Framework” portion of this EIR section. The seven properties are located at:

- 584 Bosworth Street
- 21 Brompton Avenue
- 23-25 Brompton Avenue
- 2830-2842 Diamond Street
- 2852-2862 Diamond Street
- Glen Park BART Station and power station (2901 Diamond Street)
- Glen Park Elementary School (151 Lippard Avenue)

As evaluated in the Carey and Co. HRE, all of the above listed properties were evaluated for their historical significance. Carey & Co. determined that only the Glen Park BART Station and the Glen Park Elementary School were eligible for listing under the California Register. The remaining five properties did not meet the criteria to qualify for inclusion on either federal, State, or local registers. For the two eligible resources, the HRE presents research into its history, provides a physical description of the resource, and describes its current condition. The HRE evaluates the resources’ significance under the relevant California Register eligibility criteria: Criterion 1 (Events); Criterion 2 (Persons); and Criterion 3 (Design/Construction).

¹² Carey & Co., Inc., *Historic Resources Evaluation, Draft Glen Park Community Plan, San Francisco, California*, December 21, 2010. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

The Planning Department completed an additional HRE, dated March 24, 2011, which documents the Departments' survey of historic-age (built in or before 1964) properties west of Lippard Avenue (51 total).¹³ In addition, the Planning Department completed an HRER of one historic-age property east of Lippard Avenue.¹⁴ The Department found two properties to be eligible for the California Register. These properties are located at:

- 813 Chenery Street
- 831 Chenery Street

In addition, the Planning Department HRE conducted additional evaluations of the properties located within the newly proposed NCT zoning area. The Planning Department determined five properties to be eligible for the California Register. These properties are located at:

- 601 Bosworth Street
- 657 Chenery Street
- 683 Chenery Street
- 701-703 Chenery Street
- 2784-2786 Diamond Street

In summary, of all of the properties surveyed and evaluated by Carey and Co. and the Planning Department, nine properties were determined to be eligible for the California Register. Figure III.D-1, p. III.D-13, depicts the properties surveyed and evaluated, as well as the historical resources identified within the plan area. Figure III.D-2 through Figure III.D-4, pp. III.D-14 through III.D-16, present photographs of each identified resource. The resources that were studied and found not eligible for the California Register were determined to be not associated with events that have made a significant contribution to history (California Register Criterion 1), nor are they associated with the lives of significant persons in the past (California Register Criterion 2), nor do they embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that

¹³ San Francisco Planning Department, *San Francisco Glen Park Area Plan HRE: West of Lippard and NCT*, January 12, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

¹⁴ San Francisco Planning Department, *Historic Resources Evaluation Response, Glen Park Community Plan – July 2011 Refinements*. August 16, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction (California Register Criterion 3). The identified resources, which are described below, include:

- Glen Park BART Station (2901 Diamond Street) (Figure III.D-2A)
- Glen Park Elementary School (151 Lippard Avenue) (Figure III.D-2B)
- 601 Bosworth Street (Figure III.D-2C)
- 657 Chenery Street (Figure III.D-3A)

- 683 Chenery Street (Figure III.D-3B)
- 701-703 Chenery Street (Figure III.D-3C)
- 813 Chenery Street (Figure III.D-4A)
- 831 Chenery Street (Figure III.D-4B)
- 2784-2786 Diamond Street (Figure III.D-4C)

Glen Park BART Station


The Glen Park BART Station appears to be eligible for the California Register under Criterion 3 (Design/Construction) for possessing high artistic value, for representing the work of a master, and for embodying the distinctive characteristics of a period. Its character-defining features are the exterior plazas, in particular the circular courtyard, interplay of building materials including BART rails for the roof structure, rusticated concrete, marble mosaic, slate cladding, painted concrete materials, and roof form. It does not yet appear to be eligible for the National Register, since it does not appear to meet the higher threshold of Criterion Consideration G for buildings that are less than 50 years old. Although the station was completed in 1970 and is not yet 45 years old, the building is able to express its historical significance for listing in the California Register. While the BART Station does not appear to be eligible for the National Register under Criterion Consideration G, it is eligible for listing as a City Landmark.

Glen Park Elementary School

The Glen Park Elementary School appears to be eligible for the National Register and the California Register under Criterion A/¹⁵ for its association with the Golden Age of school construction in San Francisco and as an excellent example of a Public Works Administration (PWA)-funded school building constructed in the City during the Great Depression. It also appears to be eligible for the National Register and California Register under Criterion C/¹⁶ as a

¹⁵ Criterion A, under the *National Register of Historic Places*, refers to properties that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. Criterion 1, under the *California Register of Historical Resources* (CRHR), refers to resources associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.

¹⁶ Criterion C, under the *National Register of Historic Places*, refers to properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction. Criterion 3, under the *California Register of Historical Resources*, refers to resources that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction, or that represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values.



SOURCE: PBS&J, 2010; Carey and Co., 2010.



GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE III.D-1: EXISTING HISTORICAL RESOURCES WITHIN THE PLAN AREA



A. Glen Park BART Station




B. Glen Park Elementary



C. 601 Bosworth Street

SOURCE: Merrill Morris Partners, 2010.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE III.D-2: HISTORICAL RESOURCE PHOTOGRAPHS



A. 657 Chenery Street



B. 683 Chenery Street



C. 701 - 703 Chenery Street

SOURCE: Merrill Morris Partners, 2010.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE III.D-3: HISTORICAL RESOURCE PHOTOGRAPHS



SOURCE: Merrill Morris Partners, 2010.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE III.D-4: HISTORICAL RESOURCE PHOTOGRAPHS

significant example of an Art Deco-style building in San Francisco, and it retains a high level of integrity. It also appears to be eligible as a City Landmark. Its character-defining features are a plan and massing that emphasizes its geometric form, stylized detailing in the form of fluted pilasters, terra cotta panel, belt courses, and ranked windows emphasizing verticality.

601 Bosworth Street

601 Bosworth Street, a two-story mixed-use building built in 1912, is eligible for the California Register under Criterion 3 (Design/Construction) for its architectural significance. Its character-defining features are the distinctive corner entrance with transoms on the first story and the projecting bay on the second story.

657 Chenery Street

657 Chenery Street, a single-story residential building built in 1872, is eligible for the California Register under Criterion 3 (Design/Construction) for its architectural significance. Its character-defining features are its rectangular form and gable roof. It is also eligible under Criterion 1 (Events) for its association with the earliest period of settlement of Glen Park and as the oldest extant building in Glen Park.

683 Chenery Street

683 Chenery Street, a single-story with mezzanine commercial building built in 1929, is eligible for the California Register under Criterion 3 (Design/Construction) for its architectural significance. Its character-defining features are its distinctive shaped parapet with red clay tile and its second story fenestration featuring six paired windows with carved mullions and a semi-circular indentation above each window.

701-703 Chenery Street

683 Chenery Street, a single-story with mezzanine commercial building built in 1929, is eligible for the California Register under Criterion 3 (Design/Construction) for its architectural significance. Its character-defining features are its distinctive shaped parapet with red clay tile and its second story fenestration featuring six paired windows with carved mullions and a semi-circular indentation above each window.

813 Chenery Street

813 Chenery Street, a two-story, two-unit residential flat built in 1907, is eligible for the California Register under Criterion 3 (Design/Construction) for its architectural significance. Its

character-defining features are its projecting bay window, glass transom and sidelights, dentil molding and scalloped wood shingles in the frieze.

831 Chenery Street

831 Chenery Street, a small, single-family dwelling built before 1906, is eligible for the California Register under Criterion 1 (Events) for its association with the earliest development period of Glen Park. In addition, is eligible for the California Register under Criterion 3 (Design/Construction) for its architectural significance. Its character-defining features are its rectangular form and low sloped front gable roof.

2784-2786 Diamond Street

2784-2786 Diamond Street, a two-and-a-half story mixed-use building built in 1916, is eligible for the California Register under Criterion 3 (Design/Construction) for its architectural significance. Its character-defining features are its first-story storefront with angled storefront windows and multi-lite transom, crenellated bay windows, canted oriel window with brackets and wide roof eave overhang with brackets.

Potential Historical Resources

Structures older than 45 years old that were surveyed but not evaluated are considered to be potential historical resources due to their age. These include 103 out of the 110 parcels surveyed by the Planning Department east of Lippard Avenue.¹⁷ The parcels that were not evaluated are considered to be potential historical resources because, while they do not appear eligible under Criterion 3 (Design), research was not conducted to identify if there are significant associations per Criteria 1 (Event) or 2 (Persons).

¹⁷ Carey & Co., Inc., *Historic Resources Evaluation, Draft Glen Park Community Plan, San Francisco, California*, December 21, 2010. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

Evaluation of Historic Districts

No local, State, or national register-eligible historic districts were identified within the areas surveyed by Carey & Co. or the Planning Department. Six areas were evaluated for potential districts, but none met the thresholds of significance.^{18,19} In general, surveyed parcels contain buildings designed in a range of architectural styles and massing and are interspersed with newer development and buildings with a low threshold of integrity. Therefore, none of the 162 parcels surveyed appear to qualify as districts.

Previous Evaluations

None of the surveyed resources in the plan area have been previously listed as a California Point of Historical Interest, as a California Historical Landmark, on the California Register, or on the National Register. They also have not been listed as a San Francisco Structure of Merit or Landmark, or as a contributing building to a historic or conservation district in the City. Lastly, previous local surveys such as the 1968 Junior League of San Francisco Survey, the 1976 Planning Department Citywide Architectural Survey, the 1978 San Francisco Architectural Heritage Survey, and the 1990 Unreinforced Masonry Building Survey did not identify any of the 162 parcels surveyed.^{20,21,22} The Glen Park BART Station is included in the US/Northern California Chapter's Northern California Modern Register²³ of notable modern buildings in the Bay Area.

¹⁸ Carey & Co., Inc., *Historic Resources Evaluation, Draft Glen Park Community Plan, San Francisco, California*, December 21, 2010. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

¹⁹ San Francisco Planning Department, *San Francisco Glen Park Area Plan HRE: West of Lippard and NCT*, January 12, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

²⁰ Olmsted, Roger and T.H. Watkins, *Here Today San Francisco's Architectural Heritage*, 1968.

²¹ Corbett, Michael R., *Splendid Survivors San Francisco's Downtown Architectural Heritage*, 1979.

²² A context statement and architectural/historical survey of unreinforced masonry building (UMB) construction in San Francisco from 1850 to 1940 submitted by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, San Francisco Department of City Planning. Published 1990 by Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board in San Francisco.

²³ Northern California Chapter of the international DOCOMOMO, Documentation and Conservation of the Modern Movement. Available at: http://www.docomomo-us.org/chapters/northern_california. Accessed January 10, 2011.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Records Search and Literature Review

NWIC Records Search and Inventories Consulted

A records search²⁴ was requested on May 13, 2009 from the Northwestern Information Center (NWIC). The record search provided documentation on previously recorded archaeological sites, NHRP properties, other cultural resources, and cultural resource investigations performed within the C-APE and a half-mile radius.²⁵ Sources consulted included the National Register,

²⁴ PBS&J correspondence between Denise Jurich, Archaeologist, PBS&J and Northwestern Information Center (NWIC), May 13, 2009.

²⁵ PBS&J correspondence between Denise Jurich, Archaeologist, and Lisa Hagel, NWIC, June 23, 2009, NWIC File # 08-1376.

the California Register, California Historical Landmarks, Points of Historical Interest, and state and local inventories of historical resources. The search found no recorded prehistoric or historic archaeological sites present within the C-APE. The NWIC listed 16 recorded historical-era sites and 9 historical-related studies as present within the half-mile radius of the C-APE. No recorded resources were identified within the C-APE by a search of either the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) Historic Properties Directory or the California Inventory of Historical Resources.

Finally, historical maps of the project area were consulted for indications of historical settlement or activity, depending on availability. Five historic maps were also consulted: 1856 Rancho San Miguel Plat Map, the 1857 Rancho Rincon de las Salinas y Potrero Plat Map, the 1864 General Land Office Plat Map, the 1853 Clement Humphreys' Map of the Northern Portion of San Francisco County, and the 1915 (reprinted in 1939) USGS San Mateo Quadrangle. The 1853 map shows some development within the C-APE, most particularly the San Jose Road, while the 1915 map reflects the rapid development that occurred in the area after the 1906 earthquake (see Appendix C of the Carey & Co. HRE).

Native American Consultation

A search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) sacred lands database was conducted to determine if any Native American cultural resources are present on or in the vicinity of the project C-APE. A response received from the NAHC on June 5, 2009 stated that no Native American resources are known to exist within the project area.²⁶ The NAHC response included a list of Native American organizations and individuals who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the C-APE. Initial contact letters were sent to the individuals on June 15, 2009. Records of contact are presented in Appendix B of the PBS&J archaeological survey report.

PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Paleontological resources are the fossilized remains or impressions of prehistoric plants and animals. They are valuable, nonrenewable, scientific resources used to document the existence of extinct life forms and to reconstruct the environments in which they lived. Fossils can be used to determine the relative ages of the depositional layers in which they occur and of the geologic events that created and affected those deposits. Typically, they are found in river, lake, and bog deposits, although they may occur in nearly any type of sedimentary sequence.

²⁶ PBS&J correspondence between Denise Jurich, Archaeologist, and Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), June 5, 2009.

The Conformable Impact Mitigation Guidelines Committee of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) published its Standard Guidelines in response to a recognized need to establish procedures for the investigation, collection, preservation, and cataloguing of fossil-bearing sites.²⁷ The Standard Guidelines are widely accepted among paleontologists, followed by most investigators, and identify the key phases of paleontological resource protection as (1) assessment and (2) implementation. Assessment involves identifying the potential for a project site to contain significant nonrenewable paleontological resources that could be damaged or destroyed by project excavation or construction. Implementation involves formulating and applying measures to reduce such adverse effects. The SVP defines the level of potential as one of three sensitivity categories for sedimentary rocks and deposits: High, Moderate, and Low, as defined below. Two additional categories, Marginal and Zero, define non-sedimentary rocks.

- High Sensitivity: assigned to geologic formations known to contain paleontological localities with rare, well-preserved, and/or critical fossil materials for stratigraphic or palaeo-environmental interpretation, and fossils providing important information about the palaeo-biology and evolutionary history (phylogeny) of animal and plant groups. Generally speaking, highly sensitive formations are known to produce vertebrate fossil remains or are considered to have the potential to produce such remains.
- Moderate Sensitivity: assigned to geologic formations known to contain paleontological localities with moderately preserved, common elsewhere, or stratigraphically long-ranging fossil material. The moderate sensitivity category also is applied to geologic formations that are judged to have a strong, but unproven potential for producing important fossil remains (e.g., Pre-Holocene sedimentary rock units representing low to moderate energy, of marine to non-marine depositional settings).
- Low Sensitivity: assigned to geologic formations that, based on their relative youthful age and/or high-energy depositional history, are judged unlikely to produce important fossil remains. Typically, low sensitivity formations may produce invertebrate fossil remains in low abundance.

Most of the plan area is underlain by slope debris derived from the surrounding hillsides, which are formed of Franciscan bedrock (sandstone, shale, chert, and greenstone). Fossils have been reported in Franciscan rocks. As the name implies, the radiolarian chert beds in the Franciscan Complex contain microfossils of radiolaria – the silicon-based skeletons of single-celled planktonic marine organisms – which are important as stratigraphic markers. Limestone nodules and concretions in Franciscan shales, and the shales themselves, often contain

²⁷ Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, Conformable Impact Mitigation Guidelines Committee, 2007 Policy Statements, *Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Nonrenewable Palaeontologic Resources: Standard Guidelines*, 2007. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

radiolaria, foraminifera (another single-celled marine organism), gastropods (snails), pelecypods (clams), and plant microfossils (pollen and spores).²⁸ The slope debris may contain fossils eroded from the Franciscan rocks, but such fossils would have been transported from their original locations and would lack stratigraphic context and, therefore, would be of limited scientific value. For the same reason, no valuable fossils are likely to occur in the artificial fill.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

FEDERAL

Federal regulations for cultural resources are primarily governed by Section 106 of the NHPA of 1966, which applies to actions taken by federal agencies. The goal of the Section 106 review process is to offer a measure of protection to sites that are determined eligible for listing in the National Register. The criteria for determining National Register eligibility are found in 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 60. Because the proposed project would require no federal entitlement or federal funding, Section 106 review would not be required.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

The *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (the Secretary's Standards) are the benchmark by which federal agencies and many local government bodies evaluate rehabilitative work on historic properties. The Secretary's Standards are a useful analytic tool for understanding and describing the potential impacts of substantial changes to historical resources. Compliance with the Secretary's Standards does not determine whether a project would cause a substantial adverse change to the significance of an historic resource. Rather, projects that comply with the Secretary's Standards benefit from a regulatory presumption that they would have a less-than-significant impact on an historic resource. Projects that do not comply with the Secretary's Standards may or may not cause a substantial adverse change to the significance of an historic resource.

STATE

Under CEQA, public agencies must consider the effects of their actions on both "historical resources" and "unique archaeological resources." Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21084.1, a "project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment." Section

²⁸ CH₂MHill, for the City and County of San Francisco, *Final Application for Certification for the San Francisco Electric Reliability Project*, submitted to the California Energy Commission, March 2004, Section 8.16 Paleontological Resources. 2004, pp. 13 – 18.

21083.2 requires agencies to determine whether proposed projects would have effects on “unique archaeological resources.”

“Historical resource” is a term with a defined statutory meaning (see Public Resources Code, Section 21084.1 and *CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15064.5, subdivisions (a) and (b)). The term embraces any resource listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register. The California Register includes resources listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the National Register, as well as some California State Landmarks and Points of Historical Interest.

Properties of local significance that have been designated under a local preservation ordinance (local landmarks or landmark districts) or that have been identified in a local historical resources inventory may be eligible for listing in the California Register and are presumed to be “historical resources” for purposes of CEQA unless a preponderance of evidence indicates otherwise (Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1 and California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 4850). Unless a resource listed in a survey has been demolished, lost substantial integrity, or there is a preponderance of evidence indicating that it is otherwise not eligible for listing, a lead agency should consider the resource to be potentially eligible for the California Register.

In addition to assessing whether historical resources potentially impacted by a proposed project are listed or have been identified in a survey process, lead agencies have a responsibility to evaluate them against the California Register criteria prior to making a finding as to a proposed project’s impacts to historical resources (Public Resources Code, Section 21084.1 and *CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15064.5, subdivision (a)(3)). In general, an historical resource, under this approach, is defined as any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that:

- a) Is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political or cultural annals of California; and
- b) Meets any of the following criteria:
 - 1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
 - 2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
 - 3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
 - 4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.²⁹

²⁹ *CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15064.5 (a) (3).

CEQA requires that “when a project will impact an archaeological site, a lead agency shall first determine whether the site is a historical resource”(CEQA Section 15064.5(c)).³⁰ In addition, Public Resources Code Section 5024 requires consultation with the OHP when a project may impact historical resources located on State-owned land.

For historic structures, *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5, subdivision (b)(3), indicates that a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings, or the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* (1995) shall mitigate impacts to a level of less than significant. Potential eligibility also rests upon the integrity of the resource. Integrity is defined as the retention of the resource’s physical identity that existed during its period of significance. Integrity is determined through considering the setting, design, workmanship, materials, location, feeling, and association of the resource.

As noted above, CEQA also requires lead agencies to consider whether projects would impact “unique archaeological resources.” Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, subdivision (g), states that “‘unique archaeological resource’ means an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

Treatment options under Section 21083.2 include activities that preserve such resources in place in an undisturbed state. Other acceptable methods of mitigation under Section 21083.2 include excavation and curation or study in place without excavation and curation (if the study finds that the artifacts would not meet one or more of the criteria for defining a “unique archaeological resource”).

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, subdivision (e), requires that excavation activities be stopped whenever human remains are uncovered and that the county coroner be called in to assess the remains. If the county coroner determines that the remains are those of Native Americans, the NAHC must be contacted within 24 hours. At that time, the lead agency must consult with the

³⁰ *CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15064.5 subdivision (c) (1).

appropriate Native Americans, if any, as timely identified by the NAHC. Section 15064.5 directs the lead agency (or applicant), under certain circumstances, to develop an agreement with the Native Americans for the treatment and disposition of the remains. As of March 1, 2005, Senate Bill 18 (Government Code sections 65352.3, 65352.4) requires that, prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan proposed on or after March 1, 2005, a city or county must consult with Native American tribes with respect to the possible preservation of, or the mitigation of impacts to, specified Native American places, features, and objects located within that jurisdiction.

Similarly, under CEQA, public agencies must consider the effects of their actions on to paleontological resources. *CEQA Guidelines*, Appendix G states that an adverse effect to a unique paleontological resource (fossilized invertebrate, vertebrate, plant or micro-fossil) is a significant adverse effect to the physical environment.

LOCAL

City and County of San Francisco Planning Department CEQA Review Procedures for Historical Resource

San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 16 provides guidance for the CEQA review process with regards to historical resources.

As a certified local government and the lead agency in CEQA determinations, the City and County of San Francisco has instituted guidelines and a system for initiating CEQA review of historical resources. The Planning Department's "CEQA Review Procedures for Historical Resources" incorporates the State's *CEQA Guidelines* into the City's existing regulatory framework. To facilitate the review process, the Planning Department has established the categories to determine the baseline significance of historic properties based on their inclusion within cultural resource surveys and/or historic districts. These categories include Category A.1 (Resources listed on or formally determined to be eligible for the California Register), Category A.2 (Adopted local registers, and properties that have been determined to appear or may become eligible, for the California Register), Category B (Properties requiring further consultation and review), Category C (Properties determined not to be historical resources or properties for which the City has no information indicating that the property is an Historical Resource).

IMPACTS

SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

The proposed project would result in a significant impact on cultural and/or paleontological resources if it would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5, including those resources listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code;
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

APPROACH TO ANALYSIS

The impact analysis for cultural resources is based primarily on the information contained in the Carey & Co. HRE, the Archaeological Survey Report prepared by PBS&J, the HRE prepared by the Planning Department, and the HRER prepared by the Planning Department. The impact analysis and mitigation measures are informed by the provisions and requirements of federal, State, and local laws and regulations that apply to cultural and paleontological resources.

Additionally, the proposed project's potential contribution to cumulative cultural resource impacts are evaluated in the context of existing, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable future development expected in the plan area. The cumulative context for each type of resource is unique and described in the cumulative impacts section below.

IMPACT EVALUATION

Historical Architectural Resources

- CP-1 *Operation and design associated with the 2010 Community Plan's Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement at the BART Station would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

General Impacts. The 2010 Community Plan does not include any specific proposals for operation that would alter historical resources, including the BART Station, nor

III. Environmental Setting and Impacts
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

are any proposed by property owners in the plan area at this time. Thus, it is not known whether any of these buildings would be demolished in the future.

Although the greater densities and increased height allowable under the proposed NCT rezoning and five-foot height bonus could indirectly create greater development pressures on historical resources than under current land use controls, any increased development incentive would be incremental and insubstantial. Four of the five historical resources within the area to be rezoned are one or two stories tall. There is a one-story building located at 657 Chenery Street, and three two-story buildings located at 601 Bosworth Street, 683 Chenery Street, and 701-703 Chenery Street. There is one two-and-a-half story building located at 2784 Diamond Street.

Therefore, an incentive already exists for property owners to alter these structures to take advantage of the existing 40-foot height limit within an existing NC district. The Planning Department believes that the additional five-foot height increase would not create a substantially greater incentive to alter the structures because it generally would not allow for the construction of any additional floors.

The EIR assumes potential future rezoning of the BART parking lot to NCT and 65-X. Given that there is no historical resource present on the BART parking lot infill site, rezoning of the property would not increase development pressures on a historical resource.

The 2010 *Community Plan* objectives and policies emphasize the preservation of landmarks and other buildings of historic value for their important contribution to neighborhood character.³¹ The plan calls for the historical resources survey conducted for the 2010 *Community Plan* area to be finalized and formally adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission. It also calls for eligible properties to be nominated to local, State, and national registers to take advantage of preservation incentives. Finally, the plan echoes existing General Plan policy, Planning Code requirements, and Planning Department procedures that emphasize protection of historical buildings from demolition or adverse alteration and application of the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* for projects involving historical resources.

³¹ City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Glen Park Community Plan (2010) Text Changes Memo*, from Jon Swae to Lisa Gibson, March 22, 2011. See Appendix C.

Any future proposals for alteration of historical resources would require project-level evaluation in accordance with the *City and County of San Francisco Planning Department CEQA Review Procedures for Historic Resources*. The evaluation would determine whether such proposals would cause a "substantial adverse change" to a historical resource. Should the Planning Department determine, upon further project-level study, that the alteration or demolition would cause a substantial adverse change to the resource, this would be considered a significant adverse impact under CEQA. Such an action would require project-level review in an EIR, and such an EIR would have to identify feasible mitigation measures and consider retention and reuse of the resource as an alternative to the project. Therefore, the *2010 Community Plan* would result in less-than-significant impacts on historical resources.

Infill Development. The *2010 Community Plan* encourages consideration of infill development at two sites: the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street site and the BART parking lot site. In addition, it is expected that over the life of the *2010 Community Plan*, development of additional 13 residential units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses at 2928-2958 Diamond Street within the proposed Glen Park NCT District could occur. Neither of the two infill sites contain historical structures and the *2010 Community Plan* does not include any specific development proposals for either site. While the additional 13 residential units could be developed on a site with an existing historical structure, the location of these units is not known at this time. As described in the Project Description, p. II-1, the scale of development potential at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street infill site and at the additional 13 residential units would be 45 feet. The additional 5-foot increase (from existing 40-foot height limit) would not physically impair any surrounding historical resource, and would be compatible with adjacent historical resources.

Similarly, the BART parking lot site is assumed to have a scale of development potential of 65 feet in height. While the existing height limit is 40 feet, the additional 25 feet is not anticipated to physically impair or be incompatible with adjacent historical resource (the BART Station) because the BART parking lot is far enough away that it would not impair the character defining features of the BART Station as a historical resource.

Future development proposals on either site would be subject to *2010 Community Plan* and General Plan objectives and policies emphasizing the preservation of landmarks and other buildings of historic value as an important contributor to neighborhood identity. In addition, any future proposals would require project-

level evaluation for potential effects on local historical resources. Therefore, future development of the two infill sites under the *2010 Community Plan* would result in less-than-significant impacts on the BART Station and other historical resources.

Transportation Improvements. The *2010 Community Plan* proposes transportation improvements that include traffic-calming measures, bicycle network improvements, pedestrian access, and transit improvements. Implementation of traffic calming, bicycle network, and parking improvements would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource because the improvements are relatively minor in scale, consistent with other transportation infrastructure in the plan area, and would not alter any historical resources in the plan area eligible for the California Register, National Register, or as City Landmarks. Therefore, effects of these improvements on such resources are not discussed further below. The pedestrian access and transit improvements could potentially affect eligibility of the BART Station. Potential effects of these improvements on the BART Station are discussed below.

- The *2010 Community Plan* proposes transportation improvements that could affect the physical characteristics of the BART Station that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register. As described further below, these transportation improvements include: the Diamond Street widening variant; the two options for improving the connectivity between the BART Station and the Muni Metro J-Church stop on San Jose Avenue; the BART Station plaza improvements; and the bus loop improvement at the BART Station.
- *Widening of Diamond Street Variant.* The proposed Diamond Street widening variant would consist of widening Diamond Street with a northbound right-turn lane. If this variant were implemented, the Glen Park BART Station plaza, including portions of the exterior plazas, would be modified to include a sloped landscaped area, a ramp accessible to persons with disabilities, an elevator connecting the street level to the plaza level, stairs down to plaza from the sidewalk, bench seating, bicycle lockers, bicycle parking, a bicycle ramp, and ticket machines. These modifications would alter portions of the exterior plazas of the BART Station, which are character-defining features. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed project. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes the Diamond Street widening variant would result in a significant impact, because it could

materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

- This significant impact of the proposed Diamond Street widening variant would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, described below. (As discussed on pp. III.D-30 through III.D-31, this mitigation measure also addresses significant impacts resulting from construction of the Muni Metro J-Church pedestrian connectivity improvements, the BART Station plaza improvements, and the bus loop improvement.)
- M-CP-1 *Verification of Compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.* San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), in cooperation with BART and any other agency that may have jurisdiction, will prepare materials describing and depicting the widening of Diamond Street variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement at the BART Station, including but not limited to plans, drawings, and photographs of existing conditions. Prepared materials will be submitted to the Planning Department for review by staff who meet the Secretary of Interior's professional qualification standards. Such staff will review and the Historic Preservation Commission shall approve the project for compliance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. If any aspect of the design of the widening of Diamond Street variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, or bus loop improvement at the BART Station is determined to be inconsistent with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall pursue and implement a redesign of those elements, consistent with the goals and objectives of the project, such that consistency with the standards is achieved.

- *Proposed Muni Metro J-Church Pedestrian Bridge Improvement.* The first pedestrian access option is to rebuild the existing pedestrian bridge and to construct an elevator between Diamond Street and the BART Station plaza, which would alter the BART Station. Rebuilding the existing pedestrian bridge would not directly impact the station or have a significant impact on its setting. The proposed pedestrian bridge would replace the existing structure, which is not readily visible from the station due to a row of trees lining the southwest corner of the parcel containing the station. Consequently, the reconstructed bridge would have no impact on the BART Station. However, the elevator would be located at the station's north elevation just south of the existing BART ticket machines. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed elevator, so it is not known if its design or scale would be compatible with the design of the BART Station. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes the design and operation of the elevator would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.
- This significant impact of the elevator associated with the proposed Muni Metro J-Church Pedestrian Bridge Improvement on the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, described above, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*.

- Muni Metro J-Church At-Grade Crossing Variant.* The second pedestrian access option is to construct a new pedestrian ramp between the Muni Metro J-Church platform and the BART Station at the station's south, or rear, elevation. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed pedestrian ramp, so it is not known if its design or scale would be compatible with the design of the BART Station. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes the design and operation of this at-grade crossing variant would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics,
- such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact of the pedestrian ramp associated with the Muni Metro J-Church At-Grade Crossing Variant on the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, described above, p. III.D-29, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*.

- *BART Station Plaza Improvements.* The redesign of the BART Station plaza concept would consist of removing walls and fences, expanding at-grade access, and linking Muni passenger areas to improve pedestrian access in the BART Station plaza. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed redesign of the BART Station plaza, so it is not known if its design or scale would be compatible with the design of the BART Station. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes the design and operation of the BART Station plaza improvements would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.
- This significant impact associated with the redesign of the BART Station plaza would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, described above, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*.

BART Station Bus Loop Improvement. The proposed BART Station Bus Loop Improvement would consist of a bus loop around the Glen Park BART Station with a new concourse-level entry to the station at its south elevation. This improvement would construct a concourse-level entry at the Glen Park BART Station's south elevation and a walk-through bridge through the station to the north-end plaza to reconfigure the staircase at the north plaza. These modifications would alter the station's character-defining features, including its interior space and the exterior plazas. Specifically, the bus loop improvement could significantly impact the design and character of the interior space, including, but not limited to the relationship of the roof form, the interior tile mosaic, and the fenestration. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed project. In order to provide a cautious disclosure

- of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes the bus loop improvement would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact of the proposed BART Station Bus Loop around the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, described above, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*.

- *No Bus Loop Variant.* The No Bus Loop Variant would consolidate existing private vehicle drop-off areas on Bosworth Street and on Diamond Street. This variant would not directly impact the BART Station. It would not materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the Glen Park BART Station that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register. The impact of the No Bus Loop Variant would therefore be considered less than significant.

Open Space. The areas identified in the *2010 Community Plan* for future open space improvements do not contain historical structures. Future open space improvements would be subject to *2010 Community Plan* and General Plan objectives and policies emphasizing the preservation of landmarks and other buildings of

historic value as an important contributor to neighborhood identity. In addition, any future proposals would require project-level evaluation for potential effects on historical resources. Therefore, future open space improvements would result in less-than-significant impacts on historical resources.

CP-2

Construction activities resulting from the Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement at the BART Station would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

General Impacts. The 2010 Community Plan does not include any specific proposals for construction or demolition of historical resources, including the BART Station, nor are any proposed by property owners in the plan area at this time. Thus, it is not yet known which, if any, of these buildings would be demolished in the future.

The proposed NCT rezoning and five-foot height bonus could indirectly create greater development pressures, and therefore construction activities, on or nearby historical resources than under current land use controls. Construction activities could include subsurface soil-disturbing activities resulting from grading and excavation, foundation support, and possible utility relocation.

As stated under CP-1, any future proposals for alteration or demolition of historical resources would require project-level evaluation in accordance with the *City and County of San Francisco Planning Department CEQA Review Procedures for Historical Resources*. The evaluation would determine whether the construction activities associated with such proposals would cause a "substantial adverse change" to a historical resource. Should the Planning Department determine, upon further project-level study, that the construction activity associated with the alteration or modification would cause a substantial adverse change to the resource, this would be considered a significant adverse impact under CEQA. Such an action would require project-level review in an EIR, and such an EIR would have to identify feasible mitigation measures and consider retention and reuse of the resource as an alternative to the project. Therefore, construction activities associated with the 2010 Community Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts on historical resources.

- **Infill Development.** The *2010 Community Plan* does not include any specific development proposals for the infill sites, or any of the additional 13 residential units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses at 2928-2958 Diamond Street that could be constructed within the plan area. Therefore, construction-specific information at this time is unknown. However, construction associated with future development in the plan area could involve subsurface soil-disturbing activities such

as grading and excavation, foundation construction, and utilities installation, as well as the use of heavy machinery.

Construction activities associated with infill sites would occur far enough away to not significantly impact the BART Station, a historical resource. It is anticipated that the use of construction equipment and all activity associated with construction at the infill sites would not impair the character-defining features of the BART Station. Furthermore, the infill sites are not adjacent to any other historical resources that could be adversely affected by construction activities.

Future development proposals within the plan area would be subject to *2010 Community Plan* and General Plan objectives and policies emphasizing the preservation of landmarks and other buildings of historic value as an important contributor to neighborhood identity, which would apply to construction-period activities. In addition, any future proposals would require project-level evaluation for potential effects on local historical resources, including from construction activities. Therefore, future construction activity associated with the infill and other development under the *2010 Community Plan* would result in less-than-significant impacts on the BART Station and other historical resources.

- Transportation Improvements.** Construction activities at the BART Station would
- be associated with the Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and the bus loop improvement.
 - *Widening of Diamond Street Variant.* The proposed Diamond Street widening variant would consist of widening Diamond Street with a northbound right-turn lane. Inadvertent damage to the BART Station plaza could occur during construction due to heavy machinery use, vibration, and other construction activity. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes construction altering the BART Station plaza would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.
 - This significant impact of the proposed Diamond Street widening variant would be reduced to a less-than-significant level

- through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, p. III.D-29, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties* and Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A through M-CP-2C, described below.

M-CP-2A Protection of Historical Resources during Construction. To protect the Glen Park BART Station from direct or indirect impacts during construction activities (e.g., due to damage from operation of construction equipment, vibration, staging, and material storage), SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall, prior to any construction activities, including any ground-disturbing work, prepare a plan establishing procedures to protect these resources.

SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction, shall ensure that the contractor follows this plan while working near these resources.

The plan shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian who meets the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards. At a minimum, the plan shall include:

- A requirement for the placement of perimeter fencing and/or signs around the historical resource to identify it as a sensitive resource;
- Guidelines for operation of construction equipment adjacent to the historical resource;
- Guidelines for storage of construction materials away from the resource;
- Requirements for monitoring and documenting compliance with the plan; and
- Education/training of construction workers about the significance of the historical resource around which they would be working.

M-CP-2B Historical Resource Documentation and Protection. Prior to construction, a historic preservation architect and a structural engineer shall undertake an existing condition study of the Glen Park BART Station. The purpose of the study would be to establish the baseline condition of the building and plazas prior to construction. The documentation shall take the form of written descriptions and visual illustrations, including those physical characteristics of the resource that convey its historic significance and that justify its inclusion on, or eligibility for inclusion on, the California

Register. The documentation shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department.

The structural engineer shall make periodic site visits to monitor the condition of the resource, including monitoring of any instruments such as crack gauges. The structural engineer shall consult with the historic preservation architect, to ensure that character-defining features are protected, especially if any problems with character-defining features of the historic resource are discovered. If in the opinion of the structural engineer, in consultation with the historic preservation architect, substantial adverse impacts to the historic resource related to construction activities are found during construction, the monitoring team shall so inform the SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction, or designated representative responsible for construction activities. The SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction, shall adhere to the monitoring team's recommendations for corrective measures, including halting construction in situations where construction activities would imminently endanger the historic resource. The monitoring team shall prepare site visit reports and submit them for review by the Planning Department. All documentation shall be made available to the public by request.

M-CP-2C Verification of Historic Preservation. Upon completion of construction activities at the Glen Park BART Station, a qualified architectural historian shall document (e.g., with photographs and other appropriate means) the level of success in meeting the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* and in preserving the character-defining features of the BART Station.

The SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall ensure repairs occur if any damage has occurred to the Glen Park BART Station during construction. Repair work shall occur in conformance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* and shall restore the character-defining features in a manner that does not affect the eligibility of the historic property for the California Register. The architectural historian shall prepare a verification report for review and approval by the Planning Department.

- *Proposed Muni Metro J-Church Pedestrian Bridge Improvement.* Construction activities associated with the proposed bridge would occur towards the southwest corner of the parcel containing the station, far enough way to not significantly impact the BART Station. However, the elevator would be located at the station's north elevation just south of the existing BART ticket machines. Inadvertent damage to the BART Station could occur during the construction of the elevator due to heavy machinery use, vibration, and other construction activity, which would be considered a significant impact. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes construction of the elevator would result in a potentially significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.
- This significant impact of the proposed Muni Metro J-Church Pedestrian Bridge elevator on the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*, together with Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A through M-CP-2C, pp. III.D-34 to III.D-35. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2A, calls for the protection of historical resource during construction by following a specific plan while working near these intersections. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2B calls for historical resource documentation and protection, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-2C calls for verification of historic preservation. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of construction activities on the BART Station to a less-than-significant level.

- *Muni Metro J-Church At-Grade Crossing Variant.* Inadvertent damage to the BART Station could occur during the construction of the pedestrian ramp due to heavy machinery use, vibration, and other construction activity. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes construction of the pedestrian ramp would be a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

- This significant impact of the proposed elevator on the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through incorporation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*, and Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A through M-CP-2C, pp. III.D-34 to III.D-35. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2A calls for the protection of historical resource during construction by following a specific plan while working near these intersections. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2B calls for historical resource documentation and protection, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-2C calls for verification of historic preservation. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of construction activities on the BART Station to a less-than-significant level.

- *BART Station Plaza Improvements.* The redesign of the BART Station plaza would consist of removing walls and fences, expanding at-grade access, and linking Muni passenger areas to improve pedestrian access in the BART Station plaza. Inadvertent damage to the BART Station could occur during construction altering the BART Station plaza due to heavy machinery use, vibration, and other construction activity. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes construction altering the BART Station plaza would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

- This significant impact of the proposed BART Station Plaza Improvements would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*, and Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A through M-CP-2C, pp. III.D-34 to III.D-35. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2A calls for

the protection of historical resource during construction by following a specific plan. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2B calls for historical resource documentation and protection, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-2C calls for verification of historic preservation. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of construction activities on the BART Station to a less-than-significant level.

- BART Station Bus Loop Improvement.* Inadvertent damage to the Glen Park BART Station could occur during the construction of the concourse level entry and the walk-through bridge associated with the proposed BART Station Bus Loop Improvement. The damage could occur due to heavy machinery use, vibration, and other construction activity, which would be considered a significant impact. This significant impact on the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*, and Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A through M-CP-2C, pp. III.D-34 to III.D-35. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2A calls for the protection of historical resources during construction by following a specific plan while working near these intersections. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2B calls for historic resource documentation and protection, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-2C calls for verification of historic preservation. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of construction activities on the BART Station to a less-than-significant level.

● *No Bus Loop Variant.* The No Bus Loop Variant would consolidate existing private vehicle drop-off areas on Bosworth Street and on Diamond Street. This variant would not directly impact the BART Station and would have minor construction impact on its exterior plazas. It would not materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the Glen Park BART Station that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register. The impact would therefore be considered less than significant.

Open Space. The areas identified in the *2010 Community Plan* for future open space improvements do not contain historical structures. Future open space improvements would be subject to *2010 Community Plan* and General Plan objectives and policies emphasizing the preservation of landmarks and other buildings of historic value as an important contributor to neighborhood identity. In addition, any future proposals would require project-level evaluation for potential effects on local historical resource. Therefore, construction of future open space improvements would result in less-than-significant impacts on historical resources.

Archaeological Resources

CP-3 *Future construction activities associated with the 2010 Community Plan area would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

General Impacts. Future development under the *2010 Community Plan* could involve subsurface construction that may have the potential to damage or disturb unknown subsurface archaeological deposits. No prehistoric or historical archaeological sites have been documented in the plan area. However, the area surrounding Islais Creek may contain prehistoric archaeological resources. Therefore, future development in the plan area has potential to affect prehistoric archaeological deposits. If encountered during construction, archaeological resources could be damaged or destroyed, which would be considered a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-3, below, would reduce potential effects of future development in the plan area on archaeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

M-CP-3 *Accidental Discovery of Archaeological Resources.* The SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall distribute the Planning Department archaeological resource “ALERT” sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition,

excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); or utilities firm involved in soil-disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soil-disturbing activities being undertaken, each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the "ALERT" sheet is circulated to all field personnel, including machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the Alert Sheet.

Should any indication of an archaeological resource be encountered during any soil-disturbing activity of the project, the project Head Foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soil-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken.

If the ERO determines that an archaeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant as provided by the Planning Department's List of Qualified Archeological Consultants. The archaeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archaeological resource, retains sufficient integrity, and is of potential scientific/historical/cultural significance. If an archaeological resource is present, the archaeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archaeological resource. The archaeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the project sponsor.

Measures might include preservation in situ of the archaeological resource; an archaeological monitoring program; or an archaeological testing program. If an archaeological monitoring program or archaeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Major Environmental Analysis (MEA) division guidelines for such programs. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archaeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions.

The project archaeological consultant shall submit a Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archaeological resource and describe the archaeological and historical research methods employed in the archaeological monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archaeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.

Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department shall receive three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

Infill Development. The two infill sites are near the convergence of Islais Creek and another unnamed creek. The 13 additional residential units could also be located near Islais Creek and the unnamed creek. The attractiveness of the Islais Creek corridor for prehistoric occupation is well-documented by the larger number of downstream prehistoric sites, including CA-SFR-3, -SFR-16, -SFR-17/H, -SFR-18, the Alemany-Bayshore Site, and the Lowe's midden site, some of apparent significant size and of long duration (CA-SFR-17H). The former creek drainages are within State Liquefaction Hazards Zones composed of "soft" sediments and historic fill in which new development may be required to use deeper foundations or soils improvement techniques for seismically acceptable foundational support. For these reasons, ground-disturbing activities related to potential infill development would have potential to affect prehistoric archaeological deposits. This would be a significant effect.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-3, p. III.D-37, would reduce potential effects of the infill development on archaeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

Transportation Improvements. Ground-disturbing activities related to construction of the proposed transportation improvements would have potential to affect prehistoric archaeological deposits. This would be a significant effect. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-3, p. III.D-37, would reduce potential effects of the proposed transportation improvements on archaeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

Open Space. Future open space improvements in the plan area would have the potential to affect prehistoric archaeological deposits because of related ground-disturbing activities. The implementation of the open space improvements is long term in nature and would be subject to independent study and environmental review in the future. This would be a significant effect. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-3, p. III.D-37, would reduce potential effects of future open space improvements on archaeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

Paleontological Resources

CP-4 *Future construction activities associated with the 2010 Community Plan would destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

General Impacts. Although no known paleontological resources have been recorded in the plan area, paleontological resources may be found at depths greater than previously disturbed during past development. Soil- or rock-disturbing activities resulting from future development, including construction of building foundations, have potential to affect paleontological resources that may be present in underlying geological deposits.

The slope debris in the plan area may contain fossils eroded from the Franciscan rocks, but such fossils would have been transported from their original locations and would lack stratigraphic context and, therefore, would be of limited scientific value. For the same reason, no valuable fossils are likely to occur in the artificial fill. In the unlikely event that paleontological resources are discovered in the area during construction activities extending into previously undisturbed soil or rock, a significant impact on paleontological resources could occur. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-4 would reduce impacts of the *2010 Community Plan* to paleontological resources to a less-than-significant level. This mitigation would

III. Environmental Setting and Impacts
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

apply if excavation in the plan area is expected to extend into previously undisturbed soil or rock.

- **M-CP-4** *Paleontological Resources Monitoring Plan.* If excavation in the plan area is expected to extend into previously undisturbed soil or rock, the SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall retain the services of a qualified paleontological consultant having expertise in California paleontology to design and implement a monitoring and mitigation program. The program shall include a description of when and where construction monitoring would be required; emergency discovery procedures; sampling and data recovery procedures; procedures for the preparation, identification, analysis, and curation of fossil specimens and data recovered; preconstruction coordination procedures; and procedures for reporting the results of the monitoring program. If potentially important paleontological resources (fossilized invertebrate, vertebrate, plant, or micro-fossil) are encountered during excavation, work shall cease within 25 feet of the feature, the ERO shall be notified, and the paleontologist shall identify and evaluate the significance of the potential resource, documenting the findings in an advisory memorandum to the ERO. If it is determined that avoidance of effect to a significant paleontological resource is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan that may include curation of the paleontological resource in a permanent retrieval paleontological research collections facility such as the University of California Museum of Paleontology or California Academy of Sciences. The MEA division of the Planning Department shall receive two copies of a final paleontological excavation and recovery report.

The paleontologist's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure and at the direction of the ERO. Plans and reports prepared by the paleontologist shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Paleontological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction for a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction could be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less-than-significant level potential effects on a significant paleontological resource as previously defined.

Infill Development. Ground disturbance associated with future development of the infill sites and the additional 13 residential units, including construction of building foundations, has the potential to affect paleontological resources that may be present in underlying geological deposits. This would be a significant impact. Infill development would be subject to independent study and environmental review in the future. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-4, p. III.D-40, would reduce impacts of future infill development to paleontological resources to a less-than-significant level.

Transportation Improvements. Ground disturbance associated with the proposed transportation improvements would have the potential to affect paleontological resources that may be present in underlying geological deposits. This would be a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-4 would reduce impacts of the proposed transportation improvements to paleontological resources to a less-than-significant level.

Open Space. Future open space improvements in the plan area would have potential to affect paleontological resources because of related ground-disturbing activities. This would be a significant impact. The implementation of the open space improvements is long term in nature and would be subject to independent study and environmental review in the future. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-4, p. III.D-40, would reduce potential effects of future open space improvements on paleontological resources to a less-than-significant level.

Human Remains

CP-5 *Future construction activities associated with the 2010 Community Plan would substantially disturb human remains. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

General Impacts. While no known human remains are anticipated to be found in the plan area, it is possible that such resources may be present. These resources could be encountered during ground-disturbing activities. As described in “Archaeological Resources” above, the proposed project site has sensitivity for prehistoric archaeological resources in the area surrounding Islais Creek. Ground-disturbing activities associated with future development in the plan area could adversely impact prehistoric deposits, including human remains. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-5 would reduce potential adverse impacts to human remains to a less-than-significant level.

M-CP-5 Treatment of Human Remains. The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the NAHC who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Public Resource Code Section 5097.98). The SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall direct the archaeological consultant, in coordination with the MLD, to make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

- **Infill Development.** Ground disturbance associated with future development of the infill sites and the 13 residential units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses, including construction of building foundations, have potential to remove or disturb human remains. This would be a significant impact. Infill development would be subject to independent study and environmental review in the future. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-5, above, would reduce potential adverse impacts to human remains to a less-than-significant level.

Transportation Improvements. Ground disturbance associated with the proposed transportation improvements would have potential to remove or disturb human remains. This would be a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-5, above, would reduce potential adverse impacts to human remains to a less-than-significant level.

Open Space. Future open space improvements in the plan area would have potential to remove or disturb human remains. The implementation of the open space improvements is long term in nature and would be subject to independent study and environmental review in the future. This would be a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-5, p. III.D-43, would reduce potential adverse impacts to human remains to a less-than-significant level.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

C-CP *The 2010 Community Plan, in combination with other foreseeable development, would result in potentially significant cumulative impacts to cultural and paleontological resources. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

The cumulative projects, identified in the Section III.B, Land Use, p. III.B-15 through p. III.B-17, would not create incentives to redevelop or prompt physical alterations to the identified historic architectural resources. These foreseeable projects in the vicinity of the plan area involve transportation improvements including implementing traffic calming measures, making San Francisco Bicycle Plan lane improvements, addressing pedestrian connectivity, and enhancing transit connections. Those projects would primarily result in physical changes to the public right-of-way and changes to public facilities, which would not affect the identified historic properties, either directly or indirectly, including the BART Station. Therefore, the impacts of the 2010 Community Plan on the BART Station would not have the potential to combine with the impacts of the cumulative projects, and there would be no cumulative impact with respect to historic architectural resources.

The Initial Study for the San Francisco Bicycle Plan³² identified the possibility of unanticipated archeological resources being impacted by the construction of the bicycle lanes. That Initial Study identified the same accidental discovery mitigation measure as Mitigation Measure M-CP-3, p. III.D-37, for the proposed project. Because any archeological resources that would potentially be encountered for either the San Francisco Bicycle Plan or the proposed project are unanticipated and unidentified, it is unknown whether those resources would be related such that a significant cumulative impact would occur. For the purpose of this environmental analysis, this EIR conservatively assumes that a significant cumulative impact would occur. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-3, p. III.D-37, would reduce the contribution of the 2010 Community Plan to this cumulative impact on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

The San Francisco Bicycle Plan Initial Study did not identify any significant impacts associated with paleontological resource or human remains. Nonetheless, for the purpose of this environmental analysis, the EIR conservatively assumes that a significant cumulative impact to these resources would occur as a result of the San

³² San Francisco Planning Department. *The San Francisco Bicycle Plan Project Initial Study*. March 15, 2008. Available for public review at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2007.0347E.

Francisco Bicycle Plan in combination with the *2010 Community Plan*. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-4, p. III.D-40, which calls for the design and implementation of a paleontological resources monitoring plan, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-5, p. III.D-43, which calls for the treatment of human remains to comply with applicable State and federal laws, would reduce the proposed project's contribution to this impact to a less-than-significant level

No cumulative impacts to cultural and paleontological resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed project in combination with the Sunnyside Traffic Calming Project, as no such impacts were identified as part of the environmental review for that project.³³

³³ SFMTA. *Sunnyside Traffic Calming Project. Final Report*. December 2009.

E. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

INTRODUCTION

This section examines the potential impacts of the proposed project on transportation resources in the plan area. More specifically, this section evaluates the potential impacts of the proposed project on intersection operating conditions, the transit network and service, pedestrian and bicycle conditions, and parking supply and occupancy. The information presented in this section represents a summary of the information presented in the transportation study for the proposed project.^{1,2}

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The area analyzed in this EIR is in the center of Glen Park neighborhood and is bounded generally by Chenery Street to the north; Roanoke Street to the east; San Jose Avenue and Bosworth Street to the south; and Elk Street to the west. This area is defined as the “plan area” and is shown in Chapter II, Project Description, Figure II-1, p. II-7. Glen Park is located south of the Diamond Heights and Noe Valley neighborhoods, west of the Bernal Heights neighborhood, and east of Glen Canyon Park.

REGIONAL ACCESS

Existing access points (i.e., on-ramps and off-ramps) in the plan area that provide connections to the regional roadway network are identified below.

Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue: Southbound off- and northbound on-ramps at this location provide access to and from the North Bay via U.S. 101 and to and from the East Bay via Interstate 80 (I-80).

¹ PBS&J/AECOM, *Glen Park Transportation – Final Report*, December 3, 2010. A copy of this report is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

² The *2010 Community Plan* identifies the BART parking lot as a potential location for future residential and commercial infill development. Although the *2010 Community Plan* does not itself propose development or rezoning of the site, the transportation study analyzes the transportation impacts that would result if the BART parking lot infill site were developed with a mixed residential and commercial project. The transportation study assumes potential buildout if the lot were rezoned to a Glen Park NCT District; this use district would reflect the existing pattern in the area of mixed-use, walkability, and transit access, and would be consistent with the zoning proposal for the adjacent neighborhood commercial district. The district could include a building height of 65 feet (65-X Height and Bulk District) with 90 residential units, 14,913 square feet of commercial uses, and 123 off-street parking spaces.

San Jose Avenue: Southbound on- and northbound off-ramps, located to the west of Bosworth Street, provide access to and from the Peninsula and to and from the Pacific Coast via the Pacific Coast Highway (SR 1).

LOCAL ACCESS

This section provides a discussion of the existing local roadway system in the plan area, including the roadway designation, number of travel lanes, and traffic flow directions.

Bosworth Street is the primary east-west secondary arterial in the Glen Park neighborhood. On its western end, Bosworth Street connects with O'Shaughnessy Boulevard. The actual termination of Bosworth Street lies in Glen Canyon Park, in a cul-de-sac perpendicular to O'Shaughnessy Boulevard. Bosworth Street stretches nearly one mile between O'Shaughnessy Boulevard and Mission Street. On the outer portions of the street, between O'Shaughnessy Boulevard and Congo Street/Elk Street and between Lyell Street and Mission Street, Bosworth Street has one lane in each direction. In the plan area between Congo Street/Elk Street and Lyell Street, Bosworth Street features two lanes in each direction. In addition, the street widens between Diamond Street and Arlington Street to accommodate left-turn pockets.

Bosworth Street has on-street parking on both sides and has the following designations under the *San Francisco General Plan* (General Plan):

- Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) Street in the MTS Network between O'Shaughnessy Boulevard and San Jose Avenue;
- Neighborhood Network Connection Street in the Neighborhood Pedestrian Streets Network between Elk Street/Congo Street and Diamond Street; and
- Citywide Bicycle Route (Route 55) in the Citywide Bikeway Network (Class III facilities) between O'Shaughnessy Boulevard and Lyell Street.

O'Shaughnessy Boulevard is an arterial roadway that is not within the plan area, but it does connect to Bosworth Street on its east end, traveling along Glen Canyon Park to reach Woodside Avenue and Portola Drive on its north end. Along most of its length, O'Shaughnessy Boulevard has one lane in each direction, with left-turn pockets at intersections. No on-street parking is provided. The street widens to two lanes in each direction on its northern approach to and from Portola Drive.

O'Shaughnessy Boulevard has the following designations under the General Plan:

- MTS Recreational Street in the MTS Network for its entire length; and
- Citywide Bicycle Route (Route 55) in the Citywide Bicycle Network (Class I and Class III facilities) for its full length.

Monterey Boulevard is an east-west collector stretching between Junipero Serra Boulevard and the southbound Interstate 280 (I-280) Off-Ramp/Diamond Street intersection in Glen Park. In the plan area between the I-280 ramps at Circular Avenue and Diamond Street, two lanes are provided in each direction.

Monterey Boulevard has on-street parking on both sides and has the following designation under the General Plan:

- Citywide Bicycle Route (Route 70) in the Citywide Bicycle Network (Class III facilities) at its west end, between Genessee Street and San Benito Way.

San Jose Avenue is a major north-south arterial roadway stretching through several neighborhoods between the City's southern border and centrally-located Noe Valley. In the plan area, Muni Metro light rail tracks are located in the median of San Jose Avenue and are segregated from traffic. This segment of San Jose Avenue in the plan area between Roanoke Street and the northbound on-ramp from Monterey Boulevard is characterized as an expressway, with limited access to and from adjacent streets. San Jose Avenue narrows to one lane in each direction and crosses I-280 via an underpass. South of the underpass, the Muni Metro light rail tracks in the segregated median join the roadway and share the two traffic lanes in each direction.

San Jose Avenue has on-street parking on both sides south of Theresa Street and north of Brook Street, but no on-street parking is provided on San Jose Avenue in the immediate vicinity of the plan area. San Jose Avenue has the following designations under the General Plan:

- Major Arterial in the Congestion Management Program (CMP) Network between Guerrero Street and Santa Rosa Avenue;
- MTS Street in the MTS Network between Guerrero Street and Santa Rosa Avenue;
- Primary Transit Street in the Transit Preferential Streets Network: Transit Important Street between 30th Street and Santa Rosa Avenue, and Transit Oriented Street between Santa Rosa Avenue and Broad Street; and
- Neighborhood Commercial Street in the Neighborhood Pedestrian Streets Network between Randall Street and Broad Street.

Alemaný Boulevard is a major east-west arterial roadway that is not located within the plan area, but does connect to Glen Park via Lyell Street. Alemaný Boulevard connects Junipero Serra Boulevard to the west and Bayshore Boulevard to the east. It is designated as a Major Arterial in the CMP network. Three lanes are generally provided along the length of Alemaný Boulevard east of the Glen Park neighborhood. From Mission Street west, the cross-section reduces to two lanes in each direction. On-street parking is provided on Alemaný Boulevard

west of Rousseau Street. The General Plan has the following designations for Alemany Boulevard:

- Major Arterial in the CMP Network for its entire length;
- MTS Street in the MTS Network for its entire length; and
- Citywide Bicycle Route (Route 45) in the Citywide Bicycle Network (Class II facilities) between Rousseau Avenue and San Jose Avenue.

Arlington Street is a two-lane residential street connecting Randall Street in the northeastern corner of Glen Park and the neighborhood core along Bosworth Street, generally in a northeast-to-southwest direction. The segment of Arlington Street between Roanoke Street and Bosworth Street is located within the plan area and lies adjacent to and parallels San Jose Avenue; along some blocks, only a narrow strip of open space lies between the two roadways. On-street parking is provided on both sides of Arlington Street.

Brompton Avenue is a two-lane residential street connecting in a north-south direction Chenery Street and Joost Avenue and crossing Bosworth Street in the Glen Park neighborhood core. On-street parking is provided on both sides of Brompton Avenue.

Carrie Street is a one-way residential street connecting one block between Chenery Street and Wilder Street in the Glen Park neighborhood core. Parking is not provided on Carrie Street, which operates southbound only.

Chenery Street is a two-lane residential street connecting the western edge of Glen Park at Elk Street to 30th Street in the northeastern corner of the neighborhood, generally in an east-west and northeast-to-southwest direction. On its western end, Chenery Street lies one block north of and parallels Bosworth Street; on its eastern end, it lies one block north of and parallels Arlington Street. Between Elk Street and Natick Street, Chenery Street lies within the plan area. On-street parking is provided on both sides of Chenery Street. Between Diamond Street and 30th Street, Chenery Street is designated as a Citywide Bicycle Route (Route 45) in the Citywide Bikeway Network (Class III facilities).

Diamond Street is a two-lane local street connecting generally in a north-south direction Diamond Heights Boulevard and Monterey Boulevard, crossing Bosworth Street in the Glen Park neighborhood core. In the plan area, Diamond Street travels between Monterey Boulevard and just north of Chenery Street. On-street parking is provided on both sides of Diamond Street. Between Bosworth Street and Chenery Street, Diamond Street is designated as a Citywide Bicycle Route in the Citywide Bikeway Network (Class III facilities); Route 45 is

designated on the block between Chenery Street and Bosworth Street, and Route 70 is designated on the block between Bosworth Street and Monterey Boulevard.

Elk Street is a two-lane residential street operating in a north-south direction along the western edge of Glen Park between Sussex Street and Bosworth Street. On the north, the street continues as Diamond Heights Boulevard, and on the south the street connects with Congo Street. Elk Street traverses the plan area between Chenery Street and Bosworth Street. On-street parking is provided on the east side of Elk Street.

Lippard Avenue is a one-way residential street connecting in a north-south direction Surrey Street and Joost Avenue and crossing Bosworth Street in the Glen Park neighborhood core. In the plan area, the segment of Lippard Avenue between Chenery Street and Bosworth Street operates in the southbound direction; between Joost Avenue and Bosworth Street, Lippard Avenue operates in the northbound direction. On-street parking is provided on both sides of Lippard Avenue.

Lyell Street is a residential street connecting in a north-south direction Bosworth Street at the southern edge of the Glen Park neighborhood and Alemany Boulevard in the Mission Terrace neighborhood. As one of the few streets in the area that cross I-280, Lyell Street fills an important role as a connector. In the plan area, Lyell Street operates in both directions between the I-280 overpass and Bosworth Street. Along this segment, one lane is provided in each direction and on-street parking is provided on both sides of the street. Providing part of the connection between Alemany Boulevard and Chenery Street, Lyell Street is designated as a Citywide Bicycle Route (Route 45) in the Citywide Bikeway Network (Class III facilities).

Joost Avenue is a two-lane residential street connecting in an east-west direction Monterey Boulevard at the southern edge of the Glen Park neighborhood, through the Sunnyside neighborhood to Hazelwood Avenue. In the plan area between Lippard Avenue and Diamond Street, Joost Avenue lies one block north of and parallels Monterey Boulevard. On-street parking is provided on both sides of Joost Avenue.

Natick Street is a one-way residential street wholly contained within the plan area connecting the block between the intersection of Arlington Street/Wilder Street and Chenery Street. Parking is provided on the east side of the street, which operates northbound only. Providing part of the connection between Alemany Boulevard and Chenery Street, Natick Street is designated as a Citywide Bicycle Route (Route 45) in the Citywide Bikeway Network (Class III facilities).

Wilder Street is a two-lane local street wholly contained within the plan area traveling in an east-west direction between the intersection of Arlington Street/Natick Street and Diamond Street. Wilder Street lies mid-block between and is roughly parallel to Chenery Street to the north and Bosworth Street to the south. On-street parking is provided on both sides of Wilder Street.

INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) CONDITIONS

Existing intersection operating conditions were evaluated for the peak hour (hour of the day with the highest traffic volumes) of the weekday AM peak period (7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.) and PM peak period (4:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.), respectively. Intersection turning movement counts (counts of vehicles performing turns through an intersection) were conducted at 18 study intersections in March and October, 2009. The locations of these intersections relative to the plan area are shown in Figure III.E-1, p. III.E-7.

The operating characteristics of signalized and unsignalized intersections are described by the concept of level of service (LOS). LOS is a qualitative description of the performance of an intersection based on the average delay per vehicle. Intersection levels of service range from LOS A, which indicates free flow or excellent conditions with short delays, to LOS F, which indicates congested or overloaded conditions with extremely long delays. LOS A through LOS D is considered excellent to satisfactory service levels, LOS E is undesirable, and LOS F conditions are representative of gridlock. In San Francisco, intersection LOS E and LOS F are considered unacceptable.

The operating characteristics of all 18 study intersections were evaluated using the 2000 *Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM) methodology. For signalized intersections, this methodology determines the capacity of each lane group approaching the intersection. Roundabout capacity calculations were performed using RODEL software, which estimates approach capacities and compares those capacities to approach demand to determine operations of the roundabout. The LOS for both signalized intersections and roundabouts is based on a weighted average delay (in seconds per vehicle) for the various movements within the intersection. For unsignalized intersections, the average delay and LOS operating conditions are calculated by approach (e.g., northbound) and movement (e.g., northbound left-turn), for those movements that are subject to delay. Unsignalized intersections are considered to operate at unsatisfactory conditions if



SOURCE: AECOM, 2010.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE III.E-1: COMMUNITY PLAN AREA AND STUDY INTERSECTIONS

one approach operates at LOS E or LOS F and peak hour signal warrants are met.³ As such, in the LOS summary tables, the operating conditions for unsignalized intersections are presented for the worst approach, and it is noted if the intersection meets signal warrants.

The results of the intersection LOS analysis for the existing weekday AM and PM peak hour conditions are presented in Table III.E-1, p. III.E-9. Currently, all study intersections operate at acceptable conditions (LOS D or better) during the weekday AM and PM peak hour, except for the following intersections (the intersection numbers are depicted in Figure III.E-1, p. III.E-7):

#7 Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street (AM/PM peak hours) – LOS E;

#8 Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue (AM peak hour) – LOS F; and

#12 Bosworth Street/Lyell Street (AM/PM peak hours) – LOS F.

According to these results, the unsignalized intersections of Bosworth Street/Lippard Street and Bosworth Street/Lyell Street would meet peak hour signal warrants.

TRANSIT CONDITIONS

The Glen Park neighborhood is well served by both regional and local transit services. The Glen Park BART Station and adjacent intersection of Bosworth Street/Diamond Street serve as a multimodal hub, facilitating transfers between transit modes (both bus, and heavy and light rail) as well as transfers between transit modes and other modes, such as walking, biking, and private automobile. The existing transit services within the plan area are shown in Figure III.E-2, p. III.E-10.

³ Signal warrants indicate whether the installation of a traffic control signal may be beneficial at a particular location. The results of an engineering study of the traffic conditions and pedestrian characteristics of a location are compared with a set of factors described in Chapter 4C of the *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*, published by the Federal Highway Administration in 2010, to determine whether signal warrants are met. The peak hour signal warrant, defined in Section 4C.04, is intended for use at a location where traffic conditions are such that for a minimum of one hour of an average day, the minor street traffic suffers undue delay when entering or crossing the major street.

**TABLE III.E-1
INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE – EXISTING CONDITIONS**

Intersection	Traffic Control (See Notes Below)	Weekday AM Peak Hour		Weekday PM Peak Hour	
		LOS (Worst Approach)	Delay	LOS (Worst Approach)	Delay
1 Chenery Street/Diamond Street	AWSC	B (NB)	12.1	B (NB)	10.3
2 Chenery Street/Carrie Street	OWSC	A (WB)	8.1	A (WB)	8.0
3 Chenery Street/Natick Street	OWSC	B (NB)	10.6	B (NB)	11.0
4 Wilder Street/Arlington Street/Natick Street/San Jose Avenue	AWSC	A (NB)	7.7	A (NB)	7.9
5 Wilder Street/Carrie Street	OWSC	A (SB)	9.6	A (SB)	9.5
6 Wilder Street/Diamond Street	OWSC	B (WB)	12.1	B (WB)	12.2
7 Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street	Signal	E	56.6	E	61.5
8 Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue	AWSC	F (EB/WB)	>50.0	D (EB)	32.2
9 Bosworth Street/Brompton Avenue	OWSC	B (WB)	12.0	B (WB)	11.3
10 Bosworth Street/Diamond Street	Signal	D	52.7	D	43.0
11 Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/SB I-280 On-Ramp	OWSC	D (SB)	30.7	D (SB)	30.4
12 Bosworth Street/Lyell Street	AWSC	F (NB/WB)	>50.0	F (NB/WB)	>50.0
13 Still Street/Lyell Street	OWSC	C (WB)	15.1	B (WB)	13.8
14 Alemany Boulevard /Lyell Street	Signal	B	18.1	B	15.9
15 Monterey Boulevard/Acadia Street	OWSC	C (SB)	22.8	D (SB)	32.3
16 Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps	Signal	D	47.8	D	38.0
17 Monterey Boulevard/Joost Avenue	OWSC	B (SB)	11.2	B (SB)	11.1
18 Monterey Boulevard/Diamond Street/San Jose Avenue	Signal	B	15.0	B	14.1

Source: AECOM, 2010.


Notes:

Delay is indicated in seconds per vehicle. **Bold** indicates unacceptable conditions.

AWSC = All-way stop-controlled; OWSC = One-way stop-controlled;

NB = Northbound; EB = Eastbound; SB = Southbound; WB = Westbound

For stop-controlled intersections, average delay beyond 50 seconds is shown as ">50.0"; delays greater than 50 seconds are beyond the meaningful range of the analysis methodology.



SOURCE: AECOM, 2010.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE III.E-2: EXISTING TRANSIT NETWORK

Regional Transit

San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) is the primary regional transit provider serving the plan area, connecting the Glen Park neighborhood with destinations in the East Bay and the Peninsula. Since the BART Station is centrally located in Glen Park near the intersection of Bosworth Street and Diamond Street, BART also serves a substantial component of local transit travel within San Francisco and is generally the preferred mode of choice for residents traveling to and from Downtown San Francisco. Four of BART's five lines, and all of the system's San Francisco lines, serve the Glen Park BART Station. The minimum headway on each of the lines during the weekday AM and PM peak periods is 15 minutes, which results in the arrival of a train approximately every three to four minutes in both directions at the station.

A summary of BART service at the station during the weekday AM and PM peak periods is presented in Table III.E-2, below.

TABLE III.E-2 BART SERVICE AT GLEN PARK STATION – EXISTING CONDITIONS				
Direction/Line	Weekday AM Peak Period		Weekday PM Peak Period	
	Trains per hour	Headways (min)	Trains per hour	Headways (min)
Northbound				
Richmond	4	15	4	15
Pittsburg/Bay Point	4	15	8	5-10
Dublin/Pleasanton	4	15	4	15
Fremont	4	15	4	15
Total	16	4	20	3
Southbound				
Daly City (only)	12	2-7	8	7.5
Daly City/SFO	4	15	4	15
Daly City/Millbrae	4	15	4	15
Total	20	3	16	4

Source: BART, 2010.

At other stations in its network, BART also connects to other regional transit providers in the Bay Area, including San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni), Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit), ferry service to the East Bay and North Bay, Caltrain, SamTrans serving

the Peninsula and the South Bay, and Golden Gate Transit serving the North Bay. AC Transit and Golden Gate Transit services are accessed at the Transbay Terminal, a short walk from the Montgomery Street BART Station. Ferry services are accessible from the Embarcadero BART Station. Caltrain shares the intermodal Millbrae Station with BART. SamTrans buses stop at each of the BART stations in San Mateo County, which are located in Colma, South San Francisco, San Bruno, San Francisco International Airport, and Millbrae.

Ridership data for the entire BART system were obtained in April 2008. While this does not include possible fluctuations in ridership due to fare increases, service cuts, or economic conditions, it is expected that using slightly older data will facilitate a more conservative analysis of BART demand. Although BART has made several service changes since April 2008, these changes have only affected route and frequency during the off-peak periods and their effect on peak period operations may be considered negligible.

Capacity data are based on scheduled train service and observations of typical train length on each of BART's lines. For simplicity, BART cars are assumed to have a seating capacity of 70 passengers. In order to account for the fact that a substantial number of passengers stand during peak periods, the capacity utilization standard set by BART is equivalent to 135 percent of the seated capacity of trains for the AM and PM peak hour (the one-hour peak of the three-hour peak period) in the Transbay Tube, and 115 percent for the remaining two hours of each peak period.

As shown in Table III.E-3, p. III.E-13, ridership patterns indicate that the maximum load point (MLP)⁴ south of Downtown is approaching the Civic Center BART Station in the northbound direction during the weekday AM peak hour and departing the Civic Center BART Station in the southbound direction during the weekday PM peak hour. East of Downtown, the MLP is approaching Embarcadero BART Station in the westbound direction during the weekday AM peak period and departing Embarcadero BART Station in the eastbound direction during the weekday PM peak hour.

⁴ The MLP represents the point along the line where passenger loads are highest, and thus, is the most critical location along the line.

**TABLE III.E-3
BART CAPACITY AND RIDERSHIP – EXISTING WEEKDAY CONDITIONS**

Screenline/Peak Hour	Direction	Maximum Load Point	Ridership	Capacity Utilization
South Downtown Screenline (to / from Peninsula / South Bay)				
AM Peak Hour	Northbound	Approaching Civic Center	11,185	105%
PM Peak Hour	Southbound	Departing Civic Center	9,545	92%
AM Peak Hour	Westbound	Approaching Embarcadero	18,064	123%
PM Peak Hour	Eastbound	Departing Embarcadero	16,985	120%

Source: Transit Center District Plan Technical Analysis, AECOM, April 2010.

As shown in Table III.E-3, BART operates below its 135 percent capacity utilization standard in the Transbay Tube (the east Downtown screenline⁵) during both the weekday AM and PM peak periods. On the south Downtown screenline⁶—most relevant for the proposed project, which would add the majority of its BART demand to this MLP—capacity utilization is below the 115 percent standard during both the weekday AM and PM peak periods. During the weekday AM peak hour, trains entering Downtown San Francisco from the south have a small number of standing passengers. During the weekday PM peak hour, trains southbound from Downtown San Francisco generally have sufficient seating capacity to handle ridership demand. Since it is not the MLP, train capacity utilization at Glen Park BART Station would be anticipated to be less than that for the Civic Center BART Station.

Local Transit

San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) provides local transit service in the plan area, and its routes connect the neighborhood with other parts of San Francisco. Muni operates several types of service, including bus (diesel and electric), surface/subway light rail (Muni Metro), streetcar, and cable car lines. Muni also provides direct connections with regional transit hubs at the Ferry Building, the temporary Transbay Terminal, BART stations, and Caltrain's San Francisco Terminal at Fourth Street/King Street.

⁵ East Downtown Screenline (to/from East Bay) - Westbound approaching Embarcadero and eastbound departing Embarcadero.

⁶ South Downtown Screenline (to/from Peninsula/South Bay) - Northbound approaching Civic Center and southbound departing Civic Center.

The plan area is currently directly served by the Muni routes described below, all of which stop at Glen Park BART Station.

23 Monterey. This cross-town route runs east-west across the southern half of San Francisco, connecting the plan area with the San Francisco Zoo/Lake Merced area and St. Francis Wood in the west and Bernal Heights and Bayview/Hunters Point in the east. Stops for Glen Park BART Station are provided at Bosworth Street/Diamond Street on the southeast corner (on Diamond Street) in the eastbound direction and on the southwest corner (on Diamond Street) in the westbound direction.

36 Teresita. This community service route serves neighborhoods in central San Francisco, connecting the plan area with Sunnyside, Laguna Honda/Forest Hill, and the Inner Sunset at its west end and parts of Bernal Heights and the Inner Mission at its east end. Stops for Glen Park BART Station are provided at Bosworth Street/Diamond Street in the same locations as the 23 Monterey.

44 O'Shaughnessy. This major cross-town route runs through southeastern, central, and western San Francisco, connecting the plan area with the Inner Richmond, Golden Gate Park, the Inner Sunset, and Laguna Honda/Forest Hill in the west and Portola and Bayview/Hunters Point in the east. Stops for Glen Park BART Station are provided at Bosworth Street/Diamond Street on the southeast corner (on Bosworth Street) in the eastbound direction and on the northeast corner (on Bosworth Street) in the westbound direction.

52 Excelsior. This community service route serves neighborhoods in central and southern San Francisco, connecting the plan area with Laguna Honda/Forest Hill and Diamond Heights in the west and the Outer Mission and Excelsior in the east. Stops for Glen Park BART Station are provided at Bosworth Street/Diamond Street in the same locations as the 44 O'Shaughnessy.

Muni Metro J-Church. This light rail line connects the plan area with Balboa Park in the south and Noe Valley, the Castro, and Downtown (Civic Center, Union Square, and Financial District) in the north. The plan area is served by the San Jose Avenue/Glen Park Station, which is located within the median of San Jose Avenue and consists of two raised platforms separated from vehicular traffic by concrete barriers. The only access to and from the Glen Park Station is via an elevated pedestrian bridge across San Jose Avenue that connects to the intersection of Diamond Street/Monterey Boulevard.

Service on these Muni lines is summarized in Table III.E-4, p. III.E-15, which is current as of January 2010 and incorporates the major service changes implemented in December 2009.

**TABLE III.E-4
MUNI LINES AND FREQUENCIES – EXISTING CONDITIONS**

Route	Weekday Service Frequency (minutes)			
	AM Peak	Midday	PM Peak	Evening
23 Monterey	15	20	15	30
36 Teresita	30	30	30	30
44 O'Shaughnessy	5-10	12	7-10	20
52 Excelsior	15	30	15	30
Muni Metro J-Church	5-10	10	5-10	10-20

Source: SFMTA, 2010.

In addition to the Muni routes operating in the immediate vicinity of the plan area, additional Muni service is located a short bike ride or ten-minute walk away, including the 35 Eureka (additional community service) and major trunk line service on Mission Street (14 Mission, 14L Mission Limited, 14X Mission Express, and 49 Van Ness/Mission). Despite the number of Muni routes serving Glen Park, BART is generally the preferred mode of choice for plan area residents traveling to and from Downtown due to high frequency and quick travel times compared to the lower service frequency of the Muni Metro J-Church, which is generally less convenient to access.

The predominant land use associated with the 2010 *Community Plan*, from a trip generation standpoint (see Table III.E-5 on p. III.E-16), is potential residential development, with the primary travel pattern being outbound in the AM period (away from the plan area) and inbound in the PM period (to the plan area). Muni ridership and capacity at localized peak load points were evaluated to determine where transit service was oversaturated relative to passenger demand.

Ridership and capacity data for Muni were obtained from data collection efforts under the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Transit Effectiveness Program (TEP). Capacity data are based on 85 percent of the design capacity of the transit vehicle, taking the SFMTA Board's threshold for capacity utilization into account. As shown in Table III.E-5, p. III.E-16, most lines were found to currently operate below the SFMTA Board's 85 percent policy threshold for capacity utilization. The highest capacity utilization during the AM peak hour was observed on the northbound Muni Metro J-Church (92 percent at the Van Ness Station), while the other lines operate well below capacity. During the PM peak hour, all lines operate below the capacity utilization threshold, although the eastbound 44 O'Shaughnessy operates at 84 percent.

**TABLE III.E-5
MUNI RIDERSHIP AND CAPACITY - EXISTING CONDITIONS
(WEEKDAY AM & PM PEAK HOUR)**

Route	Direction	Ridership at Localized Peak Point		Capacity	
		AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak Hour Utilization	PM Peak Hour Utilization
23 Monterey	EB	81	150	38%	70%
	WB	109	63	51%	29%
26 Valencia	NB	42	20	26%	12%
	SB	25	91	16%	57%
44 O'Shaughnessy	EB	167	269	52%	84%
	WB	354	191	73%	59%
52 Excelsior	EB	69	69	32%	43%
	WB	39	17	24%	16%
Muni Metro J Church	NB	745	146	92%	18%
	SB	74	541	10%	67%

Source: Glen Park Transportation Study, 2010. Transit Effectiveness Project, SFMTA, 2008.

PEDESTRIAN CONDITIONS

Most streets in the plan area have sidewalks ranging from six to nine feet in width. However, as a transit hub and the center of the Glen Park neighborhood, there is a substantial amount of pedestrian traffic around Glen Park BART Station, as well as along Bosworth Street and Diamond Street, resulting in pedestrian and vehicular traffic conflicts at this location. As much as half of riders at Glen Park BART Station walk to the station.

The plan area also features several major access points to and from I-280 and is crossed by several major urban thoroughfares, including Bosworth Street, O'Shaughnessy Boulevard, Monterey Boulevard, and San Jose Avenue, which bring high volumes of traffic, including heavy vehicles such as buses and semi-trailer trucks, through the neighborhood. Both San Jose Avenue and I-280 separate the neighborhood from areas to the south, and the only pedestrian connections across these high-volume roadways are a pedestrian bridge just west of the intersection of Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 ramps (touching down on the south side of San Jose Avenue between Cotter Street and Theresa Street) and Bosworth Street, passing beneath the San Jose Avenue overpass.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant ramps with detectable warning tiles are generally only provided at crosswalks at major intersections, including Bosworth Street/Diamond Street, and Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/southbound I-280 on-ramp. Ramps, but not ADA-compliant detectable warnings, are provided at the intersections of Diamond Street/Monterey Boulevard/San Jose Avenue, Monterey Boulevard/Joost Avenue, and Diamond Street/Chenery Street.

Sidewalk conditions in the plan area range from poor to good. Due to the hilly terrain, many of these facilities are at steep grades and may present difficulties for some pedestrians. In some locations immediately adjacent to the BART parking lot, such as along the north side of Bosworth Street between Diamond Street and Arlington Street and the west side of Arlington Street between Wilder Street and Bosworth Street, pavement may be uneven. Along the north side of Bosworth Street, obstructions such as street trees, bus stop benches, traffic signal equipment, and garbage receptacles limit the effective width of the sidewalk.

Pedestrian Activity

Pedestrian counts were collected at nine of the study intersections during the weekday AM (7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.) and weekday PM (4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.) peak periods in March and October, 2009. Detailed counts for the nine pedestrian count locations are provided in Appendix B of the transportation study.

The pedestrian counts indicate that activity is currently highest at the intersection of Bosworth Street/Diamond Street, which carries much of the pedestrian traffic heading to and from the BART Station, bus stops, and neighborhood retail center along Diamond Street. Pedestrian activity is particularly high in the south and east crosswalks at this intersection, as these are the primary crosswalks carrying pedestrians to and from the station. Additional heavy pedestrian activity was observed along the south side of Bosworth Street east of the station, and along the north side of Monterey Boulevard west of the station.

Crosswalk Analysis

A pedestrian LOS analysis was conducted for all crosswalks at the intersection of Bosworth Street/Diamond Street using the 2000 HCM methodology for crosswalk time-space, which calculates an average density or “circulation space” for pedestrians based on the pedestrian flow, the dimensions of the crosswalk, the length of the pedestrian phases and signal cycle at the intersection, and the volume of conflicting right-turning vehicular traffic. LOS D or better (15 square feet or more of circulation area per pedestrian) is generally considered acceptable conditions. The intersection of Bosworth Street/Diamond Street was selected since it serves the

highest pedestrian flows in the plan area and is the primary access point for pedestrian traffic to and from the BART Station and other transit services in the Glen Park area.

The results of the analysis indicate that all crosswalks at the intersection of Bosworth Street/Diamond Street operate at acceptable conditions at LOS A. Although crosswalks operate at LOS A at this intersection, observations indicated that the east crosswalk at Bosworth Street/Diamond Street is a pedestrian-vehicle conflict location, with a high number of vehicles turning onto eastbound Bosworth Street conflicting with the high volume of pedestrians in the crosswalk. During the weekday AM peak period, this crosswalk carries up to a maximum of 30 to 35 people per cycle (usually coincident with the arrival of a westbound 44 O'Shaughnessy or 52 Excelsior at the adjacent bus stop), most traveling towards the BART Station.


In addition to the conflict on the east crosswalk at the intersection of Bosworth Street/Diamond Street, field observations identified an additional conflict location on the south crosswalk at the intersection of Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/southbound I-280 on-ramp. At this location, vehicles attempting to access the I-280 on-ramp from both directions of Bosworth Street as well as Arlington Street conflict with heavy pedestrian traffic traveling to and from Glen Park BART Station.

BICYCLE CONDITIONS

Citywide Bicycle Routes

In the plan area, there are three main Citywide Bicycle Routes, consisting of Class I, Class II and Class III facilities. Class I bicycle facilities are separated from motorized vehicular traffic by an open space or barrier. Class II bicycle facilities are separate bicycle lanes adjacent to the curb lane, while Class III bicycle facilities are signed routes only, where bicyclists share travel lanes with vehicles. The major bicycle routes in the study area are shown in Figure III.E-3, p. III.E-19, and are described below.

Route 45 is a north-south mixed Class II/Class III facility connecting the Marina and Fillmore Districts with the Outer Mission District and Daly City. In the vicinity of the plan area, the facility travels along Chenery Street on the north, where it is a Class III facility, and Alemany Boulevard on the south, where it is a Class II facility. Within the plan area, southbound travel is routed from Chenery Street along Diamond Street, Bosworth Street, and Lyell Street to reach Alemany Boulevard. Northbound travel is routed from Alemany Boulevard along Rousseau Street, Still Street, Lyell Street, Bosworth Street, and Diamond Street to reach Chenery Street.



SOURCE: AECOM, 2010.



GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE III.E-3: EXISTING BICYCLE CONDITIONS

An alternative route between Noe Valley and Glen Park is offered by the bike lanes on San Jose Avenue, which parallel Route 45. This route is more direct and offers cyclists designated travel lanes, but has more limited access to the surrounding neighborhood and exposes cyclists to faster-moving traffic.

Route 55 is a north-south Class III facility connecting the Presidio to Glen Park through the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood. Within the plan area, the facility is routed on Bosworth Street and O'Shaughnessy Boulevard. To the north, a Class I path is provided along O'Shaughnessy Boulevard along the west edge of Glen Canyon Park.

Route 70 is an east-west Class III facility connecting Hunters Point with St. Francis Wood. In the vicinity of the plan area, the facility is routed along Silver Avenue to the east and Hearst Avenue to the west. Within the plan area, bicycle travel is routed along Silver Avenue at Alemany Boulevard via Route 45 to Bosworth Street. From Bosworth Street to Hearst Avenue, bicycle travel is routed via Diamond Street, Monterey Boulevard, and Circular Avenue.

All three bicycle routes described above converge at the intersection of Bosworth Street/Diamond Street, the neighborhood's center of activity and location of the Glen Park BART Station transit hub. As such, cyclists can experience a high level of conflict with other modes while traveling through Glen Park, because they must share the roadway with vehicular traffic and because of the substantial amount of pedestrian traffic in this area. However, bicycles represent a much smaller component of overall travel in the neighborhood, representing only two percent of BART riders.

Bicycle parking is provided at the Glen Park BART Station entry plaza; 12 single-use lockers requiring a rental agreement provide long-term, Class I parking, and 49 spaces at bicycle racks provide short-term, Class II parking.⁷ Within the paid area of the station, 21 additional spaces at bicycle racks are provided.⁸ In addition, the installation of eight Class I electronic BikeLink lockers is planned at the station, which would allow secure parking for short-term as well as long-term use. BikeLink lockers are accessed with a smart card.

⁷ A Class I bicycle parking space protects the bicycle and other accessories against inclement weather and theft. Typical examples include bicycle lockers, check-in facilities, or monitored parking. Class II bicycle parking typically consists of bicycle racks, which provide a place to lock bicycles but generally without protection against inclement weather, vandalism or theft.

⁸ BART Access Survey, July 2008.

San Francisco Bicycle Plan

The *San Francisco Bicycle Plan*⁹ proposes several improvements to the bikeway network in the plan area, including Project 5-7: Glen Park Area Bicycle Lanes.

Project 5-7 would close a gap in existing bicycle lanes by providing a combination of Class II and Class III bicycle facilities between Alemany Boulevard and San Jose Avenue. Additionally, it would close a gap between the existing bicycle lanes on San Jose Avenue, Bicycle Route 45, and the existing Class III Route 70 on Circular Avenue by providing Class I, Class II, and Class III facilities between Monterey Boulevard and San Jose Avenue.

The *San Francisco Bicycle Plan* also recommends a long-term improvement on Monterey Boulevard between Circular Avenue and Genessee Street, and minor improvements on Diamond Street/Chenery Street (Route 45); O'Shaughnessy Boulevard/Bosworth Street (Route 55); and Hearst Avenue/Circular Avenue/Monterey Boulevard (Route 70). Detailed design options have not been developed for long-term and minor improvement projects.

PASSENGER LOADING/UNLOADING

In the plan area, Glen Park Elementary School and Glen Park BART Station are generators of significant auto pick-up and drop-off activity. The main entrance for the Glen Park Elementary School is located on one-way (northbound) Lippard Avenue, which has one through lane with parking lanes on either side. Two "No Stopping" zones are designated at the south end of the school's street frontage for bus stops, in effect from 7:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. and 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. on school days. Outside of this area, passenger loading and unloading may take place on either side of the street, although two- or four-hour parking limits are in effect. No designated passenger loading zone for private vehicles is provided.

At the Glen Park BART Station, two areas accommodate passenger loading and unloading activities:

- The designated passenger loading zone (approximately 150 feet long) on the east side of Diamond Street; and
- The designated passenger loading zone (approximately 75 feet long) on the south side of Bosworth Street immediately east of the Muni stop for eastbound buses on the 44 O'Shaughnessy and 52 Excelsior.

⁹ San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, *San Francisco Bicycle Plan*, June 26, 2009.

Despite these provisions, private automobile and employee shuttle pick-up and drop-off activities have been observed to exceed available curb space and stop inside the bus zones on the southeast corner of the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection. While average stopped time for waiting vehicles was observed between 1.5 and 4.5 minutes, some automobiles were observed stopped in the passenger zones for more than 40 minutes, which suggests minimal enforcement of the passenger zone areas.

EMPLOYEE SHUTTLE SERVICE

The Glen Park BART Station is the centralized pick-up and drop-off point for two employee shuttle services. Genentech provides an employee shuttle service to and from its main campus in South San Francisco (operated by Compass Transportation), while Google provides an employee shuttle service to and from its headquarters in Mountain View (operated by Bauer's Transportation). These shuttle services are typically operated with charter coach buses with capacities of 40 to 50 passengers per bus, although observations in March 2009 indicated that smaller charter "minibuses" with a capacity for 15 to 20 passengers are used on some runs. Pick-up and drop-off is handled in one of the two passenger loading/unloading areas described in the previous section.

Employee shuttle service operates at a frequency of 15 buses during the two-hour AM peak period and 25 buses during the two-and-a-half-hour PM peak period. Although dwell times generally remained in the one- to two-minute range, some buses stopped for longer than four minutes. The majority of activity during the weekday AM peak period occurs at the Bosworth Street passenger zone, while the opposite is true during the weekday PM peak period. The average employee shuttle carries 10 to 20 passengers each run. Further detail regarding existing employee shuttle service operations at the Glen Park BART Station can be found in the transportation study.

EMERGENCY ACCESS CONDITIONS

Emergency access to the plan area is enabled by a fine-grained street network providing multiple access routes for emergency vehicles. In addition to I-280, the following streets provide the main routes of access to the plan area: Bosworth Street, O'Shaughnessy Boulevard, Monterey Boulevard, San Jose Avenue, Alemany Boulevard, and Mission Street. As noted previously in this section, the intersections of Bosworth Street with Elk Street and Congo Street, with Lippard Avenue, and with Lyell Street operate at unacceptable conditions during peak hours; these conditions have the potential to delay emergency vehicles accessing and leaving the plan area.

PARKING CONDITIONS

The parking supply within the plan area consists of both on- and off-street parking spaces. Land uses within the study area often compete for parking availability, with merchants wanting to secure parking for customers, BART riders seeking parking near the station, and residents desiring parking near their homes.

On-Street Parking

On-street parking is generally provided on all streets within the plan area (with the exception of San Jose Avenue) and is used by store customers, transit riders, and residents alike. There are 649 on-street parking spaces within the study area. On-street parking on the main commercial stretch of Diamond Street between Chenery Street and Bosworth Street is metered, while much of the rest of the on-street parking supply in the plan area is under time limit restrictions of two to four hours. The Glen Park neighborhood is also within Residential Parking Permit (RPP) Area D, which stretches roughly in a radial direction surrounding the BART Station along Circular Avenue, Monterey Boulevard, Bosworth Street, Diamond Street, and Lyell Street.

A survey of on-street parking occupancy was conducted for the weekday midday (1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.) and evening (7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.) periods on April 1, 2009. On-street parking was observed to be generally well utilized during the midday and evening periods, in the survey area.¹⁰ However, the occupancy survey indicates that there is still a surplus of approximately 210 spaces during the weekday midday period and 185 spaces during the weekday evening period, although these spaces are not necessarily concentrated in specific locations. Overall occupancy is roughly the same between the weekday midday and weekday evening peak parking demand periods, at approximately 65 percent of the total on-street parking supply during the weekday midday period and 68 percent during the weekday evening period.

¹⁰ The survey area for on-street parking occupancy included all roadways within the Glen Park Community Plan Area, with the exception of Elk Street, Paradise Avenue, Arlington Street, and Chenery Street (between Elk Street and Lippard Avenue). In addition, portions of Diamond Street, Monterey Boulevard, Lyell Street, Bosworth Street, Rotteck Street, Rousseau Street, and Mirando Street beyond the plan area were surveyed because of their proximity to the neighborhood and Glen Park BART Station.

Off-Street Parking

A weekday, midday, and evening survey of off-street parking facilities (private lots) in the plan area was also conducted on April 1, 2009. There are four primary parking facilities in the plan area, all surface lots with a total of 114 spaces.

- **Chenery Street lot.** This lot has capacity for approximately ten vehicles, and a single access point on the south side of Chenery Street between Brompton Avenue and Diamond Street. This lot is available to permit holders only.
- **BART parking lot.** This lot has capacity for 53 vehicle spaces and 19 motorcycle spaces, located on the north side of Bosworth Street immediately west of Arlington Street. The lot is signed for BART patrons only, and parking is subject to a five-hour limit.
- **Diamond Street lot.** This lot has capacity for approximately six vehicles, and a single access point on the east side of Diamond Street between Wilder Street and Bosworth Street. This lot is private and not available for public parking.
- **Bosworth Street lot.** This lot has capacity for 26 vehicles, occupying almost the entire block bounded by Kern Street on the north, Bosworth Street on the south, Diamond Street on the east, and Brompton Avenue on the west. The lot is private, with tow-away restrictions except for patrons of an adjacent law office.

Similar to on-street parking, off-street parking also is generally well-utilized during the midday and evening periods. Occupancy is highest during the weekday midday period, when occupancy of off-street parking facilities is at 75 percent of supply. During the weekday evening period, off-street parking occupancy is at 67 percent of supply. The occupancy survey indicates there is a surplus of approximately 20 spaces or more during the weekday midday and weekday evening periods.

The BART parking lot and the Bosworth Street lot have the highest percent occupancy among the four surveyed facilities. While occupancy at the BART parking lot drops between the weekday midday and weekday evening period, the occupancy at the Bosworth Street lot increases between the weekday midday and weekday evening periods, indicating that the BART parking lot is likely used more by commuters while the Bosworth Street is likely used more by residents of the area.

IMPACTS

SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

The significance criteria used by the San Francisco Planning Department for the determination of transportation impacts associated with a project are identified below.

- The operational impacts on signalized intersections are considered significant if project-related traffic causes the level of service to deteriorate from LOS D or better to LOS E or LOS F, or from LOS E to LOS F. The operational impacts on unsignalized intersections are considered significant if project-related traffic causes the level of service at the worst approach to deteriorate from LOS D or better to LOS E or LOS F and Caltrans signal warrants would be met, or would cause Caltrans signal warrants to be met when the worst approach is already operating at LOS E or LOS F. The project may result in significant adverse impacts at intersections that operate at LOS E or LOS F under existing conditions depending upon the magnitude of the project's contribution to the worsening of the average delay per vehicle. In addition, the project would have a significant adverse impact if it would cause major traffic hazards, or would contribute considerably to the cumulative traffic increases that would cause the deterioration in levels of service to unacceptable levels.
- The project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would cause a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity, resulting in unacceptable levels of transit service; or cause a substantial increase in operating delay or costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service levels could result. With the Muni and regional transit screenlines analyses,¹¹ the project would have a significant effect on the transit provider if project-related transit trips would cause the capacity utilization standard to be exceeded during the weekday PM peak hour.
- The project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks, create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians, or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the site and adjoining areas.

¹¹ A screenline analysis compares the transit loading against the available transit capacity of the transit lines that cross the screenline. The analysis assumes that there are identifiable corridors or directions of travel that are served by a group of transit lines. It is assumed that someone traveling on transit in that direction will choose one of the transit lines that collectively serve the corridor or that direction of travel. It also is further assumed that if one line is overloaded, the transit user will shift to another line headed in the same general direction. For a selected screenline that intercepts a group of transit lines at or near their maximum load point, the analysis projects the loading of the transit system as the sum of the passengers on all the transit lines and compares the loading to the sum of the capacity for all the transit lines.

- The project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the site and adjoining areas.
- The project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would result in a loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities that could not be accommodated within the proposed on-site loading supply or within on-street loading zones, and if it would create potentially hazardous conditions or significant delays affecting traffic, transit, bicycles or pedestrians.
- The project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would result in inadequate emergency access.
- Construction-related impacts generally would not be considered significant due to their temporary and limited duration. However, in circumstances involving large development plans where construction would occur over long periods of time, construction-related impacts may be considered significant, if they involve traffic impacts due to truck movements to and from the construction site or increase potential conflicts between pedestrians, bicyclists, and construction traffic.

APPROACH TO ANALYSIS

Project Components and Evaluation Scenarios

Impacts from the implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* are discussed for seven topics: traffic, transit, pedestrians, bicycles, loading, emergency access, and construction. Parking conditions are presented for informational purposes. For each topic, the impact analysis considers the same four primary components of the proposed project as other sections of this EIR; however, because the transportation improvement variants may have different transportation effects than the proposed transportation improvements, they are singled out for presentation in this section. The approach to evaluating the transportation effects of each project component is highlighted below.

- **General Impacts.** Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development or transportation improvements, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. Accordingly, the transportation effects of the project are attributed to the specific project components identified below.
- **Infill Development.** The Infill Development analysis identifies the transportation impacts related to the development potential of the Land Use and Urban Design Element of the *2010 Community Plan*, together with the rezoning of the BART parking lot infill site (see Table II-2 on p. II-19 for the type and amount of infill development evaluated). The Infill Development analysis under each topic focuses exclusively on

infill development and assumes that none of the transportation improvements or variants is implemented. The transportation analysis of infill development includes the potential development at the two infill sites as well as an additional 13 residential units that could develop over time under a Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT) zoning district. The location of these 13 residential units is unknown and could be distributed throughout the Plan area. For the purpose of this EIR, the program-level analysis assumes that these units are distributed east and west of the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection such that 11 contribute their traffic to the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street infill site and 2 contribute traffic to the BART parking lot infill site. References to Infill Development Conditions in this section address the effects of the potential infill development in the plan area and are distinct from Project Conditions and Variant Conditions (described below).

- **Transportation Improvements.** This analysis identifies the transportation impacts of the Infill Development (discussed above) plus the Transportation Element of the *2010 Community Plan* (see “Proposed Improvement” column of Table II-3 on p. II-22 for the transportation improvements evaluated). By comparing the results of the transportation analysis for the infill development (above) and the results for the proposed transportation improvements, the effects of the transportation improvements alone can be determined. References to “Project Conditions” in this section address the effects of the infill development and the proposed transportation improvements from the Transportation Element.
- **Transportation Improvement Variants.** This analysis identifies the transportation impacts of the Infill Development (discussed above) plus the transportation improvement variants (see “Variant” column of Table II-3 on p. II-22 for the transportation improvement variants evaluated). This analysis is the same as that described above for Transportation Improvements, except that the transportation analysis considers implementation of the transportation improvement variants rather than the proposed transportation improvements. This analysis describes whether the variants improve, worsen, or have a negligible effect on the performance of the transportation system in the plan area. References to “Variant Conditions” in this section address the effects of the Infill Development and the transportation improvement variants.
- **Open Space.** This analysis identifies the transportation impacts of the future open space improvements in the plan area, including the possibility of a greenway link between Glen Park and Glen Canyon, improvements to Kern Street, and changes to the BART Station plaza.

As explained in Chapter II, Project Description, the potential development resulting from the policies in the Land Use and Urban Design Element is analyzed at a program level because the exact quantity and configuration of residential units and commercial space is not available, and there is no specific application before the City for evaluation. The *2010 Community Plan* introduces a new Glen NCT zoning district in the village center. Policies in the *2010 Community*

Plan identify two potential infill sites as: 1) six parcels on the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street, and 2) the Glen Park BART Station parking lot on the north side of Bosworth Street and Arlington Street. Policies in the *2010 Community Plan* identify that infill development possibilities would most likely consist of mixed-used development, including residential and commercial/retail uses presented in Table III.E-6, below.

**TABLE III.E-6
PERSON-TRIP GENERATION FOR PLAN AREA BUILDOUT**

Land Use	Size	Person-Trips				Weekday Daily
		Weekday AM Peak Hour		Weekday PM Peak Hour		
		In	Out	In	Out	
Residential						
BART Parking Lot	92 DU	54	108	106	53	920
NW Diamond/ Bosworth	<u>58 DU</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>580</u>
Subtotal	150 DU*	88	176	173	87	1,500
Retail						
BART Parking Lot	14,913 SF	28	25	96	105	2,238
NW Diamond/ Bosworth	<u>8,582 SF</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>1,286</u>
Subtotal	23,495 SF	44	40	152	165	3,524
Total		132	216	325	252	5,024

Source: AECOM, 2010.

Notes:

DU = dwelling units; SF = square feet

The values shown in this table represent buildout at the maximum development potential of the proposed project land uses, in order to provide a conservative analysis (worst traffic impacts) for the purposes of this EIR.

* The total of 150 dwelling units includes 13 potential units enabled by NCT zoning changes, with 11 modeled at the northwest corner of the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection infill site and two at the BART parking lot site, but the actual location is unknown.

Unlike the Land Use and Urban Design Element, the proposed and variant transportation improvements of the Transportation Element are analyzed at a project level since these improvements are more specifically defined. The transportation conditions are assessed for two scenarios: (1) Project Conditions (existing conditions plus the *2010 Community Plan*, defined as the Land Use and Urban Design Element, Transportation Element, and Open Space Element, plus the BART parking lot infill size rezoning), and (2) 2030 Cumulative Conditions (the effects of the first scenario in combination with impacts from other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects through the year 2030), where appropriate. The first scenario provides a near-term assessment of the transportation implications of the *2010 Community Plan* on existing

conditions in Glen Park. The second scenario provides a longer-term perspective, in year 2030, of the transportation implications of the *2010 Community Plan* along with other foreseeable development, background growth, and implementation of other City-adopted plans that could affect the Glen Park neighborhood.

Similar to the Land Use and Urban Design Element, the Open Space Element is analyzed at a programmatic level and is addressed qualitatively. The small scale of the proposed open space improvements would provide additional amenity in the community “downtown” for community residents and visitors and give them more reasons to linger in the downtown area instead of just passing through. Because of the existing high volumes of pedestrian, vehicular, and transit trips in Glen Park, the open space improvements are not expected to attract substantially more trips to Glen Park.

Travel Demand

This transportation analysis provides an estimate of the travel demand that would be generated from the potential infill development. The travel demand estimates were based on information contained in the *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review* (SF Guidelines),¹² augmented with outputs from the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) model.

In general, travel demand refers to the new vehicle, transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and other traffic generated by a project, and is based on trip generation rates (number of trips anticipated for different land uses) and mode splits (percentage of travelers using a particular type of transportation; i.e., private vehicles, public transit, walking, or biking). Once the number of trips has been derived based on the trip generation rates and the mode splits, the trips are assigned to specific roads and transit lines. The determination of which road or transit line would be used and in which direction is based on trip distribution percentages, which describe the direction of travel for different types of trips.

Typically, travel demand (trip generation, mode split, average vehicle occupancy, and trip distribution), parking demand, and freight/service vehicle loading demand estimates are based on information contained in the San Francisco Planning Department’s *SF Guidelines*. Information for the residential units (in terms of mode split, average vehicle occupancy, and trip distribution) is based on the 2000 U.S. Census data on home-based work trips for Census Tract 218, which contains the plan area.

¹² City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review*, October 2002. Available at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=6753>.

Trip Generation

The person-trip generation rates include residents and visitors of the residential units, plus employees and visitors of the commercial uses, and are based upon weekday daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trip generation rates expressed in number of trips per residential unit and number of trips per 1,000 square feet of retail space.¹³ These rates were applied to the infill development to obtain the person-trips for the project. Based on information presented in Chapter II, Project Description (see Table II-2, p. II-19), the traffic analysis uses conservative estimates of development potential in the plan area; i.e., assuming the maximum potential development and no credits for existing uses proposed to be replaced by the near-term development. There are approximately 7,000 sf of existing commercial uses at the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site. The transportation analysis of future commercial uses at the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site utilized the conservative assumption that, although this existing commercial floor area and the associated trips would likely be added to or replaced by new infill development, the analysis assumed 8,582 sf of additional commercial space at this infill site, without crediting the 7,000 sf of existing commercial uses. As a result, even though the potential rezoning of the six parcels on the west side of Diamond Street south of Bosworth Street from RH-3 to Glen Park NCT could yield additional commercial floor area of approximately 5,250 sf and correspondingly additional person trips in the Glen Park commercial core, the commercial space and associated trips are accounted for in the analysis performed for the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site in this DEIR. The zoning refinements at 605 Chenery Street and 3121-3125 Castro Street would not generate any additional trips from increased commercial development since the parcels are already being used for commercial uses (legal, non-conforming) and are not anticipated to change. There are currently no proposals for development of private property, and actual projects, if pursued, would likely be of a smaller scale and the estimate of trips from the new use at the site would net out (subtract) those trips associated with the existing land use that would be displaced. If individual property owners pursued development, additional project-level review of the actual proposals would be required.

The *SF Guidelines*, however, only present weekday daily and weekday PM peak hour trip generation rates. To estimate the weekday AM peak hour trip generation rates, a ratio of

¹³ Although the 2010 *Community Plan* contains policy recommendations for “commercial” land uses, there are also a number of references to retail uses, which are a type of commercial use. In particular, Policy 2.2 mentions infill commercial opportunities and then characterizes these opportunities as small-scale retail development. For the purposes of this EIR, retail trip generation rates are used to estimate travel demand, since retail uses typically exhibit a greater number of trips per square foot than other commercial uses, and thus yield a more conservative (greater) assessment.

weekday AM peak hour and PM peak hour trip generation was obtained from peak hour trip generation rates presented in the *Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (8th ed)*. The travel demand calculations conservatively assume that all residential units are two bedrooms or more, which generate a higher number of trips than studios or one-bedroom units, according to the *SF Guidelines*. Thus, the actual number of trips likely would be lower than the estimates presented herein.

The trip generation estimates for the infill sites are presented in Table III.E-6, p. III.E-28. Overall, buildout of these sites would generate a maximum of approximately 5,024 new person-trips on a weekday daily basis, 348 new person-trips during the weekday AM peak hour (132 inbound and 216 outbound), and 577 new person-trips during the weekday PM peak hour (325 inbound and 252 outbound). The proposed land uses would generate 132 (88 residential and 44 retail) and 325 (173 residential and 152 retail) inbound person-trips during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively, and 216 (176 residential and 40 retail) and 252 (87 residential

and 165 retail) outbound person-trips during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

Mode Split

The person-trips are assigned to travel modes in order to determine the number of auto, transit, and “other” trips (“other” includes walk, bicycle, motorcycle, taxi, and additional modes) that would be generated by the infill development. Mode split and average vehicle occupancy information was obtained from the 2000 U.S. Census for residential trips (Census Tract 218) and from the *SF Guidelines* for retail trips.

Although minor fluctuations in mode choice may be observed between the weekday AM and PM peak hours, the mode split was assumed to be consistent between peak hours for the purposes of this analysis. The trip generation by mode for the infill development for the weekday AM peak hour and PM peak hour is presented in Table III.E-7, p. III.E-32.

Trip Distribution/Assignment

The distribution of trips to and from the infill sites is based on the origin/destination of each trip, and is distributed to the four quadrants of San Francisco (Superdistricts 1, 2, 3, and 4), the East Bay, the North Bay, the South Bay/Peninsula, and out of the region. Most of the residential trips generated by the infill development would come from Superdistrict 1 (northeast San Francisco). Most of the retail work trips and retail non-work trips generated by the infill development would predominantly come from South Bay and Superdistrict 3 (mid and southeast San Francisco), respectively.

Per Appendix D of the *SF Guidelines*, journey-to-work data was utilized to generate residential work trips and residential non-work trips. For purposes of this analysis, residential work and residential non-work trip distribution for the weekday AM and PM peak hours is assumed to be the same. Table III.E-8, III.E-33, presents the person-trip distribution for the infill sites.

**TABLE III.E-7
PROJECT PEAK HOUR (AM AND PM) PERSON-TRIPS BY MODE**

Land Use	Person-Trips					Vehicle-Trips
	Auto	Transit	Walk	Other ^a	Total	
Weekday AM Peak Hour						
Residential						
BART Parking Lot	109	47	2	4	162	101
NW Diamond/ Bosworth*	<u>68</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>102</u>	<u>63</u>
Subtotal	177	77	4	6	264	164
Retail						
BART Parking Lot	34	6	11	1	53	18
NW Diamond/ Bosworth	<u>20</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>10</u>
Subtotal	54	10	18	2	84	28
Total	231	87	22	8	348	192
Weekday PM Peak Hour						
Residential						
BART Parking Lot	107	47	2	4	160	99
NW Diamond/ Bosworth*	<u>67</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>62</u>
Subtotal	174	76	4	6	260	161
Retail						
BART Parking Lot	129	24	44	4	201	70
NW Diamond/ Bosworth	<u>75</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>40</u>
Subtotal	204	38	69	6	317	110
Total	378	114	73	12	577	271

Source: AECOM, 2010.

Note:

"Other" includes bicycles, motorcycles, and taxis.

* The person-trips estimated for the infill sites also includes 13 potential units that could result throughout the plan area.

**TABLE III.E-8
PERSON-TRIP DISTRIBUTION**

Trip End	Residential				Retail			
	Work		Non-Work		Work		Non-Work	
	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
San Francisco								
Superdistrict 1	62	61	63	61	0	1	3	12
Superdistrict 2	9	9	9	9	0	1	5	17
Superdistrict 3	9	9	9	9	1	2	31	118
Superdistrict 4	9	9	9	9	0	1	3	10
East Bay	14	14	14	14	0	1	2	6
North Bay	14	14	14	14	0	0	0	4
South Bay	14	14	14	14	1	2	5	17
Out of Region	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>10</u>
Total	132	130	132	130	2	8	52	194

Source: SF Guidelines, Tables E-5 and E-14, San Francisco Planning Department, October 2002; 2000 U.S. Census (Tract 218).

Cumulative Analysis (2030)

The cumulative analysis presents the transportation effects of the project in 2030 in combination with other anticipated development. Anticipated development can be derived from a list of known or foreseeable projects or from an assumed rate of background growth. For this EIR, a growth factor was used. Specifically, SFCTA model growth factors (indicating the projected change between future year (2030) and base year (2005) volumes) were applied to existing intersection volumes in the study area to derive future 2030 intersection volumes. The development of 2030 Cumulative Conditions considers growth from background development both within and outside the plan area, in addition to the 2010 *Community Plan*. This approach to the cumulative analysis accounts for other development that could occur beyond the specific projects and plans identified in Section III.B, Land Use, p. III.B-15, although these projects and plans were also considered, and thus, presents a conservative evaluation of potential future transportation impacts.

TRAFFIC IMPACT EVALUATION

Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection

TR-1 *The 2010 Community Plan would cause the level of service (LOS) at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM and PM peak hours. (Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)*

General Impacts. Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. As discussed in further detail below, traffic associated with infill development would cause the LOS at the intersection of Bosworth Street/Diamond Street to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM and PM peak hours. Similarly, with the addition of the proposed transportation improvements to the infill development, namely the pedestrian scramble phase, the LOS also would deteriorate to unacceptable levels. Implementation of the transportation improvement variants, specifically the widening of Diamond Street together with the infill development, would result in acceptable operating conditions at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection. The open space improvements, like the transportation improvement variants, would have a less-than-significant impact at this intersection. Implementation of mitigation measures identified below would reduce the impact of the infill development to a less-than-significant level, but the impact of the proposed transportation improvements, specifically the pedestrian scramble phase, would remain significant and unavoidable.

TR-1A *The infill development would cause the LOS at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to degrade to unacceptable levels. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

Infill Development. The additional traffic generated by the infill development would cause the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to degrade from LOS D under Existing Conditions to LOS E under Existing plus Infill Development Conditions during both the weekday AM peak hour and PM peak hour (see Table III.E-9, p. III.E-35). Therefore, the infill development would result in a significant impact at this intersection.

The significant impact of the infill development at this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of M-TR-1A, p. III.E-37.

**TABLE III.E-9
INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE – EXISTING PLUS PLAN AREA BUILDOUT**

		Project Conditions:								Variant Conditions:							
		Existing Conditions				Existing + Infill Development				Existing plus Infill Development + Proposed Transportation Improvements				Existing + Infill + Variant Transportation Improvements			
		AM		PM		AM		PM		AM		PM		AM		PM	
Intersection		LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay
1 Chenery Street / Diamond Street		B (NB)	12.1	B (NB)	10.3	B (NB)	12.2	B (NB)	10.4	B (EB)	12.2	B (NB)	10.4	B (NB)	12.2	B (NB)	10.4
2 Chenery Street / Carrie Street		A (WB)	8.1	A (WB)	8	B (NB)	11.9	A (NB)	8	B (NB)	11.9	B (NB)	12.4	A (WB)	8.1	A (WB)	8
3 Chenery Street / Natick Street		B (NB)	10.6	B (NB)	11	A (WB)	8.1	B (WB)	11.1	A (WB)	8.1	A (WB)	7.9	B (NB)	10.7	B (NB)	11
4 Wilder Street/Arlington Street/Natick Street/San Jose Avenue		A (NB)	7.7	A (NB)	7.9	A (SB)	7.8	A (NB)	7.9	A (SB)	7.8	A (NB)	8	A (SB)	7.7	A (NB)	8
5 Wilder Street / Carrie Street		A (SB)	9.6	A (SB)	9.5	A (SB)	9.2	A (SB)	9.5	A (SB)	9.2	A (SB)	7.9	A (SB)	9.6	A (SB)	9.5
6 Wilder Street / Diamond Street		B (WB)	12.1	B (WB)	12.2	B (WB)	12.2	B (WB)	12.3	B (WB)	12.2	B (WB)	12.3	B (WB)	12.2	B (WB)	12.3
7 Bosworth Street / Elk Street/Congo Street		E	56.6	E	61.5	E	60.2	E	67.8	E	60.2	E	67.8	E	60.2	E	68.2
8 Bosworth Street / Lippard Avenue		F (EB/WB)	>50.0	D (EB)	32.2	F (WB)	>50.0	D (EB)	34.3	F (WB)	>50.0	D (EB)	34.3	F (WB)	>50.0	D (EB)	34.5
9 Bosworth Street / Brompton Avenue		B (WB)	12	B (WB)	11.3	B (WB)	12.1	B (WB)	11.4	B (WB)	12.1	B (WB)	11.4	B (WB)	12.1	B (WB)	11.4
10 Bosworth Street / Diamond Street		D	52.7	D	43	E	67.9	E	75.9	E	67.9	E	74.6	D	50.6	D	43.9
11 Bosworth Street/Arlington Street SB I-280 On-Ramp ^a		D (SB)	30.7	D (SB)	30.4	D (SB)	32.6	D (SB)	34	D (SB)	32.6	D (SB)	34	B	11.1	B	10.2
12 Bosworth Street / Lyell Street		F (NB/WB)	>50.0	F (NB/WB)	>50.0	F (WB)	>50.0	F (WB)	>50.0	F (WB)	>50.0	F (WB)	>50.0	B	13.5	B	17.8

**TABLE III.E-9
INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE – EXISTING PLUS PLAN AREA BUILDOUT**

		Project Conditions: Existing plus Infill Development + Proposed Transportation Improvements								Variant Conditions: Existing + Infill + Variant Transportation Improvements							
		Existing Conditions				Existing + Infill Development											
		AM		PM		AM		PM		AM		PM		AM		PM	
Intersection		LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay
13 Still Street/Lyell Street		C (WB)	15.1	B (WB)	13.8	C (WB)	15.4	B (WB)	13.9	C (WB)	15.4	B (WB)	13.9	C (WB)	15.4	B (WB)	14
14 Alemany Boulevard / Lyell Street		B	18.1	B	15.9	B	18.3	B	16.1	B	18.3	B	16.1	B	18.3	B	16
15 Monterey Boulevard / Acadia Street		C (SB)	22.8	D (SB)	32.3	C (SB)	23.3	D (SB)	33.4	C (SB)	23.3	D (SB)	33.4	C (SB)	23.3	D (SB)	33.4
16 Monterey Boulevard / Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps		D	47.8	D	38	E	55.8	D	47.7	E	55.8	D	47.7	E	55.7	D	47.5
17 Monterey Boulevard/ Joost Avenue		B (SB)	11.2	B (SB)	11.1	B (SB)	11.6	B (SB)	11.5	B (SB)	11.6	B (SB)	11.5	B (SB)	11.6	B (SB)	11.5
18 Monterey Boulevard / Diamond Street/S. Jose Avenue		B	15	B	14.1	B	17.5	B	16.8	B	17.5	B	16.8	B	17.4	B	16.5

Source: AECOM, 2010.

Notes: Delay is indicated in seconds per vehicle. Bold indicates unacceptable conditions. (LOS indicates the worst approach).

For stop-controlled intersections, average delay beyond 50 seconds is shown as ">50.0", as delays greater than 50 seconds are beyond the meaningful range of the analysis methodology.

a. The Bosworth Street/Arlington Street intersection was broken into three simple intersections. LOS of the worst of the three intersections is reported in the table.

- M-TR-1A Signal Timing Modifications at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection without Transportation Improvements.* SFMTA shall monitor intersection operations at this location as the plan area builds out. Once the intersection LOS deteriorates to LOS E, SFMTA shall optimize the signal and increase the cycle length from 80 to 90 seconds. This signal timing modification would improve the intersection operations to acceptable conditions (LOS D) during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours under Existing plus Infill Development Conditions, and would therefore reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. No secondary impacts would occur as a result of this increase in cycle length, because this intersection is not coordinated with an adjacent signalized intersection.
- TR-1B The addition of the proposed pedestrian scramble phase to the infill development would cause the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels. (Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)*

Transportation Improvements. The transportation improvements proposed in the 2010 Community Plan for the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection include an increase in the cycle length, a pedestrian scramble phase, leading northbound and southbound left-turn vehicle movements, red curb restrictions, and traffic calming measures.

While the approximately 30-second new pedestrian scramble phase would worsen traffic conditions at this intersection, the other improvements proposed with the new pedestrian scramble would cause the average delay during the AM and PM peak hours to slightly improve (see Table III.E-9, p. III.E-35). Under the Existing plus Infill Development Conditions, the AM peak period average delay would be 67.9 seconds and the PM peak period average delay would be 75.9 seconds. Under the Project Conditions, the average delay during the AM peak would remain the same as under Existing plus Infill Development Conditions, but during the PM peak, the average delay would decrease to 74.6 seconds. Nevertheless, the LOS during both AM and PM peak hours would remain at LOS E, so that Project Conditions would continue to have a significant impact at this intersection.

The significant impact of the proposed infill development and transportation improvements at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection during both AM and PM weekday peak hours would be reduced through the implementation of

Mitigation Measure M-TR-1B, below. However, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

M-TR-1B Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection Signal Timing Modifications with Transportation Improvements. SFMTA shall monitor intersection operations at this location as the plan area builds out and transportation improvements occur. Once the intersection LOS deteriorates to LOS E, if feasible, SFMTA shall re-optimize the signal and increase the cycle length to 140 seconds (compared to 90 seconds as recommended by M-TR-1A if the transportation improvements are not implemented). This measure would improve traffic operations during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours under Project Conditions, but the intersection would continue to operate at unacceptable conditions, and therefore the project's impact at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection during both AM and PM weekday peak hours would remain significant and unavoidable. A secondary effect of this mitigation, although less than significant, would be that lengthening the cycle would cause pedestrians and vehicles to wait longer before being able to cross and access the intersection. Given the undesirable consequences of a signal cycle length increase of this magnitude, SFMTA has expressed strong reservations about the feasibility of this mitigation measure. For this reason, implementation of this mitigation measures is considered uncertain.

TR-1C The implementation of the transportation improvement variants, together with the infill development, would not result in unacceptable service levels at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection. (Less than Significant)

Transportation Improvement Variants. The transportation improvement variants would modify the signalization at the intersection of Bosworth Street/Diamond Street and widen the roadway at the northbound approach of Diamond Street; change the intersection of Arlington Street/Bosworth Street/SB I-280 On-Ramp to a roundabout configuration; and signalize the Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersection. The LOS results at the 18 study area intersections are reported in Table III.E-9, p. III.E-35.

Under the transportation improvement variants, the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection would operate at acceptable conditions. A right-turn pocket added to the northbound approach of Diamond Street would decrease vehicular

delay without affecting the benefits to pedestrian safety introduced by the pedestrian scramble phase. Although the variant of widening Diamond Street would improve the operating conditions at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection, its implementation is uncertain because it would encroach into adjacent sidewalks, Muni facilities, and BART property.

TR-1D The 2010 Community Plan includes policies that encourage open space improvements and would not introduce new sources of traffic. (Less than Significant)

Open Space. The 2010 Community Plan includes policies that encourage open space improvements in the plan area. Future open space improvements in the plan area include the possibility of a greenway link between Glen Park and Glen Canyon, improvements to Kern Street, and changes to the BART Station plaza. These future open space improvements would enhance connectivity within the community and improve accessibility to land uses in the downtown as well as to transit services. As such, the open space improvements could attract more pedestrians or bicyclists to travel into and through Glen Park. The increase in pedestrian and bicyclists would be a desired outcome of the open space improvements, and would have a less-than-significant traffic effect at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection.

Summary

At the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection, the 2010 Community Plan would cause the LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels. Specifically, the traffic generated by the infill development without any of the transportation improvements would reduce the LOS to LOS E during the AM and PM peak hours. The delays at this intersection could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by modifying the signal timing (Mitigation Measures M-TR-1A). When the transportation improvements (primarily the addition of a pedestrian scramble phase) are included along with the infill development, the LOS would not improve but remain at an unacceptable LOS E during both the AM and PM peak hours. Although re-optimization of the signal cycle, proposed as a mitigation measure (M-TR-1B), would improve conditions, the impact under the transportation improvements would remain significant and unavoidable. Furthermore, the feasibility of this mitigation measures is uncertain due to SFMTA concerns about secondary effects of its implementation on pedestrian and vehicle wait times. The transportation improvement variants, by widening the Diamond Street northbound movement into adjacent (BART) property, would improve conditions to acceptable levels; however, this implementation is uncertain due to required encroachment onto BART property. The future

open space improvements identified by the 2010 Community Plan would not introduce new sources of traffic and would thus have a less-than-significant effect on traffic conditions.

Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps

TR-2 *The 2010 Community Plan would cause the LOS at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection to deteriorate from acceptable levels to unacceptable levels during the AM peak hour. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

General Impacts. Implementation of the 2010 Community Plan would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. As discussed in further detail below, traffic associated with infill development would cause the LOS at the intersection of Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection to deteriorate from acceptable levels to unacceptable levels during the AM peak hour. With the addition of either the proposed transportation improvements or their variants, the LOS would deteriorate to unacceptable levels. The open space improvements would have a less-than-significant impact at this intersection. Implementation of the mitigation measure identified below would reduce the impact of the infill development and the proposed transportation improvements to a less-than-significant level.

TR-2A *The infill development plus transportation improvements or transportation improvement variants would cause the LOS at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM peak hour. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

Infill Development. The additional traffic generated by the infill development would cause intersection operations at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection to degrade from LOS D under weekday AM peak hour Existing Conditions to LOS E under weekday AM peak hour infill development conditions during the weekday AM peak hour (see Table III.E-9, p. III.E-35). Therefore, development of the infill sites would result in a significant impact during the AM peak hour at this intersection. The significant impact of the infill development at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection during AM peak hour would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A, below.

M-TR-2A Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps Intersection Signal Timing Modifications. SFMTA shall monitor intersection operations at this location as the potential infill development builds out and transportation improvements occur. Once intersection LOS deteriorates to LOS E, SFMTA shall increase the cycle length to 90 seconds. This signal timing modification would improve the intersection operations to acceptable conditions (LOS D) during the weekday AM peak hour. No secondary impacts would occur as a result of this increase in cycle length, because this intersection is not coordinated with an adjacent signalized intersection.

Transportation Improvements. Implementation of the transportation improvements of the 2010 *Community Plan* would result in the same unacceptable levels of service at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection during AM peak hour (see Table III.E-9, p. III.E-35) that were identified for the Infill Development Conditions. Thus, the Project Conditions would result in a significant impact.

The significant impact of the transportation improvements with the infill development at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection during AM peak hour would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A, above.

Transportation Improvement Variants. The variants would not alter the average delay at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection from that identified for the transportation improvements (see Table III.E-9, p. III.E-35). As a result, the Variant Conditions would result in a significant impact. Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A, above, would reduce the impact during the AM peak hour to a less-than-significant level.

TR-2B The 2010 Community Plan includes policies that encourage open space improvements and would not introduce new sources of traffic. (Less than Significant)

Open Space. The 2010 *Community Plan* includes policies that encourage open space improvements in the plan area. As described under Impact TR-1D, p. III.E-39, the open space improvements could attract more pedestrians or bicyclists to travel into and through Glen Park. The increase in pedestrian and bicyclists would be a desired

outcome of the open space improvements, and would have a less-than-significant traffic effect at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection.

Summary

At the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection, the *2010 Community Plan* would cause the LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels. Specifically, the traffic generated by the infill development without any of the transportation improvements would reduce the LOS to LOS E during the AM peak hour. The delays at this intersection could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by modifying the signal timing (Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A). When the transportation improvements are included in the traffic evaluation along with the infill development, the LOS would not improve but remain at unacceptable LOS E during the AM peak hour. Implementation of the transportation improvement variants would not improve or worsen the LOS at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection as compared to the transportation improvements. The same mitigation, modifying the signal timing, identified for the Infill Development Conditions would reduce the effects of the Project Conditions and the Variant Conditions to a less-than-significant level. The future open space improvements identified by the *2010 Community Plan* would not introduce new sources of traffic and would thus have a less-than-significant effect on traffic conditions at this intersection.

Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street, Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue, and Bosworth Street/Lyell Street Intersections

TR-3 *The 2010 Community Plan would not contribute significantly to the existing unacceptable operating conditions at the Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street, Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue, and Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersections. The transportation improvement variants would improve conditions to acceptable levels at Bosworth Street/Lyell Street. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. As discussed in further detail below, traffic associated with development of the infill sites and the transportation improvements or variants would not substantially contribute to further congestion at the Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street, Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue, and Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersections. The open space improvements would have a less-than-significant impact at these intersections.

Infill Development. Table III.E-9, p. III.E-35 shows that there are three other intersections that operate at unacceptable levels of service (LOS E or LOS F) under Existing Conditions. Addition of trips from potential infill development would not, however, contribute significantly to intersection volumes and worsen operations.

Intersection #7: Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street – AM and PM Peak Hour. The infill development would add traffic to this intersection, which operates at unacceptable conditions (LOS E) during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours under Existing Conditions. However, the project's contribution (14 vehicles in the AM peak hour and 13 in the PM peak hour) to the critical movement operating at unacceptable conditions (westbound through movement) would be less than two percent of that movement for both the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, development of the infill sites would not contribute significantly to the existing unacceptable operating conditions at this intersection and its impact would be considered less than significant.

Intersection #8: Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue – AM Peak Hour. The infill development would add traffic to this intersection, which operates at unacceptable conditions (LOS F) during the weekday AM peak hour under Existing Conditions and already meets Caltrans traffic signal warrants. However, the project's contribution of eight vehicles to the eastbound approach and 14 vehicles to the westbound approach would be less than two percent of this intersection's worst approaches for the weekday AM peak hour. Therefore, development of the infill sites would not contribute significantly to the existing unacceptable operating conditions at this intersection and its impact would be considered less than significant.

Intersection #12: Bosworth Street/Lyell Street – AM and PM Peak Hour. The infill development would add traffic to this unsignalized intersection, which operates at unacceptable conditions (LOS F) and meets Caltrans signal warrants during both the weekday AM peak hour and PM peak hour under Existing Conditions. However, during the AM peak hour the project's contribution of five vehicles to the northbound approach (Lyell Street) and seven vehicles to the westbound approach (Bosworth Street) would be one percent or less of the intersection's worst approaches. During the PM peak hour, the project's contribution of six vehicles to the northbound approach and 14 vehicles to the westbound approach would be two percent or less of the intersection's worst approaches. Therefore, potential infill development would not contribute significantly to the existing unacceptable

operating conditions at this intersection and its impact would be considered less than significant.

Transportation Improvements. Implementation of the transportation improvements of the *2010 Community Plan* would not change the average delays at these three intersections from those identified under the Infill Development Conditions (see Table III.E-9, p. III.E-35). Accordingly, the Project Conditions would also have a less-than-significant effect at the Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street, Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue, and Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersections.

Transportation Improvement Variants. Implementation of the variants would have no effect on two of these intersections and improve the LOS at the third (see Table III.E-9, p. III.E-35), as compared to the Project Conditions. Specifically, the intersections of Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street and Bosworth Street/Lippard Street would continue to operate at unacceptable levels, although the traffic volumes would not substantially increase and the effect would be less than significant. Thus, for these intersections, the Variant Conditions would have the same effect as the Project Conditions. By contrast, the intersection of Bosworth Street/Lyell Street would change the LOS F under Project Conditions to LOS B under Variant Conditions. This improved LOS is due to the proposed signalization of this intersection under the transportation improvement variants.

Open Space. The *2010 Community Plan* includes policies that encourage open space improvements in the plan area. As described under Impact TR-1D, p. III.E-39, the open space improvements could attract more pedestrians or bicyclists to travel into and through Glen Park. The increase in pedestrian and bicyclists would be a desired outcome of the open space improvements. Although delays for vehicles would be slightly greater while waiting for the pedestrians and bicyclists to clear an intersection, the open space improvements would have a less-than-significant traffic effect at the Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street, Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue, and Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersections.

Remaining Intersections

TR-4 *The 2010 Community Plan would alter traffic at 13 other study intersections in the plan area; however, the intersection LOS would continue to operate at acceptable levels. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. As discussed in further detail below, traffic associated with development of the infill sites and the transportation improvements or variants would have a less-than-significant impact at the 13 other study area intersections evaluated. The open space improvements would have a less-than-significant impact at these intersections.

Infill Development. The transportation analysis of the *2010 Community Plan* evaluated 18 intersections in and near the plan area. Table III.E-9, p. III.E-35 shows that there are five intersections that operate at unacceptable levels of service (LOS E or LOS F) under Infill Development Conditions. All 13 other intersections would operate at acceptable levels of service with the infill development. As a result, infill development would have a less-than-significant traffic impact at these intersections.

Transportation Improvements. The same 13 other intersections that would operate at acceptable levels of service under the Infill Development Conditions would operate at acceptable levels under the Project Conditions (see Table III.E-9, p. III.E-35). While the overall intersection operations would not deteriorate, the proposed transportation improvements would change the local roadway network by modifying the signalization at the intersection of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street and reversing the direction of Natick Street and Carrie Street. The delays at the intersections of Chenery Street/Carrie Street, Chenery Street/Natick Street, Wilder Street/Arlington Street/Natick Street/San Jose Avenue, and Wilder Street/Carrie Street would change slightly as a result of the reversal of direction on Carrie Street and Natick Street, but would continue to operate at acceptable conditions.

Transportation Improvement Variants. As shown in Table III.E-9, p. III.E-35, of the 13 other study area intersections that would operate at acceptable levels under the Project Conditions, ten intersections would have the same LOS under the Variant Conditions; one intersection would experience a reduced LOS (Chenery Street/Natick Street would degrade from LOS A to LOS B during the PM peak hour); and two intersections would experience an improved LOS (Chenery Street/Carrie Street would improve from LOS B to LOS A during the AM and PM peak hours, and Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/SB I-280 On-Ramps would improve from LOS D to LOS B during the AM and PM peak hours). Because these intersections would

operate at an acceptable LOS, the transportation improvement variants would have a less-than-significant effect at these 13 intersections.

Open Space. The *2010 Community Plan* includes policies that encourage open space improvements in the plan area. As described under Impact TR-1D, p. III.E-39, the open space improvements could attract more pedestrians or bicyclists to travel into and through Glen Park. The increase in pedestrian and bicyclists would be a desired outcome of the open space improvements, and would have a less-than-significant traffic effect at the 13 other study area intersections.

TRANSIT IMPACT EVALUATION

TR-5 *The 2010 Community Plan would increase transit demand, but that demand could be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. As discussed in further detail below, transit demand associated with infill development would increase, but could be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity. The addition of the transportation improvements or variants would generally improve accessibility to transit services but would not increase demand. Similarly, the open space improvements would not generate transit ridership. The overall transit demand effect of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Infill Development. The potential infill development would generate 31 inbound transit trips and 56 outbound transit trips in the weekday AM peak hour, and 68 inbound transit trips and 46 outbound transit trips in the weekday PM peak hour. The expected distribution of these trips is summarized in Table III.E-10, p. III.E-47.

As shown in Table III.E-10, the majority of transit trips are bound to and from Superdistrict 1 (SD-1), which contains the northeastern quadrant of San Francisco, including Downtown, Civic Center, Union Square, Financial District, Chinatown, and North Beach areas. Although a small portion would use the Muni Metro J-Church, most of these trips to and from SD-1 would be expected to use BART.

**TABLE III.E-10
PROJECT-GENERATED TRANSIT RIDERSHIP AND CORRESPONDING TRANSIT LINES**

Trip End	Weekday AM Peak Hour		Weekday PM Peak Hour		Transit Lines
	In	Out	In	Out	
San Francisco					
Superdistrict 1 (SD-1)	13	25	27	16	BART, J
Superdistrict 2 (SD-2)	3	4	6	4	J, 44
Superdistrict 3 (SD-3)	4	6	12	11	BART, J, 23, 36, 44, 52
Superdistrict 4 (SD-4)	2	4	4	3	23
East Bay	3	6	6	5	BART
North Bay	3	5	6	3	BART
South Bay	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	BART
Total	31	56	68	46	

Source: AECOM, 2010.

For Muni service, project-generated transit demand on buses and light rail vehicles would, on average, be less than one additional rider passing through the localized peak load points during the weekday AM peak hour and PM peak hour. The projected increase in transit ridership at the localized peak load point would not cause utilization on Muni vehicles to exceed the 85 percent capacity utilization standard. For the northbound Muni Metro J-Church line, which already operates at 92 percent capacity utilization, the infill development's contribution to the capacity utilization would not be considered significant. Consequently, the Infill Development Conditions would result in a less-than-significant impact to Muni service.

Project-related demand on BART would be approximately two to three additional passengers per BART train at the MLP on the south Downtown screenline. Overall, BART ridership on the south Downtown screenline would increase as a result of infill development by 35 to 40 passengers, which would not cause total ridership to exceed the 115 percent capacity threshold for BART service. On the east Downtown screenline, the infill development would add three to four additional passengers in the peak hour at the MLP, on average, well under one passenger per train and insufficient to cause BART trains to exceed the 135 percent capacity utilization threshold. Therefore, the Infill Development Conditions would result in a less-than-significant impact to regional BART service.

Transportation Improvements. The transportation improvements in and of themselves would not generate new transit demand. Slight increases in transit ridership could result with those transportation improvements that enhance accessibility to transit services; however, the increase would be relatively small. Accordingly, the transit demand effects of Project Conditions are virtually the same as those of the Infill Development Conditions. As a result, the Project Conditions effects on transit demand would be less than significant.

Transportation Improvement Variants. The variants, like the transportation improvements, would have minimal effect on transit services, since they would not generate new demand but could enhance accessibility to transit services. As a result, the Variant Conditions effects on transit demand would be similar to those of the Project Conditions and would be less than significant.

Open Space. The *2010 Community Plan* includes policies that encourage open space improvements in the plan area. As described under Impact TR-1D, III.E-39, the open space improvements could attract more pedestrians or bicyclists to travel into and through Glen Park. The increase in pedestrian and bicyclists would be a desired outcome of the open space improvements, and would have a less-than-significant effect on transit demand.

TR-6 *The 2010 Community Plan would not cause a substantial increase in transit travel times or conflict with transit operations. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. As discussed in further detail below, infill development would have a less-than-significant effect on transit operations. The addition of the transportation improvements or variants would generally improve accessibility to transit services but could also affect transit travel times. The net effect on transit operations would be less than significant. Similarly, the open space improvements would not affect transit ridership. The overall effect of the proposed project on transit operations would be less than significant.

Infill Development. The vehicular, pedestrian, or bicycle traffic generated by the infill development would not result in substantial operational impacts to transit

service. Once individual projects are proposed, the design and proposed site access would be subject to review by SFMTA for potential conflicts or impacts to Muni operations. Generally, existing delays experienced by left- and right-turning transit vehicles in conflict with through vehicle and pedestrian movements, primarily at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection, would continue but would not be substantially worse than under Existing Conditions. Given the location of the Glen Park BART Station within the plan area, most project-generated BART ridership would likely walk to and from the station, adding to pedestrian traffic and project-generated pick-up and drop-off activities at the station. While increased traffic and transit riders would have some impact on transit travel time through the plan area, such as by increasing queues (and thus delay to buses), the Infill Development Conditions would not result in a substantial contribution to existing conditions.

Transportation Improvements. The proposed transportation improvements would change transit conditions primarily by adding a bus loop at Glen Park BART Station, modifying bus routes and stops, and improving access to the Muni Metro J-Church line. Project Conditions transit impacts would be less than significant as described below.

Transit Improvements. While regional transit service and the 52 Excelsior and 44 O'Shaughnessy transit routes would not substantially be affected, the bus loop would modify the routes and travel times for the 23 Monterey and 36 Teresita. The travel time for the 23 Monterey would remain about the same as existing conditions or no more than one minute longer. The transit-only bus loop would overall reduce travel times, but times for specific movements (e.g., left-turns in and out of the bus loop) could increase travel times. The southbound 36 Teresita would be rerouted via the bus loop, avoiding the Bosworth/Diamond Street intersection; however, this would not substantially impact travel times. The bus loop would improve passenger safety, namely transit riders on the westbound 23 Monterey and 36 Teresita would not have to cross a street to access the BART Station, because dedicated access without vehicular conflict would be provided between the BART concourse and the bus loop.

The bus loop would also eliminate the designated loading zone for private employee shuttle and private auto pick-ups and drop-offs on the south side of Bosworth Street. The consolidation of these loading activities along the east side of Diamond Street could increase conflict for space among private autos, transit vehicles (36 Teresita), and employee shuttles; however, transit conflicts would be reduced as compared to

existing conditions. Conflicts between private vehicles and shuttles could be managed through the enforcement of existing loading and unloading regulations.

In summary, these transit improvements would have some effects on transit travel times, but the overall change to transit service through Glen Park would be less than significant.

Pedestrian Access Improvements. The proposed pedestrian access improvements include converting the Muni Metro J-Church stop to a center-platform configuration with an accessible boarding ramp, rebuilding the existing pedestrian bridge across San Jose Avenue with a new ramp to platform level, and an improved pedestrian path to and from the station plaza. While these changes would enhance accessibility to Muni and BART services, they would have a less-than-significant impact transit travel times or operations since they would not impede or substantially alter transit boardings or circulation.

Traffic Calming Improvements. The proposed traffic calming treatments on Bosworth Street would restrict excessive traffic speeds, but would have no measurable effect on transit travel times or operations. As a result, the traffic calming improvements would have a less-than-significant effect on transit operations through Glen Park.

Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection Improvements. The proposed improvement for the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection includes the introduction of a pedestrian scramble phase, which would contribute to a deterioration of vehicle LOS at this intersection and new northbound and southbound left-turn lanes and movements, which would improve vehicle operations at this intersection. Most of the bus lines serving the plan area use this intersection and would experience minor increases in signal delay and transit travel times. The delays were estimated at less than a minute for these routes, which would be considered less than significant.

Transportation Improvement Variants. The transportation improvement variants, would instead of the bus loop, change transit conditions primarily by relocating a bus stop and improving access to the Muni Metro J-Church line. As a result, the Variant Conditions effects on transit demand would be similar to those of the Project Conditions and would be less than significant.

Transit Improvements. The variants do not include a bus loop, so that the pedestrian safety and other benefits identified for the transportation improvements would not occur, nor would the slight travel time reductions for the 36 Teresita. The consolidated loading zone on the east side of Diamond Street would have approximately 60 more feet of curb space under the variant, which would result in less likelihood of spillover into bus zones (and, hence, delays in travel times), for the 36 Teresita inbound line.

Pedestrian Access Improvements. Under the variants, a new at-grade pedestrian connection would be constructed between the east side of Glen Park BART Station and the east end of the Muni Metro J-Church platforms to enhance transit service accessibility, specifically to and from the Muni Metro J-Church. This improvement would have little effect on transit travel times or operations, similar to the effects identified for the pedestrian access improvements under the Project Conditions.

Traffic Calming Improvements. Under the variants, the roundabout proposed at the Bosworth Street/Arlington Street intersection, compared to the transportation improvements, would further lower travel speeds at this intersection and add up to a few seconds of travel time to the 23 Monterey, 44 O'Shaughnessy, and 52 Excelsior in both travel directions. The additional travel time under the Variant Conditions would not adversely effect the overall transit service levels for Muni, similar to under the Project Conditions.

Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection Improvements. Under the variants, modifications to the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection, specifically the widening of Diamond Street to include a northbound right-turn pocket would improve intersection operations and reduce delays to all vehicles, including transit, as compared to Project Conditions. Although the variant of widening Diamond Street would improve the operating conditions at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection, its implementation is uncertain because it would encroach into adjacent sidewalks, Muni facilities, and BART property.

Open Space. The *2010 Community Plan* includes policies that encourage open space improvements in the plan area. As described under Impact TR-1D, p. III.E-39, the open space improvements could attract more pedestrians or bicyclists to travel into and through Glen Park. The increase in pedestrian and bicycle use would be a desired outcome of the open space improvements, although the additional pedestrians and bicyclists could slightly increase transit travel times through the

plan area. The increase in travel time for Muni service, however, would be negligible and the overall effect on transit operations would be less than significant.

PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE IMPACT EVALUATION

TR-7 *The 2010 Community Plan would not result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks, create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians, or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the plan area and adjoining areas. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Implementation of the 2010 Community Plan would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. Consequently, the 2010 Community Plan would not generate new trips or alter the transportation network such that it would result in significant pedestrian impacts. Pedestrian impacts may, however, result from the potential infill development and open space improvements by increasing pedestrian activity and from the transportation improvements by altering sidewalks, crosswalks, and vehicle conflict points and are further described below. The proposed project impacts to pedestrian facilities and safety, however, would be less than significant.

Infill Development. The majority of pedestrian traffic generated by infill development would be trips to and from transit services (transit walk trips) or parked vehicles, with a small additional contribution of local pedestrian trips, such as the neighborhood retail along Diamond Street. Based on the peak hour person-trips by mode presented previously in Table III.E-7, p. III.E-32, infill development would generate approximately 20 walk-only trips and 90 transit walk trips during the weekday AM peak hour, and 70 walk-only trips and 110 transit walk trips during the weekday PM peak hour.

Without specific information on types of infill development, building intensities, and building entries, pedestrian pathways and routes are difficult to predict. Therefore, the pedestrian LOS analysis focused on the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection (for pedestrian traffic to and from the BART Station) and made some conservative assumptions. First, although on-street parking and walking trips to and from vehicles would generally be well dispersed in the plan area, it was assumed that approximately 50 percent these trips would pass through the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection. Similarly, although walk-only trips exhibit a dispersed distribution, and not all transit riders would need to pass through the

Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection, the analysis assumed a majority of these trips would indeed pass through this intersection. Pedestrian trips were distributed across the four crosswalks based on existing crosswalk counts and distribution. The analysis determined all crosswalks at the intersection of Bosworth Street/Diamond Street would continue to operate at an acceptable LOS A or LOS B. None of the crosswalks would operate at unacceptable conditions with the infill development pedestrian trips added.

Trips to and from parked vehicles would be primarily concentrated in the residential streets north of Bosworth Street, since these areas would be most practically accessible for drivers. Based on the project-generated transit ridership summarized in Table III.E-10, p. III.E-47, transit-related pedestrian activity corresponds to approximately 40 to 50 outbound and 20 to 30 inbound pedestrians during the weekday AM peak hour (and the reverse, during the weekday PM peak hour). This number of pedestrians corresponds to less than one pedestrian a minute, on average, which would not be considered a substantial contribution to impacts to pedestrian facilities, such as sidewalks and crosswalks, in the plan area.

The Infill Development Conditions could introduce additional conflict areas related to project parking and loading driveways and pedestrians. At a program level, this would not be considered a significant impact because similar conflicts currently occur at sites where future development could occur, and once individual projects are proposed, the design would be subject to review and approval by the Planning Department and SFMTA, who would ensure that all applicable City codes/requirements are met.

Consequently, potential infill development would not result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks, create hazardous conditions for pedestrians, or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the plan area. In addition, the development of infill sites would not cause any of the crosswalks in the area to operate at unacceptable (LOS E or LOS F) conditions. Therefore, the Infill Development Conditions on pedestrian circulation and safety would be less than significant.

Transportation Improvements. Like the above analysis of Infill Development Conditions, Project Conditions would have a less-than-significant effect on, and in many circumstances improve pedestrian circulation and safety as described below.

Transit Improvements. The proposed bus loop and modifications to transit lines at Glen Park BART Station would improve pedestrian conditions and access to and from the BART station. This improved access would benefit approximately 12 percent of Muni transit patrons at the Glen Park BART Station. The bus loop driveways would present two new conflict areas on Bosworth Street and Diamond Street. However, the number of pedestrians that could conflict with buses entering and exiting the bus loop would be offset by a greater reduction of conflict from relocation of bus stops behind the BART Station and away from vehicle traffic on Diamond Street.

Pedestrian Access Improvements. The proposed pedestrian access improvements under Project Conditions would upgrade the existing pedestrian bridge serving the Muni Metro J-Church platform to ADA compliance and provide ADA access from Diamond Street to the BART plaza via a half-level elevator at the west edge of the plaza. The provision of ADA access, where none exists currently, would have a beneficial impact on pedestrian conditions in the plan area.

Traffic Calming Improvements. The proposed traffic calming measures along Bosworth Street and at the Monterey Boulevard/Joost Avenue and Arlington Street/Natick Street/Wilder Street/San Jose Avenue Off-Ramp intersections would have beneficial impacts on the pedestrian network in the plan area by reducing traffic speeds, shortening crossing distances, and increasing pedestrian visibility.

Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection Improvements. The proposed Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection improvements would feature a widened sidewalk along the north side of Bosworth Street east of Diamond Street, a new bulbout at the northwest corner (for the west crosswalk), and removal of parking on the southbound and eastbound approaches to provide additional traffic lanes. A pedestrian scramble phase lasting approximately 30 seconds would facilitate pedestrians crossing the intersection. The pedestrian LOS analysis of the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection after implementation of the pedestrian scramble phase shows an improvement over Infill Development Conditions. Limiting pedestrian movements to the pedestrian scramble phase would improve pedestrian safety, but would increase pedestrian wait times by up to 28 seconds, from up to a 52-second wait under existing conditions to up to an 80-second wait with the pedestrian scramble phase.

Other intersection changes under the Project Conditions would generally improve pedestrian circulation and facilities through sidewalk widenings and bulbouts; however, the removal of on-street curb parking near the intersection to aid vehicle movements would reduce the perceived buffer for pedestrians on the sidewalk from roadway traffic. Sidewalk widening and bulbout design would be subject to the San Francisco Department of Public Works sidewalk permit program requirements, and would need to conform with City Better Streets, Streetscape, and Traffic Calming Plans.

Transportation Improvement Variants. Similar to the Project Conditions, Variant Conditions would result in a less-than-significant effect and in many cases improve upon pedestrian circulation and safety in the plan area.

Transit Improvements. Under the Variant Conditions, instead of the bus loop, the transit improvements would include shifting the 23 Monterey bus stop from Diamond Street to Bosworth Street, which would have minimal impact on pedestrian travel patterns.

Pedestrian Access Improvements. The variant new ADA-compliant pedestrian connection to the Muni Metro J-Church line on the east side of the BART Station would provide a second means of pedestrian access to the station in addition to the existing pedestrian bridge, which would remain. The ADA accessible pathway between the BART Station and the Muni Metro J-Church line, would be slightly longer than under Project Conditions, and would require a push-button pedestrian crossing of San Jose Avenue. Pedestrian crosswalks along the pathway would be improved, such as with in-roadway flashing lights and additional setbacks to allow for better visibility of pedestrians by drivers.

Traffic Calming Improvements. Under Variant Conditions, the intersection of Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/I-280 On-Ramp intersection would be converted to a roundabout with crosswalks across all four approaches (the Project Conditions would provide crosswalks at three of the approaches, missing one across Bosworth Street west of the intersection). A signal would be installed at the Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersection, and a new crosswalk provided on the south side of the intersection.

The proposed roundabout is estimated to lower traffic speeds by 10 to 15 mph, improving pedestrian safety to a greater degree than under the Project Conditions,

which may achieve a 5-mph reduction. However, roundabouts can be difficult for pedestrians to navigate as it can be unclear where drivers intend to exit, and in the case of this roundabout this would be most evident on the west side crosswalk and on the I-280 on-ramp crosswalk. This crosswalk would also be somewhat longer and circuitous under the Variant Conditions, which requires two shorter, but angled crosswalks joined across a traffic island.

Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection Improvements. The Variant Conditions include the same improvements at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection as the Project Conditions, and also shifts the sidewalk eastward on the northbound Diamond Street approach to accommodate an additional exclusive right-turn lane. This additional lane would increase pedestrian crossing distances by approximately eight feet and correspondingly the required time for pedestrians to cross. Vehicle flow and speeds adjacent to the sidewalks would be moderately increased as a result of the roadway widening.

Open Space. The *2010 Community Plan* includes policies that encourage open space improvements in the plan area. Future open space improvements in the plan area include the possibility of a greenway link between Glen Park and Glen Canyon, improvements to Kern Street, and changes to the BART Station plaza. These future open space improvements would add some additional pedestrian conflict points but would overall enhance connectivity within the community and improve accessibility to land uses and transit in the downtown. As such, the open space improvements could attract more pedestrians or bicyclists to travel into and through Glen Park, and have a net beneficial effect on pedestrian circulation and safety.

TR-8 *The 2010 Community Plan would not create substantially hazardous conditions for bicyclists or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the plan area and adjoining areas. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. Consequently, the *2010 Community Plan* would not generate new trips or alter the transportation network such that it would result in significant bicycle impacts. Bicycle impacts may, however, result from the individual components of the proposed project. Infill development and open space improvements could increase bicycle activity in the

area and transportation improvements and variants could affect bike routes and potential areas of conflict with vehicular movements. The proposed project impacts to bicycle circulation and safety, however, would be less than significant.

Infill Development. The assessment of bicycle impacts from land use development typically includes an evaluation of the anticipated number of bicycle trips, Planning Code bicycle parking requirements, potential safety concerns, and conflict locations. However, the program-level analysis includes a general assessment of bicycle conditions within the plan area and areas of potential conflict with bicycle facilities. The impacts of infill development on bicycle conditions would primarily involve an increased demand for bicycle parking and potential for some additional conflicts with bicycles and land use development vehicle traffic. While development projects for infill sites have not yet been proposed, an estimated 24 Class I bicycle parking spaces would be required at the infill site at the northwest corner of the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street intersection, and 35 Class I bicycle parking spaces would be required at the BART parking lot infill site. Future development on any of the individual parcels would be required to meet the City's bicycle, shower, and locker requirements.

Although some additional conflicts may occur at project driveways with bicycle routes (specifically Route 55 along Bosworth Street and Routes 45 and 70 on Diamond Street), infill development would not typically introduce design features that would substantially alter or decrease the safety of bicyclists or inhibit bicycle travel in the plan area. Future project-level analysis for any development in the plan area will examine potential conflicts between loading vehicles and local traffic, including pedestrian and bicycle traffic, and development projects would be required to meet the Planning Code requirements.

Transportation Improvements. Project Conditions would have a less-than-significant effect on bicycle circulation and safety as described below.

Transit Improvements. The proposed bus loop and rerouting of the 36 Teresita on Natick Street and Wilder Street would introduce conflict points at the entrance and exit of the proposed bus loop (on Bosworth Street and Diamond Street, respectively) and at Natick Street and Wilder Street; however, bus volumes would be on the order of four or less buses at these locations per hour per route. Improvements would also reduce some conflict points related to buses pulling up to or away from the curb on Diamond Street.

Pedestrian Access Improvements. The proposed pedestrian access improvements would primarily serve transit-generated pedestrian traffic, but would not interfere with bicycle routes or bicycle parking facilities.

Traffic Calming Improvements. The proposed traffic calming measures along Bosworth Street and at the Monterey Boulevard/Joost Avenue and Arlington Street/Natick Street/Wilder Street/San Jose Avenue Off-Ramp intersections would reduce traffic speeds, thus improving cyclist safety and having a beneficial effect on the bicycle network.

Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection Improvements. The proposed improvements for the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection include the introduction of a pedestrian scramble phase. While this improvement would result in greater delays in crossing the intersection, it would not create a potentially hazardous condition for bicyclists nor substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility.

Transportation Improvement Variants. The Variant Conditions would have a less-than-significant effect on bicycle circulation and safety, similar to the effect identified for the Project Conditions.

Transit Improvements. Because the variants would not include the bus loop, as included under the transportation improvements, Variant Conditions would avoid potential conflicts between buses and cyclists at the entrance and exit of the bus loop, which would occur under the Project Conditions.

Traffic Calming Improvements. Although overall vehicles speeds would decrease, the vehicle speeds through the roundabout would still be higher than is considered optimal for bicycles traveling in mixed-flow traffic. Therefore, an off-street delineated bicycle path adjacent to the roundabout sidewalks is included as part of the roundabout design at the Arlington Street/Bosworth Street/I-280 on-ramp intersection. The bicycle lanes within the roadway of Bosworth Street and Arlington Street would introduce a somewhat circuitous path and sharper turns and require bicyclists to yield to traffic where crossing the legs of the roundabout; however, it would have the effect of making bicyclists more visible to motorists and improving safety. Final design of the roundabout would be required to meet Caltrans and SFMTA design standards.

Pedestrian Access Improvements. The new ADA-compliant pedestrian connection to the Muni Metro J-Church line on the east side of the BART Station under the variant would serve transit-generated pedestrian traffic and would not substantially impact the bicycle network in the plan area for the same reasons described for the Project Conditions.

Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection Improvements. In addition to the Project Conditions, the Variant Conditions would include widening the southern leg of the intersection. The benefits to vehicles (i.e., less queuing and delay) would also apply to the bicyclists at this location. On the other hand, conflicts could arise for bicyclists as they would need to travel between vehicles moving through the intersection and right-turning vehicles.

Open Space. The 2010 *Community Plan* includes policies that encourage open space improvements in the plan area. Future open space improvements in the plan area include the possibility of a greenway link between Glen Park and Glen Canyon, improvements to Kern Street, and changes to the BART Station plaza. These future open space improvements would likely add some additional bicycle conflict points but would overall enhance connectivity within the community and improve accessibility to land uses in the downtown. As such, the open space improvements could attract more bicyclists to travel into and through Glen Park. Overall, the open space improvements would not introduce hazardous conditions for bicyclists and would benefit bicycle accessibility.

LOADING IMPACT EVALUATION

TR-9 *The 2010 Community Plan would not substantially increase commercial loading and unloading activity and would not create potentially hazardous conditions related to commercial loading activities. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Implementation of the 2010 *Community Plan* would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. Consequently, the 2010 *Community Plan* would not result directly in the need for loading areas or facilities. Infill development may incrementally increase the demand and supply of loading facilities. The transportation improvements and variants would not affect demand for loading and unloading activities, since such activities are a function of land use rather than changes to the transportation network, and would not have

appreciable effects on loading conditions in the plan area. The open space improvements similarly would not affect loading and unloading demand.

Infill Development. The impacts of infill development on loading conditions would primarily involve an increased demand for loading spaces. Development on any of the individual parcels would be required to meet the City's loading space, dimension, and location requirements.

Based on the assumed 23,495 square feet of commercial uses at the two infill sites and approximately 150,000 square feet of gross floor area for residential uses, the Planning Code would require one off-street loading space for the commercial uses and one off-street loading space for the residential uses.¹⁴ The Infill Development Conditions would generate approximately ten daily service vehicle trips, translating to a demand of less than one space during either the peak hour or average hour. The likely location for these loading spaces would be off Arlington Street, Bosworth Street, or Kern Street, depending on the location of the future development. Future development would be required to meet loading space and other Planning Code requirements and project-level analysis would examine potential conflicts between loading vehicles and local traffic, including pedestrian and bicycle traffic.

Transportation Improvements. The proposed transportation improvements would not affect demand for loading spaces which is a function of land use. Furthermore, the proposed improvements would not have appreciable effects on loading conditions in the plan area, since they would not require the removal of any loading spaces or access to loading areas.

Transportation Improvement Variants. The transportation improvement variants would have the same less-than-significant effects on commercial loading as the Project Conditions.

¹⁴ The San Francisco Planning Code (Section 152) establishes different standards for uses handling goods and uses like offices, hotels, and apartments where handling of goods occurs less frequently. For the purposes of this EIR, the standard for retail uses has been used to estimate off-street loading spaces, since these, rather than other commercial uses, require the greatest number of spaces. For the residential development, the maximum development potential of 150 dwelling units at an assumed average of 1,000 square feet per unit was used to derive the residential square footage. These estimates assume that the maximum development potential for residential and commercial uses occur as a single development, since this assumption yields the greatest number of off-street loading spaces that could be required.

Open Space. The 2010 Community Plan includes policies that encourage open space improvements in the plan area would not affect demand for loading spaces or have appreciable effects on loading conditions in the plan area.

TR-10 *The 2010 Community Plan would not substantially increase or affect existing passenger loading and unloading activity. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Implementation of the 2010 Community Plan would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. Consequently, the 2010 Community Plan would not result directly in the need for passenger loading areas or facilities. Loading demand may incrementally increase from infill development. The transportation improvements and variants would not affect demand for passenger loading and unloading activities, but would alter existing activities near the Glen Park BART Station. However, the impact to passenger loading/unloading under the proposed project was determined to be less than significant. The open space improvements similarly would not affect passenger loading and unloading demand.

Infill Development. In the plan area, Glen Park Elementary School and the Glen Park BART Station are generators of significant auto pick-up and drop-off activity. Infill development would incrementally increase demand for passenger loading/unloading in the plan area. However, since most trips from development sites to these locations would likely be made by walking, the contribution would be minimal.

Transportation Improvements. None of the proposed transportation improvements are close enough to Glen Park Elementary School to have direct impacts on passenger loading and unloading at that location. Near the BART Station, the proposed bus loop would eliminate the private passenger loading/unloading area on Bosworth Street (approximately 75 feet long) which would increase private vehicle drop-offs/pick-ups at the Diamond Street passenger loading/unloading location. This drop-off area would also be shortened by approximately 60 feet to accommodate the bus loop driveway. Despite the reduction in available curb space and considering the use and turnover of the existing passenger loading areas, the consolidated passenger loading/unloading area on Diamond Street was determined to be sufficient to meet this demand. The consolidation of passenger loading

activities at one location would likely increase conflict for space between private autos/employee and require some private shuttles to alter their drop-off routes.

Transportation Improvement Variants. Under the Variant Conditions, there would not be a bus loop, so that the total amount of curb space available for passenger loading and unloading activity on Diamond Street would remain the same as under existing conditions, but the passenger loading area on Bosworth Street would still be removed as under Project Conditions. The passenger loading and unloading effects under the Variant Conditions would be slightly less than under the Project Conditions.

Open Space. Similar to the analysis of the open space improvements on commercial loading and unloading, the proposed open space improvements would not affect demand for loading space or have an appreciable effect on passenger loading conditions in the plan area.

EMERGENCY ACCESS IMPACT EVALUATION

TR-11 *The 2010 Community Plan would not result in inadequate emergency access. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. Consequently, the *2010 Community Plan* would not result directly in a change to emergency access. As described further below, access to infill sites would be via the existing street network. The transportation improvements and variants would generally improve vehicular movement and thus have a beneficial effect on emergency access. The open space improvements would not result in inadequate emergency access.

Infill Development. Emergency access to the infill sites would likely be provided via Arlington Street and Bosworth Street, which abut the BART parking lot site, and via Diamond Street, Bosworth Street, and Kern Street, which abut the infill sites at the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street. Emergency access to individual infill sites would be subject to City review upon submittal and would be required to meet Planning Code and other City access requirements. The infill development, would therefore be considered to have a less-than-significant impact on emergency vehicle access.

Transportation Improvements. Under Project Conditions, the transportation improvements would change emergency access conditions primarily by allowing emergency vehicles additional access to the east side of the Glen Park BART Station, as well as provide a connection between Bosworth Street and Diamond Street in the event the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection is substantially blocked. The proposed traffic calming speed tables, lane reductions and bulbouts would calm traffic but would be designed to accommodate emergency vehicles. The proposed improvements for the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection would benefit traffic flow through the intersection for all vehicles, including emergency vehicles.

Transportation Improvement Variants. Because the variants would not include the bus loop that is part of the Project Conditions, the Variant Conditions would not allow emergency vehicles to access the east side of the Glen Park BART Station, or provide a connection between Bosworth Street and Diamond Street; however, the widening of Diamond Street under Variant Conditions would improve traffic flow through the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection. Instead of the speed tables and lane reductions included under Project Conditions, the variant traffic calming measures would signalize an intersection and modify another to a roundabout configuration. These improvements would be designed to accommodate emergency vehicles; therefore, the Variant Conditions improvements, like the Project Conditions, would generally have a beneficial impact on emergency access.

Open Space. The 2010 *Community Plan* includes policies that encourage open space improvements in the plan area. Future open space improvements in the plan area would not affect emergency vehicle access.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACT EVALUATION

TR-12 *Implementation of the 2010 Community Plan could result in construction activities that interfere with local circulation and access over extended periods of time. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

General Impacts. Implementation of the 2010 *Community Plan* would not, in itself, result in construction activities, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. Accordingly, the transportation effects of the proposed project are attributed to the specific components identified below.

TR-12A *A simultaneous construction of two or more major components (bus loop, roundabout, or widening of northbound approach of Diamond Street) of the transportation improvements or transportation improvement variants would interfere with local circulation and access as a result of construction activities over extended periods of time. (Less than Significant with Mitigation).*

As discussed in further detail below, construction-related impacts for the infill development and transportation components of the proposed project would individually be anticipated to be temporary in nature and would therefore, be considered less than significant. Although not anticipated, if two or more major transportation improvements (specifically the bus loop, roundabout, or widening of the northbound approach of Diamond Street) were constructed simultaneously, the combination of these projects could result in a significant construction-related impact.¹⁵ Implementation of the Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A below would reduce this significant impact to a less-than-significant level.

The *2010 Community Plan* identifies privately-owned parcels where individual development projects have not been proposed nor submitted for review to the Planning Department, but where a NCT district could potentially be applied. Typically, the assessment of construction impacts is focused on individual development projects and evaluates the proposed construction schedule; number of daily construction-related trucks and workers; and anticipated street closures, sidewalk closures, or bus stop relocations. For this analysis, a general assessment of construction conditions for infill development land uses was conducted at a program level for the level of anticipated development described in Chapter II, Project Description, as the individual project development, schedules, and staging is not known at this time. Program-level impacts are estimated based on overall potential development, and additional project-level analysis and review would occur with any submittal of land use development, including the potential BART parking lot development. The analysis of the transportation improvements and transportation improvement variants are conducted on a project-level based on construction information provided on right-of-way requirements, staging areas, temporary construction easements, and volumes/quantities of materials to be hauled in and transported out of the plan area. While each transportation improvement or

¹⁵ The Glen Park BART Station entry plaza would also have to be reconfigured in order to accommodate the widening of northbound Diamond Street.

improvement variant would be developed individually, typical or likely construction conditions are described here.

For all development, construction-related activities typically occur Monday through Friday, between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., with some activities potentially occurring on weekends. Construction activities, including hours, would be subject to San Francisco Building and Police Codes. Construction staging would occur on individual project sites. When sidewalks need to be reconstructed or roadways repaved, temporary traffic lane closures, pedestrian walkways, or Muni bus stop relocations may be necessary.

During the construction period, temporary and intermittent traffic and transit impacts may result from truck movements (such as from trucks hauling excavation materials or delivering construction materials) to and from construction sites. Additionally, construction workers driving to and from the site, and construction worker parking in the site vicinity would temporarily increase traffic levels and parking occupancy in the project area. Construction traffic would generally access the area using truck routes, arterials or freeways except for local deliveries. Access to the Glen Park plan area for construction-related traffic would likely be via I-280 and San Jose Avenue, as designated Freight Traffic Routes, the on- and off-ramps at the intersection of Monterey Boulevard/Diamond Street and at the intersection of Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue, and the on-ramp on Bosworth Street. A restriction banning vehicles over three tons is in effect on Diamond Street north of Chenery Street, and on Elk Street and Diamond Heights Boulevard between Elk Street and Berkeley Way.

The impact of construction traffic would vary with the volume and time of truck activity. The impacts of construction truck traffic would be a lessening of the capacities of the local access streets and haul routes, due to slower movements and larger turning radii of the trucks. Truck movements during periods of peak traffic flow would have a greater potential to create conflicts than truck movement during non-peak hours. Contractors would be required to follow the *Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets (The Blue Book)*. All lane and sidewalk closures are subject to review and approval by the SFMTA and the Department of Public Works (DPW) and project sponsors would have to meet with SFMTA, the Transportation Advisory Staff Committee, and other responsible City agencies to coordinate construction activities so as to minimize construction impacts on vehicular, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic.

Infill Development. Considering the above, the construction-related transportation impact of the infill development would be less than significant.

Transportation Improvements. In addition to the impacts of construction-related traffic, transportation impacts from construction activities for transportation improvements would also include temporary changes to or restrictions on traffic lanes and grading and paving activities. It is anticipated that most construction staging would occur on individual project sites and that any work within street right-of-way would be temporary in nature and limited to off-peak periods whenever feasible. Replacement of the pedestrian bridge and reconfiguration of the Muni Metro J-Church platform would require temporary closure of the station and likely substitution of bus shuttle service. Construction of the bus loop would likely occur in two phases over 20-24 weeks and would include substantial grading of the area behind the BART Station and require the realignment of the I-280 on-ramp. Traffic control devices would be utilized as appropriate, and as required under *Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets (The Blue Book)*.

The impacts of the transportation improvements would be less than significant unless the bus loop element were constructed at the same time as the variant roundabout improvement, or widening of northbound approach of Diamond Street, also a variant improvement, in which case the transportation impact would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

M-TR-12A Construction Transportation Management Plan. In the event that two or more major proposed transportation improvements (specifically the bus loop, roundabout, or widening of the northbound approach of Diamond Street) are constructed simultaneously, SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall develop and implement a Construction Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to anticipate and minimize impacts of potentially overlapping construction activities. The TMP would coordinate construction activities to minimize disruptions and ensure that overall circulation is maintained to the extent possible, with particular focus on ensuring pedestrian, transit, and bicycle connectivity. The TMP would supplement and expand, rather than modify or supersede, any existing regulations and requirements. The TMP shall be submitted to SFMTA Traffic Engineering Division, the

Department of Public Works (DPW) and presented as part of review by the Transportation Advisory Staff Committee.

Transportation Improvement Variants. The impacts of the transportation improvement variants would be less than significant. Construction of the roundabout would include some lane shifts and closures on Bosworth Street over an estimated 32 to 40 weeks. Construction of the ADA-compliant pedestrian connection to the Muni Metro J-Church line east of the BART Station would require a work zone and some grading activities between the two facilities. Similar to Project Conditions, any work on the Muni Metro J-Church platform would need to occur in the evenings or require a temporary closure of this stop with alternate shuttle service being provided. Similar to the Project Conditions analysis, if construction of the roundabout or the Diamond Street widening were both constructed at the same time or one was constructed at the same time as the bus loop element under Project Conditions, the construction-related transportation impact would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A, p. III.E-66, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

TR-12B *Implementation of the open space improvements would not result in construction activities that interfere with local circulation and access over extended periods of time. (Less than Significant)*

Open Space. The construction activities that would be associated with a greenway link between Glen Park and Glen Canyon, improvements to Kern Street, and changes to the BART Station plaza would be typical of landscaping projects, such as short-term, minor grading and planting. The activities would occur on site and are not expected to interfere with local circulation and access. The impact would be less than significant.

Summary

Construction of the infill development, transportation improvements, and transportation improvement variants of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant effect on transportation access and circulation if major improvements were constructed separately. If two or more major transportation improvements (bus loop, roundabout, or Diamond Street widening) were constructed at the same time, the impact would be significant. The impact on access and circulation could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A, Construction Transportation Management Plan. Construction

of the future open space improvements identified by the *2010 Community Plan* would involve landscaping activities, which would have less than significant impact on access and circulation.

PARKING CONDITIONS

San Francisco does not consider parking supply as part of the permanent physical environment and, therefore, does not consider changes in parking conditions to be environmental impacts as defined by CEQA. The Planning Department acknowledges, however, that parking conditions may be of interest to the public and decision makers. Therefore, this report presents a parking analysis for informational purposes.

Parking conditions are not static, as parking supply and demand varies from day to day, from day to night, from month to month, etc. Hence, the availability of parking spaces (or lack thereof) is not a permanent physical condition, but changes over time as people change their modes and patterns of travel.

Parking deficits are considered to be social effects, rather than impacts on the physical environment as defined by CEQA. Under CEQA, a project's social impacts need not be treated as significant impacts on the environment. However, environmental documents should address the secondary physical impacts that could be triggered by a social impact (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15131(a)). The social inconvenience of parking deficits, such as having to hunt for scarce parking spaces, is not an environmental impact, but there may be secondary physical environmental impacts, such as increased traffic congestion at intersections, air quality impacts, safety impacts, or noise impacts caused by congestion. In the experience of San Francisco transportation planners, however, the absence of a ready supply of parking spaces, combined with available alternatives to auto travel (e.g., transit service, taxis, bicycles, or travel by foot) and a relatively dense pattern of urban development, induces many drivers to seek and find alternative parking facilities, shift to other modes of travel, or change their overall travel habits. Any such resulting shifts to transit service, in particular, would be in keeping with the City's "Transit First" policy. The City's Transit First Policy, established in the City's Charter Article 8A, Section 8A.115, provides that "parking policies for areas well served by public transit shall be designed to encourage travel by public transportation and alternative transportation."

The transportation analysis accounts for potential secondary effects, such as cars circling and looking for a parking space in areas of limited parking supply, by assuming that all drivers would attempt to find parking at or near the proposed project site and then seek parking farther away if convenient parking is unavailable. Moreover, the secondary effects of drivers searching for parking is typically offset by a reduction in vehicle trips due to others who are aware of constrained parking conditions in a given area. Hence, any secondary environmental impacts

which may result from a shortfall in parking in the vicinity of the proposed project would be minor, and the traffic assignments used in the transportation analysis, as well as in the associated air quality, noise and pedestrian safety analyses, reasonably address potential secondary effects.

In summary, changes in parking conditions are considered to be social impacts rather than impacts on the physical environment. Accordingly, the parking analysis below is presented for informational purposes only.

The retail uses of the infill sites would be required to meet the Planning Code requirements for parking, accessible and carshare parking space requirements. The Glen Park NCT District introduced in the *2010 Community Plan* would modify minimum residential parking requirements. The new Glen Park NCT District would require one parking space per one residential unit, and one parking space per 1,500 sf of commercial space. It is possible that the BART redevelopment project as its parking lot site may include some public parking to replace existing parking lot spaces, but no details on the development programs are known at this time.

Infill Development

Planning Code Requirements. Considering the zoning of the plan area (primarily Public, NC-2, and RH-1 districts), the Planning Code would require the provision of between 0 to 149 spaces for the residential uses and 0 to 47 spaces for the retail uses associated with the infill development portion of the proposed project. In addition, the ADA requires that any parking facility open to public use, such as any parking for BART patrons or retail spaces, provide a minimum supply of accessible spaces depending on the total number of parking spaces provided in the facility, or an estimated two accessible spaces.

The Glen Park NCT District implemented by the *2010 Community Plan* would modify minimum residential parking requirements in this transit-oriented area. The *2010 Community Plan* proposes a number of other residential parking management strategies, including the establishment of design controls to prevent adverse visual and traffic impacts and changing the management approach to the Residential Permit Parking (RPP) program that is currently being operated within the plan area. SFMTA has already initiated some parking changes in the plan area, primarily focused on Bosworth Street, which include establishing time limits on previously unregulated on-street parking spaces, creating short-term metered spaces, and establishing a new RPP area.

Supply. Individual developments, when submitted to the Planning Department would be required to meet the Planning Code requirements for parking, accessible and carshare parking space requirements.

Demand. Consistent with the SF Guidelines, the infill development analyzed under the *2010 Community Plan* would have a parking demand of approximately 321 spaces during the weekday midday period and approximately 359 spaces during the weekday evening period. However, this is a conservative calculation based on a comparatively high parking demand of 1.50 spaces per dwelling unit and a high automobile mode share among retail visitors. Given the proximity of the development site to the BART Station and other transit services, it is expected that a substantial number of residents would choose to take transit, and some may choose to not own a car. Given the proximity of the site to nearby commercial uses on Diamond Street, it is also expected that a substantial proportion of trips (and parking demand) generated by the land use changes associated with the proposed project would be linked local trips to existing uses and would therefore not represent entirely new demand.

In addition, there is a surplus of approximately 200 or more on-street parking spaces during the weekday midday and weekday evening periods, which could satisfy some of the estimated parking demand generated by the proposed project. Based on these considerations and the size of the proposed project, it is not expected that the proposed project would substantially affect parking conditions in the plan area.

Transportation Improvements/Variants

Similar to the above discussion, effects to parking conditions related to the proposed and variant transportation improvements are described below for informational purposes.

Transit Improvements. The proposed transit improvements would not impact the supply of parking spaces. The relocation of the private bus and auto pick-up and drop-off area from Bosworth Street to Diamond Street would consolidate all passenger loading activity onto Diamond Street. The implementation of the proposed bus loop entrance and exit would result in a reduction of approximately 60 feet of curb space available for such activity.

The variant for transit improvements with 23 Monterey stop relocation instead of the bus loop would not impact the supply of parking spaces, as compared to Project Conditions.

Pedestrian Access Improvements. The proposed pedestrian access improvement would have no impact on the supply of parking spaces. Similarly, the variant, like the proposed improvements, would have no impact on parking supply.

Traffic Calming Improvements. The proposed traffic calming improvements would require the loss of one parking space at each intersection. The traffic calming improvements (roundabout) proposed under the variant would remove four spaces on the west side of Arlington Street.

Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection Improvements. The proposed improvements to the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection and the variants would each remove some parking on the southbound Diamond Street and eastbound Bosworth Street approaches near the intersection. A total of approximately five spaces under either set of improvements would be eliminated from the southbound and eastbound approaches.

CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS

As indicated in “Approach to Analysis” Section, the cumulative analysis presents the transportation effects of the project in 2030 in combination with other anticipated development, including known projects and plans, such as those identified in Section III.B, Land Use, as well as background growth as anticipated in the SFCTA model.

The 2030 Cumulative Conditions LOS at the study intersections without the proposed project are summarized in Table III.E-11, p. III.E-72. Conditions would generally worsen at the study intersections under 2030 Cumulative Conditions due to the background growth in traffic, and a total of six intersections would operate at an unacceptable level of service.

7. Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street (AM and PM peak hour) – LOS F;
8. Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue (AM peak hour) – LOS F (worst approach: eastbound Bosworth Street), (PM peak hour) – LOS E (worst approach: eastbound Bosworth Street);
10. Bosworth Street/Diamond Street (AM peak hour) – LOS F;
11. Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/SB I-280 On-Ramp (AM/PM peak hours) – LOS E (worst approach: southbound Arlington Street);
12. Bosworth Street/Lyell Street (AM/PM peak hours) – LOS F (worst approaches: northbound Lyell Street); and
16. Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps (AM peak hour) – LOS E.

**TABLE III.E-11
INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE – 2030 CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS WITHOUT
PROJECT**

Intersection		Existing Conditions				2030 Cumulative Conditions Without Project			
		AM		PM		AM		PM	
		LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS (Worst Approach)	Delay	LOS (Worst Approach)	Delay
1	Chenery Street / Diamond Street	B	12.1	B	10.3	C (NB)	17.3	B (NB)	10.7
2	Chenery Street / Carrie Street	A	8.1	A	8.0	A (WB)	8.3	A (WB)	8.0
3	Chenery Street / Natick Street	B	10.6	B	11.0	B (NB)	11.2	B (NB)	11.3
4	Wilder Street/Arlington Street/Natick Street/San Jose Avenue	A	7.7	A	7.9	A (SB)	8.0	A (SB)	8.5
5	Wilder Street / Carrie Street	A	9.6	A	9.5	A (SB)	9.5	A (SB)	9.5
6	Wilder Street / Diamond Street	B	12.1	B	12.2	B (WB)	13.2	B (WB)	12.4
7	Bosworth Street / Elk Street/Congo Street	E	56.6	E	61.5	F	>80.0	F	>80.0
8	Bosworth Street / Lippard Avenue	F	>50.0	D	32.2	F (EB)	>50.0	E (EB)	42.9
9	Bosworth Street / Brompton Avenue	B	12.0	B	11.3	B (WB)	13.2	B (WB)	13.0
10	Bosworth Street / Diamond Street	D	52.7	D	43.0	F	>80.0	D	46.0
11	Bosworth Street/Arlington Street SB I-280 On-Ramp	D	30.7	D	30.4	E (SB)	35.1	E (SB)	38.4
12	Bosworth Street / Lyell Street	F	>50.0	F	>50.0	F (NB)	>50.0	F (NB)	>50.0
13	Still Street / Lyell Street	C	15.1	B	13.8	C (WB)	17.3	B (WB)	14.2
14	Aleman Boulevard / Lyell Street	B	18.1	B	15.9	D	41.4	D	39.0
15	Monterey Boulevard / Acadia Street	C	22.8	D	32.3	D (SB)	24.6	D (SB)	34.3
16	Monterey Boulevard / Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps	D	47.8	D	38.0	E	57.6	D	38.4
17	Monterey Boulevard/ Joost Avenue	B	11.2	B	11.1	B (SB)	12.0	B (SB)	11.1
18	Monterey Boulevard / Diamond Street/S. Jose Avenue	B	15.0	B	14.1	B	15.9	B	14.2

Source: AECOM, 2010.

Notes: Delay is indicated in seconds per vehicle. **Bold** indicates unacceptable conditions.

For stop-controlled intersections, average delay beyond 50 seconds is shown as ">50.0", as delays greater than 50 seconds are beyond the meaningful range of the analysis methodology.

For signalized intersections, average delay beyond 80 seconds is shown as ">80.0", as delays greater than 80 seconds are beyond the meaningful range of the analysis methodology.

In addition to the three intersections which operate under Existing Conditions at unacceptable conditions – Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street (LOS E under AM and PM peak hours), Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue (LOS F in AM peak hour), and Bosworth Street/Lyell Street (LOS F under AM and PM peak hours) – three additional intersections, as listed above, would also operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 Cumulative Conditions without the proposed project.

Infill Development

The weekday AM and PM peak hour vehicle-trips generated by the infill development of the proposed project were added to 2030 Cumulative Conditions traffic volumes to obtain 2030 Cumulative plus Infill Development traffic volumes. The LOS at the study intersections are summarized in Table III.E-12, p. III.E-74.

As shown in Table III.E-12, p. III.E-74, although eleven of the studied intersections would continue to operate acceptably, the other seven study area intersections would operate at unacceptable conditions (LOS E or LOS F) under 2030 Cumulative plus Infill Development Conditions, and two intersections specifically due to Infill Development Conditions:

- 10. Bosworth Street/Diamond Street (PM peak hour) – LOS E; and
- 15. Monterey Boulevard/Acadia Street (PM peak hour) – LOS E.

Transportation Improvements

Similarly, the weekday AM and PM peak hour vehicle-trips of the infill development were added to 2030 Cumulative Conditions traffic volumes and proposed transportation improvements to obtain 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions traffic volumes. The 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions LOS at the study intersections (with the proposed transportation improvements) are summarized in Table III.E-13, p. III.E-75.

As shown in Table III.E-13, p. III.E-75, 11 of the 18 study intersections would continue to operate acceptably under 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions. The following two intersections would operate at unacceptable conditions (LOS E or LOS F) specifically related to Project Conditions (infill development plus proposed transportation improvements):

- 10. Bosworth Street/Diamond Street (PM peak hour) – LOS E (PM); and
- 15. Monterey Boulevard/Acadia Street (PM peak hour) – LOS E.

**TABLE III.E-12
INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE – 2030 CUMULATIVE INFILL DEVELOPMENT
CONDITIONS**

Intersection		2030 Cumulative Conditions				2030 Cumulative plus Infill Development Conditions			
		AM		PM		AM		PM	
		LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS (Worst Approach)	Delay	LOS (Worst Approach)	Delay
1	Chenery Street / Diamond Street	C	17.3	B	10.7	C (NB)	17.7	B (NB)	10.8
2	Chenery Street / Carrie Street	A	8.3	A	8.0	A (WB)	8.3	A (WB)	8.1
3	Chenery Street / Natick Street	B	11.2	B	11.3	B (NB)	11.3	B (NB)	11.4
4	Wilder Street/Arlington Street/Natick Street/San Jose Avenue	A	8.0	A	8.5	A (SB)	8.0	A (SB)	8.6
5	Wilder Street / Carrie Street	A	9.5	A	9.5	A (SB)	9.5	A (SB)	9.5
6	Wilder Street / Diamond Street	B	13.2	B	12.4	B (WB)	13.3	B (WB)	12.5
7	Bosworth Street / Elk Street/Congo Street	F	>80.0	F	>80.0	F	>80.0	F	>80.0
8	Bosworth Street / Lippard Avenue	F	>50.0	E	42.9	F (EB)	>50.0	E (EB)	45.9
9	Bosworth Street / Brompton Avenue	B	13.2	B	13.0	B (WB)	13.3	B (WB)	13.1
10	Bosworth Street / Diamond Street	F	>80.0	D	46.0	F	>80.0	E	77.6
11	Bosworth Street/Arlington Street SB I-280 On-Ramp ^a	E	35.1	E	38.4	E (SB)	37.6	E (SB)	44.3
12	Bosworth Street / Lyell Street	F	>50.0	F	>50.0	F (NB)	>50.0	F (NB)	>50.0
13	Still Street / Lyell Street	C	17.3	B	14.2	C (WB)	17.5	B (WB)	14.4
14	Aleman Boulevard / Lyell Street	D	41.4	D	39.0	D	42.0	D	39.4
15	Monterey Boulevard / Acadia Street	D	24.6	D	34.3	D (SB)	25.2	E (SB)	35.5
16	Monterey Boulevard / Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps	E	57.6	D	38.4	E	66.8	D	47.6
17	Monterey Boulevard/ Joost Avenue	B	12.0	B	11.1	B (SB)	12.5	B (SB)	11.5
18	Monterey Boulevard / Diamond Street/S. Jose Avenue	B	15.9	B	14.2	B	18.3	B	16.9

Source: AECOM, 2010.

Notes: Delay is indicated in seconds per vehicle. Bold indicates unacceptable conditions.

For stop-controlled intersections, average delay beyond 50 seconds is shown as ">50.0", as delays greater than 50 seconds are beyond the meaningful range of the analysis methodology.

For signalized intersections, average delay beyond 80 seconds is shown as ">80.0", as delays greater than 80 seconds are beyond the meaningful range of the analysis methodology.

a. The Bosworth St./Arlington St. intersection was broken into three simple intersections. LOS of the worst of the three intersections is reported in the table.

**TABLE III.E-13
INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE – 2030 CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS**

Intersection		2030 Cumulative Conditions				2030 Cumulative plus Project			
		AM		PM		AM		PM	
		LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay
		(Worst Approach)		(Worst Approach)		(Worst Approach)		(Worst Approach)	
1	Chenery Street / Diamond Street	C	17.3	B	10.7	C (NB)	17.7	B (NB)	10.8
2	Chenery Street / Carrie Street ^a	A (WB)	8.3	A (WB)	8.0	B (NB)	13.1	B (NB)	13.0
3	Chenery Street / Natick Street ^a	B (NB)	11.2	B (NB)	11.3	A (WB)	8.3	A (WB)	8.1
4	Wilder Street/Arlington Street/ Natick Street/San Jose Avenue ^a	A	8.0	A (SB)	8.5	A (SB)	8.1	A (SB)	8.5
5	Wilder Street / Carrie Street ^a	A (SB)	9.5	A (SB)	9.5	A (EB)	7.8	A (EB)	7.9
6	Wilder Street / Diamond Street	B	13.2	B	12.4	B (WB)	13.3	B (WB)	12.5
7	Bosworth Street / Elk Street/Congo Street	F	>80.0	F	>80.0	F	>80.0	F	>80.0
8	Bosworth Street / Lippard Avenue	F	>50.0	E	42.9	F (EB)	>50.0	E (EB)	46.1
9	Bosworth Street / Brompton Avenue	B	13.2	B	13.0	B (WB)	13.3	B (WB)	13.2
10	Bosworth Street / Diamond Street	F	>80.0	D	46.0	F	>80.0	E	55.8
11	Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/SB I-280 On-Ramp ^b	E	35.1	E	38.4	E (SB)	37.6	E (SB)	44.3
12	Bosworth Street / Lyell Street	F	>50.0	F	>50.0	F (NB)	>50.0	F (NB)	>50.0
13	Still Street / Lyell Street	C	17.3	B	14.2	C (WB)	17.6	B (WB)	14.4
14	Aleman Boulevard / Lyell Street	D	41.4	D	39.0	D	42.0	D	39.1
15	Monterey Boulevard / Acadia Street	D	24.6	D	34.3	D (SB)	25.2	E (SB)	35.5
16	Monterey Boulevard / Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps	E	57.6	D	38.4	E	66.6	D	47.3
17	Monterey Boulevard/ Joost Avenue	B	12.0	B	11.1	B (SB)	12.5	B (SB)	11.5
18	Monterey Boulevard / Diamond Street/S. Jose Avenue	B	15.9	B	14.2	B	18.2	B	16.6

Source: AECOM, 2010.

Notes: Delay is indicated in seconds per vehicle. **Bold** indicates unacceptable conditions.

For stop-controlled intersections, average delay beyond 50 seconds is shown as ">50.0", as delays greater than 50 seconds are beyond the meaningful range of the analysis methodology.

For signalized intersections, average delay beyond 80 seconds is shown as ">80.0", as delays greater than 80 seconds are beyond the meaningful range of the analysis methodology.

a. The LOS changes as the lane configuration is reversed.

b. The Bosworth Street/Arlington Street. intersection was broken into three simple intersections. LOS of the worst of the three intersections is reported in the table.

Transportation Improvement Variants

As shown in Table III.E-14, p. III.E-77, 13 of the 18 intersections would continue to operate acceptably under 2030 Cumulative plus Variant Conditions. In addition to the intersections that operate unacceptably under 2030 Cumulative Conditions (without the proposed project), similar to Project Conditions above, the Monterey Boulevard/Acadia Street intersection would operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour under 2030 Cumulative plus Variant Conditions. Unlike the Project Conditions, the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection with roadway widening would improve operations to LOS E during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM peak hour.

TRAFFIC IMPACT EVALUATION

Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection

C-TR-13 *The 2010 Community Plan in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the LOS at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM and PM peak hours. (Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)*

General Impacts. Implementation of the 2010 Community Plan would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. As discussed in further detail below, traffic associated with the infill development would cause the LOS at the intersection of Bosworth Street/Diamond Street, which operates at unacceptable conditions during the weekday AM and weekday PM peak hours in 2030 Cumulative Conditions, to continue to operate at unacceptable conditions (see Table III.E-12, p. III.E-74). With the addition of the proposed transportation improvements to the infill development, the LOS also would also operate at unacceptable levels. Implementation of the transportation improvement variants, through the widening of Diamond Street, would improve operations to LOS E during the weekday AM peak hour and LOS D during the weekday PM peak hour. The open space improvements would have a less than significant impact at this intersection. Implementation of mitigation measures identified below would reduce the impact of the infill development to a less-than-significant level, but the impact of the proposed transportation improvements would remain significant and unavoidable.

**TABLE III.E-14
INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE – 2030 CUMULATIVE PLUS VARIANT CONDITIONS**

Intersection		2030 Cumulative Conditions				2030 Cumulative plus Variant Conditions			
		AM		PM		AM		PM	
		LOS (Worst Approach)		LOS (Worst Approach)		LOS (Worst Approach)		LOS (Worst Approach)	
		Delay	Delay	Delay	Delay	Delay	Delay	Delay	Delay
1	Chenery Street / Diamond Street	C	17.3	B	10.7	C (NB)	17.7	B (NB)	10.8
2	Chenery Street / Carrie Street	A (WB)	8.3	A (WB)	8.0	A (WB)	8.3	A (WB)	8.1
3	Chenery Street / Natick Street	B (NB)	11.2	B (NB)	11.3	B (NB)	11.3	B (NB)	11.4
4	Wilder Street/Arlington Street/ Natick Street/San Jose Avenue	A	8.0	A (SB)	8.5	A (SB)	8.1	A (SB)	8.6
5	Wilder Street / Carrie Street	A (SB)	9.5	A (SB)	9.5	A (SB)	9.5	A (SB)	9.5
6	Wilder Street / Diamond Street	B	13.2	B	12.4	B (WB)	13.3	B (WB)	12.5
7	Bosworth Street / Elk Street/Congo Street	F	>80.0	F	>80.0	F	>80.0	F	>80.0
8	Bosworth Street / Lippard Avenue	F	>50.0	E	42.9	F (EB)	>50.0	E (EB)	46.1
9	Bosworth Street / Brompton Avenue	B	13.2	B	13.0	B (WB)	13.3	B (WB)	13.2
10	Bosworth Street / Diamond Street	F	>80.0	D	46.0	E	67.5	D	45.3
11	Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/SB I-280 On-Ramp ^a	E	35.1	E	38.4	B	12.2	B	18.6
12	Bosworth Street / Lyell Street	F	>50.0	F	>50.0	B	13.0	C	24.4
13	Still Street / Lyell Street	C	17.3	B	14.2	C (WB)	17.6	B (WB)	14.4
14	Aleman Boulevard / Lyell Street	D	41.4	D	39.0	D	42.0	D	39.1
15	Monterey Boulevard / Acadia Street	D	24.6	D	34.3	D (SB)	25.2	E (SB)	35.5
16	Monterey Boulevard / Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps	E	57.6	D	38.4	E	67.5	D	47.3
17	Monterey Boulevard/ Joost Avenue	B	12.0	B	11.1	B (SB)	12.5	B (SB)	11.5
18	Monterey Boulevard / Diamond Street/S. Jose Avenue	B	15.9	B	14.2	B	18.2	B	16.6

Source: AECOM, 2010.

Notes: Delay is indicated in seconds per vehicle. **Bold** indicates unacceptable conditions.

For stop-controlled intersections, average delay beyond 50 seconds is shown as ">50.0", as delays greater than 50 seconds are beyond the meaningful range of the analysis methodology.

For signalized intersections, average delay beyond 80 seconds is shown as ">80.0", as delays greater than 80 seconds are beyond the meaningful range of the analysis methodology.

a. The Bosworth St./Arlington St. intersection was broken into three simple intersections. LOS of the worst of the three intersections is reported in the table.

C-TR-13A *The infill development in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to degrade to unacceptable levels during the PM peak hour and significantly contribute to unacceptable operating conditions in the AM peak hour. (Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)*

Infill Development. The infill development would add traffic to this intersection, which under 2030 Cumulative Conditions would operate at unacceptable conditions (LOS F) during the weekday AM peak hour; and degrade from LOS D under 2030 Cumulative Conditions to LOS E under 2030 Cumulative plus Infill Development Conditions during the weekday PM peak hour (see Table III.E-12, p. III.E-74). The degradation in the LOS would be a significant cumulative traffic impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A (signal timing modification), p. III.E-37, identified for Impact TR-1A, would improve traffic operations during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours, but the intersection would continue to operate at unacceptable conditions, and therefore the project's impact at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection during the weekday AM and PM peak hours would remain significant and unavoidable.

C-TR-13B *The addition of the proposed transportation improvements to the infill development, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would cause the intersection level of service at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the PM peak hour and significantly contribute to unacceptable operating conditions in the AM peak hour. (Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)*

Transportation Improvements. Implementation of the transportation improvements in combination with the infill development would add traffic to this intersection, which under 2030 Cumulative Conditions would operate at unacceptable conditions (LOS F) during the weekday AM peak hour; and degrade from LOS D under 2030 Cumulative Conditions to LOS E under 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions during the weekday PM peak hour (see Table III.E-13, p. III.E-75). The infill development's contribution to this intersection's unacceptable operation is cumulatively considerable. Additionally, the proposed transportation improvements at this intersection include an increase in the cycle length to 120 seconds to include a pedestrian scramble phase; and the introduction of leading northbound and southbound left-turn vehicle movements.

While the addition of the approximately 30-second pedestrian scramble phase would worsen traffic delay at this intersection, the other improvements (left turn pockets) cause the average delay during the AM and PM peak hours to slightly improve, resulting in the LOS during both AM and PM peak hours remaining at LOS E. Therefore, as the project improves the pedestrian crossing environment and some vehicle traffic flow, the cumulative traffic impact would continue to be considered significant at this intersection.

Mitigation Measure M-C-TR-13B would reduce the project impacts at this intersection, but the cumulative impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

M-C-TR-13B Intersection #10 Signal Timing Modifications. MTA shall monitor intersection operations at this location as the plan area infill development and transportation improvements occur. Once the transportation improvements are complete and/or the intersection LOS deteriorates to LOS E, if feasible, SFMTA shall re-optimize the signal and increase the cycle length to 150 seconds. This measure would be expected to improve traffic operations during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours under 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions, but the intersection would likely continue to operate at unacceptable conditions, and therefore the project's impact at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection during both AM and PM weekday peak hours would remain significant and unavoidable. A secondary effect of this mitigation, although less than significant, would be that lengthening the cycle would cause pedestrians and vehicles to wait longer before being able to cross and access the intersection. Given the undesirable consequences of a signal cycle length increase of this magnitude, SFMTA has expressed strong reservations about the feasibility of this mitigation measure. For this reason, implementation of this mitigation measures is considered uncertain.

C-TR-13C The implementation of the transportation improvement variants, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not contribute to cumulative traffic conditions at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection. (Less than Significant with Mitigation).

Transportation Improvement Variants. The cumulative intersection LOS and delay would be improved under the variant transportation improvements at the Bosworth

Street/Diamond Street intersection, through the widening of the northbound approach of Diamond Street, as compared with the proposed transportation improvements. The intersection would operate at unacceptable conditions (LOS F) under 2030 Cumulative Conditions. Under 2030 Cumulative plus Variant Conditions, the intersection with roadway widening would operate at LOS E during the weekday AM peak hour and operate at acceptable conditions (LOS D) during the weekday PM peak hour. Although the operation of the intersection improves under 2030 Cumulative plus Variant Conditions, the contribution to the improved LOS E operating conditions in the AM peak hour would still be considered significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A (signal timing modification), p. III.E-37, identified for Impact TR-1A, p. III.E-34, would however, reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

C-TR-13D The 2010 Community Plan includes policies that encourage open space improvements and would not introduce new sources of traffic. (Less than Significant)

Open Space. The 2010 Community Plan includes policies that encourage open space improvements in the plan area. Future open space improvements in the plan area would not alter traffic operations. Furthermore, the proposed improvements would not introduce any new sources of traffic. Therefore, the open space improvements would have a less-than-significant impact on traffic operations.

Summary

The Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection would operate at unacceptable operating conditions (LOS F during the AM peak hour) under 2030 Cumulative Conditions. The traffic generated by the Infill Development Conditions without any of the transportation improvements would cause the PM peak hour LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels (LOS E). While Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A (signal timing modification) would improve conditions, this cumulative impact would remain significant and avoidable. When the transportation improvements (primarily the addition of a pedestrian scramble phase) are included along with the infill development, the LOS would not improve but remain at an unacceptable level. Although re-optimization and lengthening of the signal cycle, proposed as a mitigation measure (M-C-TR-13B), would improve conditions, the impact under the transportation improvements would remain significant and unavoidable. The transportation improvement variants, by widening the Diamond Street northbound movement into adjacent (BART) property, would improve operating conditions to LOS E during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM peak hour; however, this implementation is uncertain due to required

encroachment onto BART property, and the contribution to the improved operating conditions in the AM peak hour would still be considered significant. Under Variant Conditions, re-optimization of the signal cycle, proposed as Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A, would improve conditions to a less-than-significant level. The future open space improvements identified by the 2010 *Community Plan* would not introduce new sources of traffic and would thus have a less-than-significant effect on traffic conditions.

Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps

C-TR-14 The proposed project in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps during the AM peak hour. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

General Impacts. Implementation of the 2010 *Community Plan* would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. As discussed in further detail below, the infill development would add traffic to the intersection at Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps, which would already operate at unacceptable conditions (LOS E) during the weekday AM peak hour under 2030 Cumulative Conditions. With the addition of the proposed transportation improvements and transportation variants to the infill development, the LOS would continue to operate at unacceptable levels. The open space improvements would have a less than significant impact at this intersection. Implementation of mitigation measures identified below would reduce the impact of the infill development and impact of the proposed transportation improvements and variants to a less-than-significant level.

C-TR-14A The infill development plus transportation improvements or transportation improvement variants in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps during the AM peak hour. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Infill Development. The infill development would add traffic to the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection, which would already operate at unacceptable conditions (LOS E) during the weekday AM peak hour under 2030 Cumulative Conditions. The infill development would add seven vehicles to the southbound through movement, which would exceed five percent and, therefore, would be considered a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure

M-TR-2A (signal timing modifications), p. III.E-41, identified previously for Impact TR-2 for Existing plus Project Conditions, would mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level by increasing the signal cycle length by five seconds, improving operations to acceptable conditions (LOS D) during the weekday AM peak hour.

Transportation Improvements. Under 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions, LOS at Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection does not improve, and therefore the impact identified for the infill development would remain significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A (signal timing modification), p. III.E-41, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level by increasing the signal cycle length by five seconds, improving operations to acceptable conditions (LOS D) during the weekday AM peak hour under 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions.

Transportation Improvement Variants. The Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection would continue to operate unacceptably under 2030 Cumulative plus Variant Conditions. This significant cumulative traffic impact would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A, p. III.E-41, which includes signal cycle length changes at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps during the AM peak hour.

C-TR-14B The open space improvements in combination with other foreseeable projects would not cause the LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps during the AM peak hour. (Less than Significant)

Open Space. The 2010 Community Plan includes policies that encourage open space improvements in the plan area. Future open space improvements in the plan area would not alter traffic operations. Furthermore, the proposed improvements would not introduce any new sources of traffic. Therefore, the open space improvements would have a less-than-significant impact on traffic operations.

Summary

At the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection, the traffic generated by the Infill Development Conditions without any of the transportation improvements would cause the intersection to operate at unacceptable conditions (LOS E) during the weekday AM peak hour. Under 2030 Cumulative plus Project and Variant Conditions, LOS at Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection does not improve, and therefore the impact identified for the infill development would remain significant. The delays at this

intersection could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by modifying the signal timing (Mitigation measure MR-TR-2A). The future open space improvements identified by the 2010 *Community Plan* would not introduce new sources of traffic and would thus have a less than significant effect on traffic conditions.

Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street, Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue, the Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/SB I-280 On-Ramp, Bosworth Street/Lyell Street, and the Monterey Boulevard/Acadia Street Intersections

C-TR-15 *The 2010 Community Plan in combination with other foreseeable projects would not substantially increase traffic at the following intersections operating unacceptably under 2030 Cumulative Conditions: the Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street intersection; the Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue intersection; the Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/SB I-280 On-Ramp intersection; the Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersection; and the Monterey Boulevard/Acadia Street intersection. The transportation improvement variants would improve conditions to acceptable levels at the Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersection. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Implementation of the 2010 *Community Plan* would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. As discussed in further detail below, the infill development would add traffic to the intersections at Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street, Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue, Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/SB I-280 On-Ramp, Bosworth Street/Lyell Street, and the Monterey Boulevard/Acadia Street intersections, which with the exception of the Monterey Boulevard/Acadia Street intersection would already operate at unacceptable conditions during the both weekday AM and PM peak hour under 2030 Cumulative Conditions. The infill development would not contribute significantly to the unacceptable operating conditions under 2030 Cumulative Conditions at these intersections and its cumulative contribution would be considered less than significant. The addition of the proposed transportation improvements would not improve or worsen conditions at these intersections, therefore, the LOS also would continue to operate at unacceptable levels. Implementation of the transportation improvement variants, together with the infill development, would not alter the level of service or delay, with the exception of the Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersections where operations with proposed

signalization would be improved. The open space improvements would have a less-than-significant impact at these intersections.

Infill Development. The additional traffic generated by the infill development at the Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street, Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue, Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/SB I-280 On-Ramp, and Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersections would not contribute significantly to the unacceptable operating conditions under 2030 Cumulative Conditions. At the Monterey Boulevard/Acadia Street intersection, the additional traffic would cause the LOS to degrade from LOS D to LOS E; however signal warrants would not be met. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.

Transportation Improvements. The transportation improvements in combination with the infill development's contribution to cumulative traffic operation at the Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street, Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue, Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/SB I-280 On-Ramp, Bosworth Street/Lyell Street, and the Monterey Boulevard/Acadia Street intersections were found to be less than significant. The proposed transportation improvements identified in the *2010 Community Plan* would not improve or worsen conditions at these intersections, and, therefore, the proposed transportation improvements impact would remain less than significant.

Transportation Improvement Variants. The variants would not alter the level of service or delay at the Bosworth Street/Elk Street/Congo Street, Bosworth Street/Lippard Avenue, and the Monterey Boulevard/Acadia Street intersections, from that identified for the transportation improvements. The variants, through signalizing Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersection and including a roundabout at the Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/SB I-280 On Ramp, would improve the operating conditions at these intersections to LOS B during the AM peak hour and LOS B and LOS C, respectively, during the PM peak hour. As a result, the Variant Conditions would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact.

Open Space. The *2010 Community Plan* includes policies that encourage open space improvements in the plan area. Future open space improvements in the plan area would not alter traffic operations. Furthermore, the proposed improvements would not introduce any new sources of traffic. Therefore, the open space improvements would have a less-than-significant impact on traffic operations.

Remaining Intersections

C-TR-16 *The 2010 Community Plan in combination with other foreseeable projects would alter traffic at 11 other study intersections in the plan area; however, the intersection LOS would continue to operate at acceptable levels. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Implementation of the 2010 Community Plan would not, in itself, result in the construction of new development, but would establish a policy framework to encourage new residential, retail and commercial development, transportation/street improvements, and open space improvements. As discussed in further detail below, traffic associated with development of the infill sites and the transportation improvements or variants would have a less-than-significant impact at the 11 other study area intersections evaluated. The open space improvements would have a less-than-significant impact at these intersections.

Infill Development. The transportation analysis of the proposed project evaluated 18 intersections in and near the plan area. Table III.E-12, p. III.E-74, shows that there are seven intersections that operate at unacceptable levels of service (LOS E or LOS F) under 2030 Cumulative plus Infill Development Conditions. All 11 other intersections would operate at acceptable levels of service with the infill development. As a result, infill development would have a less-than-significant traffic impact at these intersections.

Transportation Improvements. The same 11 other intersections that would operate at acceptable levels of service under the 2030 Cumulative plus Infill Development Conditions would operate at acceptable levels under the Project Conditions (see Table III.E-13, p. III.E-75). While the overall intersection operations would not deteriorate, the proposed transportation improvements would change the local roadway network by modifying the signalization at the intersection of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street and reversing the direction of Natick Street and Carrie Street. The delays at the intersections of Chenery Street/Carrie Street, Chenery Street/Natick Street, Wilder Street/Arlington Street/Natick Street/San Jose Avenue, and Wilder Street/Carrie Street would change slightly as a result of the reversal of direction on Carrie Street and Natick Street, but would continue to operate at acceptable conditions.

Transportation Improvement Variants. The transportation improvements variants would change the local roadway network by widening the roadway at the northbound approach of Diamond Street; changing the intersection of Arlington Street/Bosworth Street/SB I-280 On-Ramp to a roundabout configuration; and signalizing the intersection of Bosworth Street/Lyell Street. A northbound right-turn pocket added by widening Diamond Street at Bosworth Street would decrease vehicular delay. The intersection of Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/SB I-280 On-Ramp would operate as a single-lane roundabout, which would reduce vehicle delay and thereby improve the level of service. The unsignalized intersection of Bosworth Street and Lyell Street would operate as a signalized intersection with separate northbound left- and right-turn lane pockets, which would similarly improve the level of service operating conditions.

As shown in Table III.E-14, p. III.E-77, with the improvements proposed, the same 11 intersections would continue to operate acceptably under 2030 Cumulative plus Variants Conditions, and the Bosworth Street/Arlington Street/SB I-280 On-Ramp along with the Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersections would improve to acceptable operating conditions.

Open Space. The 2010 Community Plan includes policies that encourage open space improvements in the plan area. As described under Impact TR-1D, p. III.E-39, the open space improvements could attract more pedestrians or bicyclists to travel into and through Glen Park. The increase in pedestrian and bicyclists would be a desired outcome of the open space improvements, and would have a less-than-significant traffic effect at the 11 other study area intersections.

TRANSIT IMPACT EVALUATION

C-TR-17 The 2010 Community Plan (with either the transportation improvements or the transportation improvement variants) in combination with other foreseeable projects would not cause a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity, resulting in unacceptable levels of transit service. (Less than Significant)

The SFMTA has drafted several recommended service changes based on information gathered during TEP data collection. The recommendations include improved service on some routes through the study area, including the 35 Eureka, 44 O'Shaughnessy, and Muni Metro J-Church, and service cuts on others. As discussed above, BART is also looking at improving the Glen Park BART Station to address

future ridership by improving station entry and circulation. The planned TEP changes or potential BART improvements to the station are not expected to substantially affect project-generated transit ridership. Given that a majority of the project-generated transit ridership is expected to make use of BART, the TEP changes would likely have a negligible effect on which transit services project-generated riders choose to use. Similarly, although any transit-related improvements can foster some mode-shifts to transit, the BART improvements were proposed to address future ridership needs, and therefore, it is not anticipated that station improvements would substantially increase ridership levels. Furthermore, the transportation improvements or variant transportation improvements would be consistent with the implementation of these potential future improvements.

Muni. All but one of the Muni lines in the plan area would operate at above established capacity utilization standards under 2030 Cumulative Conditions. The Muni Metro J-Church would have the highest capacity utilization at 89 percent. As discussed under the project analysis, the infill development's contribution to this capacity utilization would not be considered significant. Consequently, the infill sites (with either the transportation improvements or the transportation improvement variants) would have a less-than-significant impact on Muni ridership and capacity under 2030 Cumulative Conditions.

BART. BART ridership on the south Downtown screenline would not exceed the 115 percent capacity threshold. On the east Downtown screenline, BART ridership would exceed the 135 percent capacity threshold in the Transbay Tube. However, as discussed in Impact TR-6, p. III.E-48, and Impact TR-8, p. III.E-56, the infill development would only add three to four additional passengers to the east Downtown screenline MLP in the peak hour, and this only a fraction of a percent of the total ridership at the MLP.

Therefore, the infill development (with either the transportation improvements or the transportation improvement variants) would have a less-than-significant impact to BART service under 2030 Cumulative Conditions, as the addition of project-generated transit ridership would not cause capacity utilization to exceed established thresholds, and the project's contribution would not be significant at locations where the MLP would exceed the established threshold.

C-TR-18 *The 2010 Community Plan (with either the transportation improvements or the transportation improvement variants) in combination with other foreseeable development*

would not cause a substantial increase in transit travel times or conflict with transit operations. (Less than Significant)

In general, operational impacts to cumulative transit service as a result of the infill development and transportation improvements are expected to be similar to the impacts under Existing plus Project Condition (see Impact TR-6, p. III.E-48, and Impact TR-7, p. III.E-52), although slightly worse due to background growth in traffic and transit ridership.

The 35 Eureka would be rerouted and extended to serve the Glen Park BART Station, stopping on the south side of Bosworth Street. Buses would loop back onto Diamond Street via Arlington Street and Wilder Street. Under the proposed transportation improvements, a bus loop at the BART Station and bus-only left-turn on westbound Bosworth Street would be available for use by the extended 35 Eureka. Overall, the effect on travel times is expected to be negligible. Although total distance traveled would increase slightly under the proposed improvement, there is the potential for some time savings, as the 35 Eureka could get delayed trying to stop at Bosworth Street/Diamond Street as a result of other buses or private autos. The dedicated bus loop under the proposed improvement would reduce the potential for competition for curb space. Therefore, the infill development and proposed transportation improvements would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact to transit operations or travel times.

Under the 2030 Cumulative plus Variant Conditions, the stop for the 35 Eureka at the BART Station would remain on the south side of Bosworth Street, and no substantial impacts are expected beyond what would already occur without the project. Therefore, the variant transportation improvements would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact to transit operations or travel times.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

F. NOISE AND VIBRATION

INTRODUCTION

This section of the EIR discusses existing and future sources of noise and vibration in the plan area and vicinity and examines the potential for: (1) exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the Environmental Protection Element of the *San Francisco General Plan* (General Plan) and San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29, San Francisco Police Code); (2) exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration levels; (3) a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; (4) a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; or (5) substantial impacts from existing noise sources.

Data used to prepare this analysis were obtained from the Environmental Protection Element of the General Plan; from the Federal Transit Administration's Transit Noise and Vibration and Impact Assessment methodology;¹ and by measuring and modeling of existing and future noise levels within the project area and vicinity, completed by PBS&J.² Traffic information contained in the transportation impact study for this EIR was used to prepare the noise modeling for vehicular sources.³ As discussed in the Initial Study, p. 56 (see Appendix A of this EIR), the plan area is not located near a major commercial airport or private airstrip and would not expose future residents, employees, and visitors to substantial aircraft noise. Therefore, this issue is not discussed in the EIR.

ACOUSTIC TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS

Sound is created when vibrating objects produce pressure variations that move rapidly outward into the surrounding air. The main characteristics of these air pressure waves are amplitude, which we experience as a sound's loudness, and frequency, which we experience as a sound's pitch. The standard unit of sound amplitude is the decibel (dB); it is a measure of the physical

¹ Federal Transit Administration: Office of Planning and Environment, *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, May 2006. Available at: http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_anual.pdf, accessed November 22, 2010.

² PBS&J, Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas, and Noise Calculations Memorandum to Lisa Gibson, August 24, 2010. This report is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

³ AECOM, *Glen Park Community Plan EIR Transportation Impact Study – Final Report*, December 3, 2010. This report is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

magnitude of the pressure variations relative to the human threshold of perception. The human ear's sensitivity to sound amplitude is frequency-dependent; it is more sensitive to sounds in the mid-frequency range than to sounds with much lower or higher frequencies.

Most "real world" sounds (e.g., a dog barking, a car passing, etc.) are complex mixtures of many different frequency components each having different amplitudes. When the average amplitude of such sounds is measured with a sound level meter, it is common for the instrument to apply adjustment factors to each of the measured sound's frequency components. These factors account for the differences in perceived loudness of each of the sound's frequency components relative to those to which the human ear is most sensitive. Because the human ear is not equally sensitive to a given sound level at all frequencies, a special frequency-dependent rating scale is used to relate noise to human sensitivity. The A-weighted decibel scale (dBA) provides this compensation by discriminating against frequencies in a manner approximating the sensitivity of the human ear. The unit of A-weighted sound amplitude is also the decibel. In reporting measurements to which A-weighting has been applied, an "A" is appended to dB (dBA) to make this clear. In some cases, however, it is useful to know the actual average sound amplitude without application of the A-weighting factors; this type of averaging is called C-weighting and its result is reported in C-weighted decibels (dBC). Finally, since environmental sound levels usually vary greatly over time, it is often useful to know the degree of variability at a particular location over any measurement period. This variability is specified in terms of statistical sound levels (L_n), where n is the percentage of time these levels are exceeded during the measurement period. For example, L_{10} , L_{50} , and L_{90} are descriptors that represent the sound level exceeded 10 percent of the time, 50 percent of the time, and 90 percent of the time, respectively, during a measurement, while L_{min} and L_{max} represent the minimum and maximum sound levels during the measurement period.

Noise is the term generally given to the intrusive, "unwanted" aspects of sound. Many factors influence how a sound is perceived and whether it is considered harmful or disruptive to an individual or a community. These factors include the primary physical characteristics of a sound (e.g., amplitude, frequency, duration, etc.), but also secondary acoustic and non-acoustic factors that can influence judgment regarding the degree to which it is intrusive and disruptive. Table III.F-1, p. III.F-3, lists representative noise levels for the environment.

**TABLE III.F-1
REPRESENTATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL NOISE LEVELS**

Common Outdoor Activities	Noise Level (dBA)	Common Indoor Activities
	—110—	Rock Band
Jet Fly-over at 100 feet	—105—	
	—100—	
Gas Lawnmower at 3 feet	—95—	
	—90—	
	—85—	Food Blender at 3 feet
Diesel Truck going 50 mph at 50 feet	—80—	Garbage Disposal at 3 feet
Noisy Urban Area during Daytime	—75—	
Gas Lawnmower at 100 feet	—70—	Vacuum Cleaner at 10 feet
Commercial Area	—65—	Normal Speech at 3 feet
Heavy Traffic at 300 feet	—60—	
	—55—	Large Business Office
Quiet Urban Area during Daytime	—50—	Dishwasher in Next Room
	—45—	
Quiet Urban Area during Nighttime	—40—	Theater, Large Conference Room (background)
Quiet Suburban Area during Nighttime	—35—	
	—30—	Library
Quiet Rural Area during Nighttime	—25—	Bedroom at Night, Concert Hall (background)
	—20—	
	—15—	Broadcast/Recording Studio
	—10—	
	—5—	
Lowest Threshold of Human Hearing	—0—	Lowest Threshold of Human Hearing

Source: California Department of Transportation, Technical Noise Supplement, 1998.

The General Plan has defined noise-sensitive uses as land uses and/or receptors that include residences of all types, schools, libraries, hospitals, convalescent facilities, rest homes, hotels, motels, and places of worship. Sensitive uses from a noise perspective include places where there is a reasonable expectation that individuals could be sleeping, learning, worshipping, or recuperating. All quantitative descriptors used to measure environmental noise exposure recognize the strong correlation between the high acoustical energy content of a sound (i.e., its loudness and duration) and the disruptive effect it is likely to have as noise. Because environmental noise fluctuates over time, most such descriptors average the sound level over the time of exposure, and some add “penalties” during the times of day when intrusive sounds would be more disruptive to listeners. The rating scales of L_{eq} , L_{min} , and L_{max} are measures of ambient noise, while the L_{dn} and Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) are measures of community noise. L_{eq} is the average A-weighted sound level measured over a given time interval. L_{eq} can be measured over any time period, but is typically measured for 1-minute, 15-minute, 1-hour, or 24-hour periods. L_{dn} is another average A-weighted sound level measured

over a 24-hour time period. However, this noise scale is adjusted to account for some individuals' increased sensitivity to noise levels during the evening and nighttime hours. L_{eq} , L_{min} , and L_{max} , as well as L_{dn} and CNEL are all applicable to this analysis.

The most commonly used noise descriptors for environmental exposures are:

- **L_{eq}** , the equivalent-energy noise level, is the average acoustic energy⁴ content of noise over any chosen exposure time. The L_{eq} is the constant noise level that would deliver the same acoustic energy to the ear as the actual time-varying noise over the same exposure time. L_{eq} does not depend on the time of day during which the noise occurs. L_{dn} , the day-night average noise level, is a 24-hour average L_{eq} with a 10 dBA "penalty" added to noise during the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. to account for increased nighttime noise sensitivity. Because of this penalty, the L_{dn} would always be higher than its corresponding 24-hour L_{eq} (e.g., a constant 60 dBA noise over 24 hours would have a 60 dB L_{eq} , but a 66.4 dBA L_{dn}).
- **L_{min}** , Minimum Noise Level, is the lowest A/B/C weighted integrated noise level during a specific period of time.
- **L_{max}** , Maximum Noise Level, is the highest A/B/C weighted integrated noise level occurring during a specific period of time.
- **CNEL**, the Community Noise Equivalent Level, is a 24-hour average L_{eq} with a 5 dBA "weighting" during the hours of 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. and a 10 dBA "weighting" added to noise during the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. to account for noise sensitivity in the evening and nighttime, respectively. The logarithmic effect of these additions is that a 60 dBA-24 hour L_{eq} would result in a measurement of 66.7 dBA CNEL.
- **SEL**, the sound exposure level (also known as the single noise event level), is the constant noise level that would deliver the same acoustic energy to the ear of a listener during a one-second exposure as the actual time-varying noise would deliver over its entire time of occurrence.⁵ SEL is typically used to characterize the effects of short-duration noise events (e.g., aircraft fly-overs or train pass-bys).

Noise levels from a particular source decline as distance to the receptor increases. Other factors, such as the weather and other reflecting or shielding factors, also help intensify or reduce the

⁴ Averaging sound levels in decibels is not done by standard arithmetic averaging, but according to the following rule:

$L_{eq} = 10 \times \log\left(\frac{1}{n} \times (10^{L_1/10} + 10^{L_2/10} + \dots + 10^{L_n/10})\right)$; where L_1, L_2, L_n are n individual sound levels.

For example, the L_{eq} of the sound levels $L_1 = 60$ dBA and $L_2 = 70$ dBA is 67.4 dBA, not 65 dBA as it would if standard arithmetic averaging were used. The larger individual sound levels contribute much more substantially to the L_{eq} than they would to an average done in the standard way.

⁵ For a sound lasting longer than one second, its SEL would be higher than that of the largest of the shorter-duration component sounds that make up the total. For example, if a sound with a ten-second-long duration made up of 10 one-second-long component sounds, each of 60 dBA amplitude, its SEL would be 70 dBA

noise level at any given location. A commonly used rule of thumb for roadway noise is that for every doubling of distance from the source, the noise level is reduced by about 3 dBA at acoustically “hard” locations (i.e., where the area between the noise source and the receptor is nearly complete asphalt, concrete, hard-packed soil, or other solid materials) and 4.5 dBA at acoustically “soft” locations (i.e., where the area between the source and receptor is unpacked earth or has vegetation, including grass). Noise from stationary or point sources (such as commercial heating and ventilation units [HVAC] or construction equipment) is reduced by about 6 to 7.5 dBA for every doubling of distance at acoustically hard and soft locations, respectively. Generally, if a noise source is completely enclosed or completely shielded with a solid barrier located close to the source, an 8 dBA noise reduction can be expected; if the enclosure and/or barrier it is interrupted, noise would be reduced by only 5 dBA. The exterior-to-interior reduction of newer residential units and office buildings is generally 30 dBA or more.

FUNDAMENTALS OF ENVIRONMENTAL GROUND BORNE VIBRATION

Vibrating objects in contact with the ground radiate energy through the ground. If the object is massive enough and/or close enough to an observer, the ground vibrations are perceptible. Vibration magnitude is measured in vibration decibels (VdB) relative to a 1 micro-inch-per-second reference level. Background vibration levels in most inhabited areas are usually 50 VdB or lower, well below the threshold of perception (i.e., typically about 65 VdB). In most cases, when vibration is perceptible to people in their homes or workplaces, the source is within the same building (i.e., operation of HVAC equipment, movement of other occupants, slamming of doors, etc.). The outdoor sources most commonly responsible for producing perceptible vibration are heavy construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and motor vehicle traffic on rough roads (if the roadway is smooth, the vibration from traffic is rarely perceptible). At about 100 VdB, vibration levels are strong enough to begin to cause structural damage in fragile buildings.

Vibration at high enough levels can result in human annoyance. Groundborne vibration can also potentially damage the foundations and exteriors of fragile structures if they are close enough to the construction activity. However, damage potential is typically limited to vibration generated by impact equipment, such as pile drivers.

HEALTH EFFECTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL NOISE

The World Health Organization (WHO) is perhaps the best source of current knowledge regarding health impacts due to the fact that the European nations have continued to study noise and its health effects, while the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) all but

eliminated its noise investigation and control program in the 1970s.⁶ According to WHO, sleep disturbance can occur when continuous indoor noise levels exceed 30 dBA or when intermittent interior noise levels reach 45 dBA, particularly if background noise is low. With a bedroom window slightly open (a reduction from outside to inside of 15 dB), the WHO criteria would suggest exterior continuous (ambient) nighttime noise levels should be 45 dBA or below, and short-term events should not generate noise in excess of 60 dBA. WHO also notes that maintaining noise levels within the recommended levels during the first part of the night is believed to be effective for the ability to fall asleep.⁷

Other potential health effects of noise identified by WHO include decreased performance on complex cognitive tasks, such as reading, attention, problem solving, and memorization; physiological effects such as hypertension and heart disease (after many years of constant exposure, often by workers, to high noise levels); and hearing impairment (again, generally after long-term occupational exposure, although shorter-term exposure to very high noise levels, for example, exposure several times a year to concert noise at 100 dBA). Noise can also disrupt speech intelligibility at relatively low levels; for example, in a classroom setting, a noise level as low as 35 dBA can disrupt clear understanding. Finally, noise can cause annoyance, and can trigger emotional reactions like anger, depression, and anxiety. WHO reports that, during daytime hours, few people are seriously annoyed by activities with noise levels below 55 dBA, or moderately annoyed with noise levels below 50 dBA. The City and County of San Francisco has incorporated WHO findings into the San Francisco Noise Ordinance.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

EXISTING NOISE ENVIRONMENT

The plan area is located in the center of the Glen Park neighborhood, which includes mixed-use residential and commercial uses. Noise sources within the plan area are primarily automobiles and buses. East and south of Glen Park, major transportation corridors include I-280, U.S. 101, San Jose Avenue, and Mission Street. The Glen Park BART Station is also within the plan area; however, the BART tracks are below ground within the plan area.

In 2008, the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFPDH) produced a comprehensive map showing the transportation noise levels on every street throughout the City, as well as the

⁶ The *San Francisco General Plan Land Use Compatibility Guidelines* for Community Noise were created during the same era.

⁷ World Health Organization, *Guidelines for Community Noise*. Geneva, 1999. Available at: <http://www.who.int/docstore/peh/noise/guidelines2.html>.

areas subject to noise levels over 60 dBA (L_{dn}).⁸ This map was created using a digital local traffic-based model, which was based on the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Traffic Noise Model. In order to more precisely characterize the existing noise environment in the plan area, PBS&J conducted long- and short-term noise measurements at five locations. One long-term (24-hour) measurement was taken within the existing BART parking lot and was measured to be 69.4 dBA L_{eq} for the 24-hour period, with a maximum hourly average noise level occurring during the hours of 12:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.⁹ Noise levels for the long- and short-term measurements are shown in Table III.F-2, below, and the locations of these measurements are shown in Figure III.F-1 on p. III.F-8. Figure III.F-2 on p. III.F-9 shows the results of the long-term noise measurement. Short-term traffic noise measurements (i.e., 15 minutes each) were also taken within the project area at four near-curb locations in the plan area during the weekday PM peak commute period.¹⁰ Short-term noise measurement locations were chosen based on the projected traffic increases associated with the *2010 Community Plan* in the transportation study, and the location of sensitive receptors along those roadways.

TABLE III.F-2
EXISTING PEAK-HOUR TRAFFIC NOISE MEASUREMENTS (L_{eq})

Noise Receptor	Land Use Description	Noise Level (dBA)			Primary Noise Source
		L_{eq}	L_{min}	L_{max}	
L-1	BART Parking Lot – Infill Site (24-hour measurement)	69.4	41.5	99.3	Traffic along Bosworth
S-1	Residential Uses along Lyell south of San Jose Avenue overcrossing	71.5	63.5	90.5	Traffic along Lyell
S-2	Vacant Lot between Bosworth and Kern – Infill Site	59.8	51.9	75.3	Traffic along Bosworth
S-3	Residential Uses along Diamond Street west of Bosworth (across from BART Station)	67.2	57.8	83.8	Traffic along Diamond Street
S-4	Residential Uses along Monterey Boulevard west of Arcadia	68.9	54.2	91.1	Traffic along Monterey

Source: PBS&J, 2010.

Notes:

Long-term noise measurement was taken from 4:00 p.m. on February 17, 2010 to 4:00 p.m. on February 18, 2010.

Short-term noise measurements were taken on February 17, 2010, between the hours of 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. for 15 minutes each.

⁸ San Francisco Department of Public Health, *Transportation Noise Map 2008*, 2008. Available at: <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/files/EHSdocs/ehsPublSDocs/Noise/TransitNoiseMap.pdf>

⁹ Long-term noise measurement was taken by PBS&J using a Larson Davis Model 720 digital sound level meter from 4:00 p.m. on February 17, 2010 to 4:00 p.m. on February 18, 2010.


¹⁰ Short-term noise measurements were taken by PBS&J using a Larson-Davis Model 820 sound level meter on February 17, 2010, between the hours of 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. for 15 minutes each.



SOURCE: PBS&J, 2010.



GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE III.F-1: NOISE MONITORING LOCATIONS



SOURCE: PBS&J, February 17, 2010.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE III.F-2: LONG-TERM NOISE MEASUREMENT, BART PARKING LOT

Existing noise-sensitive uses in the project area and vicinity include residential uses throughout the Glen Park neighborhood, including residents along Diamond Street and Bosworth Street. Schools in the project vicinity include Glen Park Elementary School and Saint John School along Bosworth Street. The Glen Park Library is also located on Diamond Street near Bosworth Street.

EXISTING GROUNDBORNE VIBRATION ENVIRONMENT

Typical sources of groundborne vibration in the plan area are heavy-duty vehicular travel (e.g., refuse trucks, delivery trucks, and transit buses) on local roadways such as Bosworth Street, Diamond Street, and Monterey Boulevard. Trucks and buses typically generate groundborne vibration velocity levels of around 63 VdB, and these levels could reach 72 VdB where trucks and buses pass over bumps in the road.¹¹ Vibration is also caused by BART, which travels underground through the plan area.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

FEDERAL

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

The Federal *Noise Control Act of 1972* addressed the issue of noise as a threat to human health and welfare, particularly in urban areas. In response to the Act, the EPA published *Information of Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety* (EPA Levels). Table III.F-3, p. III.F-11, summarizes EPA recommendations for noise-sensitive areas. Ideally, the yearly average L_{eq} should not exceed 70 dBA to prevent measurable hearing loss over a lifetime, and the L_{dn} should not exceed 55 dBA outdoors and 45 dBA indoors to prevent significant activity interference and annoyance in noise-sensitive areas. In addition to the identified noise levels to protect public health, the EPA Levels identify an increase of 5 dBA as an adequate margin of safety relative to a baseline noise exposure level of 55 dBA L_{dn} before a noticeable increase in adverse community reaction would be expected.

¹¹ Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, May 2006.

TABLE III.F-3
SUMMARY OF NOISE LEVELS IDENTIFIED AS REQUISITE TO PROTECT
PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE WITH AN ADEQUATE MARGIN OF SAFETY

Effect	Level	Area
Hearing Loss	$L_{eq}(24 \text{ hr}) < 70 \text{ dBA}^a$	All areas.
Outdoor activity interference and annoyance	$L_{dn} < 55 \text{ dBA}$	Outdoors in residential areas and farms and other outdoor areas where people spend widely varying amounts of time and other places in which quiet is a basis for use.
Outdoor activity interference and annoyance	$L_{eq}(24 \text{ hr}) < 55 \text{ dBA}$	Outdoor areas where people spend limited amounts of time, such as school yards, playgrounds, etc.
Indoor activity interference and annoyance	$L_{dn} < 45 \text{ dBA}$	Indoor residential areas.
Indoor activity interference and annoyance	$L_{eq}(24 \text{ hr}) < 45 \text{ dBA}$	Other indoor areas with human activities such as schools, etc.

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety*, March 1974.

Note:

a. Yearly average equivalent sound levels in decibels; the exposure period that results in hearing loss at the identified level is a period of forty years.

Federal Transit Administration

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) developed a methodology and significance criteria to evaluate noise impacts from surface transportation modes (i.e., passenger cars, trucks, buses, and rail) in Transit Noise Impact and Vibration Assessment (FTA Guidelines).¹² The incremental noise impact criteria, as presented in Table III.F-4, p. III.F-12, are based on EPA Levels and subsequent studies of annoyance in communities affected by transportation noise and contained in the FTA Guidelines. The scientific rationale for the choice of these criteria is also explained in the FTA Guidelines. Starting from the EPA's definition of minimal noise impact as a 5 dBA change from an established protective ambient level, the FTA extended the EPA's incremental impact criteria to higher baseline ambient levels. As baseline ambient noise levels increase, smaller and smaller increments of additional noise are allowed to limit increases in community annoyance (e.g., in residential areas with a baseline ambient noise level of 50 dBA L_{dn} , a 5 dBA increase in noise levels would be acceptable, while at 70 dBA L_{dn} , only a 1 dBA increase would be allowed).

¹² Federal Transit Administration: Office of Planning and Environment, *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, May 2006. Available at: http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf. Accessed November 22, 2010.

**TABLE III.F-4
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION
IMPACT CRITERIA FOR NOISE-SENSITIVE USES**

Residences and Buildings Where People Normally Sleep^a		Institutional Land Uses with Primarily Daytime and Evening Uses^b	
Existing L_{dn} (dBA)	Allowable Noise Increment (dBA)	Existing Peak Hour L_{eq} (dBA)	Allowable Noise Increment (dBA)
45	8	45	12
50	5	50	9
55	3	55	6
60	2	60	5
65	1	65	3
70	1	70	3
75	0	75	1
80	0	80	0

Source: Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise Impact and Vibration Assessment, May 2006.

Notes:

- a. This category includes homes, hospitals, and hotels where a nighttime sensitivity to noise is assumed to be of utmost importance.
- b. This category includes schools, libraries, theaters, and churches where it is important to avoid interference with such activities as speech, meditation, and concentration on reading material.

The FTA has also developed criteria for judging the significance of vibration produced by transportation sources and construction activity, as shown in Table III.F-5, p. III.F-13. The FTA Guidelines provide screening distances for various transportation-related vibration sources. For a rapid transit railway, such as BART, the screening distance would be 200 feet (measured from source to receptor).

Under Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) regulations, noise abatement must be considered for new highway construction and highway reconstruction projects when the noise levels approach or exceed the noise-abatement criteria. For residential, school, and other noise sensitive sites, these criteria indicate that the L_{eq} during the noisiest 1-hour period of the day should not exceed 67 dBA at the exterior or 52 dBA within the interior. For commercial uses, the exterior L_{eq} should not exceed 72 dBA.

**TABLE III.F-5
GROUNDBORNE VIBRATION IMPACT CRITERIA FOR GENERAL ASSESSMENT**

Land Use Category	Impact Levels (VdB; relative to 1 micro-inch/second)		
	Frequent Events ^a	Occasional Events ^b	Infrequent Events ^c
Category 1: Buildings where vibration would interfere with interior operations	65 ^d	65 ^d	65 ^d
Category 2: Residences and buildings where people normally sleep	72	75	80
Category 3: Institutional land uses with primarily daytime uses	75	78	83

Source: Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise Impact and Vibration Assessment, May 2006.

Notes:

- a. "Frequent Events" is defined as more than 70 vibration events of the same source per day.
- b. "Occasional Events" is defined as between 30 and 70 vibration events of the same source per day.
- c. "Infrequent Events" is defined as fewer than 30 vibration events of the same source per day.
- d. This criterion limit is based on levels that are acceptable for most moderately sensitive equipment such as optical microscopes. Vibration-sensitive manufacturing or research would require detailed evaluation to define the acceptable vibration levels.

STATE

Governor's Office of Planning and Research

The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) *General Plan Guidelines 2003* (GP Guidelines) promotes use of L_{dn} or CNEL for evaluating the compatibility of various land uses with respect to their noise exposure. The designation of a level of noise exposure as "normally acceptable" for a given land use category implies that the interior noise levels would be acceptable to the occupants without the need for any special structural acoustic treatment. The GP Guidelines identify the suitability of various types of construction relative to a range of outdoor noise levels. The GP Guidelines provide each local community some flexibility in setting local noise standards that allow for the variability in community preferences. Findings presented in the EPA Levels influenced the recommendations of the GP Guidelines, most importantly in the choice of noise exposure metrics (i.e., L_{dn} or CNEL) and in the upper limits for the "normally acceptable" outdoor exposure of noise-sensitive uses (i.e., no higher than 60 dBA L_{dn} /CNEL for residential, which is obtained when the EPA's 5 dBA margin of safety is added to the baseline noise exposure level of 55 dBA level that the EPA believes is completely adequate to protect public health and welfare). The City has adopted and changed the GP Guidelines for use within San Francisco.

Title 25 (California Noise Insulation Standards)

The California Noise Insulation Standards (California Code of Regulations, Title 25, Section 1092) establishes uniform minimum noise insulation performance standards for new hotels, motels, dormitories, apartment houses, and dwellings other than detached single-family dwellings. Specifically, Title 25 states that interior noise levels attributable to exterior sources shall not exceed 45 dBA L_{dn} or CNEL (the same levels that the EPA recommends for residential interiors) in any habitable room of new dwellings. Acoustical studies must be prepared for proposed multiple unit residential and hotel/motel structures where outdoor L_{dn} or CNEL is 60 dBA or greater. The studies must demonstrate that the design of the building would reduce interior noise to 45 dBA L_{dn} or CNEL, or lower. Dwellings are to be designed so that interior noise levels would meet this standard for at least ten years from the time of building permit application. Interior noise levels can be reduced through the use of noise-insulating windows, and by using sound isolation materials when constructing walls and ceilings.

LOCAL

San Francisco General Plan

The General Plan focuses on the effect that noise from ground-transportation noise sources has on the community and identifies a range of noise levels considered generally compatible or incompatible with various land uses and indicates when special noise reduction requirements should be considered or analyzed, such as providing sound insulation for affected properties. Residential and hotel uses are considered compatible in areas where the noise level is 60 dBA L_{dn} or less; schools, classrooms, libraries, churches, and hospitals are compatible in areas where the noise level is 65 dBA L_{dn} or less; and playgrounds, parks, offices, retail commercial uses, and noise-sensitive manufacturing and communication uses are considered compatible in areas where the noise level is 70 dBA L_{dn} or less.

San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29, San Francisco Police Code)

The San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29, San Francisco Police Code, Section 2900) specifically recognizes that adverse effects on a community can arise from noise sources such as transportation, construction, mechanical equipment, entertainment, and human and animal behavior. The Noise Ordinance makes the following declaration:

It shall be the policy of San Francisco to maintain noise levels in areas with existing healthful and acceptable levels of noise and to reduce noise levels, through all practicable means, in those areas of San Francisco where noise

levels are above acceptable levels as defined by the World Health Organization's Guidelines on Community Noise.

The following policies are included to address and limit disruptive noise intrusions from these sources.

Waste Disposal Services (Section 2904)

The Noise Ordinance limits noise from waste disposal services mechanical or hydraulic device to 75 dBA when measured from 50 feet. This maximum noise level does not apply to the noise associated with crushing, impacting, dropping, or moving garbage on the truck, but only to the truck's mechanical processing system.

Construction (Sections 2907 and 2908)

The Noise Ordinance limits noise from powered construction equipment to a level of 80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet (or an equivalent level at some other distance).¹³ This does not apply to impact tools (provided they are equipped with appropriate noise control features recommended by the manufacturers and approved by the Director of Public Works or the Director of Building Inspection) nor to construction equipment used in connection with emergency work. Also, construction activities are generally prohibited between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. if the noise created would be in excess of the ambient noise level by 5 dBA at the nearest property line (although exceptions to these limits can be made in certain cases by the Director of Public Works or the Director of Building Inspection).

Noise Limits (Section 2909)

Construction noise is regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code), amended in November 2008. The ordinance requires that noise levels from individual pieces of construction equipment, other than impact tools, not exceed 80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the source. Impact tools (jackhammers, hoerammers, impact wrenches) must have both intake and exhaust mufflers as well as be equipped with acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works or the Director of Building Inspection. Section 2908 of the Ordinance prohibits construction work between 8:00 p.m. and

¹³ By definition, Noise Ordinance Section 2901(j) states "Powered construction equipment" means any tools, machinery, or equipment used in connection with construction operations which can be driven by energy in any form other than manpower, including all types of motor vehicles when used in the construction process of any construction site, regardless of whether such construction site be located on-highway or off-highway, and further including all helicopters or other aircraft when used in the construction process except as may be preempted for regulation by state or federal law.

7:00 a.m., if noise would exceed the ambient noise level by 5 dBA at the project property line, unless a special permit is authorized by the Director of Public Works or the Director of Building Inspection. The Noise Ordinance limits noise from sources defined as “any machine or device, music or entertainment or any combination of same” located on residential or commercial/industrial property to 5 dBA or 8 dBA, respectively, above the local “ambient”¹⁴ at any point outside of the property plane of a residential, commercial/industrial or public land use, respectively, containing the noise source. An additional low-frequency criterion applies to noise generated from a licensed Place of Entertainment, specifically that no associated noise or music shall exceed the low-frequency ambient noise level by more than 8 dBA.

The Noise Ordinance limits noise from a “fixed source”¹⁵ from causing the noise level measured inside any sleeping or living room in any dwelling unit located on residential property to 45 dBA between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. or 55 dBA between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. with windows open except where building ventilation is achieved through mechanical systems that allow windows to remain closed.

Variances (Section 2910)

The Noise Ordinance gives the Directors of Public Health, Public Works, Building Inspection, or the Entertainment Commission, or the Chief of Police authority to grant variances to noise regulations over which they have jurisdiction. The Department of Public Health has jurisdiction over sources specified in Noise Limits (Section 2909), the Departments of Building Inspection and Public Works over sources specified in Construction (Sections 2907 and 2908), and the Director of the Entertainment Commission may enforce noise standards associated with licensed Places of Entertainment.

¹⁴ By definition, Noise Ordinance Section 2901(a) states “ambient” means the lowest sound level repeating itself during a minimum ten-minute period as measured with a type 1, precision sound level meter, set on slow response and A-weighting ... in no case shall the ambient be considered or determined to be (1) less than 35 dBA for interior residential noise, and (2) 45 dBA in all other locations.”

¹⁵ By definition, Noise Ordinance Section 2901(e) states “fixed source” means a machine or device capable of creating a noise level at the property upon which it is regularly located, including but not limited to: industrial and commercial process machinery and equipment, pumps, fans, air-conditioning apparatus or refrigeration machines.

IMPACTS

SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

The proposed project would result in significant adverse noise impacts if it would:

- Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies;
- Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels;
- Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project;
- Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; or
- Be substantially affected by existing noise levels.

Based on the following quantitative significance thresholds specifically included in the General Plan or Noise Ordinance, the *2010 Community Plan* would result in a significant noise impact if it would:

- Generate construction noise between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. that exceeds the ambient noise level by 5 dBA at the nearest property line (unless a special permit has been granted by the Director of Public Works or the Director of Building Inspection); or produce noise by any construction equipment (except impact tools) that would exceed 80 dBA at 100 feet.
- Cause an increase in noise (i.e., as produced by “any machine or device, music or entertainment or any combination of same”) greater than 5 dBA or 8 dBA above the local ambient (i.e., defined as the “lowest sound level repeating itself during a minimum 10-minute period as measured with a sound level meter, using slow response and A-weighting”) at any point outside the property plane of a residential, commercial/industrial or public land use, respectively, containing the noise source.

In the following cases where quantitative significance thresholds may not be included in the General Plan or Noise Ordinance, the *2010 Community Plan* would cause or be subject to a significant noise or vibration impact if it would:

- Cause outdoor traffic noise levels at existing or proposed residential and other noise-sensitive uses to increase by more than the FTA criteria specified in Table III.F-4, p. III.F-12, which vary depending on the baseline ambient noise levels.
- Expose persons to or generate groundborne vibrations from construction activities that exceed the FTA vibration impact thresholds for residential and other vibration-sensitive

land uses as specified in Table III.F-5, p. III.F-13. Groundborne vibration impacts associated with construction activities on historic resources are addressed in Section III.D, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, pp. III.D-32 to III.D-38.

APPROACH TO ANALYSIS

Construction noise and vibration levels were quantified using equipment noise reference levels and modeling techniques developed by the FTA. The analysis of the existing and future noise environments is based on noise-level monitoring, noise-prediction computer modeling, and empirical observations of receptor noise exposure characteristics. As noted above, one long-term 24-hour ambient noise measurement and four short-term noise measurements were taken by PBS&J in the project area between February 17 and February 18, 2010. The results of these noise measurements are shown in Table III.F-2 on p. III.F-7. Figure III.F-1 on p. III.F-8 shows the locations of these measurements.

Traffic noise modeling procedures involved the calculation of existing and future vehicular noise levels at selected noise-sensitive uses in the plan area using the FHWA Traffic Noise Model (TNM). The model calculates the average noise level at specific locations based on traffic volumes, average speeds, roadway geometry, truck mix, distance from roadway to receptor, and site environmental conditions. The average vehicle noise rates (energy rates) utilized in the TNM reflect the latest measurements of average vehicle noise rates for all vehicle classes. Traffic volumes utilized as data inputs in the noise prediction model are based on those in the transportation impact study prepared for this EIR.¹⁶ For purposes of analysis, the average peak-hour traffic volumes were extrapolated from the project transportation study and input into the model to estimate existing and future traffic noise levels on roadway segments in the project area where existing or proposed sensitive receptors are located.

IMPACT EVALUATION

NO-1 The 2010 Community Plan would not result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels during construction. (Less than Significant)

General Impacts. Adoption of the *2010 Community Plan* would not result in construction activities, although implementation of certain individual plan components could have localized impacts, as discussed below.

¹⁶ AECOM, *Glen Park Community Plan EIR Transportation Impact Study – Final Report*, December 3, 2010. This report is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

Infill Development. Construction of the infill development, including the two infill sites and the 13 additional units that could be constructed within the plan area, would potentially cause disturbance to nearby residents, library patrons, and schools. No specific development applications for the infill sites have been proposed at this time. Therefore, specific construction details are unknown, including phasing and equipment. Construction activities would be temporary and intermittent. It is assumed that construction would require the use of heavy equipment for demolition of pavement, site grading and excavation, paving, and building fabrication. Construction activities would also involve the use of smaller power tools, generators, mechanical equipment, and other noise sources. During each construction stage, there would be a different mix of equipment operating and noise levels would vary based on the amount of equipment in operation and the location of the building demolition or construction activity. Impacts would generally be limited to the period during which new foundations and exterior structural and façade elements would be constructed. Noise from interior construction activities would be substantially reduced by the presence of exterior walls. Throughout the construction period, there would be truck traffic to and from the site, hauling away excavated materials and debris, or delivering building materials. It is anticipated that the construction hours for the infill development would be during the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., in compliance with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance. However, if nighttime work is required for construction of the infill developments, construction activities must comply with regulations set forth in the Noise Ordinance.

The San Francisco Noise Ordinance regulates construction-related noise. Compliance with the Noise Ordinance is required by law and would serve to avoid significant negative impacts of the proposed project on sensitive receptors. Therefore, compliance with the Noise Ordinance would ensure noise impacts from development at the two infill sites and the 13 additional units would be less than significant.

Transportation Improvements. Construction of the transportation improvements would require the use of heavy equipment for demolition of pavement, grading, excavation, and paving. Construction activities would also involve the use of smaller power tools, generators, mechanical equipment, and other noise sources. During each construction stage, there would be a different mix of equipment operating and noise levels would vary based on the amount of equipment in operation, the location of the construction activity, and the location of the receptor.

It is anticipated that the construction hours for the transportation improvements could occur during nighttime hours if necessary to avoid disruption or closure of local streets and the BART Station during peak travel times.

As noted above, the Noise Ordinance regulates construction-related noise, and compliance with the Noise Ordinance is required by law. If the transportation improvements require nighttime construction, construction activities must comply with regulations set forth in the Noise Ordinance. Therefore, noise impacts associated with the construction of the transportation improvements would be less than significant.

Open Space. Future open space improvements would require the use of heavy equipment for grading and excavation. Construction activities would be temporary and intermittent. No specific open space improvements have been proposed at this time. Therefore, specific construction details are unknown, including phasing and equipment. The implementation of the open space improvements is long-term in nature and would be subject to independent study and environmental review in the future. In addition, compliance with the Noise Ordinance is required by law and would serve to avoid significant negative impacts of future open space improvements on sensitive receptors. Therefore, noise impacts associated with construction of open space improvements would be less than significant.

NO-2 *Construction activities would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive vibration levels. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Modification of existing zoning would not result in construction activities, except under development of the individual components of the *2010 Community Plan*. Construction impacts associated with the individual components of the *2010 Community Plan* could have localized vibration impacts, as discussed below.

Infill Development. Construction of the infill development, including the two infill sites and the 13 additional units that could be constructed within the plan area, would involve operation of construction equipment adjacent to the existing residential uses that surround the sites. No specific development applications for the infill sites have been proposed at this time. Therefore, specific construction details are unknown, including phasing and equipment. Although construction-related vibration associated with the proposed project would be temporary, there are

two potential impacts that could occur: annoyance to nearby residents and damage to fragile structures. However, the potential for damage is typically limited to vibration generated by impact equipment, especially pile drivers.

Most construction activities would only have the potential to generate low levels of groundborne vibration. Table III.F-6, below, identifies various vibration levels for the types of construction equipment that may operate during construction of the infill development. Because construction activities could be within 25 feet of adjacent residential uses, there would be the potential for annoyance from operation of construction equipment. It is anticipated that pile driving would not be required for construction of low-rise buildings, such as the buildings (up to 65 feet) that would occur in the plan area.

As noted above, the Noise Ordinance regulates construction-related noise, and compliance with the Noise Ordinance is required by law. Compliance with the Noise Ordinance would also serve to avoid significant negative vibration impacts of the proposed project on sensitive receptors since it would restrict the use of construction equipment to the daytime hours, when people are less likely to be home. Compliance with the Noise Ordinance would ensure less-than-significant vibration impacts.

**TABLE III.F-6
VIBRATION SOURCE LEVELS FOR CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT**

Equipment	Approximate VdB			
	25 Feet	50 Feet	75 Feet	100 Feet
Large Bulldozer	87	78	69	60
Loaded Trucks	86	77	68	52
Jackhammer	79	70	61	52
Small Bulldozer	58	49	40	31
Pile Driver (Impact)	112	103	94	85
Pile Driver (Sonic)	105	96	87	78

Source: Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, May 2006.

Transportation Improvements. Construction of the transportation improvements would require construction activities to occur in residential areas. It is also anticipated that the construction hours for the transportation improvements could require construction during nighttime hours if necessary to avoid disruption or closure of local streets during peak travel times. It is anticipated that the construction activities under the transportation improvements would not require the

use of pile driving. Groundborne vibrations impacts associated with construction activities on historic resources are addressed in Section III.D, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, pp. III.D-32 through III.D-39.

Because construction activities would be on residential streets, construction equipment could operate within 25 feet of residential properties. This could result in annoyance for nearby residents. Compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance would require most activities to occur during daytime hours. However, as noted above under NO-1, if nighttime activities are required, these activities would still need to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance. Compliance with these noise requirements would also reduce the potential for vibration equipment as it would likely restrict the use of heavy equipment to the daytime hours. Vibration impacts from construction of the transportation improvements would be less than significant.

Open Space. Future open space improvements would require the use of heavy equipment for grading and excavation that could result in groundborne vibration effects. Construction activities would be temporary and intermittent. No specific open space improvements have been proposed at this time. Therefore, specific construction details are unknown, including phasing and equipment. The implementation of the open space improvements is long-term in nature and would be subject to independent study and environmental review in the future. Compliance with the Noise Ordinance is required by law and would serve to avoid significant negative impacts of the proposed open space improvements on sensitive receptors. Therefore, vibration impacts associated with construction of open space improvements would be less than significant.

NO-3 *Operation of the proposed project, including the use of mechanical equipment or the delivery of goods, would not expose noise-sensitive land uses on or off site to noise levels that exceed the standards established by the City. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Adoption of the 2010 Community Plan would not result in operational noise sources, although implementation of certain individual plan components could have localized impacts, as discussed below.

Infill Development. Daily operations of new retail and residential uses at the infill sites, and potentially the 13 additional units that could be constructed elsewhere in the plan area, would generate noise from operation of mechanical HVAC systems, delivery of commercial supplies, and activities such as trash collection. It is

anticipated that the plan area under future conditions would have a daily noise environment of a typical urban area with average noise levels ranging on average between approximately 60 and 70 dBA.

Large-scale HVAC systems, such as those that would likely be installed for new mixed-use buildings, can result in noise levels that average between 50 and 65 dBA L_{eq} at 50 feet from the equipment without shielding, and are usually shielded such that noise levels do not affect nearby residents. Therefore, HVAC equipment would not be anticipated to produce noise levels that would be 5 dBA above the future ambient noise levels, which is the threshold under Section 2909(a) of the Noise Ordinance.

Delivery of goods and food stuffs to the commercial operations and refuse pick up would not result in increases of 5 dBA over the anticipated ambient noise level. Therefore, the daily operational activity would not exceed the noise standards established by the Noise Ordinance and this impact would be less than significant.

Transportation Improvements. The transportation improvements would not involve the installation of new stationary sources of noise, such as HVAC equipment. The proposed relocation of bus stops in the vicinity of the Glen Park BART Station would either result in the stops being the same distance or farther away from the existing residential uses. The remaining transportation improvements would not introduce new stationary sources of noise to nearby sensitive receptors. Therefore, the transportation improvements would not result in increases over ambient noise levels.

Open Space. Future open space improvements would not involve the installation of new stationary sources of noise, such as HVAC equipment. Therefore, the open space improvements would not result in increases over ambient noise levels.

NO-4 *Operation of the proposed project would expose residents of the BART parking lot infill development to excessive groundborne vibration. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

General Impacts. Adoption of the 2010 *Community Plan* would not result in exposure of residents to vibration, although implementation of certain individual plan components could have localized impacts, as discussed below

Infill Development. The southeast corner of the BART parking lot infill site is located directly on top of the underground facilities of the Glen Park BART Station, including the BART tracks. Because of the proximity to the tracks and station, residents of the infill development at that site could be exposed to excessive vibration levels of 80 VdB or more. According to the FTA Guidelines, residential receptors within 200 feet of a rapid transit railway, such as BART, have the potential for impacts from vibration. Infill development that would occur within the plan area at a distance greater than 200 feet from the underground BART tracks (measured as a diagonal distance from the receptor to the underground source) would not be exposed to excessive vibration levels. However, since the BART parking lot is directly above the station, residential uses constructed at that site would be within the 200-foot screening distance, and vibration levels from BART trains could exceed the FTA criteria for residential uses. This would be a significant impact.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-4, which calls for a site-specific vibration assessment and vibration reduction measures, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

M-NO-4 BART Infill Site Vibration Assessment. Prior to the submittal of a building permit application for the infill site, BART or BART's developer shall obtain a qualified vibration consultant to complete a site-specific vibration assessment. The vibration assessment shall measure the vibration levels at the existing BART parking lot within 200 feet of the underground BART alignment. If vibration levels exceed the FTA 72 VdB criteria for "frequent" vibration events impacting a residential use (i.e., more than 70 vibration events from the same source per day, which is typical of most rail rapid transit vibration sources), the vibration assessment shall recommend measures to reduce vibration levels to 72 VdB or less. Examples of such measures that have been very successfully used, separately or in combination, to avoid vibration impacts to other residential projects located near rail transit vibration sources include:

- Building Foundation Mats – the use of increased mass in the foundation of the building to increase the effective vibration reduction that occurs at the boundary between the soil and the building foundation structure.
- Vibration Isolation – after provision of a break or gap in the structure between the first floor concrete slab and the top of the basement

walls/columns, isolation would be achieved by placing rubber pads between the top of the basement walls/columns and the first floor structure.

Recommended vibration reduction measures provided by the site-specific assessment shall be incorporated into the design and construction of the proposed infill development project and their effectiveness shall be verified by vibration monitoring measurements after construction. BART or BART's developer shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) documentation demonstrating compliance with this measure for review and approval once construction has been completed, but prior to occupancy of the building(s).

Transportation Improvements. The transportation improvements would not introduce new sources of vibration. The proposed relocation of bus stops would change the routing of existing sources of vibration (i.e., buses), but because the bus stops would be the same distance or farther away from the existing residential uses, the transportation improvements would not result in exposure of residents to increased vibration. The remaining transportation improvements would not introduce new sources of vibration or expose sensitive receptors to increased vibration.

Open Space. Future open space improvements would not introduce new sources of vibration and would not result in exposure of sensitive receptors to increased vibration.

NO-5 *Operation of land uses identified in the 2010 Community Plan would not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in existing residential areas along the major access routes to the plan area. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Modification of existing zoning would not result in increased traffic volumes, except for the infill development, and potentially the 13 additional units that could be constructed elsewhere in the plan area, identified in the *2010 Community Plan*. The proposed transportation improvements and future open space improvements would not result in increased traffic volumes. Impacts associated with future infill development could have localized impacts, as discussed below.

Infill Development. The *2010 Community Plan* would result in an increase in traffic volumes from future development and cumulative growth over the next 20 years.

This increase in traffic volumes would increase ambient noise levels at noise-sensitive locations along the major vehicular access routes in the plan area. Table III.F-7, below, identifies the changes in future noise levels along the study area roadway segments where the greatest increase in traffic volumes would occur as a result of the *2010 Community Plan*, and that also have sensitive receptors, such as residential uses.

As stated in thresholds of significance, increases in ambient noise due to increases in plan-related traffic are based upon the FTA criteria specified in Table III.F-4 on p. III.F-12. As shown in the table below, the infill development would not generate noise level increases that exceed the adopted threshold for a “substantial permanent increase” in traffic noise for sensitive receptors. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

**TABLE III.F-7
MODELED TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS ALONG MAJOR ACCESS ROADS**

Noise Receptor	Land Use	Noise Level (dBA) ^a				Significant Impact?
		Existing Noise Level ^b	Existing Plus Project	Project-Related Increase	Allowable Increase ^c	
L-1	BART Parking Lot –Infill Site	71.0	71.1	0.1	1	No
S-1	Residential Uses along Lyell south of San Jose Avenue overcrossing	71.5	71.5	0	1	No
S-2	Vacant Lot between Bosworth and Kern –Infill Site	58.7	58.9	0.2	3	No
S-3	Residential Uses along Diamond Street west of Bosworth (across from BART station)	67.4	67.5	0.1	1	No
S-4	Residential Uses along Monterey Boulevard west of Arcadia	68.6	68.6	0	1	No

Source: PBS&J, 2010.

Notes:

- Noise levels modeled using FHWA Traffic Noise Model based on traffic data from the transportation study.
- The existing noise levels may differ from the measured noise levels shown in Table III.F-2, since these noise levels were based on the existing traffic volumes from the transportation study. However, the modeled noise levels for each location are within approximately 1 dB of the measured existing noise levels for each location.
- Based on FTA Guidelines.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

C-NO *The 2010 Community Plan would not result in significant cumulative noise and vibration impacts. (Less than Significant)*

The cumulative impact analysis below includes the following projects within the plan area or vicinity (see Section III.B Land Use, pp. III.B-15 to III.B-17, for descriptions of these projects):

- San Francisco Bicycle Plan
- Traffic Calming Projects – Sunnyside Projects

The geographic context for an analysis of cumulative impacts with regard to noise and vibration is limited to the immediate vicinity of the plan area. This is due to the dissipation of noise and vibration with the increase of distance between receptors and noise sources. Noise and vibration impacts from cumulative development in the plan area can be largely attributed to an increase in vehicular traffic that is generated by the development both within and in the immediate vicinity of the plan area.

Substantial construction-related noise and vibration would affect only areas in close proximity to each of the individual construction sites, since noise and vibration intensity decreases substantially with distance. It is unlikely that construction noise or vibration from these other construction sites would jointly affect the same sensitive receptors. The only projects in the immediate vicinity of the plan area that have the potential to be constructed at the same time as the proposed project are the San Francisco Bicycle Plan improvements. However, it is unlikely that construction of these improvements would occur at the same time as the proposed project, and if they did, that they would contribute construction noise or vibration that would adversely affect nearby sensitive receptors. Further, compliance with the Noise Ordinance would reduce noise and vibration impacts from the proposed project and other cumulative development to less than significant.

As noted above, operation of the proposed project would increase traffic noise levels that would affect sensitive receptors along access roads to the plan area. The noise increases associated with cumulative development, including the proposed project, are shown in Table III.F-8 on p. III.F-28. As shown in Table III.F-8, the cumulative increase would not exceed the adopted threshold for a “substantial permanent increase” in traffic noise in residential areas. Therefore, the cumulative noise impacts associated with traffic would be less than significant.

**TABLE III.F-8
MODELED CUMULATIVE TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS ALONG MAJOR ACCESS ROADS**

Noise Receptor	Land Use	Noise Level (dBA) ^a				
		Existing Noise Level ^b	Cumulative	Cumulative Increase	Allowable Increase ^b	Significant Impact?
L-1	BART Parking Lot –Infill Site	71.0	71.3	0.3	1	No
S-1	Residential Uses along Lyell south of San Jose Avenue overcrossing	71.5	71.6	0.1	1	No
S-2	Vacant Lot between Bosworth and Kern – Infill Site	58.7	59.4	0.7	3	No
S-3	Residential Uses along Diamond Street west of Bosworth (across from BART station)	67.4	67.8	0.4	1	No
S-4	Residential Uses along Monterey Boulevard west of Arcadia	68.6	68.8	0.2	1	No

Source: PBS&J, 2010.

Notes:

- a. Noise levels modeled using FHWA Traffic Noise Model based on traffic data from the transportation study.
- b. The existing noise levels may differ from the measured noise levels shown in Table III.F-2, since these noise levels were based on the existing traffic volumes from the transportation study. However, the modeled noise levels for each location are within approximately 1 dB of the measured existing noise levels for each location.
- c. Based on FTA Guidelines.

G. AIR QUALITY

INTRODUCTION

This section of the EIR evaluates the potential impacts on air quality resulting from implementation of the proposed project. This includes the potential for the project to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. This section identifies program-level, project-level, and cumulative air quality impacts, as well as feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid the identified impacts. The Initial Study, pp. 63-64 (see Appendix A), concluded that none of the 2003 *Community Plan Summary* components would result in a perceptible increase of, or change in, odors in the plan area, since none of the proposed land uses typically generate odors. This issue is not discussed in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed project is located in the City and County of San Francisco, which is within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). The SFBAAB also encompasses all of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Mateo, and Santa Clara Counties, the southern half of Sonoma County, and the southwestern portion of Solano County.

Ambient air quality is influenced by climate conditions, topography, and the quantity and type of pollutants released in an area. The major determinants of transport and dilution of a given pollutant are wind, atmospheric stability, terrain, and sunshine, all of which affect the concentrations of photochemical pollutants.

CLIMATE, TOPOGRAPHY, AND METEOROLOGY

The regional climate in the SFBAAB is considered semi-arid and is characterized by mild, dry summers and mild, moderately wet winters (about 90 percent of the annual total rainfall is received in the November-April period), moderate daytime onshore breezes, and moderate humidity. The climate is dominated by a strong, semi-permanent, subtropical high-pressure cell over the northeastern Pacific Ocean. Climate is also affected by the moderating effects of the adjacent oceanic heat reservoir. In summer, when the high-pressure cell is strongest and

farthest north, fog forms in the morning, and temperatures are mild. In winter, when the high-pressure cell is weakest and farthest south, occasional rainstorms occur.

The plan area is located in the San Francisco Peninsula climate subregion that extends northwest from San Jose to the Golden Gate. The Santa Cruz Mountains run up the center of the Peninsula, creating an area of warmer temperatures and fewer foggy days to the east where the ridgeline blocks the marine layer. In San Francisco, the mean maximum summer temperatures are in the mid-60s degrees Fahrenheit, while mean minimum temperatures during the winter months are in the high-30s to low-40s degrees Fahrenheit. Annual average wind speeds range from 4 to 9 knots throughout the Peninsula with prevailing winds from the west, although local wind patterns are often influenced greatly by local topographic features.

In summer, the northwest winds to the west of the Pacific coastline are drawn into the interior through the Golden Gate and over the lower portions of the San Francisco Peninsula. This channeling of the flow through the Golden Gate produces a wind that sweeps eastward but widens downstream producing southwest winds in Berkeley and northwest winds in San Jose. Wind speeds may be locally strong in regions where air is channeled through a narrow opening such as the Golden Gate or San Bruno Gap. For example, the average wind speed at San Francisco International Airport from 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. in July is about 17 knots, compared with approximately 9 knots at San Jose and less than 6 knots at the Farallon Islands.

The sea breeze between the coast and the Central Valley commences near the surface along the coast in late morning or early afternoon; it may be first observed only through the Golden Gate. Later in the day, the layer deepens and intensifies while spreading inland. As the breeze intensifies and deepens, it flows over the lower hills farther south along the Peninsula. This process frequently can be observed as a bank of stratus "rolling over" the coastal hills on the west side of the Bay. The depth of the sea breeze depends in large part upon the height and strength of the inversion. The generally low elevation of this stable layer of air prevents marine air from flowing over the coastal hills. It is unusual for the summer sea breeze to flow over terrain exceeding 2,000 feet in elevation.

In winter, the Bay Area experiences periods of storminess and moderate-to-strong winds and periods of stagnation with very light winds. Winter stagnation episodes are characterized by outflow from the Central Valley, nighttime drainage flows in coastal valleys, weak onshore flows in the afternoon and otherwise light and variable winds.

Onshore winds from the west dominate in the plan area such that emissions from the plan area would be blown eastward over the San Francisco Bay.

EXISTING AIR QUALITY CONDITIONS

In addition to climate, topography, and meteorology, a wide range of emissions sources—such as dense population centers, heavy vehicular traffic, and industry—influences the air quality within the SFBAAB. Air pollutant emissions within the Bay Area are generated by stationary (or point), area-wide, and mobile sources. Stationary sources exist at identified locations and are usually associated with specific large manufacturing and industrial facilities; examples include fossil-fuel power plants or large boilers that provide industrial process heat. Area-wide sources consist of many smaller point sources that are widely distributed spatially; examples include residential and commercial water heaters, painting/coating operations, power lawn mower use, agricultural operations, landfills, and the use of consumer products such as barbeque lighter fluid, hair spray, etc. Mobile sources include on-road motor vehicles and other transportation sources like aircraft, ships, trains, and self-propelled construction equipment. Air pollutants can also be generated by natural sources such as fine dust particles suspended in the air by high winds.

Air Pollutants

Both the federal and State governments have established ambient air quality standards for outdoor concentrations of various pollutants intended to protect public health and welfare. Such pollutants are called “criteria” air pollutants. The national and State ambient air quality standards have been set at concentrations (with a margin of safety) to which the public can be exposed without adverse health effects.

The criteria air pollutants that are most relevant to air quality planning and regulation in the Bay Area include ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), respirable particulate matter (PM₁₀), fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and lead. Table III.G-1, p. III.G-4, shows the national and State ambient air quality standards for these pollutants together with their known health effect and major sources.

**TABLE III.G-1
STATE AND FEDERAL CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANT STANDARDS, HEALTH EFFECTS, AND SOURCES**

Pollutant	Averaging Time	State Standard		Federal Standard		Pollutant Health and Atmospheric Effects	Major Pollutant Sources
		Concentration	Attainment Status	Concentration	Attainment Status		
Ozone	1-Hour 8-Hour	0.09 ppm 0.070 ppm	N N	— 0.075 ppm	— N	High concentrations can directly affect lungs, causing irritation. Long-term exposure may cause damage to lung tissue.	Formed when reactive organic gases and NO _x react in the presence of sunlight. Major sources include on-road motor vehicles, solvent evaporation, and commercial industrial mobile equipment.
Carbon Monoxide	1-Hour 8-Hour	20 ppm 9.0 ppm	A A	35 ppm 9 ppm	A A	Interferes with the transfer of oxygen to the blood and deprives sensitive tissues of oxygen.	Internal combustion engines, primarily gasoline-powered motor vehicles.
Nitrogen Dioxide	1-Hour Annual	0.18 ppm 0.030 ppm	A A	0.100 ppm ^a 0.053 ppm	U A	Irritates eyes and lungs. Can cause breathing difficulties at high concentrations. Studies have linked short-term exposure to increased asthma symptoms, respiratory illness, more difficulty controlling asthma, and increased visits to emergency departments. Colors atmosphere reddish-brown. Major contributor to ozone formation.	Motor vehicles, petroleum-refining operations, industrial sources, aircraft, ships, and railroads.
Sulfur Dioxide	1 Hour 24-Hour	0.25 ppm 0.04 ppm	A A	— 0.075 ppm ^a	— A	Irritates upper respiratory tract; injurious to lung tissue. Can yellow the leaves of plants, destructive to marble, iron, and steel. Limits visibility and reduces sunlight.	Fuel combustion, chemical plants, sulfur recovery plants, and metal processing.

**TABLE III.G-1
STATE AND FEDERAL CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANT STANDARDS, HEALTH EFFECTS, AND SOURCES**

Pollutant	Averaging Time	State Standard		Federal Standard		Pollutant Health and Atmospheric Effects	Major Pollutant Sources
		Concentration	Attainment Status	Concentration	Attainment Status		
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	24 Hour Annual	50 µg/m ³ 20 µg/m ³	N N	150 µg/m ³ ---	U	May irritate eyes and respiratory tract, decreases in lung capacity, causes cancer, and increased mortality. Produces haze and limits visibility.	Dust and fume-producing industrial and agricultural operations, combustion, atmospheric photochemical reactions, and natural activities (e.g., wind-raised dust and ocean sprays).
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	24 Hour Annual	— 12 µg/m ³	N	35 µg/m ³ 15 µg/m ³	N A	Increases respiratory disease, lung damage, cancer, and premature death. Reduces visibility and results in surface soiling.	Fuel combustion in motor vehicles, equipment, and industrial sources; residential and agricultural burning. Also formed from photochemical reactions of other pollutants, including NO _x , SO ₂ , and organics.
Lead	Monthly Quarterly	1.5 µg/m ³	A	— 1.5 µg/m ³	A	Disturbs gastrointestinal system, and causes anemia, kidney disease, and neuromuscular and neurological dysfunction.	Present source: lead smelters, battery manufacturing and recycling facilities. Past source: combustion of leaded gasoline.

Source: BAAQMD internet site http://hank.baaqmd.gov/pln/air_quality/ambient_air_quality.htm, accessed February 13, 2011.

Notes:

A = Attainment

N = Nonattainment

U = Unclassified (insufficient data collected to determine classification; generally indicates low concern for the pollutant levels)

ppm = parts per million

µg/m³ = micrograms per cubic meter

a. Standard established 2010.

In addition, a diverse group of air pollutants called toxic air contaminants (TACs) are of concern nationwide and in the Bay Area. TACs can adversely affect human health, but have not had ambient air quality standards established for them. There are over 244 designated TACs. They are not fundamentally different from the pollutants discussed above, but lack ambient air quality standards for a variety of reasons (e.g., insufficient data on toxicity, association with particular workplace exposures rather than general environmental exposure, etc.). The health effects of TACs can result from either acute or chronic exposure, and many types of cancer are associated with chronic TAC exposures. An important group of TACs are contained in the exhaust from both diesel and gasoline engines in motor vehicles, including benzene, 1,3-butadiene, formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, acrolein, naphthalene, and diesel particulate matter (DPM). Collectively, these TACs (along with the criteria pollutants CO, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}) are commonly referred to as traffic-related pollutants (TRPs), as described further below.

Traffic-Related Air Pollutants

Motor vehicles are responsible for a large share of air pollution, especially in California. Vehicle tailpipe emissions contain diverse forms of particles and gases, and also contribute to particulates by generating road dust and through tire wear. Epidemiologic studies have demonstrated that people living in proximity to freeways or busy roadways have poorer health outcomes, including increased asthma symptoms and respiratory infections and decreased pulmonary function and lung development in children. Air pollution monitoring done in conjunction with epidemiological studies has confirmed that roadway-related health effects vary with modeled exposure to particulate matter and nitrogen dioxide. In traffic-related studies, the additional non-cancer health risk attributable to roadway proximity was seen within 1,000 feet of the roadway and was strongest within 300 feet.¹ As a result, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) recommends that new sensitive land uses not be located within 500 feet of a freeway or urban roads carrying 100,000 vehicles per day.

Existing Regional Air Quality

With the assistance of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), the CARB compiles inventories of CO, ROG (reactive organic gases, which are ozone precursors), NO₂, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} emissions for the SFBAAB. Table III.G-2, p. III.G-7, presents a summary of the 2008 emissions data for the SFBAAB and San Francisco County.

¹ California Air Resources Board, *Air Quality Land Use Handbook: A Community Perspective*, April 2005. Available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf>.

**TABLE III.G-2
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA AIR BASIN AND SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY CRITERIA AIR
POLLUTANT EMISSIONS INVENTORY AND PROJECTIONS, 2008
(TONS/DAY—ANNUAL AVERAGE)**

	CO	ROG	NOX	SOX	PM10	PM2.5
SFBAAB						
<u>2008 Estimated</u>						
Total Emissions	1,748	378	448	62	212	81
On-Road Motor Vehicle Emissions	1,542	183	381	15	20	16
San Francisco						
<u>2008 Estimated</u>						
Total Emissions	148	34	79	15	17	8
On-Road Motor Vehicle Emissions	142	18	74	15	5	4

Source: California ARB, Almanac Emission Projection Data, <http://www.arb.ca.gov/app/emsmv/emssumcat.php> (accessed February 2010).

Note:

Natural sources are excluded from this inventory.

Existing Local Air Quality

The SFBAAB has instances of recorded violations of federal and State standards for ozone, CO, and PM₁₀ over the last 30 years. Since the early 1970s, substantial progress has been made toward controlling these pollutants. Emissions and ambient concentrations of CO decreased in the SFBAAB with the introduction of the catalytic converter in 1975, and with subsequent improvements in motor vehicle engine technology and the introduction of oxygenated fuel. No violations of the State or federal standards for CO have been recorded in the Bay Area since 1991. The Bay Area is in attainment for all State and federal standards except those for ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. For ozone, the SFBAAB does not meet either the State or federal standards. For PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, the SFBAAB does not meet the State standards but does meet the current federal standards.² The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recently established new 1-hour standards for NO₂ and SO₂, and attainment status of these pollutants will be determined by 2012.

The BAAQMD operates many air quality monitoring stations throughout the Bay Area. The closest monitoring station to the plan area is the San Francisco-Arkansas Street monitoring station, which is located approximately three miles northeast of the plan area on Potrero Hill.

² U.S. EPA lowered the 24-hour PM_{2.5} standard from 65 µg/m³ to 35 µg/m³ in 2006 and issued attainment status designations for the 35 µg/m³ standard on December 22, 2008. U.S. EPA designated the SFBAAB as nonattainment for the 35 µg/m³ PM_{2.5} standard; however, that designation has not yet been published in the Federal Register and is, therefore, not yet effective.

Table III.G-3, p. III.G-9, shows recent data taken at this monitoring station. From 2006 to 2008, the State and federal ozone standards were not exceeded. The State 24-hour PM₁₀ standard was exceeded five times while the federal 24-hour PM₁₀ standard was not exceeded. For this time period, the annual average was above the State standard of 20 µg/m³. The federal 24-hour standard for PM_{2.5} standard was exceeded eight times over this period at this station (based on air samples collected every 6th day); however, over this period, the annual average was below both the State 12 µg/m³ and federal 15 µg/m³ standards.

As of January 22, 2010, the EPA added a one-hour standard for NO₂ in addition to their annual standard. To achieve a nonattainment designation in an area, the 3-year average of the 98th percentile of the daily maximum one-hour average at each monitor within an area must not exceed 100 ppb (which is equivalent to 0.100 ppm). Although no designation under the new standards have been published, as shown in Table III.G-3, p. III.G-9, the maximum one-hour concentration from year 2006 exceeds the new NO₂ one-hour standard.

The BAAQMD measures ambient levels of TACs at a number of monitoring stations in the region. The station nearest the plan area is on Arkansas Street in San Francisco. Table III.G-4, p. III.G-10, summarizes monitored concentrations of carcinogenic TACs for 2008, the most recent year for which data are available.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Air quality within the Bay Area is maintained and improved through the efforts of various federal, State, regional, and local government agencies. These agencies work jointly, as well as individually, to improve air quality through legislation, regulations, planning, policy-making, education, and a variety of other programs.

FEDERAL

The EPA is responsible for setting and enforcing the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for atmospheric pollutants. It regulates emission sources that are under the exclusive authority of the federal government, such as aircraft, ships, and certain locomotives.

As part of its enforcement responsibilities, the EPA requires each state with federal nonattainment areas to prepare and submit a State Implementation Plan (SIP) that demonstrates the means to attain the national standards. The SIP must integrate federal, State, and local plan components and regulations to identify specific measures to reduce pollution, using a combination of performance standards and market-based programs within the timeframe identified in the SIP.

**TABLE III.G-3
SUMMARY OF LOCAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY IN THE PROJECT VICINITY**

Air Pollutants ^a	Year		
	2006	2007	2008
Ozone			
Maximum 1-hour concentration measured ^b	0.053 ppm	0.060 ppm	0.082 ppm
Days exceeding State 0.09 ppm 1-hour standard	0	0	0
Maximum 8-hour concentration measured ^c	0.046 ppm	0.049 ppm	0.066 ppm
Days exceeding State 0.07 or federal 0.075 ppm 8-hour standard	0	0	0
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM₁₀)			
Annual average concentration measured ^a	22.9 µg/m ³	21.9 µg/m ³	22.0 µg/m ³
Maximum 24-hour concentration measured ^d	61.4 µg/m ³	69.8 µg/m ³	41.3 µg/m ³
Days exceeding federal 150 µg/m ³ 24-hour standard ^e	0	0	0
Days exceeding State 50 µg/m ³ 24-hour standard	3	2	0
Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5})			
Annual average concentration measured ^a	9.7 µg/m ³	8.7 µg/m ³	9.8 µg/m ³
Maximum 24-hour concentration measured	54.3 µg/m ³	45.2 µg/m ³	29.4 µg/m ³
No. of days exceeding federal 35 µg/m ³ 24-hour standard ^f	3	5	N/A ^g
Carbon Monoxide (CO)			
Maximum 8-hour concentration measured	2.09 ppm	1.60 ppm	2.3 ppm
Number of days exceeding federal and State 9.0 ppm 8-hour standard	0	0	0
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)			
Annual average concentration measured ^a	0.016 ppm	0.016 ppm	0.016 ppm
Maximum 1-hour concentration measured	0.11 ppm	0.069 ppm	0.062 ppm
Days exceeding State 0.18 ppm 1-hour standard	0	0	0

Source: BAAQMD Annual Bay Area Air Quality Summaries, 2006 through 2008, (http://www.baaqmd.gov/~link.aspx?_id=7BE01D796A3644E2B0BC30BDD4665912&_z=z, Accessed October 2009).

Notes:

- Data are from the BAAQMD San Francisco-Arkansas Street monitoring station.
- ppm = parts by volume per million of air.
- The California 8-hour ozone standard was implemented on May 17, 2005.
- µg/m³ = micrograms per cubic meter.
- Based on a sampling schedule of one out of every six days, for a total of approximately 60 samples per year.
- On December 17, 2006, the U.S. EPA implemented a more stringent federal 24-hour PM_{2.5} standard revising it from 65 µg/m³ to 35 µg/m³. PM_{2.5} exceedance days for 2006 to 2008 reflect the new 35 µg/m³ standard.
- Insufficient data available per California ARB.

**TABLE III.G-4
ANNUAL AVERAGE AMBIENT CONCENTRATIONS OF
CARCINOGENIC TACS MEASURED AT BAAQMD MONITORING
STATION, 10 ARKANSAS STREET, SAN FRANCISCO**

Compound	Concentration (ppb)^a	Cancer Risk (per million)
Acetaldehyde	0.39	2
Benzene	0.18	17
1,3-Butadiene	0.036	14
para-Dichlorobenzene	0.15	10
Carbon Tetrachloride	0.094	25
Chloroform	0.015	0.4
Formaldehyde	2.96	20
Perchloroethylene	0.02	0.8
Methylene Chloride	0.12	0.4
Trichloroethylene	0.01	0.1
Hexavalent Chromium	0.059 ug/m ³	9
Total Risk		89.7

Source: BAAQMD, Toxic Air Contaminant Air Monitoring Data for 2008. Accessed via <http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Engineering/Air-Toxics/Toxic-Air-Contaminant-Control-Program-Annual-Report.aspx>; February 13, 2011.

Formaldehyde and Hexavalent Chromium are statewide averages for the year 2008.

Notes:

a. ppb = parts per billion.

STATE

CARB, a part of the California EPA, is responsible for the coordination and administration of both federal and State air pollution control programs within California. In this capacity, CARB conducts research, sets California ambient air quality standards, compiles emission inventories, develops suggested control measures, provides oversight of local programs, and prepares the SIP. CARB establishes emissions standards for motor vehicles sold in California, consumer products (e.g., hairspray, aerosol paints, and barbecue lighter fluid), and various types of commercial equipment. It also sets fuel specifications to further reduce vehicular emissions.

REGIONAL

BAAQMD is the primary agency responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in the SFBAAB, including San Francisco County. To that end, BAAQMD, a regional agency, works directly with the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), and local governments and cooperates actively with all federal and State government agencies. BAAQMD develops rules and regulations, establishes permitting requirements for stationary sources, inspects emissions sources, and enforces such

measures through educational programs or fines, when necessary. BAAQMD is directly responsible for reducing emissions from stationary (area and point)³ sources and for assuring that State controls on mobile sources are effectively implemented. It has responded to this requirement by preparing a sequence of Ozone Attainment Plans and Clean Air Plans that comply with the Federal Clean Air Act and the California Clean Air Act to accommodate growth, reduce the pollutant levels in the Bay Area, meet federal and State ambient air quality standards, and minimize the fiscal impact that pollution control measures have on the local economy. The Ozone Attainment Plans are prepared for the federal ozone standard, and the Clean Air Plans are prepared for the State ozone standards. The most recent air quality plan is the 2010 *Clean Air Plan*, which updates the 2005 *Ozone Strategy*, and was adopted by the Board of Directors on September 15, 2010. It serves to:

- Update the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy in accordance with the requirements of the California Clean Air Act to implement “all feasible measures” to reduce ozone;
- Provide a control strategy to reduce ozone, particulate matter (PM), air toxics, and greenhouse gases in a single, integrated plan;
- Review progress in improving air quality in recent years; and
- Establish emission control measures to be adopted or implemented in the 2010-2012 timeframe.

These planning efforts have substantially decreased the population’s exposure to unhealthful levels of pollutants, even while substantial population growth has occurred within the Bay Area.

In 2003, the California Legislature enacted Senate Bill 656 (SB 656) to reduce public exposure to PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. SB 656 required CARB, in consultation with local air districts, to develop and adopt, by January 1, 2005, a list of the most readily available, feasible, and cost-effective control measures that could be used by CARB and the air districts to reduce PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. In November 2005, BAAQMD adopted a Particulate Matter Implementation Strategy focusing on those measures most applicable and cost effective for the Bay Area.

Although BAAQMD is responsible for regional air quality planning efforts, it does not have the authority to directly regulate the air quality issues associated with plans and new development projects within the Bay Area. Instead, BAAQMD has prepared the *BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (CEQA Air Quality Guidelines)* to indirectly address these issues in accordance with the projections and programs of the *Ozone Attainment Plan* and *Clean Air Plan*. The purpose of

³ A point source is a single, identifiable source of air pollutant emissions. Area sources are small pollution sources that are relatively small, but collectively their emissions can be of concern.

the *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* is to assist lead agencies, as well as consultants, project proponents, and other interested parties, in evaluating potential air quality impacts of projects and plans proposed in the Bay Area. Specifically, the *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* explain the procedures that BAAQMD recommends be followed during environmental review processes required by CEQA. The *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* provide direction on how to evaluate potential air quality impacts, how to determine whether these impacts are significant, and how to mitigate these impacts. BAAQMD intends that by providing this guidance, the air quality impacts of plans and development proposals will be analyzed accurately and consistently throughout the Bay Area, and adverse impacts will be minimized.

The BAAQMD recently updated its *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, and adopted revised CEQA significance thresholds on June 2, 2010. The most recent revision to the *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* was on June 17, 2010. According to BAAQMD's policy, all of the adopted CEQA thresholds of significance, except for the risk and hazards thresholds for new receptors, were effective June 2, 2010. It is BAAQMD's policy that the risk and hazards thresholds for new receptors will be effective May 1, 2011. The new guidelines provide methodologies for analyzing air quality impacts for the updated CEQA significance thresholds for construction-related and operational emissions of criteria air pollutants, ozone precursors, health risks, and greenhouse gases (GHGs). However, because it is BAAQMD's policy that the risk and hazards thresholds for new receptors are not going to be effective until May 1, 2011, this document evaluates the 2010 *Community Plan* under both the 2010 *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* and the previous (1999) version of the *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* for health risks.⁴ All other air quality impacts are evaluated under the thresholds from the 2010 *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*.

LOCAL

San Francisco General Plan

The goal of the Air Quality Element of the *San Francisco General Plan* (General Plan) is to reduce the level of air pollutants and to protect and improve public health, welfare, and quality of life of the citizens of San Francisco and the residents of the metropolitan region. To do so, the General Plan contains policies designed to:

- Adhere to State and federal ambient air quality standards and programs, reduce mobile sources of air pollution through implementation of the transportation element of the General Plan;

⁴ Bay Area Air Quality Management District. BAAQMD *CEQA Guidelines*, 1999 (December). Available at: <http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/CEQA-GUIDELINES/1999-CEQA-Guidelines.aspx>. Last updated December 1999. Accessed July 2010.

- Decrease the air quality impacts of development by coordination of land use and transportation decisions;
- Improve air quality by increasing public awareness regarding the negative health effects of pollutants generated by stationary and mobile sources;
- Minimize particulate matter emissions from road and construction sites; and
- Link the positive effects of energy conservation and waste management to emission reductions.

San Francisco Municipal Code

Construction Dust Control

The Construction Dust Control Ordinance was adopted in July 2008 and requires that all site preparation work, demolition, or other construction activities within the City and County of San Francisco comply with specific dust control measures.⁵ For projects over one-half acre, the Construction Dust Control Ordinance requires that the project sponsor submit a Dust Control Plan for approval by the San Francisco Health Department prior to issuance of a building permit by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). Building permits will not be issued without written notification from the Director of Public Health that the applicant has a site-specific Dust Control Plan, unless the Director waives the requirement. The requirement for a Dust Control Plan cannot be waived if sensitive land uses exist within 1,000 feet of a project site. The Construction Dust Control Ordinance requires project sponsors and contractors responsible for construction activities to control construction dust on the site or implement other practices that result in equivalent dust control that are acceptable to the Director of DBI.

Reclaimed water must be used if required by Article 21, Section 1100 et seq. of the San Francisco Public Works Code. This Article requires the use of reclaimed water for soil compaction or dust control activities unless the Director of Public Works determines in writing that either (1) reclaimed water is not available in sufficient quality and quantity from wastewater treatment facilities located within 10 miles of the construction site, or (2) well water or ground water is not available in sufficient quality and quantity from wells and groundwater sources located within 10 miles of the construction site.

If not required, based on the Director of Public Works' determination, reclaimed water still should be used whenever possible. Contractors are required to provide as much water as necessary to control dust (without creating runoff in any area of land clearing and/or earth movement). During excavation and dirt-moving activities, contractors are required to wet

⁵ City and County of San Francisco Municipal Code, Health Code Article 22b.

sweep or vacuum the streets, sidewalks, paths, and intersections where work is in progress at the end of the workday. Inactive stockpiles (where no disturbance occurs for more than seven days) greater than 10 cubic yards or 500 square feet of excavated materials, backfill material, import material, gravel, sand, road base, and soil are required to be covered with a 10 millimeter (0.01 inch) polyethylene plastic (or equivalent) tarp, braced down, or use other equivalent soil stabilization techniques.

The Construction Dust Control Ordinance requires that the applicant submit a Dust Control Plan for approval by the San Francisco Health Department. Site-specific Dust Control Plans require the project sponsor to submit a map to the Director of Public Health showing all sensitive receptors within 1,000 feet of the site; wet down areas of soil at least three times per day; provide an analysis of wind direction and install upwind and downwind particulate dust monitors; record particulate monitoring results; hire an independent, third party to conduct inspections and keep a record of those inspections; establish shut-down conditions based on wind, soil migration, etc.; establish a hotline for surrounding community members who may be potentially affected by project-related dust; limit the area subject to construction activities at any one time; install dust curtains and windbreaks on the property lines, as necessary; limit the amount of soil in hauling trucks to the size of the truck bed and secure with a tarpaulin; enforce a 15 mph speed limit for vehicles entering and exiting construction areas; sweep affected streets with water sweepers at the end of the day; install and utilize wheel washers to clean truck tires; terminate construction activities when winds exceed 25 miles per hour; apply soil stabilizers to inactive areas; and sweep off adjacent streets to reduce particulate emissions. The project applicant would be required to designate an individual to monitor compliance with dust control requirements.

San Francisco Health Code Article 38

Epidemiologic studies have demonstrated that people who live near freeways and high-traffic roadways have poorer health outcomes, including increased asthma symptoms and respiratory infections and decreased pulmonary function and lung development in children. As a result, the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) sponsored local legislation to require air quality modeling and installation of air filtration systems under specified circumstances, now codified as Article 38 of the *Health Code* (Article 38). Article 38 requires that proposed residential projects located near high-volume roadways be subject to air quality modeling conducted to determine if annual average concentrations of PM_{2.5} from roadway sources within 500 feet of a project site would exceed a concentration of 0.2 micrograms per cubic meter

($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) (annual average).⁶ According to DPH, this action level (of $0.2 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) represents about 8 percent to 10 percent of the range of ambient $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ concentrations in San Francisco based on monitoring data, and is based on epidemiological research that indicates that such a concentration can result in an approximately 0.28 percent increase in non-injury mortality, or an increased mortality rate of approximately 20 “excess deaths” per year per one million population in San Francisco.^{7,8} If this standard is exceeded, Article 38 requires that the project applicant design the project to minimize air pollutants indoors or install a filtered air supply system, with high-efficiency filters.

The 2010 *Community Plan* area identifies infill development sites at the BART parking lot and at the corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street, which have the potential to exceed the DPH $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ threshold of $0.2 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, because of the proximity of heavily trafficked roadways. Air quality modeling of the project area by DPH shows $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ concentrations would exceed $0.2 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ at the potential development sites, and thus future development at these locations would be subject to Article 38. Accordingly, residential projects of 10 or more units in these areas must be redesigned, relocated, or a ventilation system capable of removing 80 percent of ambient $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ from habitable areas of the residential units be installed.

Clean Construction Ordinance

The Clean Construction Ordinance was adopted in April 2007, became effective in March 2009, and applies to all City-contracted major construction projects, which are defined as projects that take 20 days or more of cumulative work to complete.⁹ On those major projects, emissions control requirements will apply to high use vehicles or diesel equipment, meaning those that

⁶ For purposes of evaluation of potential effects of $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure, DPH also recommends analysis where there are more than 50,000 daily vehicles within 330 feet (100 meters) of the site, or more than 10,000 daily vehicles within 165 feet (50 meters). These latter two conditions are included to capture equivalent impacts from lesser concentrations of traffic in smaller areas than the ARB-recommended standard of 100,000 daily vehicles within 500 feet (150 meters) (CARB, *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective*, 2005).

⁷ “Excess deaths” (also referred to as premature mortality) refer to deaths that occur sooner than otherwise expected, absent the specific condition under evaluation; in this case, exposure to $\text{PM}_{2.5}$.

⁸ San Francisco Department of Public Health, Occupational and Environmental Health Section, Program on Health, Equity, and Sustainability, “Assessment and Mitigation of Air Pollutant Health Effects from Intra-urban Roadways: Guidance for Land Use Planning and Environmental Review,” May 6, 2008. Twenty excess deaths per million based on non-injury, non-homicide, non-suicide mortality rate of approximately 714 per 100,000. Although San Francisco’s population is less than one million, the presentation of excess deaths is commonly given as a rate per million population.

⁹ City and County of San Francisco Municipal Code, Administrative Code, Chapter 6.

are used 20 or more hours during any portion of the project. Under the Clean Construction Ordinance, contractors performing major public works projects in San Francisco must:

- Use biodiesel in the off-road vehicles and equipment used on the job. The fuel must be at least a 20 percent blend of biodiesel (B20), but can be as high as 100 percent (B100); and
- Use construction equipment (25 hp or more) with engines that either meet U.S. EPA Tier 2 standards for off-road engines, or use the most effective verified diesel emission control strategy, also known as best available control technology.

IMPACTS

SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

The proposed project would result in significant adverse impacts to air quality if it would:

- Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan;
- Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
- Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal, State, or regional ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors); or
- Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

The Initial Study found that there would be less-than-significant impacts associated with the generation of objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people; therefore, odor impacts are not analyzed in this EIR.

APPROACH TO ANALYSIS

The recently adopted (June 2010) BAAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* include thresholds of significance relating to emissions of criteria air pollutants from construction and operational sources, and exposures of sensitive receptors to ambient TACs and PM_{2.5}, as shown below in Table III.G-5, p. III.G-17. As discussed above, because it is BAAQMD policy that the risk and hazards thresholds for new receptors are not to be effective until May 1, 2011, this document evaluates the potential for health risks under both the 2010 *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* and the previous (1999) version of the BAAQMD *CEQA Guidelines*. All other impacts are evaluated under the 2010 *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* only. The risk and hazards thresholds under the 1999 BAAQMD *CEQA Guidelines* include only exposure of sensitive receptors to an increased cancer risk of greater than 10 in a million or an increased Hazard Index greater than 1.0.

**TABLE III.G-5
2010 BAAQMD CEQA AIR QUALITY THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Criteria Air Pollutants and Ozone Precursors	Construction-Related	Operational-Related	
	Average Daily Emissions (lbs/day)	Average Daily Emissions (lbs/day)	Maximum Annual Emissions (tons/year)
Project-Level			
ROG	54	54	10
NO _x	54	54	10
PM ₁₀ (equipment exhaust)	82	82	15
PM _{2.5} (equipment exhaust)	54	54	10
PM ₁₀ /PM _{2.5} (fugitive dust)	No Impact with Implementation of Best Management Practices	None	
CO (local concentration)	None	9.0 ppm (8-hour average) 20.0 ppm (1-hour average) Compliance with Qualified Community Risk Reduction Plan Or Increased cancer risk of >10.0 in a million Increased non-cancer risk of > 1.0 Hazard Index (Chronic or Acute) Ambient PM _{2.5} increase: > 0.3 µg/m ³ annual average Zone of Influence: 1,000-foot radius from fence line of source or receptor Compliance with Qualified Community Risk Reduction Plan Or Increased cancer risk of >100.0 in a million Increased non-cancer risk of > 10.0 Hazard Index (Chronic only) Ambient PM _{2.5} increase: > 0.8 µg/m ³ annual average Zone of Influence: 1,000-foot radius from fence line of source or receptor	
Risks and Hazards ^a (Project Level) ^a	Same as Operational Thresholds		
Risks and Hazards (Cumulative) ^a	Same as Operational Thresholds		
Plan-Level			
Criteria Air Pollutants and Ozone Precursors	None	1. Consistency with Current Air Quality Plan control measures, and 2. Projected VMT or vehicle trip increase is less than or equal to projected population increase	
Toxic Air Contaminants ^a	None	1. Overlay zones around existing and planned sources of TACs (including adopted Risk Reduction Plan areas) and 2. Overlay zones of at least 500 feet from all freeways and high volume roadways	

Source: California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines, BAAQMD, adopted June 2010.

Notes:

a. It is BAAQMD policy that the risk and hazards thresholds for new receptors are not to be effective until May 1, 2011.

The 2010 *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* state that for a project to have a less-than-significant air quality impact from construction-generated dust, the project shall implement the following BAAQMD-identified dust control measures:

1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
5. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
8. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

IMPACT EVALUATION

AQ-1 *The 2010 Community Plan would not conflict or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. The most current air quality plan for the region is the recently adopted *2010 Clean Air Plan*, which updates the *2005 Ozone Strategy* and represents a unique approach to air planning, by including greenhouse gases as well as criteria air pollutants and TACs. For the *2010 Clean Air Plan*, the travel activity adjustments used in preparing the on-road mobile source inventory are the same as those used in the Transportation Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the MTC's regional

transportation plans. MTC's travel demand model utilizes regional demographic forecasts from ABAG's socioeconomic and population projections. Under BAAQMD methodology, for consistency with the *2010 Clean Air Plan* (CAP), a project or plan must demonstrate that the population or vehicle miles traveled (VMT) assumptions contained in the CAP would not be exceeded and that the project or plan implements transportation control measures (TCMs) as applicable.

Except for the residential uses proposed for the infill sites and the 13 additional residential units that could be constructed anywhere in the plan area, the *2010 Community Plan* area is largely built out and the intensity of the development in its residential neighborhoods would not be expected to change with implementation of the *2010 Community Plan*. Thus, the population of the *2010 Community Plan* area with project implementation would not be substantially different from that included in the CAP. The bulk of the air emissions from the *2010 Community Plan* stems from the operation of mobile sources in and around the area; the *2010 Community Plan* does not include policies that would be expected to result in the siting of any new stationary sources. Both the *2010 Clean Air Plan* and the *2005 Ozone Strategy* emphasize the need for smart growth and a reduction of single automobile usage. The *2010 Community Plan* is consistent with these plans in that it includes a transportation improvement program that improves access for alternative transportation routes and promotes the use of alternative transportation modes, such as transit, biking, and walking. Therefore, the proposed project would be expected to reduce VMT from motor vehicle trips associated with development in the area through implementation of a transportation improvement plan and would conform to the regional air quality plans.

In addition, the *2010 Community Plan* recommends a number of specific transportation improvements that collectively enhance connectivity through the plan area, promote safe pedestrian and bicycle circulation, increase accessibility to transit, and calm traffic. These improvements are supportive of the transportation control measures (TCMs) identified in the *2005 Ozone Strategy* as critical to attaining the State ozone standard. Specifically, the *2010 Community Plan* transportation improvements would satisfy TCM #3 (improve local and area wide bus service), TCM #5 (improve access to rail and ferries), TCM #9 (improve bicycle access and facilities), TCM #12 (improve arterial traffic management), TCM#19 (improve pedestrian access and facilities), and TCM #20 (promote traffic calming measures).

Because the *2010 Community Plan* would reduce VMT and conform to regional air quality plans, it would have a less-than-significant impact on the implementation of State and federal air quality plans.

Infill Development. As noted above, the *2010 Community Plan* would be consistent with the *2010 Clean Air Plan* and *2005 Ozone Strategy*. Infill development could potentially occur at two sites: at the northwest corner of Bosworth Street and Diamond Street and at the BART parking lot. An additional 13 units could occur throughout the plan area. The specific infill development sites and the additional 13 units would accommodate new residences near the Glen Park BART Station, which is also served by multiple Muni buses. As such, the *2010 Community Plan* promotes transit-oriented development which is a primary goal of the air quality plans. Thus, the potential infill development would have a less-than-significant impact on the implementation of State and federal air quality plans.

Transportation Improvements. The proposed transportation improvements would enhance pedestrian, transit, and bicycle circulation, and accessibility in the plan area. The proposed project would serve to improve transit services by improving transit efficiency and congestion around the BART Station. The transportation improvements would also include traffic calming measures that would improve pedestrian and bicycle travel. The proposed project's promotion of the use of alternative transportation modes would be consistent with the goals of the *2010 Clean Air Plan*. This same conclusion would apply to the transportation improvement variant, since this variant promotes improved circulation and use of alternative modes of transportation, similar to the proposed project. Finally, the transportation improvements would implement six of the *2005 Ozone Strategy* TCMs that are targeted for implementation by local governments (see discussion above under "General Impacts"). Therefore, the transportation improvements would have a less-than-significant impact on the implementation of State and federal air quality plans.

Open Space. Future open space improvements would not conflict with the goals of the air quality plans. Development of open space under the *2010 Community Plan* would likely incorporate walkways and possibly bike lanes that would help promote the use of alternative transportation modes. Promotion of open space for walkways and bicycle use would be consistent with the goals of the air quality

plans, and would, therefore, have a less-than-significant impact on the implementation of State and federal air quality plans.

AQ-2 *Fugitive dust from construction activities associated with the 2010 Community Plan would not result in short-term violations of particulate matter ambient air quality standards. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Adoption of the *2010 Community Plan* would not result in construction activities, except under development of the individual components of the *2010 Community Plan*. Construction impacts associated with the individual components of the *2010 Community Plan* could have localized air quality impacts, as discussed below.

Infill Development. Development under the *2010 Community Plan* could include development of commercial and residential uses at two infill sites, plus development of 13 additional residential units throughout the plan area. No specific development for the infill sites has been proposed at this time, and thus, specific construction details, such as construction phasing and equipment, are unknown. However, this analysis assumes that construction activities for the infill sites would include site preparation, grading, placement of infrastructure, placement of foundations for structures, and fabrication of structures. Demolition, excavation, and construction activities would likely require the use of heavy trucks, excavating and grading equipment, concrete breakers, concrete mixers, and other mobile and stationary construction equipment. Fugitive dust emissions during construction would be caused by material handling, traffic on unpaved or unimproved surfaces, and demolition of structures and pavement.

Throughout construction, fugitive dust emissions could vary day to day, depending on the specific construction phase. When considered in the context of long-term operations of the *2010 Community Plan*, demolition and construction-related fugitive dust emissions would be temporary, but these activities could still impact local air quality.

The San Francisco Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008) discussed in the “Regulatory Framework” section would reduce dust emissions generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of onsite workers, and to minimize public nuisance complaints. The requirements of the Construction Dust

Control Ordinance may be waived if there are no sensitive receptors within 1,000 feet of the construction site. The Glen Park Community Plan Area is largely built out with residential uses in close proximity; therefore, the requirements of the Construction Dust Ordinance would apply to all construction sites.

The BAAQMD considers construction-related fugitive dust emissions to be less than significant with implementation of defined best management practices as described on page III.G-18. The Construction Dust Control Ordinance of the San Francisco Health Code includes the BAAQMD-recommended measures identified above. Compliance with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance, as required, would reduce fugitive dust impacts from construction under the *2010 Community Plan* to a less-than-significant level.

Transportation Improvements. Transportation improvements would be carried out by the City and City contractors. Pursuant to the Construction Dust Control Ordinance, Health Code Article 22B, Section 1247, "All departments, boards, commissions, and agencies of the City and County of San Francisco that authorize construction or improvements on land under their jurisdiction under circumstances where no building, excavation, grading, foundation, or other permit needs to be obtained under the San Francisco Building Code shall adopt rules and regulations to insure that the same dust control requirements that are set forth in this Article are followed." Thus, compliance with Article 22B and all adopted rules and regulations will ensure that potential dust-related air quality impacts would be less than significant.

Open Space. Construction of the future open space improvements would also generate fugitive dust during construction. While specific open space proposals are not known at this time, it can be anticipated that improvements for greenways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and possible daylighting of Islais Creek would likely involve site preparation, grading, and placement of infrastructure. These improvements, like the transportation improvements, would be undertaken by the City, which would be required to comply with the San Francisco Construction Dust Control Ordinance, similar to the transportation improvements. Compliance with the San Francisco Construction Dust Control Ordinance would reduce open space improvements construction fugitive dust emissions to a less-than-significant level.

AQ-3 *Equipment used for construction activities associated with the 2010 Community Plan would result in short-term emission increases of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria. (Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)*

General Impacts. Adoption of the *2010 Community Plan* would not result in construction activities, except under development of the individual components of the *2010 Community Plan*. Demolition, excavation, and new construction activities of the individual components would require the use of heavy trucks, excavating and grading equipment, material loaders, cranes, concrete breakers, and other mobile and stationary construction equipment. Emissions during construction would be caused by materials handling, demolition of pavement, use of paving materials and architectural coatings, exhaust from construction worker vehicle trips, truck trips, and exhaust from construction equipment such as loaders, graders, and cranes. Construction impacts associated with the individual components of the *2010 Community Plan* could have regional air quality impacts, as discussed below.

Infill Development. Development under the *2010 Community Plan* could include development of commercial and residential uses on two infill sites and residential development of 13 additional units throughout the plan area. No specific development for the infill sites has been proposed at this time, and no specific locations have been identified for the additional 13 units. Therefore, specific construction details, such as construction phasing and equipment, are unknown. However, this analysis assumes that construction activities for the infill sites would include site preparation, grading, placement of infrastructure, placement of foundations for structures, and fabrication of structures. Demolition, excavation, and construction activities would likely require the use of heavy trucks, excavating and grading equipment, concrete breakers, concrete mixers, and other mobile and stationary construction equipment. Emissions during construction would be generated from the use of paving materials and architectural coatings, exhaust from construction worker vehicles, and exhaust from powered construction equipment.

For project-level analysis, this section provides a quantitative assessment of the project's construction-related emissions to determine whether they would exceed the significance thresholds. Emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors were modeled based on URBEMIS default and BAAQMD-recommended settings and parameters attributable to the activity period and site location. It is estimated

that the “worst-case”, construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors would be associated with concurrent construction of the infill sites and transportation improvements. However, because the daily emissions of the infill sites and transportation improvements would be largely dependent on how the individual components are phased, it is unknown whether their construction would overlap with each other to result in significant criteria air pollutant emissions.

Table III.G-6, p. III.G-25, summarizes the modeled construction-related emissions of each criteria air pollutant and ozone precursors for the two potential infill sites. As shown in the table, construction-related emissions of ROG for the individual developments at the two infill lots would not have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD thresholds of significance. If the infill sites at either the BART parking lot or at the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street site were constructed concurrently with each other, or concurrently with any of the transportation improvements, construction emissions of ROG and NO_x would have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD thresholds of significance for construction criteria pollutants. Because the PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} exhaust emissions associated with the improvements are well below the BAAQMD thresholds, even if construction of both the infill sites and the transportation improvements were to overlap with each other, emissions from the infill development and transportation improvements would not likely exceed the PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} thresholds. However, emissions of ROG and NO_x under the 2010 *Community Plan* would result in potentially significant impacts on air quality.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A, p. III.G-25, is proposed to reduce emissions from construction of all project components; however, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A, construction-related emissions associated with infill development would still have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds for ROG and NO_x. It should be noted that Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3 not only addresses criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors, which are the subject of this Impact AQ-3, but would also serve to reduce particulate matter emissions and thus is also recommended to address construction health risk impacts as reported in Impact AQ-6, p. III.G-31.

**TABLE III.G-6
CONSTRUCTION CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANT EMISSIONS**

Emission Source	ROG (lbs/day)	NOX (lbs/day)	Exhaust PM₁₀ (lbs/day)	Exhaust PM_{2.5} (lbs/day)
BART Parking Lot Infill Development	50	43	2.6	2.4
Diamond and Bosworth Infill Development	32	37	2.3	2.2
2928-2958 Diamond Street ^a	21	5	0.3	0.1
Transportation Improvements				
Intersection and Traffic Calming Improvements (each improvement)	3	23	1.2	1.1
Pedestrian Bridge	3	23	1.2	1.1
Bus Loop	4	42	1.8	1.7
Roundabout	3	23	1.2	1.1
2010 BAAQMD Significance Threshold	54	54	82	54
Any Individual Components Exceed 2010 BAAQMD Threshold?	No	No	No	No
Combined Components Exceed 2010 BAAQMD Threshold?	Yes	Yes	No	No

Source: PBS&J, 2011. Based on URBEMIS 2007 Version 9.2.4, and compliance with BAAQMD Regulation 8, Rule 3.

- a. Atkins, *Glen Park Community Plan EIR – URBEMIS Update Associated with Plan Refinements Subsequent to DEIR Publication*, memorandum from Kimberly Comacho to Lisa Gibson, October 12, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as a part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

Should concurrent construction activities be undertaken, there is a potential for such activities to exceed the ROG and NO_x significance thresholds identified by BAAQMD, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A, below. Phasing of construction activities could reduce criteria air pollutant impacts to less than significant. Therefore, Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3B, p. III.G-26, has been identified to require subsequent review of the transportation improvements and development of the infill sites. However, since specific developments have not been identified for the infill sites and the implementation schedule for the transportation improvements is undetermined since it depends largely on available funding, it is unknown whether phasing the different projects to reduce criteria air pollutant impacts is feasible. Therefore, construction emissions from infill development are considered significant and unavoidable.

M-AQ-3A Construction Vehicle Emissions Minimization. To reduce the potential health risk resulting from project construction activities, the project sponsor shall include in contract specifications a requirement for the following measures:

- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to two minutes

- The project shall develop a construction plan demonstrating that the off-road equipment (more than 50 horsepower) to be used in the

construction project (i.e., owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles) would achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NO_x reduction and 45 percent PM reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average (as specified in California Code of Regulations Article 4.8, Section 2449 General Requirements for In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets). Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on devices such as particulate filters, and/or other options as such become available;

- All construction equipment, diesel trucks, and generators shall be equipped with Best Available Control Technology for emission reductions of NO_x and PM;
- Use of Interim Tier 4 or equivalent equipment for all uses where such equipment is available;
- Use of Tier 3 equipment with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) or alternative fuel vehicles for applications where Tier 4 Interim engines are not available; and
- Prohibition of diesel generators for construction purposes where feasible alternative sources of power are available.

M-AQ-3B Construction Phasing. Prior to construction of development at the infill sites, any transportation improvements, or any open space improvements, the project sponsor shall coordinate with the Planning Department to determine: (1) whether any concurrent construction activities identified in the *2010 Community Plan* is occurring, (2) whether concurrent construction activities could exceed the BAAQMD's criteria air pollutant thresholds, and (3) whether project phasing could reduce criteria air pollutant to below BAAQMD's significance thresholds. The Planning Department may require additional criteria air pollutant analysis that includes implementation of the mitigation measures described in M-AQ-3A or more refined construction details.

Transportation Improvements. As noted above, and in Table III.G-6, p. III.G-25, the "worst-case", construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors would be associated with concurrent construction of the infill sites and transportation improvements. Construction of the individual transportation improvements would not have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds; however, if these improvements were constructed

concurrently with each other and with the infill developments, emissions of ROG and NO_x would have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds.

Construction of the transportation improvements would be required to comply with the City's Clean Construction Ordinance, discussed in the "Regulatory Framework" section. This would require construction contractors to use biodiesel in the off-road vehicles and equipment used on the construction site and use construction equipment that either meets U.S. EPA Tier 2 standards for off-road engines or use the most effective diesel emission control strategy. Compliance with the Clean Construction Ordinance would reduce construction emissions of ROG and NO_x in diesel exhaust, but would not reduce emissions to a less-than-significant level. Consequently, emissions after complying with the Clean Construction Ordinance would still be significant.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A, p. III.G-25, would further reduce construction-related emissions from transportation improvements; however, even with this measure, concurrent construction and associated criteria air pollutant emissions would still have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds. It may be possible to phase construction of the infill development and transportation improvements to avoid overlapping construction schedules. However, since specific developments have not been identified for the infill developments, or specific timing identified for the transportation improvements, it is unknown whether phasing is a feasible measure. Therefore, construction impacts for ROG and NO_x are considered significant and unavoidable.

Open Space. Construction of the future open space improvements would also generate construction emissions. The implementation of the open space improvements is long-term in nature and would be subject to independent study and environmental review in the future. At this time, it is unknown what construction activities would be associated with the open space developments and it would be speculative to estimate construction criteria air pollutant emissions. If construction activities were to overlap with the infill developments and the transportation improvements, the resulting air quality impacts could also be significant.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A, p. III.G-25, would further reduce construction-related emissions from open space improvements; however, even with this measure, construction-related emissions would still have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds. It may be possible to phase construction of each of the individual components of the *2010 Community Plan* to avoid overlapping construction schedules. However, since specific timing has not been identified for the various components, it is unknown whether phasing is a feasible measure. Therefore, construction impacts for ROG and NO_x are considered significant and unavoidable.

AQ-4 *Operational emissions associated with the 2010 Community Plan would not emit criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that exceed 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Adoption of the *2010 Community Plan* would not result in operational emissions, except under development of the individual components of the *2010 Community Plan*. Operational activities under the *2010 Community Plan* that would generate emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors include both mobile and area-wide sources. Mobile sources include the additional vehicular trips generated by the infill development. Area-wide sources include residential and commercial water heaters and use of consumer products, such as barbeque lighter fluid and hair spray. Operational emissions associated with the individual components of the *2010 Community Plan* are discussed below.

Infill Development. The BAAQMD has established thresholds for projects requiring its review for potential air quality impacts. These thresholds are based on the minimum size project that the BAAQMD considers capable of generating emissions with the potential to exceed BAAQMD's significance thresholds of 54 pounds per day each of ROG, NO_x, and PM_{2.5}, and 82 pounds per day of PM₁₀. The two identified infill sites together could include up to 150 units¹⁰ and up to about 23,500 square feet of retail/commercial development. As described in Section III.E, Transportation and Circulation, the proposed uses would generate 930 daily vehicle trips associated with the residential units and 1,222 daily vehicle trips associated with the retail uses, for a total of 2,152 daily vehicle trips at the two sites. Based on

¹⁰ The total of 150 dwelling units includes 13 potential units enabled by NCT zoning changes, with 11 modeled at the northwest corner of the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection infill site and two at the BART parking lot site.

URBEMIS modeling results, the on-site emissions and increased motor vehicle trips associated with the proposed infill development would generate air pollutant emissions as shown in Table III.G-7, below. Implementation of the project would not cause operational emissions to exceed the BAAQMD's significance thresholds for ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5} and, thus, would not result in a significant air quality impact.

Transportation Improvements. The transportation improvements would serve to improve congestion and access to alternative modes of transportation for most locations in the plan area. See Section III.E, Transportation and Circulation, for level of service (a measure of roadway congestion and delay) with and without adoption of the *2010 Community Plan*. These improvements would not result in an increase in vehicle trips and would promote use of alternative transportation modes, which collectively reduce air pollutant emissions. Therefore, no increase in regional air emissions would be expected as part of the transportation improvements.

**TABLE III.G-7
PROJECT DAILY OPERATIONAL AIR POLLUTANT EMISSIONS^a**

Emissions Source	Project Emissions (Pounds per Day)			
	ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
BART Parking Lot Infill Site				
Stationary	6.87	1.37	0.2	0.2
Vehicle	9.03	10.82	18.22	3.48
Diamond and Bosworth Infill Site				
Stationary	4.37	0.86	0.01	0.01
Vehicle	5.46	6.51	10.96	2.09
2928-2958 Diamond Street ^b				
Stationary	0.13	0.19	0	0
Vehicle	4.52	5.96	0	0
Total	30.38	25.71	29.39	5.78
BAAQMD Significance Thresholds	54.0	54.0	82.0	54.0
Exceeds BAAQMD Thresholds?	No	No	No	No

TABLE III.G-8
PROJECT DAILY OPERATIONAL AIR POLLUTANT EMISSIONS^a

Source: PBS&J, 2011.

Note:

- a. Emissions are based on maximum development potential for the plan area, as described in Chapter II, Project Description.
- b. Atkins, *Glen Park Community Plan EIR – Urbemis Update Associated with Plan Refinements Subsequent to DEIR Publication*, memorandum from Kimberly Comacho to Lisa Gibson, October 12, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as a part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

Open Space. Future open space improvements would not be expected to generate vehicle trips to or from the plan area. The improvements are proposed as local amenities and venues for residents of Glen Park and not city or regional destinations. The implementation of the open space improvements is long-term in

nature and would be subject to independent study and environmental review in the future. Therefore, no increase in regional air emissions would be expected as part of the open space improvements of the *2010 Community Plan*.

AQ-5 *Operational emissions from motor vehicles trips associated with the 2010 Community Plan would not cause local concentrations of CO to exceed State and federal ambient air quality standards. (Less than Significant)*

General Impacts. Adoption of the *2010 Community Plan* would not result in direct emissions of CO, except under development of the individual components of the *2010 Community Plan*. CO emissions would result from the operation of motor vehicles, and these emissions can contribute to CO “hot spots” (i.e., elevated concentrations) at highly congested intersections. Operational CO emissions from motor vehicles associated with the individual components of the *2010 Community Plan* are discussed below.

Infill Development. Future development of the infill sites and the 13 additional units would increase vehicular trips and thus mobile source air emissions. These emissions would contribute to localized CO concentrations. CALINE4 dispersion modeling to determine local CO concentrations was performed for receptors near four intersections in the plan area. These intersections were selected because they represent locations where traffic from the infill development sites would produce the greatest change in traffic level of service (and, therefore, the greatest increase in congestion, which would produce the greatest increase in CO emissions) and/or the highest total traffic volumes of all intersections in the study area. Table III.G-9, p. III.G-31, presents CO concentrations and shows that the combined land use, transportation, and open space elements recommended in the *2010 Community Plan* would not result in exceedances of the State and federal CO standards. Other intersections affected by project traffic and at a further distance from the proposed project would be expected to have CO concentration levels similar to or lower than the selected intersections. Therefore, infill development that could occur under the *2010 Community Plan* would have less-than-significant CO impacts.

Transportation Improvements. The transportation improvements would serve to improve congestion and access to alternative modes of transportation for most areas. See Section III.E, Transportation and Circulation, for level of service with and without adoption of the *2010 Community Plan*. These improvements would not

result in an increase in vehicle trips. Therefore, the effects of the transportation improvements on ambient CO standards would be less than significant.

Open Space. Future open space improvements would not be expected to generate vehicle trips to or from the project area. The implementation of the open space improvements is long-term in nature and would be subject to independent study and environmental review in the future. However, it is expected that open space impacts with respect to CO would be less than significant, since future open space improvements would not result in vehicle trips nor involve substantial stationary or area-wide CO sources.

**TABLE III.G-9
CARBON MONOXIDE CONCENTRATIONS AT SELECTED INTERSECTIONS**

Intersection	One-Hour Average CO (ppm) ^a			Eight-Hour Average CO (ppm) ^a		
	Existing (2010)	Existing with Project (2010)	Cumulative (2030)	Existing (2010)	Existing with Project (2010)	Cumulative (2030)
Bosworth Street / Elk Street / Congo Street	4.4	4.4	3.8	2.6	2.6	2.2
Bosworth Street / Lippard Avenue	4.5	4.5	3.8	2.6	2.6	2.2
Bosworth Street / Diamond Street	4.5	4.6	3.8	2.6	2.7	2.2
Bosworth Street / Lyell Street	4.7	4.7	3.9	2.7	2.7	2.2

Source: PBS&J, 2010.

The BAAQMD recommends that the current CO background for use with CALINE4 be chosen as the second highest recorded value over the last two years at the nearest BAAQMD station (i.e., the Arkansas Street station on Potrero Hill, in this case); these background levels are shown below. The California ARB has estimated San Francisco's CO emissions through the year 2020, but not for more distant future years; such CO emissions show a steady decrease over time at least up to 2020. Consequently, the current CO background levels were also used as the 2030 background levels, a conservative approach considering that 2030 levels are likely to be lower than current levels since ambient concentrations generally follow emission trends.

CO Background:

1-hour average: 3.6 ppm

8-hour average: 2.0 ppm

Ambient CO Standards:

1-hour average—federal: 35 ppm; State 20 ppm

8-hour average—federal and State: 9 ppm

a. Calculations reflect CO levels at 25 feet from roadside.

AQ-6 *Construction equipment associated with the proposed development under the 2010 Community Plan would emit PM_{2.5} and other TACs that exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria. (Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)*

The BAAQMD's 2010 *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* identify a significant health risk from construction activities that result in an increased cancer risk greater than 10 per

million population, a non-cancer hazard index each greater than 1.0 (both chronic and acute), or average annual ambient PM_{2.5} increases of 0.3. The 1999 BAAQMD CEQA *Guidelines* did not establish construction health risk thresholds. The 2010 BAAQMD CEQA *Air Quality Guidelines* also established a screening methodology for determining carcinogenic health risk, non-carcinogenic health hazard, and maximum annual PM_{2.5} concentration in areas near construction sites, and for establishing the size of a buffer zone around construction sites sufficient to protect sensitive receptors from adverse health impacts.¹¹ The size of the buffer zone depends on the type of land use under construction (i.e., “Residential,” “Commercial,” or “Industrial”) and the size of the construction site. In general, the larger the construction site, the wider the buffer zone recommended to avoid potential health impacts. Even for relatively small construction sites (i.e., less than 1 acre in size), the buffer zone is never less than 95 meters (about 300 feet).

General Impacts. Adoption of the *2010 Community Plan* would not result in construction activities, except under development of the individual components of the *2010 Community Plan*. Construction impacts associated with the individual components of the *2010 Community Plan* could have localized impacts, as discussed below.

Infill Development. The two sites proposed for infill development, both of which include residential uses, are each about one-half acre in size. The 2010 BAAQMD CEQA *Air Quality Guidelines* recommend a 300-foot buffer zone around the construction activity to assure that existing sensitive receptors in Glen Park are not significantly impacted by construction-phase TAC and PM_{2.5} emissions. Furthermore, while the 13 additional units could be constructed anywhere within the plan area, they would be constructed near other residential units and potentially on lots adjacent to another residential parcel. Given that existing residential uses in the *2010 Community Plan* area are adjacent to the infill sites, resultant health risks from construction equipment emissions would result in potentially significant impacts.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A on p. III.G-25 is proposed to reduce construction-related emissions, which would also reduce the exposure of nearby residents to construction-related health risks. However, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A, construction-related health risks would still have the potential to

¹¹ *Screening Tables for Air Toxics Evaluation During Construction*; BAAQMD, May 2010.

exceed the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Transportation Improvements. Each of the transportation improvements would be constructed on relatively small construction sites (i.e., less than 1 acre in size), but as noted above, the buffer zone for screening potential impacts is never less than 300 feet wide. Each of the transportation improvement sites would be within 300 feet of residential uses due to the compact nature of Glen Park. Therefore, health risks from construction equipment emissions would result in potentially significant impacts. Compliance with the City's Clean Construction Ordinance would reduce PM_{2.5} and TAC emissions from construction activities, but it is unknown whether emissions would be reduced below BAAQMD significance thresholds. In addition to compliance with the Clean Construction Ordinance, Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A, p. III.G-25, is proposed to reduce construction-related emissions, which would also reduce the exposure of nearby residents to construction-related health risks. However, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A, construction-related health risks would still have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Open Space. No specific development for the open space improvements has been proposed at this time. Therefore, specific construction details are unknown. The implementation of the open space improvements is long-term in nature and would be subject to independent study and environmental review in the future. Nevertheless, as noted above, the buffer zone for screening potential health risk impacts is never less than 300 feet wide. It is likely that construction of open space areas would be within 300 feet of residential uses due to the compact character of the Glen Park community. Therefore, health risks from construction equipment emissions would result in potentially significant impacts. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A, p. III.G-25, is proposed to reduce construction-related emissions, which would also reduce the exposure of nearby residents to construction-related health risks. However, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A, construction-related health risks would still have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

AQ-7 *Motor vehicles and stationary sources operating in and near the 2010 Community Plan area emit PM_{2.5} and other TACs. Given that project implementation would introduce new residential sensitive receptors in locations exposed to high levels of PM_{2.5} and other TACs, resultant health risks would exceed the 1999 and the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria. (Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)*

The 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines use the same thresholds of significance as the 1999 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines for health risk from operational sources (i.e., increased cancer risk greater than 10 per million, and for both chronic and acute non-cancer hazard index each greater than 1.0). The 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines also established a new threshold of 0.3 µg/m³ or greater annual average for operational ambient PM_{2.5} increases, and recommended more complex modeling techniques for determining carcinogenic health risk, non-carcinogenic health hazard, and maximum annual PM_{2.5} concentrations in areas subject to mobile source TAC emissions. If a single roadway or stationary source exceeds any one of these thresholds, the project would be considered to expose sensitive receptors to a significant health risk impact. The BAAQMD also recommends cumulative thresholds of an increased cancer risk of 100 in one million, chronic or acute non-cancer hazard index greater than 10.0, and a PM_{2.5} concentration greater than 0.8 µg/m³. If the total of all roadway and stationary sources within 1,000 feet of the proposed project exceed these cumulative thresholds, the project would be considered to expose sensitive receptors to a significant cumulative health risk impact. Sources of TACs include both mobile and stationary sources. To determine whether the proposed project would be below BAAQMD thresholds for TAC exposure, roadway and stationary sources in proximity to the plan area were identified and quantified using the BAAQMD's screening-level methodology.¹²

The 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines reference a master list maintained by the BAAQMD of all the stationary source facilities in the Bay Area that have permits to operate and that emit one or more TACs. For each permitted stationary source, the BAAQMD list also includes screening cancer risks, hazard indices and PM_{2.5} concentrations that may be use to characterize the maximum TAC exposure of any sensitive receptors within 1,000 feet of the permitted stationary source.¹³ The listed permitted sources within 1,000 feet of the 2010 Community Plan area include three dry cleaning plants (which emit the TAC perchloroethylene): Glen Park

¹² Recommended Methods for Screening and Modeling Local Risks and Hazards, BAAQMD, May 2010.

¹³ Ibid.

Cleaners (701 Chenery Street), Clean N' Save (647 Bosworth Street), and Cameo Cleaners (2920 Diamond Street). These sources were verified by the BAAQMD, and according to more recent information from the BAAQMD, Glen Park Cleaners and Clean N' Save have discontinued the use of perchloroethylene, and by site survey at the time of preparation of this document, Cameo Cleaners is no longer in business at the listed location in Glen Park.¹⁴ Therefore, since these businesses are no longer emitting perchloroethylene within 1,000 feet of the plan area, TAC emissions from stationary sources would not exceed the BAAQMD individual health risk significance thresholds.

The BAAQMD also considers roadways with average daily vehicle traffic greater than 10,000 to result in potential health risks. Table III.G-10, p. III.G-36, identifies three roadways within 1,000 feet of the plan area with traffic over 10,000 vehicles per day. Both Bosworth Street and San Jose Avenue exceed the BAAQMD's individual health risk significance thresholds for cancer risk of 10 chances in a million. No roadways in the plan area are anticipated to exceed the non-cancer hazard index thresholds individually or cumulatively. As shown in Table III.G-10, the existing mobile sources within 1,000 feet of the plan area would represent a significant community health risk for cancer risks and ambient PM_{2.5}. However, the combined health risk impacts from all roadway and stationary sources would not exceed the BAAQMD cumulative health risk thresholds.

General Impacts. As shown in Table III.G-10, adoption of the *2010 Community Plan* would allow for new residential uses to be constructed in areas where the cancer risk and PM_{2.5} levels exceed the 2010 BAAQMD thresholds. This would be a potentially significant impact under both the 1999 and 2010 BAAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*.

¹⁴ Virginia Lau, BAAQMD, personal communication with Jessica Range, San Francisco Planning Department, December 14, 2010.

**TABLE III.G-10
STATIONARY AND ROADWAY TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANT SOURCES**

Roadways Greater than 10,000 vehicles within 1,000 feet					
Street	Volume^a	Distance^b	Cancer Risk^c	Chronic Hazard^c	PM_{2.5c}
Bosworth Street	23,200	<100 feet	15	0.10	0.11
San Jose Avenue	46,122	100 feet	37	0.24	0.29
Interstate 280	195,000	500 feet	0.39	0	0.14
Total Roadway			52.39	0.34	0.54
Cumulative Health Risk					
			Cancer Risk	Chronic Hazard	PM_{2.5}
Total Point Sources ^d			0	0	0
Total Roadway Sources			52.39	0.34	0.54
Cumulative Impact			52.39	0.34	0.54
BAAQMD Individual Project Threshold			>10.0 in a million	>1.0 Hazard Index (Chronic or Acute)	>0.3 µg/m ³ annual average
BAAQMD Cumulative Project Threshold			>100 in a million from all local sources	>10.0 Hazard Index from all local sources	>0.8 µg/m ³ annual average from all local sources
Individually Significant?			Yes	No	Yes
Cumulatively Significant?			No	No	No

Source: BAAQMD.

Notes:

- Vehicle rate data for surface streets obtained from the California Environmental Health Tracking Program website, http://www.ehib.org/traffic_tool.jsp, accessed March 17, 2011.
- Distance calculated from the BART parking lot infill site, since this site is closer to the identified roadways than the Bosworth and Diamond infill site.
- The BAAQMD screening tables are in the process of being updated by the BAAQMD and is subject to change. The screening tables do not provide data for distances less than 100 feet. As such, the actual cancer risk for receptors along Bosworth Street may be higher than those presented in this table.
- All of the stationary sources included in the BAAQMD permitted sources database within 1,000 feet of the plan area were found to no longer use perchloroethylene or were no longer in business. Therefore, for the purposes of this analysis, health risks from stationary sources are assumed to be zero.

Infill Development. As shown in Table III.G-9, the plan area includes sites that exceed the 2010 BAAQMD thresholds for health risks. The risks presented in the table are for receptors at the BART parking lot infill site, since this site is closer to the identified roadways than the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street site, and as shown, is in an area where the cancer risk and PM_{2.5} levels exceed the 2010 BAAQMD thresholds. The Diamond Street and Bosworth Street infill site is farther away from San Jose Avenue and I-280 than the BART parking lot, but is also less than 100 feet from Bosworth Street. Therefore, the screening level analysis considered the closest infill site, which is the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street site. Screening tables are less accurate at distances closer than 100 feet; therefore, the

cancer, Hazard Index, and PM_{2.5} risks are reported at 100 feet, but expected to be greater at distances closer than 100 feet. As shown in Table III.G-9, the cancer risks are exceeded at the infill sites by both San Jose Avenue and Bosworth Street. At distances closer than 100 feet, annual average PM_{2.5} concentrations may also be exceeded. The exact location of the additional 13 residential is unknown at this time (other than they would be constructed within the area plan), but could also be exposed to cancer risks and PM_{2.5} concentrations in excess of the 2010 BAAQMD thresholds from the identified roadways. Siting of residential uses at these sites would result in a potentially significant impact with respect to cancer risks and exposure to PM_{2.5} concentrations. Health risks impacts are substantially reduced with distance. A screening level analysis shows that at distances of 500 feet from the identified roadways, health risk impacts are reduced to below BAAQMD's risk levels. Therefore, any infill development at a distance greater than 500 feet from Bosworth Street, San Jose Ave, or I-280 would be below BAAQMD risk levels.

As noted in the "Regulatory Framework" section, residential developments of 10 or more units are subject to the requirements of the San Francisco Health Code Section 3807, which requires development on sites with PM_{2.5} concentrations greater than 0.2 µg/m³ to be designed or relocated to avoid exposure greater than 0.2 µg/m³, or to install a ventilation system capable of removing 80 percent of ambient PM_{2.5} from habitable areas of the residential units. According to Section 3807 requirements, if a ventilation system is the chosen form of compliance, in addition to assuring 80 percent PM_{2.5} removal efficiency, the air intakes should be placed to minimize PM_{2.5} entry from roadway sources. A licensed mechanical engineer would certify that the system offers the best available technology to minimize outdoor-to-indoor transmission of PM_{2.5}, and the developer would ensure an ongoing maintenance plan for the ventilation system and inform the occupant's regarding the proper use of this system. Compliance with the requirements of the San Francisco Health Code Section 3807 would reduce the exposure of future residents to mobile source emissions of PM_{2.5} and potentially reduce cancer risks associated with exposure to PM_{2.5}. However, it is unknown whether compliance with these requirements would reduce the health risks associated with mobile source TACs to a less-than-significant level. Additionally, Article 38 only applies to residential projects of ten or more dwelling units.

This analysis provides a programmatic evaluation of the infill developments and would be subject to independent study and environmental review in the future. As

a result, Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7 is proposed to evaluate and mitigate potentially significant health risk impacts when a specific development is proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*. The risk reduction plan included in Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7 would reduce exposure of residents to TACs from mobile sources; however, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7, it may not be feasible to reduce exposure at the sites to below the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds for cancer risks. Also, because the ventilation systems required under the San Francisco Health Code and measures that would be included in the risk reduction plan under Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7, would primarily reduce PM_{2.5} levels within the interiors of the residential uses, potentially significant impacts could still result from outdoor exposure of the future residents. Therefore, this would be a significant and unavoidable impact of the project.

M-AQ-7 Health Risk Review for Future Sensitive Receptors. To reduce the potential health risk to new sensitive receptors within the plan area, new residential or open space development proposed under the *2010 Community Plan* that is within 500 feet of Bosworth Street, San Jose Avenue, or I-280 shall, as part of its CEQA review, include an analysis of toxic air contaminants, including PM_{2.5}, diesel particulate matter (DPM), and total organic gases (TOGs), and shall, if warranted based on the results, develop a plan to minimize exposure of future sensitive receptors to TACs (which includes PM_{2.5}, DPM, and TOGs). The analysis shall employ either site-specific modeling of TAC concentrations or BAAQMD methodology to determine whether the average annual concentration of PM_{2.5} from the roadway sources within 500 feet would exceed the threshold, or action level of 0.3 µg/m³, or if the TAC exposure of PM_{2.5}, DPM, and TOGs would result in an increased cancer risk greater than 10 in a million or a hazard index greater than 1.0.

The health risk analysis shall be submitted to the Planning Department and shall identify measures to reduce exposure of new sensitive receptors in the plan area. These measures may include redesigning the project site plan to provide greater separation between the sensitive receptors and pollutant sources, installation of a filtered air supply system for residential uses, or placement of air intakes for the ventilation system at greater horizontal and/or vertical distances from pollutant sources.

Transportation Improvements. As discussed above under Impact AQ-5, p. III.G-30, the transportation improvements would serve to improve congestion and access to alternative modes of transportation for most areas and would not result in an increase in vehicle trips. Therefore, the operational health risk effects of the transportation improvements on sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

Open Space. The open space improvements would not be expected to generate vehicle trips to or from the project area; however, the open space improvements could include recreational uses in the open space area. New recreational uses would be considered sensitive receptors to mobile source emissions, especially for areas near Bosworth Street. The implementation of the open space improvements is long-term in nature and would be subject to independent study and environmental review in the future. At this time, it is unknown whether recreational or other sensitive uses would be associated with the open space developments and it would be speculative to estimate their location in relation to the roadways. Therefore, the operational effects of the open space improvements on sensitive receptors would be potentially significant with respect to health risks.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7, p. III.G-38, would require review of the potential health risks of any sensitive uses proposed under the open space improvements; however, at this time it is unknown whether health risks for these sensitive uses could be reduced to a level below the BAAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, this would be a significant and unavoidable impact of the project.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Other foreseeable projects that would be expected to occur in or near the plan area that could result in cumulative air quality impacts are identified in Section III.B, Land Use, p. III.B-15.

BAAQMD considers projects that result in a significant criteria air pollutant impact to also result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional criteria air pollutants. The analysis in this section identified less-than-significant fugitive dust and operational criteria air pollutant impacts; therefore, the *2010 Community Plan* would not result in cumulatively considerable construction-related fugitive dust or operational criteria air pollutant emissions. Furthermore, the analysis of CO impacts, under Impact AQ-5 included all traffic anticipated from cumulative development and found that State CO standards would not be exceeded; therefore, cumulative CO impacts would also be less than significant.

This section identifies other cumulative air quality impacts that could occur from implementation of the 2010 *Community Plan* in combination with other foreseeable development. Specifically, the following cumulative impacts are described: criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors from cumulative construction activities; health risks to plan area residents from construction and operations; and introduction of sensitive receptors into areas with cumulative health risk sources.

C-AQ-1 *Construction activity associated with the proposed development under the 2010 Community Plan and with other development in the area would generate criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that would exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria. (Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)*

As discussed under Impact AQ-3, development under the 2010 *Community Plan* would potentially exceed the 2010 BAAQMD thresholds of significance if the different components of the 2010 *Community Plan* were constructed concurrently. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B are proposed to reduce emissions from construction of all project components, and to phase the project components; however, even with implementation of the mitigation measures, construction-related emissions associated with the 2010 *Community Plan* would still have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds. BAAQMD considers projects that result in a significant criteria air pollutant impact to also result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional criteria air pollutants. Therefore, construction activities under the 2010 *Community Plan* would contribute to a significant cumulative impact with respect to criteria air pollutant and ozone precursors.

C-AQ-2 *Construction activities associated with the proposed development under the 2010 Community Plan and with other development in the area would emit PM_{2.5} and other TACs. Although construction emissions would be temporary for each separate project, given the close proximity of sensitive receptors in the 2010 Community Plan area to the project and other development sites, resultant cumulative health risks would be significant. (Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation)*

Given the BAAQMD requirement for a least a 300-foot buffer zone to avoid potential health impacts even for relatively small construction sites (i.e., less than 1 acre in size), the compact mixed-use nature of the 2010 *Community Plan* area, and the potential for overlapping buffer zones of multiple projects in the area, there is a potential for cumulatively considerable contributions of TACs from construction of multiple projects. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A on p. III.G-25 is proposed to reduce

construction-related emissions, which would also reduce the exposure of nearby residents to construction-related health risks. However, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A, construction-related health risks would still have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative TAC impacts.

C-AQ-3 *Development anticipated under the 2010 Community Plan would result in operation activities that emit TACs and PM_{2.5} and would introduce new sensitive receptors to an area exposed to TACs from cumulative motor vehicle sources on roadways in and near the 2010 Community Plan area, but would not exceed the 2010 BAAQMD cumulative significance thresholds. (Less than Significant)*

The project does not involve sources that would contribute substantial amounts of TACs and PM_{2.5}. Operational sources associated with the proposed project would include motor vehicle emissions and would contribute to the cumulative health risks in the plan area. Nevertheless, the project's 2,152 daily vehicle trips would be considered minor, low impact sources as per BAAQMD guidance.¹⁵ As such, operational sources would not be anticipated to result in cumulative health risks that exceed BAAQMD's 100 per million per population cancer risk, Hazard Index of 10, or an annual average ambient PM_{2.5} increase of 0.8 µg/m³.

Table III.G-1, p. III.G-4, shows cumulative cancer risks, chronic hazard, and PM_{2.5} levels in the 2010 Community Plan area. As shown, the plan area would be exposed to roadways that are individually significant with respect to health risks under the BAAQMD significance thresholds. However, the plan area would not include areas where the cancer risks, chronic hazard, or PM_{2.5} levels exceed the BAAQMD cumulative thresholds. Thus, the proposed project's operational sources of health risks and the cumulative health risks to the new residential population of the infill sites, the 13 additional units, and the proposed open space developments would be less than cumulatively significant.

¹⁵ *Recommended Methods for Screening and Modeling Local Risks and Hazards*, BAAQMD, May 2010.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

H. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

INTRODUCTION

This section provides a description of global climate change, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, the existing regulatory framework governing GHG emissions, and an analysis of the potential impacts related to GHGs associated with implementation of the proposed *2010 Community Plan* including the proposed transportation infrastructure improvements, the anticipated development on the two infill sites, the 13 residential units developed any place within the plan area, 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses at 2928-2958 Diamond Street, and future open space improvements. The proposed project is evaluated for compliance with San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, recognized as meeting the criteria of a qualified GHG Reduction Strategy by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD).

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

SOURCES OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are referred to as GHGs because they capture heat radiated from the earth, similar to a greenhouse. The accumulation of GHGs has been implicated as a driving force for global climate change. Definitions of climate change vary between and across regulatory authorities and the scientific community, but in general can be described as the changing of the earth's climate caused by natural fluctuations and anthropogenic activities (i.e., activities relating to, or resulting from the influence of human beings) that alter the composition of the global atmosphere.

Individual projects contribute to the cumulative effects of climate change by emitting GHGs during demolition, construction, and operational phases. The primary GHGs associated with land use development projects are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O). Although the presence of the primary GHGs in the atmosphere is naturally occurring, CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O are largely emitted from human activities, accelerating the rate at which these compounds accumulate in the earth's atmosphere. CO₂ is the "reference gas" for GHG emissions, meaning that emissions of total GHGs are typically reported in "carbon dioxide equivalent" (CO₂e). Emissions of CO₂ are largely byproducts of fossil fuel combustion, whereas methane results from offgassing associated with agricultural practices and landfills. Other GHGs, with much greater heat-absorption potential than CO₂, include hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride, and are generated in certain industrial processes.

There is international scientific consensus that human-caused increases in GHGs have contributed, and will continue to contribute, to global warming, although there is uncertainty concerning the magnitude and rate of the warming. Potential global warming impacts in California may include a decrease in snowpack, sea level rise, more extreme heat days per year, more high ozone days, increased frequency and intensity of wildfires, and more drought years.¹ Secondary effects are likely to include a global rise in sea level, impacts on agriculture, water resources, changes in disease vectors, and changes in habitat and biodiversity.

The California Air Resources Board (ARB) estimated that in 2008 California produced about 478 million gross metric tons (MMT_{CO₂E}; about 525 million U.S. tons) of CO₂e GHG emissions.² The ARB found that transportation is the source of 37 percent of the State's GHG emissions, followed by electricity generation (both in-state and out-of-state) at 24 percent and industrial sources at 19 percent. Commercial and residential fuel use (primarily for heating) accounted for 9 percent of GHG emissions.³ In the Bay Area, fossil fuel consumption in the transportation sector (on-road motor vehicles, off-highway mobile sources, and aircraft) and the industrial/commercial sector were the two largest sources of GHG emissions, each accounting for about 36 percent of the Bay Area's 95.8 MMT_{CO₂E} (105.4 million U.S. tons) of GHG emissions in 2007. Industrial and commercial sources (including office and retail uses) were the second largest contributors of GHG emissions with about 34 percent of total emissions. Electricity generation accounts approximately 16 percent of the Bay Area's GHG emissions, followed by residential fuel usage (e.g., home water heaters, furnaces, etc.) at 7 percent, off-road equipment at 3 percent, and agriculture at 12 percent. Among industrial sources, oil refining currently accounts for more than 40 percent of GHG emissions, or approximately 15 percent of the total Bay Area GHG emissions.⁴

¹ California Natural Resources Agency, *2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy Discussion Draft*, 2009, Sacramento, CA. Pages 48–55.

² The abbreviation for “million metric tons” is MMT; thus, “million metric tons of CO₂ equivalents is written as MMT_{CO₂E}.”

³ California Air Resources Board, “California Greenhouse Gas Inventory for 2000-2008—by Category as Defined in the Scoping Plan.” Available at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/tables/ghg_inventory_scopingplan_00-08_2010-05-12.pdf. Accessed online January 10, 2011.

⁴ BAAQMD, *Source Inventory of Bay Area Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Base Year 2007*, December 2008. Available at: http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/Emission%20Inventory/regionalinventory2007_003_000_000_000.ashx.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

FEDERAL

Supreme Court Ruling on California Clean Air Act Waiver

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is the federal agency responsible for implementing the Clean Air Act (CAA). The U.S. Supreme Court ruled on April 2, 2007 that CO₂ is an air pollutant as defined under the CAA, and that EPA has the authority to regulate emissions of GHGs. However, there are no federal regulations or policies regarding GHG emissions applicable to the proposed project. (See Assembly Bill [AB] 1493 for further information on the California Clean Air Act [CCAA] Waiver.)

Energy and Independence Security Act of 2007 and Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards

The Energy and Independence Security Act of 2007 (EISA) amended the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (EPCA) to further reduce fuel consumption and expand production of renewable fuels. The EISA's most significant amendment includes a statutory mandate for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) to set passenger car corporate average fuel economy (CAFE) standards for each model year (MY) at the maximum feasible level. This statutory mandate also eliminates the old default CAFE standard of 27.5 miles per gallon (mpg). The EISA requires that CAFE standards for MY 2011–2020 be set sufficiently high to achieve the goal of an industrywide passenger car and light-duty truck average CAFE standard of 35 mpg. The rule making for this goal, per President Barack Obama's request, has been divided into two separate parts. The first part, which was published in the *Federal Register* in March 2009, includes CAFE standards for MY 2011 to meet the statutory deadline (i.e., March 30, 2009). The second part of the rule making applies to MY 2012 and subsequent years. These would be the maximum CAFE standards feasible under the limits of the EISA and the EPCA. NHTSA and EPA are working in coordination to develop a national program targeting MY 2012–2016 passenger cars and light trucks.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Actions

In response to the issue of climate change, EPA has taken actions to regulate, monitor, and potentially reduce GHG emissions.

Proposed Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases under the Clean Air Act. On April 23, 2009, EPA published its proposed Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases under the CAA (Endangerment Finding) in the

Federal Register. The Endangerment Finding is based on Section 202(a) of the CAA, which states that the EPA Administrator should regulate and develop standards for “emission[s] of air pollution from any class or classes of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines, which in [its] judgment cause, or contribute to, air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare.” The proposed rule addresses Section 202(a) in two distinct findings. The first addresses whether the concentrations of the six key GHGs (i.e., CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, HFCs, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride) in the atmosphere threaten the public health and welfare of current and future generations. The second addresses whether the combined emissions of GHGs from new motor vehicles and motor vehicle engines contribute to atmospheric concentrations of GHGs and thus increase the threat of climate change.

The EPA Administrator proposed the finding that atmospheric concentrations of GHGs endanger the public health and welfare within the meaning of Section 202(a) of the CAA. The evidence supporting this finding consists of human activity resulting in “high atmospheric levels” of GHG emissions, which are very likely responsible for increases in average temperatures and other climatic changes. Furthermore, the observed and projected results of climate change (e.g., higher likelihood of heat waves, wildfires, droughts, sea level rise, and higher intensity storms) are a threat to public health and welfare. Accordingly, GHGs were found to endanger the public health and welfare of current and future generations.

The Administrator also proposed the finding that GHG emissions from new motor vehicles and motor vehicle engines are contributing to air pollution, which is endangering public health and welfare. The proposed finding states that in 2006, motor vehicles were the second largest contributor to domestic GHG emissions (24 percent of the total), behind electricity generation. Furthermore, in 2005, the U.S. was responsible for 18 percent of global GHG emissions. Thus, GHG emissions from motor vehicles and motor vehicle engines were found to contribute to air pollution that endangers public health and welfare.

On December 7, 2009, EPA finalized its decision that GHG emissions from motor vehicles constitute an “endangerment” under the CAA. This EPA finding allows for the establishment of GHG emissions standards for new motor vehicles. In a related action, in June 2009, EPA granted California a waiver under the federal Clean Air Act, allowing the state to impose its own, stricter GHG regulations for vehicles beginning in 2009 (see below).

In September 2010, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration with EPA published a Notice of Intent for the development of new GHG and fuel economy standards for model year

2017-2025 vehicles. The agencies published a Supplemental Notice of Intent in December 2010. Draft regulations are anticipated in 2011, with a final rule due to be adopted in 2012.⁵

STATE

California Air Resources Board

ARB is the state agency responsible for coordination and oversight of state and local air pollution control programs in California and for implementing the California Clean Air Act (CCAA), adopted in 1988. With the passage of Assembly Bill (AB) 32, ARB was also given broad responsibility for promulgating regulations designed to achieve the general goals of AB 32. (For a discussion of AB 32, see “Assembly Bill 32 and the California Climate Change Scoping Plan” below.)

Various statewide and local initiatives have been introduced to reduce the state’s contribution to GHG emissions. However, because every nation emits GHGs and thus makes an incremental cumulative contribution to global climate change, cooperation on a global scale will be required to reduce the rate of GHG emissions to a level that can effectively slow or stop the human-caused increase in average global temperatures and associated changes in climatic conditions.

Assembly Bill 1493

In 2002, then-Governor Gray Davis signed AB 1493, which required that ARB develop and adopt, by January 1, 2005, regulations that achieve “the maximum feasible reduction of GHGs emitted by passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks and other vehicles determined by ARB to be vehicles whose primary use is noncommercial personal transportation in the state.”

To meet the requirements of AB 1493, ARB approved amendments to the California Code of Regulations (CCR) in 2004, adding GHG emissions standards to California’s existing standards for motor vehicle emissions. Amendments to CCR Title 13, Sections 1900 and 1961 (13 CCR 1900, 1961), and adoption of Section 1961.1 (13 CCR 1961.1), require automobile manufacturers to meet fleet-average GHG emissions limits for all passenger cars, light-duty trucks within various weight criteria, and medium-duty passenger vehicle weight classes (i.e., any medium-duty vehicle with a gross vehicle weight (GVW) rating of less than 10,000 pounds and which is

⁵ 75 Federal Register 76337, December 8, 2010. Available on the internet at: http://www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/rulemaking/pdf/cafe/Supplemental_Note_FR_12082010.pdf; Fact Sheet, “NHTSA and EPA Issue a Supplemental Notice in the Process for Setting Future Greenhouse Gas and Fuel Economy Standards for Passenger Cars and Light Trucks, November 2010. Available on the internet at: http://www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/rulemaking/pdf/cafe/Supplemental_NOI_CAFE_2017_Fact_Sheet.pdf. Accessed January 2, 2011.

designed primarily for the transportation of persons), beginning with Model Year (MY) 2009. For passenger cars and light-duty trucks with a loaded vehicle weight (LVW) of 3,750 pounds or less, the GHG emission limits for MY 2016 are approximately 37 percent lower than the limits for the first year of the regulations, MY 2009. For light-duty trucks with an LVW of 3,751 pounds to a GVW of 8,500 pounds, as well as for medium-duty passenger vehicles, GHG emissions will be reduced approximately 24 percent between 2009 and 2016.

Because the Pavley standards (named for the bill's author, state Senator Fran Pavley) would impose stricter standards than those under the federal Clean Air Act, California applied to the EPA for a waiver under the Clean Air Act; this waiver was denied by the Bush Administration in 2008. As noted above, in 2009 EPA granted the waiver. California has now agreed to cooperate with the federal GHG and Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards under development so that there will be a single national standard.

Executive Order S-3-05

In 2005, in recognition of California's vulnerability to the effects of climate change, then-Governor Schwarzenegger established Executive Order S-3-05, which sets forth a series of target dates by which statewide GHGs emissions would be progressively reduced: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels; by 2020, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; and by 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels.⁶

Assembly Bill 32 and the California Climate Change Scoping Plan

In 2006, the California legislature passed Assembly Bill No. 32 (California Health and Safety Code Division 25.5, Sections 38500, et seq., or AB 32), also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act. AB 32 requires ARB to design and implement emission limits, regulations, and other measures, such that feasible and cost-effective statewide GHG emissions are reduced to 1990 levels by 2020 (representing a 25 percent reduction in emissions).

Pursuant to AB 32, ARB adopted a Scoping Plan in December 2008, outlining measures to meet the 2020 GHG reduction limits.⁷ In order to meet these goals, California must reduce its GHG emissions by 30 percent below projected 2020 business as usual emissions levels, or about 15

⁶ California Air Resources Board, *Climate Change Scoping Plan: A Framework for Change*, December 2008. Available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/scopingplandocument.htm>. Accessed January 3, 2011.

⁷ On January 24, 2011, a San Francisco superior court judge issued a proposed injunction against implementation of the Scoping Plan. No formal ruling has yet been issued. (Association of Irrigated Residents et al v. California Air Resources Board, San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CPF-09-509562.)

percent from today's levels.⁸ The Scoping Plan estimates a reduction of 174 million metric tons of CO₂E (MMT CO₂E) (about 191 million U.S. tons) from the transportation, energy, agriculture, forestry, and high global warming potential sectors, see Table III.H-1, below. ARB has identified an implementation timeline for the GHG reduction strategies in the Scoping Plan.⁹ Some measures may require new legislation to implement, some will require subsidies, some have already been developed, and some will require additional effort to evaluate and quantify. Additionally, some emissions reductions strategies may require their own environmental review under CEQA or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

TABLE III.H-1
GHG REDUCTIONS FROM THE AB 32 SCOPING PLAN SECTORS¹⁰

GHG Reduction Measures By Sector	GHG Reductions (MMT CO ₂ E)
Transportation Sector	62.3
Electricity and Natural Gas	49.7
Industry	1.4
Landfill Methane Control Measure (Discrete Early Action)	1
Forestry	5
High Global Warming Potential GHGs	20.2
Additional Reductions Needed to Achieve the GHG Cap	34.4
Total	174
Other Recommended Measures	
Government Operations	1-2
Agriculture- Methane Capture at Large Dairies	1
Methane Capture at Large Dairies	1
Additional GHG Reduction Measures	
Water	4.8
Green Buildings	26
High Recycling/ Zero Waste	
• Commercial Recycling	
• Composting	
• Anaerobic Digestion	9
• Extended Producer Responsibility	
• Environmentally Preferable Purchasing	
Total	42.8-43.8

Source: California Air Resources Board

⁸ California Air Resources Board, *California's Climate Plan: Fact Sheet*. Available at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/facts/scoping_plan_fs.pdf. Accessed March 4, 2010.

⁹ California Air Resources Board, *AB 32 Scoping Plan*. Available at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scoping_plan/sp_measures_implementation_timeline.pdf. Accessed March 2, 2010.

¹⁰ California Air Resources Board, *AB 32 Scoping Plan*. Available at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scoping_plan/sp_measures_implementation_timeline.pdf. Accessed March 2, 2010.

AB 32 also anticipates that local government actions will result in reduced GHG emissions. ARB has identified a GHG reduction target of 15 percent from current levels for local governments themselves and notes that successful implementation of the plan relies on local governments' land use planning and urban growth decisions because local governments have primary authority to plan, zone, approve, and permit land development to accommodate population growth and the changing needs of their jurisdictions.

The Scoping Plan relies on the requirements of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375 discussed below) to implement the carbon emission reductions anticipated from land use decisions. SB 375 was enacted to align local land use and transportation planning to further achieve the State's GHG reduction goals. SB 375 requires regional transportation plans (RTPs), developed by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), to incorporate a "sustainable communities strategy" in their RTPs that would achieve GHG emission reduction targets set by ARB. SB 375 also includes provisions for streamlined CEQA review for some infill projects such as transit-oriented development. SB 375 would be implemented over the next several years and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's 2013 RTP would be its first plan subject to SB 375.

Executive Order S-1-07

Executive Order S-1-07, signed by then-Governor Schwarzenegger in 2007, proclaims that the transportation sector is the main source of GHG emissions in California, at over 40 percent of statewide emissions. The order establishes a goal of reducing the carbon intensity of transportation fuels sold in California by a minimum of 10 percent by 2020. It also directed ARB to determine whether this Low Carbon Fuel Standard could be adopted as a discrete, early-action measure after meeting the mandates in AB 32. ARB adopted the Low Carbon Fuel Standard on April 23, 2009.

Senate Bill 1078 and 107 and Executive Order S-14-08 and S-21-09

SB 1078 (Chapter 516, Statutes of 2002) requires retail sellers of electricity, including investor-owned utilities and community choice aggregators, to provide at least 20 percent of their supply from renewable sources by 2017. SB 107 (Chapter 464, Statutes of 2006) changed the target date to 2010. In November 2008, then-Governor Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-14-08, which expands the State's Renewable Portfolio Standard to 33 percent renewable power by 2020. In September 2009, then-Governor Schwarzenegger continued California's commitment to the Renewable Portfolio Standard by signing Executive Order S-21-09, which directs ARB under its AB 32 authority to enact regulations to help the state meet its Renewable Portfolio Standard goal of 33 percent renewable energy by 2020.

Senate Bill 1368

SB 1368 is the companion bill of AB 32 and was signed by Governor Schwarzenegger in September 2006. SB 1368 requires the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to establish a greenhouse gas emission performance standard for baseload generation from investor owned utilities by February 1, 2007. The California Energy Commission (CEC) must establish a similar standard for local publicly owned utilities by June 30, 2007. These standards cannot exceed the greenhouse gas emission rate from a baseload combined-cycle natural gas fired plant. The legislation further requires that all electricity provided to California, including imported electricity, must be generated from plants that meet the standards set by the PUC and CEC.

Senate Bill 97

SB 97, signed in August 2007, acknowledges that climate change is a prominent environmental issue requiring analysis under CEQA. This bill directed the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to prepare, develop, and transmit to the California Natural Resources Agency guidelines for the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions or the effects of GHG emissions, as required by CEQA, no later than July 1, 2009. The California Natural Resources Agency was required to certify or adopt those guidelines by January 1, 2010. On December 30, 2009, the Natural Resources Agency adopted the State *CEQA Guidelines* amendments, as required by SB 97. These State *CEQA Guidelines* amendments provide guidance to public agencies regarding the analysis and mitigation of the effects of GHG emissions in draft CEQA documents. The amendments were reviewed by the Office of Administrative Law, and became effective March 18, 2010. Accordingly, OPR's State *CEQA Guidelines* amendments have been incorporated into this analysis of the *2010 Community Plan*.

Senate Bill 375

In addition to policy directly guided by AB 32, the legislature in 2008 passed Senate Bill (SB) 375, which provides for regional coordination in land use and transportation planning and funding to help meet the AB 32 GHG reduction goals. SB 375 aligns regional transportation planning efforts, regional GHG emissions reduction targets, and land use and housing allocations. SB 375 requires regional transportation plans developed by the state's 18 Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to incorporate a "sustainable communities strategy" in their regional transportation plans (RTP) that will achieve GHG emission reduction targets set by ARB. In the Bay Area, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the MPO. SB 375 also includes provisions for streamlined CEQA review for some infill projects such as transit-oriented development. MTC's 2013 RTP will be its first plan subject to SB 375.

ARB, in consultation with MPOs, will provide each affected region with reduction targets for GHGs emitted by passenger cars and light trucks in the region for the years 2020 and 2035. These reduction targets will be updated every 8 years, but can be updated every 4 years if advancements in emissions technologies affect the reduction strategies to achieve the targets. ARB is also charged with reviewing each MPO's SCS or APS for consistency with its assigned targets. If MPOs do not meet the GHG emissions reduction targets, transportation projects would not be eligible for funding programmed after January 1, 2012.

This bill also extends the minimum time period for the Regional Housing Needs Allocation cycle from five years to eight years for local governments located within an MPO that meets certain requirements. City and county land use policies (including general plans) are not required to be consistent with the RTP (and associated SCS or APS). However, new provisions of CEQA would incentivize qualified projects that are consistent with an approved SCS or APS, categorized as "transit priority projects."

City/Local

Bay Area Air Quality Management District Climate Protection Program

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the primary agency responsible for air quality regulation in the nine county San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). The BAAQMD established a climate protection program to reduce pollutants that contribute to global climate change and affect air quality in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The climate protection program includes measures that promote energy efficiency, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and develop alternative sources of energy, all of which assist in reducing emissions of GHGs and in reducing air pollutants that affect the health of residents. BAAQMD also seeks to support current climate protection programs in the region and to stimulate additional efforts through public education and outreach, technical assistance to local governments and other interested parties, and promotion of collaborative efforts among stakeholders. In June 2010, BAAQMD adopted revised CEQA significance thresholds for GHG emissions. These recently adopted GHG significance thresholds are discussed in detail under "Significance Thresholds" below.

City and County of San Francisco Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy

Consistent with state CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5, BAAQMD has adopted a qualitative GHG threshold of significance that allows a lead agency to determine that a project's contribution of GHG emissions is less than significant if the Lead agency finds that the project is consistent with a qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, as defined in the 2010 CEQA

Air Quality Guidelines. The City and County of San Francisco (City) has a history of environmental protection policies and programs aimed at improving the quality of life for residents and reducing impacts on the environment. A comprehensive assessment of policies, programs and ordinances has been compiled into San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*.¹¹ The BAAQMD reviewed San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* and concluded that the strategy meets the criteria for a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy as outlined in BAAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* (2010).

The following plans, policies, and legislation demonstrate San Francisco's continued commitment to environmental protection. They include measures applicable to this project that would decrease the amount of GHGs emitted into the atmosphere and thus decrease San Francisco's overall contribution to climate change. These programs are collectively referred to as San Francisco's GHG Reduction Strategy.

Plans, Policies, and Programs

Transit First Policy. In 1973, the City instituted the Transit First Policy, which added Article 8A, Section 8A.115 to the City Charter with the goal of reducing San Francisco's reliance on freeways and meeting transportation needs by emphasizing mass transportation. The Transit First Policy gives priority to public transit investments; adopts street capacity and parking policies to discourage increased automobile traffic; and encourages the use of transit, bicycling, and walking instead of single-occupant vehicles.

San Francisco Sustainability Plan. In July 1997, the Board of Supervisors endorsed the *Sustainability Plan for the City and County of San Francisco*, which establishes sustainable development as a fundamental goal of municipal public policy.

Electricity Resource Plan (Revised December 2002). The City adopted the *Electricity Resource Plan* to help address growing environmental health concerns in San Francisco's southeast community, the site of two power plants. The plan presents a framework for assuring a reliable, affordable, and renewable source of energy for the future of San Francisco.

Climate Action Plan for San Francisco. In February 2002, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Resolution (Number 158-02) that set a goal for the City to reduce GHG emissions to 20 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2012. In September 2004, the San Francisco Department of the Environment and San Francisco

¹¹ San Francisco Planning Department, *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions in San Francisco*, 2010. Available at: <http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=1570>.

Public Utilities Commission published the *Climate Action Plan for San Francisco: Local Actions to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions*.¹² This climate action plan provides the context of climate change in San Francisco and examines strategies to meet the 20 percent GHG emissions reduction target. Although the Board of Supervisors has not formally committed the City to perform the actions addressed in the plan, and many of the actions require further development and commitment of resources, the plan serves as a blueprint for GHG emissions reductions, and several actions have been implemented or are now in progress.

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Zero Emissions 2020 Plan. The Zero Emissions 2020 Plan focuses on the purchase of cleaner emission transit buses, including hybrid diesel-electric buses. Under this plan, hybrid buses will replace the oldest diesel buses, some dating back to 1988. The hybrid buses emit 95 percent less particulate matter (soot) than the buses they replace; they produce 40 percent less nitrogen oxides and reduce GHGs by 30 percent.

Zero Waste. In 2004, the City committed to a goal of diverting 75 percent of its waste from landfills by 2010, with the ultimate goal of zero waste by 2020. San Francisco currently recovers 77 percent of discarded material.¹³

GoSolarSF. On July 1, 2008, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission launched its "GoSolarSF" program to San Francisco's businesses and residents, offering incentives in the form of a rebate program that could pay for approximately half the cost of installation of a solar power system and more to those qualifying as low-income residents.

The San Francisco Planning Department and the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection have also developed a streamlining process for solar photovoltaic permits and priority permitting mechanisms for projects pursuing LEED® Gold certification.

The *San Francisco Planning Code* reflects the latest smart growth policies and includes electric vehicle refueling stations in city parking garages, bicycle storage facilities for commercial and office buildings, and zoning that is supportive of high-density mixed-use infill development. The City's more recent area plans, such as the *Rincon Hill Area Plan* and the *Market and Octavia Area Plan*, provide transit-oriented development policies that allow for neighborhood-oriented

¹² San Francisco Department of the Environment and San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, *Climate Action Plan for San Francisco: Local Actions to Reduce Greenhouse Emissions*, 2004. San Francisco, CA.

¹³ San Francisco Department of the Environment, *Zero Waste*, 2011. Available at: http://www.sfenvironment.org/our_programs/overview.html?ssi=3. Accessed March 2011.

retail services and limit off-street parking to accessory parking spaces.¹⁴ At the same time, there is a communitywide focus on ensuring that San Francisco's neighborhoods are "livable," reflected in the *San Francisco Better Streets Plan*, which would improve streetscape policies throughout the city; the Transit Effectiveness Project, which aims to improve transit service; and the *San Francisco Bicycle Plan*. All of these plans and projects are intended to promote alternative transportation options for residents and visitors.

Ordinances

Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Ordinance. In 2006, the City adopted Ordinance No. 27-06, requiring all construction and demolition debris to be transported to a registered facility that can divert a minimum of 65 percent of the material from landfills. This ordinance applies to all construction, demolition, and remodeling projects within the city.

Greenhouse Gas Reduction Ordinance. In May 2008, the City adopted an ordinance amending the San Francisco Environment Code to establish GHG emissions targets and departmental action plans, to authorize the San Francisco Department of the Environment to coordinate efforts to meet these targets, and to make environmental findings. The ordinance establishes the following GHG emissions reduction limits for San Francisco and the target dates by which to achieve them:

- Determine 1990 City GHG emissions by 2008, the baseline level with reference to which target reductions are set.
- Reduce GHG emissions by 25 percent below 1990 levels by 2017.
- Reduce GHG emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2025.
- Reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

The ordinance also specifies requirements for City departments to prepare climate action plans that assess GHG emissions associated with their activities and activities regulated by them, report the results of those assessments to the San Francisco Department of the Environment, and prepare recommendations to reduce emissions. In particular, the San Francisco Planning Department is required to (1) update and amend the City's applicable General Plan elements to include the emissions reduction limits set forth in this ordinance and policies to achieve those targets; (2) consider a project's impact on the City's GHG emissions reduction limits specified in this ordinance as part of its review under CEQA; and (3) work with other City departments to enhance the Transit First Policy to encourage a shift to sustainable modes of transportation, thereby reducing emissions and helping to achieve the targets set forth by the ordinance.

¹⁴ See San Francisco Planning Code Sections 206.4 and 155.

City and County of San Francisco's Green Building Ordinance. On August 4, 2008, then-Mayor Gavin Newsom signed into law San Francisco's Green Building Ordinance for newly constructed residential and commercial buildings and renovations to existing buildings. The ordinance specifically requires newly constructed commercial buildings over 5,000 square feet, residential buildings over 75 feet in height, and renovations on buildings over 25,000 square feet to be subject to an unprecedented level of required Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED®) Green Building Rating System™ certifications, which makes San Francisco the city with the most stringent green building requirements in the nation. Cumulative benefits of this ordinance includes reducing CO₂ emissions by 60,000 tons, saving 220,000 megawatt-hours of power, saving 100 million gallons of drinking water, reducing waste and stormwater by 90 million gallons, reducing construction and demolition waste by 700 million pounds, increasing the valuations of recycled materials by \$200 million, reducing 540,000 automobile trips, and increasing generation of green power by 37,000 megawatt-hours.¹⁵

The Green Building Ordinance also continues San Francisco's efforts to reduce local GHG emissions to 20 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2012, a goal outlined in the City's 2004 Climate Action Plan. In addition, by reducing San Francisco's emissions, this ordinance furthers efforts to reduce GHG emissions statewide, as mandated by the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.

The City has also passed ordinances to reduce waste from retail and commercial operations. Ordinance 295-06, the Food Waste Reduction Ordinance, prohibits the use of polystyrene foam disposable food serviceware and requires biodegradable/compostable or recyclable food serviceware by restaurants, retail food vendors, city departments, and city contractors. Ordinance 81-07, the Plastic Bag Reduction Ordinance, requires stores located within the city to use compostable plastic, recyclable paper, and/or reusable checkout bags.

City and County of San Francisco Commuter Benefits Ordinance. The City adopted an ordinance, effective January 19, 2009, that allows commuters to deduct a specified amount per month, pretax, for transit and vanpool expenses. These commuter benefits must be offered by any employer with 20 employees or more that operates within the city. To qualify for these benefits, employees must work at least 10 hours per week averaged over a calendar month. Although not required by the ordinance, employers can offer the commuter benefits to employees who work fewer than 10 hours per week averaged over a month.

¹⁵ These findings are contained within the final Green Building Ordinance, signed by the mayor on August 4, 2008.

City and County of San Francisco Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance. The City adopted an ordinance, effective October 21, 2009, that requires all businesses and residences to compost food scraps and biodegradable products. Businesses and residents are provided with green, blue, and black bins to sort their food and other biodegradable waste, recycling, and trash, respectively. Businesses and residences that do not comply with the ordinance are subject to fines, depending on the level and duration of noncompliance. A moratorium on fines will be in place until July 2011 for owners and tenants of multifamily buildings and multitenant commercial buildings to allow time to adjust to the mandatory recycling and composting.

San Francisco has been actively pursuing cleaner energy, alternative transportation, and solid waste policies, many of which have been codified into regulations as discussed above. In an independent review of San Francisco's communitywide emissions, it was reported that San Francisco has achieved a 5 percent reduction in communitywide GHG emissions below the Kyoto Protocol 1990 baseline levels. The 1997 Kyoto Protocol sets a greenhouse gas reduction target of 7 percent below 1990 levels by 2012. The "community-wide inventory" includes greenhouse gas emissions generated by San Francisco—from residents, businesses, and commuters as well as from municipal operations. The inventory also includes emissions from both transportation and building energy sources.¹⁶

IMPACTS

SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

The proposed project would result in a significant adverse impact on GHG emissions if it would:

- Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or
- Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

APPROACH TO ANALYSIS

As discussed above, SB 97 required OPR to amend the state CEQA guidelines to address the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions or the effects of GHGs. In response, OPR amended the CEQA guidelines to provide guidance for analyzing GHG emissions. Among other changes to

¹⁶ IFC International, *City and County of San Francisco: Community GHG Inventory Review*, August 1, 2008. San Francisco, CA. Prepared for City and County of San Francisco, Department of the Environment. San Francisco, CA.

the *CEQA Guidelines*, the amendments add a new section to the CEQA Checklist (*CEQA Guidelines* Appendix G) to address questions regarding the project's potential to emit GHGs.

The BAAQMD is the primary agency responsible for air quality regulation in the nine county San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). As part of their role in air quality regulation, BAAQMD has prepared the CEQA air quality guidelines to assist lead agencies in evaluating air quality impacts of projects and plans proposed in the SFBAAB. On June 2, 2010, the BAAQMD adopted new and revised CEQA air quality thresholds of significance and issued revised guidelines that supersede the 1999 air quality guidelines. The *2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* provide for the first time CEQA thresholds of significance for greenhouse gas emissions. OPR's amendments to the *CEQA Guidelines* as well as BAAQMD's *2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* and thresholds of significance have been incorporated into this analysis accordingly.

As discussed above, the BAAQMD has adopted CEQA thresholds of significance with respect to GHGs. Consistent with state CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5, BAAQMD has adopted a qualitative GHG threshold of significance that allows a lead agency to determine that a project's contribution of GHG emissions is less than significant if the Lead agency finds that the project is consistent with a qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, as defined in the *2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*.

San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*,¹⁷ GHG reduction strategy identifies a number of mandatory requirements and incentives that have measurably reduced greenhouse gas emissions including, but not limited to, increasing the energy efficiency of new and existing buildings, installation of solar panels on building roofs, implementation of a green building strategy, adoption of a zero waste strategy, a construction and demolition debris recovery ordinance, a solar energy generation subsidy, incorporation of alternative fuel vehicles in the City's transportation fleet (including buses and taxis), and a mandatory composting ordinance. The strategy also identifies 42 specific regulations for new development that would reduce a project's GHG emissions.

San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* identifies the City's actions to pursue cleaner energy, energy conservation, alternative transportation and solid waste policies, and concludes that San Francisco's policies have resulted in a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions below 1990 levels, meeting statewide AB 32 GHG reduction goals. As reported, San Francisco's 1990 GHG emissions were approximately 8.26 million metric tons (MMT) CO₂E and 2005 GHG

¹⁷ San Francisco Planning Department. *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions in San Francisco*. 2010. Available online at: <http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=1570>.

emissions are estimated at 7.82 MMTCO₂E, representing an approximately 5.3 percent reduction in GHG emissions below 1990 levels.

The BAAQMD reviewed San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* and concluded that the strategy meets the criteria for a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy as outlined in BAAQMD's *CEQA Guidelines* (2010) and stated that San Francisco's "aggressive GHG reduction targets and comprehensive strategies help the Bay Area move toward reaching the State's AB 32 goals, and also serve as a model from which other communities can learn."¹⁸

The analysis of the proposed project's climate change impact is an analysis of the project's contribution to a cumulatively significant global impact through its emission of GHGs. Given the analysis is in a cumulative context, this section does not include an individual, project-specific impact statement.

Impact Evaluation

C-GG *The proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, but not at levels that would result in a significant impact on the environment or conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. (Less than Significant)*

The most common GHGs resulting from human activity are CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O.¹⁹ State law defines GHGs to also include hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons and sulfur hexafluoride. These latter GHG compounds are usually emitted in industrial processes, and therefore not applicable to the proposed project, which allows for additional residential, retail, commercial, transportation infrastructure improvements, and open space uses. Individual projects contribute to the cumulative effects of climate change by directly or indirectly emitting GHGs during construction and operational phases. Direct operational emissions include GHG emissions from new vehicle trips and area sources (natural gas combustion). Indirect emissions include emissions from electricity providers; energy required to pump, treat, and convey water; and landfill operations.

The proposed project would increase the activity in the plan area by modifying existing land use and zoning controls in the plan area. Implementation of the 2010

¹⁸ Letter from Jean Roggenkamp, BAAQMD, to Bill Wycko, San Francisco Planning Department. October 28, 2010. Available at: <http://www.baaqmd.gov/>. Accessed March 8, 2011.

¹⁹ Governor's Office of Planning and Research, *Technical Advisory- CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review*, June 19, 2008. Available at: <http://www.opr.ca.gov/ceqa/pdfs/june08-ceqa.pdf>. Accessed March 3, 2010.

Community Plan would potentially result in a number of physical improvements, including street network changes, transportation and infrastructure changes, potential infill development, and open space improvements. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to annual long-term increases in GHGs as a result of increased vehicle trips (mobile sources) and residential and commercial operations associated with energy use, water use and wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal. Construction activities would also result in an increase in GHG emissions.

Based on the BAAQMD's 2010 *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* would result in a less-than-significant impact with respect to GHG emissions. Furthermore, because San Francisco's strategy is consistent with AB 32 goals, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's strategy would also not conflict with the State's plan for reducing GHG emissions.

General Impacts. Adoption of the 2010 *Community Plan* would not result in direct GHG emissions; however, implementation of the individual components of the 2010 *Community Plan* could emit GHGs. The individual components of the 2010 *Community Plan* are discussed below. The 2010 *Community Plan* includes goals and policies that would apply to development within the plan area. These policies are consistent with the City's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* and the policies from the *San Francisco General Plan*, as shown in Table III.H-2, p. III.H-19. The 2010 *Community Plan* policies would support the General Plan policies for reducing greenhouse gases by providing mixed-use development near transit lines and improving walkability within the Glen Park neighborhood. Of the GHG reduction sectors listed in the City's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* (i.e., Transportation, Energy Efficiency, Renewable Energy, Waste, and Environment/Conservation), many of the 2010 *Community Plan* policies relate to improving transportation through improved transit, pedestrian, and bicycle accessibility and connections. As shown in Table III.H-2, some of the policies, including the open space policies, would help reduce GHG emissions in the Environment/Conservation sector. The 2010 *Community Plan* policies were reviewed for consistency with the *San Francisco General Plan* as well as the City's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, and were found to be consistent at a program level.²⁰

²⁰ San Francisco Planning Department. *Compliance Checklist Greenhouse Gas Analysis for Glen Park Community Plan/Transportation Improvements*. February 2011. A copy of this document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco as part of Case File. 2005.1004E.

**TABLE III.H-2
GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES THAT ADDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE**

General Plan Element Policy/ Area Plan Policy	Transportation	Energy Efficiency	Renewable Energy	Waste	Environment/ Conservation	General Plan Policy Consistency	Discussion
GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN							
<i>Objective 1 Protect and strengthen the qualities that make downtown Glen Park special</i>							
Policy 1.1 Continue to concentrate commercial uses and retail activity along Diamond and Chenery Street.	X					Air Quality Element Policy 3.2; Commerce and Industry Element Policies 6.1 and 6.4; Community Facilities Element Policy 3.4	These General Plan policies support the use of alternate forms of travel by encouraging mixed-use development near transit and promoting neighborhood-serving service-oriented uses within walking distance of transit and residential uses in order to increase accessibility and minimize automobile-dependent travel. Policy 1.1 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies as it would encourage retail activity a near transit and in proximity to residential uses within Glen Park.
Policy 1.2 Consider updating existing neighborhood commercial zoning to strengthen Glen Park's commercial district and reinforce the area's transit and pedestrian-oriented character.	X					Air Quality Element Policy 3.2; Commerce and Industry Element Policies 6.1 and 6.4; Community Facilities Element Policy 3.4	These General Plan policies support the use of alternate forms of travel by encouraging mixed-use development near transit and promoting neighborhood-serving service-oriented uses within walking distance of transit and residential uses in order to increase accessibility and minimize automobile-dependent travel. Policy 1.2 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies as potential changes under the policy would reinforce the area's transit and pedestrian-oriented character.
Policy 1.3 Improve the streetscape in the commercial core to make the area more safe, comfortable and attractive for pedestrians and shoppers.	X				X	Transportation Element Policy 1.2; Urban Design Policy 1.6	These General Plan policies support the safety and comfort of pedestrians throughout the city as well as identify that shopping streets and other centers for activity should be designed to stand out in an attractive manner through incorporation of street design features. Policy 1.3 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies in that it

**TABLE III.H-2
GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES THAT ADDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE**

General Plan Element Policy/ Area Plan Policy	Transportation	Energy Efficiency	Renewable Energy	Waste	Environment/ Conservation	General Plan Policy Consistency	Discussion
							supports improvements in the commercial core to make the area more safe, comfortable and attractive for pedestrians and shoppers.
Objective 4 Establish Glen Park's streets as comfortable and attractive places for walking and public life.							
Policy 4.1 Pursue pedestrian and streetscape improvements that enhance safety and comfort for pedestrians.	X					Transportation Element Policy 1.2; Urban Design Policy 1.6	These General Plan policies support the safety and comfort of pedestrians throughout the city as well as identify that shopping streets and other centers for activity should be designed to stand out in an attractive manner through incorporation of street design features. Policy 4.1 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies in that it supports pedestrian and streetscape improvements that enhance safety and comfort for pedestrians.
Policy 4.2 Prohibit new curbcuts or driveways on key commercial and pedestrian streets such as Diamond Street and Chenery Street.	X					Transportation Element Policies 1.2 and 34.5	These General Plan policies support pedestrian safety and call for the construction of new curb cuts in areas where on-street parking is in short supply to be minimized. Policy 4.2 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies in that it prohibits curb cuts or driveways on key commercial and pedestrian streets which will decrease potential pedestrian vehicle conflicts.
Objective 5 Improve access for bicyclists to Glen Park and the BART Station.							
Policy 5.1 Implement bicycle network improvements identified in the San Francisco Bicycle Plan.	X					Transportation Element Policies 21.9 and 27.1	These General Plan Policies support development of bicycle facilities to increase access to transit. Policy 5.1 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies in that by implementing bicycle network

**TABLE III.H-2
GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES THAT ADDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE**

General Plan Element Policy/ Area Plan Policy	Transportation	Energy Efficiency	Renewable Energy	Waste	Environment/ Conservation	General Plan Policy Consistency	Discussion
							improvements identified in the San Francisco Bicycle Plan for this area, access to transit would be increased for bicyclists.
Policy 5.2 Consider increased opportunities for bicycle parking in Glen Park.	X					Transportation Element Policies 21.9, 28.3 and 28.4	These General Plan Policies support provision of bicycle parking facilities which are safe, secure, and convenient and which increase access to transit including at all transit terminals. Policy 5.2 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies in that it considers increased opportunities for bicycle parking in Glen Park. Additional bicycle parking opportunities in the Gen Park area will increase access to transit for bicyclists.
Objective 6 Sustain Glen Park's role as an important intermodal transit center for the City and region.							
Policy 6.1 Implement recommendations of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) for the Glen Park neighborhood.	X					Transportation Element Policies 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5	These General Plan policies give priority to public transit and other alternatives to the private automobile as the means of meeting San Francisco's transportation needs. This includes consideration of measures to increase the capacity of transit during the off-peak hours and coordinate regional and local transportation systems and provide for interline transit transfers. Policy 6.1 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies in that it would support implementation of recommendations for the SFMTA's Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) for the Glen Park neighbourhood once environmental review for TEP has been completed. TEP is a citywide project to improve the efficiency and reliability of transit throughout the City.

**TABLE III.H-2
GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES THAT ADDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE**

General Plan Element Policy/ Area Plan Policy	Transportation	Energy Efficiency	Renewable Energy	Waste	Environment/ Conservation	General Plan Policy Consistency	Discussion
Policy 6.2 Manage curb space around the Glen Park BART Station to improve the function of transit.	X					Transportation Element Policies 20.4 and 20.6	These General Plan policies specify that transit centers be developed according to established guidelines to facilitate design consistency and ensure that safety, accessibility, circulation, information, comfort and aesthetic issues are adequately addressed. In addition, the policies call for priority enforcement of parking and traffic regulations on all Transit Streets, particularly Transit Preferential Streets. Policy 6.2 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies in that it encourages the management of curb space around the Glen Park BART station to improve the function of transit. For example, bus zones located properly and traffic enforcement to prevent misuse of bus zones.
Policy 6.3 SFMTA and BART should determine which future capital investments may be appropriate for transit.	X					Transportation Element Policies 1.3, 1.8, and 11.2	These General Plan policies give priority to public transit and other alternatives to the private automobile as the means of meeting San Francisco's transportation needs, support development of a flexible financing system for transportation in which funds may be allocated according to priorities and established policies without unnecessary restriction. Finally, these policies continue to favor investment in transit infrastructure and services over investment in highway development and other facilities that accommodate the automobile. Policy 6.3 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies in that it encourages SFMTA to work with BART to determine future capital investments appropriate for transit.

**TABLE III.H-2
GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES THAT ADDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE**

General Plan Element Policy/ Area Plan Policy	Transportation	Energy Efficiency	Renewable Energy	Waste	Environment/ Conservation	General Plan Policy Consistency	Discussion
Objective 7 Improve access to public transit in Glen Park.							
Policy 7.1 Make transit more ADA accessible.	X					Transportation Element Policy 1.7	This General Plan policy assures expanded mobility for the disadvantaged. Policy 7.1 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with this policy in that it supports making transit more ADA accessible.
Policy 7.2 Encourage and work with BART on a redesign of the Glen Park BART Station plaza to improve pedestrian and transit access and better connect the commercial district.	X					Transportation Element Policies 1.2, 1.5, 21.9, and 21.10	These General Plan policies ensure the safety and comfort of pedestrians throughout the city and improve pedestrian and bicycle access to transit facilities. In addition, the policies call for coordination between regional and local transportation systems to provide for interline transit transfers. Finally the policies ensure passenger and operator safety in the design and operation of transit vehicles and station facilities. Policy 7.2 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies in that it encourages coordination with BART to redesign the station plazas to improve pedestrian and transit access better connect the commercial district.
Objective 8 Seek improvements that relieve traffic congestion while minimizing impacts on other transportation modes.							
Policy 8.1 Improve the function of major intersections in Glen Park without further degrading the pedestrian environment or neighborhood character.	X					Transportation Element Policies 18.2, 23.6 and 23.7	These General Plan policies encourage street design that addresses the level of traffic that serves a street, but will not cause a detrimental impact on adjacent land uses, nor eliminate the efficient and safe movement of transit vehicles and bicycles. In addition, these ensure convenient and safe pedestrian crossings by minimizing the distance pedestrians must walk to cross a street

**TABLE III.H-2
GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES THAT ADDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE**

General Plan Element Policy/ Area Plan Policy	Transportation	Energy Efficiency	Renewable Energy	Waste	Environment/ Conservation	General Plan Policy Consistency	Discussion
							and by providing sufficient time for pedestrians to cross streets at a moderate pace. Policy 8.1 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies in that it supports improvements to the function of major intersections in Glen Park without further degrading the pedestrian environment or neighborhood character.
Objective 9 Restore the local importance of streets in the area.							
Policy 9.1 Calm traffic throughout Glen Park, especially through-traffic and freeway-oriented traffic.	X					Transportation Element Policies 15.1 and 18.4	These General Plan policies discourage excessive automobile traffic including high speed through traffic on residential streets by incorporating traffic-calming treatments. Policy 9.1 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies in that it supports traffic calming within the Glen Park area.
Policy 9.2 Conduct further analysis to determine feasibility of near and long-term improvements for San José Avenue including redesign of the street as a boulevard to improve safety, livability, and better connect surrounding neighborhoods.	X					Transportation Element Policy 18.2	This General Plan policy encourages street design that addresses the level of traffic that serves a street, but will not cause a detrimental impact on adjacent land uses, nor eliminate the efficient and safe movement of transit vehicles and bicycles. Policy 9.2 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with this policy in that the analysis will inform appropriate street design to improve San José Avenue.
Objective 10 Optimize use of existing on-street parking spaces in Glen Park.							
Policy 10.1 Pursue strategies to increase the availability of on-street parking.	X					Transportation Element Policies 16.4, 16.5 and 34.5	These General Plan policies encourage turnover and the efficient use of on-street parking by managing parking demand through appropriate pricing policies including the use of premium rates and progressive rate structures In

**TABLE III.H-2
GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES THAT ADDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE**

General Plan Element Policy/ Area Plan Policy	Transportation	Energy Efficiency	Renewable Energy	Waste	Environment/ Conservation	General Plan Policy Consistency	Discussion
							addition, the policies address reduction in parking demand through limiting the absolute amount of spaces and prioritizing the spaces for short-term and ride-share uses. Finally, these policies support limiting additional curb cuts which would reduce or eliminate on-street parking. Policy 10.1 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies in that it encourages the development of strategies to retain and efficiently use on-street parking and increase its availability.
Policy 10.2 Improve neighborhood walkability, interest, comfort, and safety to alleviate need for some local vehicle trips.	X					Transportation Element Policy 1.2; Urban Design Policy 1.6	These General Plan policies support the safety and comfort of pedestrians throughout the city as well as identify that shopping streets and other centers for activity should be designed to stand out in an attractive manner through incorporation of street design features. Policy 10.2 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies in that it supports improvements in the commercial core to make the area more walkable, safe, comfortable and attractive for pedestrians and shoppers so that some local vehicles trips may be eliminated.
Objective 11 Maintain and improve the area's mix of public open spaces							
Policy 11.1 Sustain and improve the informal pedestrian path and greenway connecting downtown Glen Park to Glen Canyon Park.	X				X	Recreation and Open Space Policies 2.8 and Transportation Element Policy 1.2	These General Plan policies ensure the safety and comfort of pedestrians throughout the city and supports links between parks and neighborhoods. Policy 11.1 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies in that it would facilitate improvements to an existing pedestrian path and greenway for the area that links the commercial area to a park.

**TABLE III.H-2
GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN POLICIES THAT ADDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE**

General Plan Element Policy/ Area Plan Policy	Transportation	Energy Efficiency	Renewable Energy	Waste	Environment/ Conservation	General Plan Policy Consistency	Discussion
Policy 11.2 Recognize Kern Street and the BART plaza as important public space opportunities.					X	Recreation and Open Space Policies 4.2 and 4.7.	These General Plan policies call for maximizing the joint use of other properties and facilities such as plazas, streets or sidewalks as open space to provide additional open space to serve neighborhood commercial districts. Policy 11.2 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies in that Kern Street and the BART plaza may be improved as important public space opportunities.
Policy 11.3 Consider reclaiming some street space in the commercial core for use as open space.					X	Recreation and Open Space Policies 4.2 and 4.7.	These General Plan policies call for maximizing the joint use of other properties and facilities such as plazas, streets or sidewalks as open space to provide additional open space to serve neighborhood commercial districts. Policy 11.3 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies in that streetscape within the commercial core may be improved for use as open space.
Policy 11.4 The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) and Planning Department should conduct a study to assess the feasibility, benefits, and impacts of daylighting a portion of Islais Creek through Glen Park.					X	Recreation and Open Space Policies 1.1, 2.13 and 4.2	These General Plan policies call for the protection of the natural character of regional open spaces and place high priority on acquiring open spaces noted for unique natural qualities as well as the preservation and protection of significant natural resource areas. In addition, the policies support maximizing joint use of other properties and facilities. Policy 11.4 of the 2010 Community Plan is consistent with these policies in that the Planning Department would work with SFPUC to determine if creek restoration of Islais Creek could be implemented in Glen Park creating additional open space.

Source: PBS&J, 2011.

- **Infill Development.** The two infill sites, the 13 additional residential units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses at 2928-2958 Diamond Street that could potentially be developed within the plan area are program-level proposals for which design details are unknown at this time. As such, a GHG Compliance Checklist has not yet been completed for the two infill sites and the 13 additional residential units, or the 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses. However, as stated above new development and renovations/alterations for private projects and municipal projects are required to comply with San Francisco's ordinances that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, as applicable. Therefore, because this development would be required to comply with the City's GHG reduction strategy, the potential GHG impacts would be less than significant. Once specific proposals for the infill development, any of the 13 residential units, at-large in the plan area, or the potential 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses at 2928-2958 Diamond Street have been designed, a GHG Compliance checklist would be submitted to the San Francisco Planning Department for review and a determination of compliance.

Transportation Improvements. As discussed in San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, new development and renovations/alterations for private projects and municipal projects are required to comply with San Francisco's ordinances that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Applicable requirements for municipal projects are shown in Table III.H-3, p. III.H-28, for the Transportation Improvements. A GHG Compliance checklist for the Transportation Improvements was submitted to the San Francisco Planning Department and reviewed for consistency with the GHG Reduction Strategy. The transportation improvements were found to be in compliance the City's GHG reduction strategy and, therefore, the potential GHG impacts would be less than significant.²¹

The 2008 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Ordinance requires that all City Departments prepare an annual department-specific climate action plan (CAP). The evaluation of GHG checklist compliance for municipal projects, such as the proposed transportation improvements, includes a summary of the sponsoring department's

²¹ San Francisco Planning Department. *Compliance Checklist Greenhouse Gas Analysis for Glen Park Community Plan/Transportation Improvements*. February 2011. A copy of this document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco as part of Case File. 2005.1004E.

III. Environmental Setting and Impacts
H. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

climate action plan. CAP summaries for both the Planning Department and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) are provided here.

**TABLE III.H-3
REGULATIONS APPLICABLE TO THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS**

Regulation	Requirement	Discussion
Commuter Benefits Ordinance (Environment Code, Section 421)	All City employees are offered commuter benefits for transit and vanpool expenses. The City Hall bike room provides secure bicycle parking, showers and lockers for bicycle commuters. City employees are also eligible for telecommuting and alternative work schedules.	All City Departments provide commuter benefits to City employees. Therefore, SFMTA and the Planning Department are in compliance with this ordinance.
Emergency Ride Home Program	All City employees are automatically eligible for the emergency ride home program.	All City employees are automatically enrolled in the emergency ride home program, and therefore, SFMTA and the Planning Department comply.
Clean Construction Ordinance (Administrative Code, Section 6.25)	Effective March 2009, all contracts for large (20+ day) City projects are required to: Fuel diesel vehicles with B20 biodiesel, and Use construction equipment that meet USEPA Tier 2 standards or best available control technologies for equipment over 25 hp.	SFMTA and the Planning Department would be required to comply with the Clean Construction Ordinance for construction of the transportation improvements.
Resource Efficiency and Green Building Ordinance (Environment Code, Chapter 7)	The ordinance requires all demolition (& new construction) projects to prepare a Construction and Demolition Debris Management Plan designed to recycle construction and demolition materials to the maximum extent feasible, with a goal of 75 percent diversion. The ordinance specifies requires for all city buildings to provide adequate recycling space.	SFMTA and the Planning Department would be required to prepare a Construction and Demolition Debris Management Plan for construction of the transportation improvements in compliance with the Green Building Ordinance.
Construction Recycled Content Ordinance (Administrative Code, Section 6.4)	Ordinance requires the use of recycled content material in public works projects to the maximum extent feasible and gives preference to local manufacturers and industry.	SFMTA and the Planning Department would comply with the Construction Recycled Content Ordinance for construction of the transportation improvements. The project could include the use of materials such as recycled concrete or asphalt.
Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Ordinance (Formerly Precautionary Purchasing Ordinance)	Requires City Departments to purchase products on the Approved Green Products List, maintained by the Department of the Environment. The items in the Approved Green Products List has been tested by San Francisco City Depts. and meet standards that are more rigorous than ecolabels in protecting our health and environment.	SFMTA and the Planning Department, comply with the Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Ordinance.

Sources: Glen Park Community Plan, 2010; San Francisco General Plan, 2009; PBS&J, 2011.

In January 2011, the Planning Department updated its department CAP. The Department CAP summarizes the Department actions to reduce operational greenhouse gas emissions by implementing GHG reduction strategies related to energy efficiency, fleet vehicle usage, employee commute, waste reduction, and water usage.

Through its role in maintaining the City's General Plan and implementing the Planning Code, the Department has the opportunity to facilitate reductions in communitywide GHG emissions. With respect to carbon sequestration and maintenance of the urban forest, the Planning Department is responsible for the following measures. During plan check of building permits, Department staff verify compliance with Planning Code Section 138.1, which requires the planting of street trees for new development. The Better Streets Plan, an inter-agency document guiding the design of City streets, includes requirements for streetscape improvement including street tree planting. In addition, the Planning Department has received funding from the State of California Strategic Growth Council to develop the Urban Forest Plan, a comprehensive plan for the planting and management of the City's street trees.

The Planning Department has been incorporating sustainable principles into the growth and development of San Francisco for some time. In 1973, the City adopted its "Transit First" policy, and the Department has worked to implement that policy since. In 1984 the Department developed the Downtown Plan, with its precedent-setting goals of reducing traffic downtown; increasing light, air and sunshine reaching streets and publicly accessible open spaces; reducing air pollution, energy use, and consumption of land for parking; increasing employment where it has greatest access to transit, retail, and service commercial spaces; and increasing housing close to downtown. These sustainable principles have continued to inform recent area plan development such as those completed for the Eastern Neighborhoods and the Better Neighborhoods Program, all of which include "green" policies aimed at increasing development near transit, increasing transit options, promoting walking and bicycling, increasing neighborhood livability through proximity to goods and services, supporting car-sharing, and finally towards improving public and environmental health.

SFMTA's 2009 CAP focuses on emission reductions achieved through transportation policies and programs. SFMTA aims to reduce its energy use footprint and reduce

its operational GHGs to 20 percent below the 1990 baseline by 2012. The SFMTA CAP outlines steps needed to achieve this goal, including emission free vehicles, fewer vehicle miles traveled and modal shift to transit, bikes and walking. The SFMTA will likely meet this goal. Since 1990 it has replaced its diesel motor coach fleet with modern, low-emission models and introduced fuel efficient hybrid buses. More than half of Muni's revenue vehicles are powered by non-polluting, hydroelectric power, including light rail trains, historic streetcars, cable cars and the largest fleet of electric trolley buses in North America. Muni, the transit division of SFMTA, has also begun to implement its *Clean Air Plan: Zero Emissions 2020*, a blueprint for further reducing motor coach emissions and fossil fuel use through bridging technologies such as hybrid and fuel cell buses and cleaner fuels such as biodiesel.

The SFMTA is working to reduce the impacts of automobile emissions and congestion through multiple initiatives. For example, the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) aims to attract motorists onto transit through a faster, more reliable and more efficient transit system. Using existing resources, the TEP will reorganize SFMTA's network of bus routes and rail lines to concentrate service improvements along the most heavily-traveled corridors. Another program, *SFpark*, will test variable pricing to improve the management of the City's limited parking supply. A major goal of *SFpark* is to reduce congestion and pollution associated with circling for parking. In addition, the SFMTA's Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) program, supported by planning and redevelopment programs in the City, will include converting property owned by the SFMTA and property adjacent to significant agency transit facilities to land uses that support and build upon transit ridership. This, in turn, will foster a lifestyle that presents a smaller carbon footprint than non-TOD projects, as studies show, and will generate revenue for the SFMTA to support the system's operation.

Open Space Improvements. The recommendations for the open space improvements in the *2010 Community Plan* are program-level proposals and design details are unknown at this time. The implementation of the open space improvements is long term in nature and would be subject to independent study and environmental review in the future. As such, a GHG Compliance Checklist has not yet been completed for these improvements. However, as stated above new development and renovations/alterations for private projects and municipal projects are required to comply with San Francisco's ordinances that reduce greenhouse gas

emissions, including these open space improvements. Once specific proposals for the open space improvements have been developed, a GHG Compliance checklist would be submitted to the Planning Department for review and a determination of compliance with the GHG Reduction Strategy. Therefore, because the open space improvements would be required to comply with the City's GHG reduction strategies, GHG impacts associated with open space improvements would be less than significant.

Summary. Depending on a proposed project's size, use, and location, a variety of controls are in place to ensure that a proposed project would not impair the State's ability to meet statewide GHG reduction targets outlined in AB 32, nor impact the City's ability to meet San Francisco's local GHG reduction targets. Given that: (1) San Francisco has implemented regulations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions specific to new construction and renovations of private developments and municipal projects; (2) San Francisco's sustainable policies have resulted in the measured success of reduced greenhouse gas emissions levels; (3) San Francisco has met and exceeded AB 32 greenhouse gas reduction goals for the year 2020; (4) current and probable future state and local greenhouse gas reduction measures will continue to reduce a project's contribution to climate change; and (5) San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* meet BAAQMD's requirements for a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's regulations would not contribute significantly to global climate change. The proposed project would be required to comply with these requirements, and was determined to be consistent with San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* as documented in the GHG Compliance Checklist for the 2010 *Community Plan*.²² As such, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact with respect to GHG emissions.

²² San Francisco Planning Department. *Compliance Checklist Greenhouse Gas Analysis for Glen Park Community Plan/Transportation Improvements*. February 2011. A copy of this document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco as part of Case File. 2005.1004E.

IV. OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

A. GROWTH INDUCEMENT

Growth inducement analysis under CEQA considers the ways in which proposed projects could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment.¹ Projects that are traditionally or most commonly considered growth inducing are those that would remove obstacles to population growth (for example, a major expansion or a wastewater treatment plant may allow for more construction in its service area, or a new freeway may allow growth at freeway exits).

The *Glen Park Community Plan (2010 Community Plan)* is a planning effort that aims to enhance the positive existing features of the neighborhood, while encouraging infill development near transit opportunities and improving accessibility. The fundamental objectives of the *2010 Community Plan* are to guide future infrastructure improvements, update zoning, design guidelines, and other city policies for future development in the Glen Park neighborhood. Development anticipated under the *2010 Community Plan* would result in the construction of up to 150 dwelling units and up to 28,745 gsf of retail space. As a result, population in the plan area would increase up to 314 residents² and up to 82 employees.³ No population or employment increases would be anticipated as a result of proposed transportation improvements. The project would increase the overall residential population of the City and County of San Francisco by less than 0.1 percent.⁴ Therefore, the *2010 Community Plan* would not induce substantial population growth.

New residential units at the infill sites would help to address citywide need for housing in which job growth and in-migration exceed the supply of new housing. Future development under the proposed project would result in up to 150 dwelling units. In addition, any proposed housing would be required to include affordable units. With anticipated new housing construction, the proposed project would increase the City's overall housing stock. However, implementation of the proposed project would not represent a significant growth in housing in

¹ CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.2(d)

² U.S. Census Bureau, DP-4. "Profile of Selected Housing Characteristics 2000: Census Tract 218, San Francisco County, California." Based on information for Census Tract 218, the average household population was 2.09 persons/household. 150 units x 2.09 persons/unit = approximately 314 residents.

³ Based on San Francisco Transportation Review Guidelines, retail/commercial uses have about 350 to 450 gsf per employee. (28,745 gsf/350 gsf/employee = 82 employees).

⁴ The calculation is based on the ABAG estimated total population of 795,800 persons in the City and County of San Francisco in 2005.

the context of the City as a whole, which is projected to have an increase of 28,750 households between 2010 and 2025.⁵

The existing BART parking lot does not have employees and the number of employees currently working at the commercial and retail portions of the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site is unknown, but presumed to be about ten. The proposed project would provide permanent on-site employment for up to 82 persons. The employment generated by the proposed project would result in a net increase of approximately 72 employees, which would result in a corresponding demand for approximately 54 new housing units.⁶ However, this demand would not be substantial in context of citywide housing growth over the next 20 years.

The proposed project is located in an urban area that is already serviced by the City's municipal infrastructure and public services. No expansion to municipal infrastructure or public services not already under construction or included with the project would be required to accommodate new development directly or indirectly induced by the proposed project. The project would not result in development of new public services that would accommodate significant further growth. For these reasons, the proposed project would not be considered to result in significant growth-inducing impacts.

B. SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

In accordance with Section 21100(b)(2)(A) of CEQA, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b), this section identifies significant impacts that could not be eliminated or reduced to an insignificant level by implementation of mitigation measures included as part of the proposed project or by other mitigation measures that could be implemented, identified in Chapter III. This is subject to final determination by the San Francisco Planning Commission as part of the certification process for the FEIR. If necessary, this section will be revised in the FEIR to reflect the findings of the Commission. The proposed project would have significant and unavoidable impacts to transportation and circulation and air quality.

⁵ ABAG Projections, 2007, 2006.

⁶ According to ABAG Projections 2007, the employees per household ratio in the City of San Francisco in 2000 was 1.33 (437,533 employed residents/329,700 households = 1.33 employees per household). Therefore, 72 new employees/1.33 employees per household = approximately 54 new housing units.

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

The proposed project would have the following significant and unavoidable impacts related to transportation and circulation:

- Traffic associated with infill development under the *2010 Community Plan* would cause the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection (Intersection #10) to degrade from LOS D under Existing Conditions to LOS E under Existing plus Infill Development conditions during both the weekday AM peak hour and PM peak hour. With the addition of the proposed transportation improvements to the infill development, the LOS would deteriorate to unacceptable levels. The transportation improvements proposed at this location include an increase in the cycle length, a pedestrian scramble phase, leading northbound and southbound left-turn vehicle movements, red curb restrictions to aid with the southbound and eastbound right-turn vehicle movements, and traffic calming measures, namely a bulbout at the northwest corner and wider sidewalks on the northeast side of Bosworth Street. While it is anticipated that the addition of the approximately 30-second pedestrian scramble phase would worsen traffic conditions at this intersection, the other improvements proposed with the pedestrian scramble would cause the average delay during the AM and PM peak hours to slightly improve. Nonetheless, the LOS during both AM and PM peak hours would remain at LOS E, and therefore would continue to be considered a potentially significant impact at this intersection.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-1B, p. III.E-38, which recommends that the existing signal timing be re-optimized and that the cycle length be increased to 140 seconds, while maintaining the pedestrian scramble phase, would reduce the project impacts at this intersection. However, the intersection would continue to operate at unacceptable conditions and the SFMTA has strong reservations about the feasibility of this mitigation measure due to the secondary effects of its implementation on pedestrian and vehicle wait times. Therefore, the project's impact at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection during both AM and PM weekday peak hours would remain significant and unavoidable.

In addition, the proposed project would have the following significant and unavoidable cumulative impact:

- The *2010 Community Plan* would add traffic to the Bosworth Street and Diamond Street intersection, which under 2030 Cumulative Conditions would operate at unacceptable conditions (LOS F) during the weekday AM peak hour; and degrade from LOS D under Cumulative Conditions to LOS E under Cumulative plus Infill Development Conditions during the weekday PM peak hour, and would result in a significant impact at this intersection. With the addition of the transportation improvements to the infill development, the LOS would deteriorate to unacceptable levels. The proposed transportation improvements at this intersection include an increase in the cycle length to 120 seconds; a pedestrian scramble phase; the introduction of leading northbound and southbound left-turn vehicle movements; curb restrictions to aid with the southbound and eastbound right-turn vehicle movements; and additional traffic calming measures, namely a bulbout at the northwest corner of the intersection and wider sidewalks on the northeast side of Bosworth Street.

While the addition of the approximately 30-second pedestrian scramble phase would worsen traffic delay at this intersection, the other improvements would cause the average delay during the AM and PM peak hours to slightly improve, resulting in the LOS during both AM and PM peak hours remaining at LOS E. Therefore, the impact would continue to be considered significant at this intersection

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-13B, p. III.E-79, which recommends that the existing signal timing be re-optimized and that the cycle length be increased to 150 seconds, would reduce the project impacts at this intersection. However, the intersection would continue to operate at unacceptable conditions and the SFMTA has strong reservations about the feasibility of this mitigation measure due to the secondary effects of its implementation on pedestrian and vehicle wait times. Therefore, the project's impact at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection during both AM and PM weekday peak hours would likely remain significant and unavoidable.

AIR QUALITY

The proposed project would have the following significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts related to air quality:

- Equipment used for construction activities associated with the *2010 Community Plan* would result in short-term emission increases of criteria air pollutants and ozone

precursors that exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria. Construction-related emissions of ROG and NO_x would have the potential to exceed the 2010 adopted BAAQMD thresholds of significance. This would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality.

- Construction equipment associated with future development under the *2010 Community Plan* would emit PM_{2.5} and other TACs. Although such emissions would be temporary, given the close proximity of sensitive receptors in the *2010 Community Plan* area to the project construction sites, resultant health risks would exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria. The two potential infill sites, which both include residential uses, are each about a half an acre in size and would require about a 300-foot buffer zone to assure that existing sensitive receptors are not significantly impacted by construction-phase TAC and PM_{2.5} emissions. Given that existing residential uses in the *2010 Community Plan* area are closer than 300 feet to the infill sites, the 13 additional units, and to other sites proposed for the construction of transportation facility improvements, resultant health risks from construction equipment emissions would result in significant and unavoidable impacts
- Motor vehicles and stationary sources operating in and near the plan area would emit PM_{2.5} and other TACs. Given that project implementation would introduce new residential sensitive receptors into the plan area in locations exposed to high levels of PM_{2.5} and other TACs, resultant health risks would exceed the 1999 and 2010 BAAQMD CEQA *Guidelines* significance criteria (the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA *Air Quality Guidelines* use the same thresholds of significance as the 1999 BAAQMD CEQA *Guidelines* for health risk from operational sources (i.e., increased cancer risk greater than 10 per million, and for both chronic and acute non-cancer hazard index each greater than 1.0). The potential infill sites would include areas where the PM_{2.5} levels exceed the BAAQMD threshold of 0.3 µg/m³. If a single roadway or stationary source exceeds any one of these thresholds, the project would be considered to expose sensitive receptors to a significant health risk impact. Since motor-vehicle-related PM_{2.5} concentrations of 1 µg/m³ translates into risk of 300 excess cancers per one million people exposed over a lifetime, the 0.3 µg/m³ exposure of residential receptors at the infill sites would entail a cancer risk of 90 per million, which would exceed the BAAQMD 10 per million threshold. Both would be significant and unavoidable impacts.

In addition, the proposed project would have the following significant and unavoidable cumulative impact:

- Construction activity associated with the proposed development under the *2010 Community Plan* and with other development in the area would generate criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that would exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria. Development under the *2010 Community Plan* would potentially exceed the 2010 BAAQMD thresholds of significance if construction of the different components of the *2010 Community Plan* were constructed concurrently. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B are proposed to reduce emissions from construction of all project components, and to phase the project components; however, even with implementation of the mitigation measures, construction-related emissions associated with the *2010 Community Plan* would still have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds. BAAQMD considers projects that result in a significant criteria air pollutant impact to also result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional criteria air pollutants. Therefore, construction activities under the *2010 Community Plan* would contribute to a significant cumulative impact with respect to criteria air pollutant and ozone precursors.
- Construction and operational activities associated with the proposed development under the *2010 Community Plan* and with other development in the area would emit PM_{2.5} and other TACS. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A, p. III.G-25, is proposed to reduce construction-related emissions, which would also reduce the exposure of nearby residents to construction-related health risks. However, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A, construction-related health risks would still have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable cumulative TAC impacts

C. SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE IMPACTS

In accordance with Section 21100(b)(2)(B) of CEQA, and Section 15126.2(c) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, an EIR must identify any significant irreversible environmental changes that could result from implementation of the proposed project. This may include current or future uses of non-renewable resources, and secondary or growth-inducing impacts that commit future uses of non-renewable resources, and secondary or growth-inducing impacts that commit future generations to similar uses. According to the *CEQA Guidelines*, irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

The proposed project would intensify development in the project area consistent with development in San Francisco's urban environment. Although not irreversible, the effects of this development would be difficult to change in the short-run. The proposed project would commit future generations to an irreversible commitment of energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels, automobiles, and during demolition and construction and ongoing use of the future development in the plan area. The consumption of other non-renewable or slowly renewable resources would also occur during construction, occupancy and use of the site. These resources include, but are not limited to: lumber, concrete, sand and gravel, asphalt, masonry, metals, and water. The proposed project would also irreversibly use water and solid waste landfill resources. However, the proposed project would not involve a large commitment of those resources relative to supply, nor would it consume any of those resources wastefully.

D. AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

This EIR assesses the proposed *2010 Community Plan's* contribution to land use changes transportation improvements in the Glen Park neighborhood. It also evaluates the potential impacts of the *2010 Community Plan* with respect to aesthetics, cultural and paleontological resources, noise and vibration, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions. The Initial Study found that all other environmental effects would be less than significant, with implementation of the identified mitigation measures.

On July 1, 2009, the Planning Department issued a Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (NOP). Individuals and agencies that received these notices included owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site, tenants of properties adjacent to the project site, and other potentially interested parties, including various regional and state agencies. A scoping meeting was held on July 16, 2009. The scoping meeting provided the public and affected governmental agencies with an opportunity to present their environmental concerns regarding the proposed project. CEQA-related concerns raised at that meeting and in written comments include aesthetics, land use, population and housing, transportation, noise, biological resources, hazardous materials, air quality, wind and shadow, public services, and hydrology and water quality.

The Planning Department distributed a Notice of Availability (NOA) and an Initial Study on January 6, 2010, announcing the availability of the Initial Study and its intent to prepare an EIR. In response to the NOA and the Initial Study, individuals submitted comment letters to the Planning Department. No comments were received from public agencies. Copies of the NOP and the Initial Study are included in this EIR as Appendix A.

On the basis of public comments on the NOP and the Initial Study and at the scoping meeting, potential areas of controversy and unresolved issues for this project include future development potential (locations, land use type, intensity, and bulk and mass); adequacy of parking supply to accommodate growth; increased traffic resulting from future growth, and potential increase of air pollution. Some of these issues, including traffic and parking, are discussed in this EIR.

V. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

As stated in Section 15126.6(a) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, “an EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.”

This section identifies potentially feasible alternatives to the *2010 Community Plan* (and discusses potential environmental impacts associated with these alternatives. Project decision-makers could approve an alternative instead of the proposed project, if that alternative would reduce or eliminate significant impacts of the project, is determined to be feasible, and would meet most of the project objectives. The determination of feasibility will be made by project decision-makers on the basis of substantial evidence in the record, which shall include, but not be limited to, information presented in the EIR and in comments received on the EIR.

Three alternatives are evaluated in this section: Alternative A - No Project; Alternative B - Reduced Development-High Residential/Low Retail Development; and Alternative C - Reduced Development-Hybrid Mix. Alternatives B and C could be implemented under City controls and would require many of the same approvals as the proposed project.

A. ALTERNATIVE A: NO PROJECT

The *CEQA Guidelines* require EIRs to include a No Project Alternative for the purpose of allowing decision-makers to compare the effects of the proposed project with the effects of not approving a project.

DESCRIPTION

The No Project Alternative would entail no *2010 Community Plan* for the Glen Park community, including no new guiding policies proposals for the community character. Specifically, the No Project Alternative would entail no specific changes to existing land use policies or Planning Code amendments (no new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit [NCT] District or rezoning of parcels in the plan area); no policies for infill development on the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street or at the BART parking lot; and no transportation and open space improvements. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the existing land use policies, zoning, height and bulk district, as well as structures in the plan area would not change.

This alternative would not preclude future proposals for development at the two infill sites or elsewhere within the plan area, or proposals for other transportation and open space improvements.

IMPACTS

If the No Project Alternative were implemented, none of the environmental impacts associated with the *2010 Community Plan* would occur. The *2010 Community Plan's* significant and unavoidable impact associated with transportation would not occur. In addition, the less-than-significant (with mitigation) potential impacts associated with noise and vibration, and cultural and paleontological resources would not occur. The project's less-than-significant aesthetic, land use, and greenhouse gas emissions impacts would also not occur under this alternative.

The No Project Alternative would not avoid the significant air quality impacts since new residential uses could be constructed within the plan area near Bosworth Street, San Jose Avenue, and I-280, similar to the proposed project. These new residential uses could be exposed to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants and particulate matter associated with the identified roadways. However, the amount of residential uses that could be constructed within this area would likely be less than under the *2010 Community Plan*. In addition, any construction activities that would occur within the plan area under the No Project Alternative could expose existing sensitive uses to significant health risks and significant cumulative health risks from construction emissions. However, new residential uses developed within the plan area under the No Project Alternative would not be exposed to significant cumulative health risks in excess of Bay Area Air Quality Management District cumulative project thresholds, for the same reasons described for the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would not include any of the transportation improvements that are part of the proposed project. As a result, two of the study intersections would experience higher vehicle delay under the No Project Alternative as compared with the proposed project: Intersection #3 Chenery Street/Natick Street, and Intersection #5 Wilder Street/Carrie Street. Although the vehicle delay at these intersections would be higher, the overall intersection level of service would remain at acceptable levels of LOS. Additionally, conditions for non-motorized transportation (i.e., pedestrians, bicyclists) in the plan area under the No Project Alternative would be worse than with the proposed project, due to the fact that many of the proposed project's transportation improvements would slow vehicular traffic and reduce potential vehicle conflicts with pedestrians and bicyclists throughout the plan area.

In addition, the significant effects in the areas of biological resources, hydrology and water quality, and hazards and hazardous materials associated with the *2003 Community Plan Summary* described in the Initial Study (see Appendix A) would not occur with this alternative; no mitigation measures would be required. Other less-than-significant effects would not occur, including: population and housing; wind and shadow; recreation; utilities and service systems; public services; geology and soils; mineral and energy resources; and agricultural resources.

B. ALTERNATIVE B: REDUCED DEVELOPMENT - HIGH RESIDENTIAL/LOW RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

DESCRIPTION

Alternative B proposes a reduced development scenario, with fewer residential units and commercial space at both the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street infill site and the BART parking lot infill site (fewer than the proposed project). All of the other aspects of the proposed project, such as the land use and zoning controls (including the Glen Park NCT District and the height increases), and transportation and open space improvements would be the same under Alternative B.

Alternative B was crafted to reduce any potential impacts associated with transportation and circulation (vehicle trip generation) from the high development potential at both of the infill sites (see Section II, Project Description, p. II-15). It was also designed to provide the opportunity for mixed-use development near the Glen Park BART Station. The components of Alternative B are described below.

- The development at the infill site at the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street would be reduced to a maximum of 10 residential units (compared to up to 47 residential units for the proposed project) and up to 1,000 gsf of ground-floor commercial space (compared to up to 8,582 gsf for the proposed project).
- Up to 11 off-street parking spaces would be included at the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street infill site (compared to up to 26 spaces for the proposed project).
- The development at the infill site at the BART parking lot would be reduced to a maximum of 31 residential units (compared to up to 90 residential units for the proposed project) and up to 2,000 gsf of ground-floor commercial space (compared to up to 14,913 gsf for the proposed project).
- Up to 33 off-street parking spaces would be included at the BART parking lot infill site (compared to up to 123 spaces for the proposed project).

- Introduction of a new Glen Park NCT District that incorporates the parcels along Diamond Street, Chenery Street, Joost Avenue, and Wilder Street currently zoned NC-2 (see Figure II-3, p.II-14) (as the proposed project).
- Height limit increase from 40-X to 45-X uniformly in areas zoned Glen Park NCT to encourage active ground-floor uses (same as assumed for proposed project).
- Height limit increase from 40-X to 65-X uniformly across the BART parking lot infill site (same as assumed for the proposed project).
- Section 152 of the Planning Code does not require off-street loading spaces for residential buildings with less than 100,000 gsf of floor area or for buildings with less than 10,000 gsf of floor area devoted to retail/non-profit use. Therefore, pursuant to Section 152 of the Planning Code, the Diamond Street /Bosworth Street and the BART parking lot infill sites would not be required to include off-street loading spaces (compared to one loading space at the BART site for the proposed project).

Additionally, all of the transportation improvements included under the proposed project would be included in Alternative B. These include traffic calming measures at the Bosworth Street and Diamond Street intersection; bicycle networks improvements; pedestrian access improvement measures including the connection to the Muni Metro J-Church Line; transit improvements such as the proposed BART Station bus loop improvement; and parking management strategies.

Development potential within the Glen Park NCT district would be expected to occur over the life of the *2010 Community Plan*. The maximum development potential in the plan area, excluding development potential associated with the two infill sites, would be 13 residential units and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses, the same as under the proposed project.

In summary, the development at the infill sites under Alternative B would be reduced to 54 residential units compared to 150 under the proposed project. In addition, the total commercial space would be limited to 3,000 gsf compared to approximately 28,745 gsf proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*.

Alternative B would require the same planning approvals and review process as the proposed project.

IMPACTS

This alternative would have environmental effects similar to those of the proposed project, as described in Section III, Environmental Setting and Impacts, of the EIR and the Initial Study (Appendix A). Exceptions to these potential effects are summarized below.

Land Use

Under Alternative B, the land use development patterns would be the similar to those occurring under the *2010 Community Plan*, except with reduced development intensity at the infill sites. Other development controls would be implemented as proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*, including the modification to the height and bulk district. Transportation improvements would also be implemented as proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*. Similar to the *2010 Community Plan* and individual plan components, Alternative B would not conflict with adopted plans, policies, and regulations.

The maximum development potential in the plan area, excluding development potential associated with the two infill sites, would be 13 residential units and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses. The development at the infill sites would be reduced compared to potential development under the *2010 Community Plan*. For the infill sites there would be potential for 54 residential units compared to 150 proposed under the project. In addition, the total commercial space would be limited to 3,000 gsf compared to approximately 28,745 gsf proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*. Overall, the development at the infill sites anticipated in the plan area under Alternative B would be less than the *2010 Community Plan* and would not have significant adverse impacts on the land use character of the plan area and vicinity. The land use impacts under Alternative B would be less-than-significant as under the proposed *2010 Community Plan*.

Additionally, under Alternative B the majority of cumulative projects in the vicinity of the plan area involve transportation improvements including implementing traffic calming measures, making *San Francisco Bicycle Plan* lane improvements, addressing pedestrian connectivity, and enhancing transit connections. Similar to the proposed project, these improvements would generally improve automobile, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation in the plan area and adjacent land uses would not be affected. Thus, similar to the proposed project, Alternative B would not result in a significant adverse change in the area's land use character and would not contribute to significant cumulative land use impacts.

Aesthetics

Under Alternative B, the land use development patterns would be the similar to those occurring under the *2010 Community Plan*, except the development intensity at the infill sites would be reduced. Transportation improvements would also be implemented as proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*. The *2010 Community Plan's* policies under Alternative B would call for design of new buildings to be consistent with the neighborhoods existing pattern. New

buildings or renovations would be expected to reinforce the character of Glen Park by creating attractive and pedestrian-friendly environment. New development would also be expected to

be appropriately scaled to fit in with existing development. In addition, the potential infill development would be expected to adhere to the policies of the Urban Design Element in the General Plan. As a result, the impact of potential infill development on the existing visual character of the plan area and surroundings would be less than significant.

Similar to the proposed project, cumulative projects in the vicinity of the plan area under Alternative B involve transportation improvements that would have minimal effects on visual character of the plan area and vicinity. Thus, cumulative impacts to visual character would be less than significant under Alternative B.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Alternative B would result in a less intense use of the plan area than the proposed project. The residential component of Alternative B would consist of 54 residential units, as compared with 150 residential units under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately 64 percent. The retail component of Alternative B would consist of 3,000 gsf, as compared with 28,745 gsf of retail space under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately 89 percent. No historical, archeological, or paleontological resources would be affected by the reduced development component. As such, no impacts to cultural resources are anticipated as a result of the reduced development.

Transportation improvements would also be implemented as proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*. Because the transportation improvements are the same under the proposed project, all impacts discussed under the proposed project apply for Alternative B. As discussed for the *2010 Community Plan*, the Diamond Street widening variant would alter portions of the exterior plazas of the BART Station, which are character-defining features. The existing pedestrian bridge would be rebuilt and an elevator would be constructed between Diamond Street and the BART Station plaza that would alter the BART Station. The BART Station plaza improvements would modify the BART Station by removing walls and fences, expanding at-grade access, and linking Muni passenger areas to improve access. These improvements could materially impair those physical characteristics, including the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register. In addition, the BART Station loop improvement would construct the concourse level entry at the Glen Park BART Station's south elevation and the walk-through bridge through the station to the north-end plaza. This modification would reconfigure the staircase at the north plaza which would alter the station's character-defining features, including its interior space.

and the exterior plazas. Alternative B, like the proposed project, could significantly impact the design and character of the interior space, including, but not limited to the relationship of the roof form, the interior tile mosaic, and the fenestration. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed project.

In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, and as analyzed under the proposed project, this analysis assumes the design and operation of the elevator would be a potentially significant impact, because it would materially impair those physical characteristics of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register. This potentially significant impact on the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through incorporation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, described in Section III, Cultural Resources, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*. In addition, to address other potential impacts associated with the construction of the improvements to the Glen Park BART Station, the project sponsor would be required to implement Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A, M-CP-2B, and M-CP-2C, described on pp. III.D-34 through III.D-36, which require preparation of a Historical Resources Protection Plan involving construction controls, documentation and protection of historic resources, as well as verification of historic preservation for activity at the Glen Park BART Station. With incorporation of these mitigation measures, impacts to the character-defining features of the station would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Additionally, Alternative B could involve subsurface construction that may have the potential to damage or disturb unknown subsurface archaeological deposits. No Native American or historic-period archaeological sites have been recorded in the area of the *2010 Community Plan*. However, the area surrounding Islais Creek may contain prehistoric archaeological resources. If encountered during construction, archeological resources could be damaged or destroyed, which would constitute a significant impact. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-3, described in Section III.D, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, p. III.D-37, provides archeological testing, monitoring, data recovery and reporting procedures for any encountered archaeological resources on the plan area. These shall be undertaken by a qualified archaeologist in consultation with the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) to reduce impacts on archaeological resources. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-3 would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

As with the proposed project, the *2010 Community Plan* could destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Although no known paleontological resources have been recorded in the plan area, paleontological resources may be found at depths greater than previously disturbed during past development during construction of the infill sites or any of the transportation improvements. In the unlikely event that paleontological resources are discovered in the area during construction activities, potential significant impact on paleontological resources could occur. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-4, described in Section III.D, Cultural and Paleontological Resources,

p. III.D-41, would reduce impacts of the proposed project to paleontological resources to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measure M-CP-4 calls for the design and implementation of a paleontological resources monitoring plan by a qualified paleontological consultant.

Furthermore, while no known human remains are anticipated to be found in the plan area, it is possible that such resources may be present. These resources could be encountered during construction (excavation) activities which would adversely impact any prehistoric deposits, including human remains. The implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-5, described in Section III.D, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, p. III.D-43, would reduce potential adverse impacts to human remains to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measure M-CP-5 calls for compliance with applicable State and federal laws in the event human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects are discovered during any soils disturbing activities.

Under Alternative B, the cumulative projects in the vicinity of the plan area would not create incentives to redevelop or prompt physical alterations to the identified historical resources, including the BART Station; therefore, there would be no cumulative impacts to historic architectural resources. Additionally, no archaeological or paleontological resources have been identified within the plan area that would be affected by the proposed project. Nevertheless, similar to the proposed project, any potential effects to archaeological resources or paleontological resources would be mitigated by implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-3, p. III.D-37, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-4, p. III.D-41, respectively. Furthermore, although it is unknown whether there would be an impact from the discovery of human remains in the plan area, any potential effects would be mitigated by the implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-5, p. III.D-43.

Transportation and Circulation

Alternative B would result in a less intense use of the plan area than the proposed project. The residential component of Alternative B would consist of 54 residential units, as compared with 150 residential units under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately 64 percent. The retail component of Alternative B would consist of 3,000 gsf, as compared with 28,745 gsf of retail space under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately 89 percent. As such, fewer retail and residential trips would be generated, which would reduce the demand for vehicle parking, bicycle parking, pedestrian space, and on and off-street freight loading/unloading. The significant and unavoidable impacts identified for Intersection #10 Bosworth Street / Diamond Street (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM and PM Peak Hour), would likely not occur with Alternative B. In addition, the impacts identified for Intersection #16 Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection (Existing

Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM Peak Hour), would also likely not occur with Alternative B. The project contributions to these affected intersections would be less than with the proposed project. Thus, Mitigation Measures M-TR-1A, M-TR-1B, and M-TR-2.2A would not be necessary.

Furthermore, transportation impacts from construction activities associated with the transportation improvements would include temporary changes to or restrictions on traffic lanes and grading and paving activities. As with the proposed project, the impacts of the transportation improvements would be less than significant unless the bus loop element were constructed at the same time as the variant roundabout improvement, or widening of northbound approach of Diamond Street, also a variant improvement, in which case the transportation impact would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A would reduce construction impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, Alternative B would result in less-than-significant transportation impacts.

Noise and Vibration

Alternative B would result in potential construction-related noise impacts similar to those of the proposed project. Construction noise is regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance. Similar to the proposed project, compliance with the Noise Ordinance would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Vibration impacts to the proposed residents at the BART parking lot site would have the potential to exceed the vibration thresholds similar to the proposed project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-4 would also reduce vibration impacts under Alternative B to a less-than-significant level.

Traffic-related noise impacts were determined to be less than significant for the proposed project. Development of residential and retail space at the infill sites would be reduced under this alternative. As a result, automobile trips would be reduced and traffic noise would be less than significant with Alternative B.

Cumulative noise impacts associated with construction, vibration, and traffic would not adversely affect nearby sensitive receptors. Similar to the proposed project, it is unlikely that construction noise or vibration from the proposed project and other construction sites would jointly affect the same sensitive receptors or would occur at the same time. Thus, cumulative noise impacts from construction and vibration would be less than significant. Furthermore, the operation of the proposed project would increase traffic noise levels that would affect sensitive receptors along access roads to the plan area; however, the cumulative increase would not

exceed the adopted threshold for a “substantial permanent increase” in traffic noise in residential areas. As such, the cumulative noise impacts associated with traffic from Alternative B would be less than significant.

Air Quality

As presented under Alternative B, there would be less intense use of the plan area than the proposed project. The reduction in residential units as well as retail square footage would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, similar to the proposed project. Under the recently adopted 2010 BAAQMD Thresholds of Significance, the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts associated with daily emissions of criteria pollutants (ROG and NO_x) during construction. The proposed project under the 2010 Significance Thresholds would also result in potentially significant construction-related health risks and expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of PM_{2.5} TACs. Alternative B would result in less construction-related emissions over the entire construction period (since it likely would take a shorter time to build fewer residential units and less retail space), including emissions of PM_{2.5} associated with health risks. However, the level of construction activities on the most active days of construction would be comparable for this alternative and the proposed project. Thus, Alternative B would still have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD construction significance thresholds for daily emissions of criteria air pollutants and expose people to PM_{2.5} TACs, even with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B. Therefore, impacts under Alternative B during construction would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the proposed project. The proposed infill sites are within an area that exceeds the BAAQMD significance thresholds for TACs from mobile sources. Alternative B would allow for fewer residential units at the infill sites than the proposed project; however, the placement of residential units within this area would result in significant and unavoidable impacts with mitigation, similar to the proposed project. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7 would reduce exposure of residents to TACs from mobile sources; however, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7, it may not be feasible to reduce exposure at the sites to below the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds for cancer risks.

Cumulative air quality impacts would be significant and unavoidable under Alternative B for construction emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors, similar to the proposed project. Alternative B would also result in significant and unavoidable impacts associated with cumulative health risks from construction activities. However, new residential uses developed within the plan area under Alternative B would not be exposed significant cumulative health risks, for the same reasons described for the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Greenhouse gas emissions were determined to be less than significant for the proposed project. Alternative B would include the same plan components as the proposed project, with modifications to the land use at the infill sites. In addition, it would include less intense uses in the infill sites. As a result, Alternative B would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases, and would result in reduced greenhouse gas emissions associated with automobile trips, energy, water, wastewater, and solid waste. Alternative B would also be required to comply with the City's GHG reduction strategies and would be in compliance with the City's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* and the policies of the *San Francisco General Plan*, as shown in Table III.H-2, p. III.H-24, similar to the proposed project. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, impacts would also be less than significant.

C. ALTERNATIVE C: REDUCED DEVELOPMENT- HYBRID MIX

DESCRIPTION

Like Alternative B, Alternative C proposes a reduced development scenario (different from Alternative B), with fewer residential units and commercial space at both the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street infill sites (fewer than the proposed project). All of the other aspects of the proposed project, such as the land use and zoning controls (including the Glen Park NCT District and the height increases), and transportation and open space improvements would be the same under Alternative C.

As with Alternative B, Alternative C was crafted to reduce any potential impacts associated with transportation and circulation (vehicle trip generation) from the high development potential at both of the infill sites (see Chapter II, Project Description, p. II-15). It was also designed to provide, the opportunity for mixed-use development near the Glen Park BART Station. The components of Alternative C are described below.

- The infill development at the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street would be reduced to a maximum of 15 residential units (compared to up to 47 residential units for the proposed project). No commercial space would be proposed under this Alternative at the corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street.
- Up to 15 off-street parking spaces would be included at the Diamond Street and Bosworth Street infill site (compared to up to 26 spaces for the proposed project).

- The infill development at the BART parking lot would be reduced to a maximum of 19 residential units (compared to up to 90 residential units for the proposed project) and up to 5,000 gsf of ground-floor commercial space (compared to up to 14,913 gsf for the proposed project).
- Up to 22 off-street parking spaces would be included at the BART parking lot infill site (compared to up to 123 spaces for the proposed project).
- Introduction of a new Glen Park NCT District that incorporates the parcels along Diamond Street, Chenery Street, Joost Avenue, and Wilder Street currently zoned NC-2 (see Figure II-3, p. II-14) (same as the proposed project).
- Height limit increase from 40-X to 45-X uniformly in areas zoned Glen Park NCT to encourage active ground-floor uses (same as the proposed project).
- Height limit increase from 40-X to 65-X uniformly across the BART parking lot infill site (same as assumed for the proposed project).
- Section 152 of the Planning Code does not require off-street loading spaces for residential buildings with less than 100,000 gsf of floor area or for buildings with less than 10,000 gsf of floor area devoted to retail/non-profit use. Therefore, pursuant to Section 152 of the Planning Code, the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street and the BART parking lot infill site would not be required to include off-street loading spaces (compared to one loading space at the BART site for the proposed project).

In addition, all of the transportation improvements included under the proposed project would be included under this alternative. These include traffic calming measures at the Bosworth Street and Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection; bicycle networks improvements; pedestrian access improvement measures including the connection to the Muni Metro J-Church Line; transit improvements such as the proposed BART Station bus loop improvement; and parking management strategies. As described under the proposed project and Alternative B above, other development potential within the Glen Park NCT district would be expected to occur over the life of the *2010 Community Plan*. The maximum development potential in the plan area, excluding development potential associated with the two infill sites would be 13 residential units and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses, the same as under the proposed project.

In summary, the development at the infill sites would be reduced to 47 residential units compared to 150 under the proposed project. In addition, the total commercial space would be

- limited to 5,000 gsf compared to approximately 28,745 gsf proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*.

Alternative C would require the same planning approvals and review process as the proposed project (Chapter II, Project Description, p. II-35).

IMPACTS

This alternative would have characteristics and potential environmental effects similar to those of the proposed project, as described in Chapter III, Environmental Setting and Impacts, of the EIR and the Initial Study (Appendix A). Exceptions to these potential effects are summarized below.

Land Use

Under Alternative C, the land use development patterns would be similar to those occurring under the *2010 Community Plan*, except with reduced development intensity at the infill sites. Other development controls would be implemented as proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*, including the modification to the height and bulk district. Transportation improvements would also be implemented as proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*. Similar to the *2010 Community Plan* and individual plan components, Alternative C would not conflict with adopted plans, policies, and regulations.

- The maximum development potential in the plan area, excluding development potential associated with the two infill sites would be 13 residential units and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses. The infill development would be reduced compared to potential development under the *2010 Community Plan*. For the infill development sites there would be potential for 47 residential units compared to 150 proposed under the project. In addition, the total commercial space would be limited to 5,000 gsf compared to approximately 28,745 gsf proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*. Overall, the infill development anticipated in the plan area under Alternative C would not have significant adverse impacts on the land use character of the vicinity. The land use impacts under Alternative C would be less-than-significant as under the proposed *2010 Community Plan*.

Additionally, under Alternative C the majority of cumulative projects in the vicinity of the plan area involve transportation improvements including implementing traffic calming measures, making *San Francisco Bicycle Plan* lane improvements, addressing pedestrian connectivity, and enhancing transit connections. Similar to the proposed project, these improvements would generally improve automobile, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation in the plan area and adjacent land uses would not be affected. Thus, similar to the proposed project, Alternative C would not

result in a significant adverse change in the area's land use character and would not contribute to significant cumulative land use impacts.

Aesthetics

Under Alternative C, the land use development patterns would be the similar to those occurring under the *2010 Community Plan*, except the development intensity at the infill sites would be reduced. Transportation improvements would also be implemented as proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*. The *2010 Community Plan's* policies under Alternative C would call for design of new buildings to be consistent with the neighborhoods existing pattern. New buildings or renovations would be expected to reinforce the character of Glen Park by creating attractive and pedestrian-friendly environment. New development would also be expected to be appropriately scaled to fit in with existing development. In addition, the potential infill development would be expected to adhere to the policies of the Urban Design Element in the General Plan. As a result, the impact of potential infill development on the existing visual character of the plan area and surroundings would be less than significant.

Similar to the proposed project, cumulative projects in the vicinity of the plan area under Alternative C involve transportation improvements that would have minimal effects on visual character of the plan area and vicinity. Thus, cumulative impacts to visual character would be less than significant under Alternative C.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Alternative C would result in a less intense use of the plan area than the proposed project. The residential component of Alternative C would consist of 47 residential units, as compared with 150 residential units under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately 69 percent. The retail component of Alternative C would consist of 5,000 gsf, as compared with 28,745 gsf of retail space under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately 83 percent. No historical, archeological, or paleontological resources would be affected by the reduced development component. As such, no impacts to these resources are anticipated.

Transportation improvements would also be implemented as proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*. Because the transportation improvements are the same under the proposed project and Alternative B, all impacts discussed under the proposed project apply for Alternative C. In addition, impacts associated with the Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity-improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and the bus loop improvement would be the same as described under Alternative B and Mitigation Measure M-CP-1 would apply. Mitigation Measure M-CP-1 described in Section III.D, Cultural Resources,

p. III.D-30, requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*.

In addition, to address other potential impacts associated with the construction of the improvements to the Glen Park BART Station, the project sponsor would be required to implement Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A, M-CP-2B, and M-CP-2C, described in Section III.D, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, on pp. III.D-34 through III.D-36, which require preparation of a Historical Resources Protection Plan involving construction controls, documentation and protection of historic resources, as well as verification of historic preservation for activity at the Glen Park BART Station. With incorporation of these mitigation measures, impacts to the character-defining features of the station would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

As with Alternative B, Alternative C could involve subsurface construction that may have the potential to damage or disturb unknown subsurface archaeological deposits. If prehistoric archaeological resources are encountered during construction, archeological resources could be damaged or destroyed, which would constitute a significant impact. Mitigation Measure M-CP-3, described in Section III.D, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, p. III.D-37, provides archeological testing, monitoring, data recovery and reporting procedures for any encountered archaeological resources on the plan area. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-3 would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

As with the proposed project, the *2010 Community Plan* could destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Furthermore, while no known human remains are anticipated to be found in the plan area, it is possible that such resources may be present. If these resources are encountered, Alternative C could have a potentially significant impact on both unique paleontological resource and human remains. As discussed under the *2010 Community Plan*, Mitigation Measure M-CP-4 in Section III.D, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, calls for the design and implementation of a paleontological resources monitoring plan by a qualified paleontological consultant. This would reduce the potential adverse impacts to any paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Additionally, implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-5, described in Section III.D, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, would reduce the potential adverse impacts if human remains are encountered to a less-than-significant level.

Under Alternative C, the cumulative projects in the vicinity of the plan area would not create incentives to redevelop or prompt physical alterations to the identified historical resources, including the BART Station; therefore, there would be no cumulative impacts to historic

architectural resources. Additionally, no archaeological or paleontological resources have been identified within the plan area that would be affected by the proposed project. Nevertheless, similar to the proposed project, any potential effects to archaeological resources or paleontological resources would be mitigated by implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-3, p. III.D-37, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-4, p. III.D-41, respectively. Furthermore, although it is unknown whether there would be an impact from the discovery of human remains in the plan area, any potential effects would be mitigated by the implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-5, p. III.D-43.

Transportation and Circulation

Alternative C would result in a less intense use of the plan area than the proposed project. The residential component of Alternative C would consist of 47 residential units, as compared with 150 residential units under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately 69 percent. The retail component of Alternative C would consist of 5,000 gsf, as compared with 28,745 gsf of retail space under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately 83 percent. As such, fewer retail and residential trips would be generated, which would reduce the demand for vehicle parking, bicycle parking, pedestrian space, and on and off-street freight loading/unloading. The significant and unavoidable impacts identified for Intersection #10 Bosworth Street / Diamond Street (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM and PM Peak Hour) would likely be reduced to a less-than-significant level with Alternative C. In addition, the impacts identified for Intersection #16 Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM Peak Hour), would also likely be reduced with Alternative C. The project contributions to these affected intersections would be less than with the proposed project, which would negate the use of the identified mitigation measures. The project contributions to these affected intersections would be less than with the proposed project.

Furthermore, transportation impacts from construction activities associated with the transportation improvements would include temporary changes to or restrictions on traffic lanes and grading and paving activities. As with the proposed project, the impacts of the transportation improvements would be less than significant unless the bus loop element were constructed at the same time as the variant roundabout improvement, or widening of northbound approach of Diamond Street, also a variant improvement, in which case the transportation impact would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A would reduce construction impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, Alternative C would result in less-than-significant transportation impacts.

Noise and Vibration

Alternative C would result in potential construction-related noise impacts similar to those of the proposed project. Construction noise is regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance. Similar to the proposed project, compliance with the Noise Ordinance would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Vibration impacts to the proposed residents at the BART parking lot site would have the potential to exceed the vibration thresholds similar to the proposed project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-4 would also reduce vibration impacts under Alternative C to a less-than-significant level.

Traffic-related noise impacts were determined to be less than significant for the proposed project. Development of residential and retail space at the infill sites would be reduced under this alternative. As a result, automobile trips would be reduced and traffic noise would be less than significant with the proposed project.

Cumulative noise impacts associated with construction, vibration, and traffic would not adversely affect nearby sensitive receptors. Similar to the proposed project, it is unlikely that construction noise or vibration from the proposed project and other construction sites would jointly affect the same sensitive receptors or would occur at the same time. Thus, cumulative noise impacts from construction and vibration would be less than significant. Furthermore, the operation of the proposed project would increase traffic noise levels that would affect sensitive receptors along access roads to the plan area; however, the cumulative increase would not exceed the adopted threshold for a “substantial permanent increase” in traffic noise in residential areas. As such, the cumulative noise impacts associated with traffic from Alternative C would be less than significant.

Air Quality

Alternative C would include the same plan components as the proposed project, with modifications to the land use and zoning designations. Under Alternative C, the prevailing 40-foot height limit in the newly proposed NCT district would be retained. This modification would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, similar to the proposed project. Under the recently adopted 2010 BAAQMD Thresholds of Significance, the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts associated with daily emissions of criteria pollutants (ROG and NO_x) during construction. The proposed project under the 2010 Significance Thresholds would also result in potentially significant construction-related health risks and expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of PM_{2.5} TACs.

Alternative C would result in less construction-related emissions over the entire construction period (since it likely would take a shorter time to build fewer residential units and less retail space), including emissions of PM_{2.5} associated with health risks. However, the level of construction activities on the most active days of construction would be comparable for this alternative and the proposed project. Thus, Alternative C would still have the potential to exceed the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds for daily emissions of criteria air pollutants and expose people to PM_{2.5} TACs, even with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B. Therefore, impacts under Alternative C during construction would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the proposed project. The proposed infill sites are within an area that exceeds the BAAQMD significance thresholds for TACs from mobile sources. Alternative C would allow for fewer residential units at the infill sites than the proposed project; however, the placement of residential units within this area would result in significant and unavoidable impacts with mitigation, similar to the proposed project. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7 would reduce exposure of residents to TACs from mobile sources; however, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7, it may not be feasible to reduce exposure at the sites to below the 2010 BAAQMD significance thresholds for cancer risks.

Cumulative air quality impacts would be significant and unavoidable under Alternative C for construction emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors, similar to the proposed project. Alternative C would also result in significant and unavoidable impacts associated with cumulative health risks from construction activities. However, new residential uses developed within the plan area under Alternative C would not be exposed significant cumulative health risks, for the same reasons described for the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Greenhouse gas emissions were determined to be less than significant for the proposed project. Alternative C would include the same plan components as the proposed project, except it would include reduced development at the infill sites. As a result, Alternative C would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases, and would result in reduced greenhouse gas emissions associated with automobile trips, energy, water, wastewater, and solid waste. Alternative C would also be required to comply with the City's GHG reduction strategies and would be in compliance with the City's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* and the policies of the *San Francisco General Plan*, as shown in Table III.H-2, p. III.H-24, similar to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts would also be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

OTHER IMPACTS

Section III, Environmental Setting and Impacts, and the Initial Study, Appendix A, determined that impacts in the following issue areas would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation: population and housing, wind and shadow, recreation, utilities and service systems, public services, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, hazards/hazardous materials, mineral and energy resources, and agricultural resources. Impacts in those issue areas would also be less than significant with implementation of Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development and Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix.

Table V-1, V-19, summarizes the significant effects of the proposed project and Alternatives B and C. The No Project Alternative is not included in this table.

**TABLE V-1
COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT TO ALTERNATIVES B AND C**

		Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development	Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix
Description	Proposed Project		
	Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street Up to 47 residential units Up to 8,582 gsf ground-floor commercial Up to 26 private parking spaces	Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street Up to 10 residential units Up to 1,000 gsf ground-floor commercial Up to 11 private parking spaces	Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street Up to 15 residential units No ground-floor commercial Up to 15 private parking spaces
	BART Parking Lot Up to 90 residential units 0 to 14,913 gsf commercial uses Up to 123 private parking spaces	BART Parking Lot Up to 31 residential units Up to 2,000 gsf commercial uses Up to 33 private parking spaces	BART Parking Lot 19 residential units Up to 5,000 gsf commercial uses Up to 22 private parking spaces
	Other Development 13 residential units 5,250 gsf ground-floor commercial	Other Development 13 residential units 5,250 gsf ground-floor commercial	Other Development 13 residential units 5,250 gsf ground-floor commercial
	Proposed Transportation Improvements Traffic Calming Bicycle Networks Pedestrian Access Transit Improvements	Proposed Transportation Improvements Traffic Calming Bicycle Networks Pedestrian Access Transit Improvements	Proposed Transportation Improvements Traffic Calming Bicycle Networks Pedestrian Access Transit Improvements
Impacts			
Land Use	No significant effects.	No significant effects.	No significant effects.
Aesthetics	No significant effects.	No significant effects.	No significant effects.

**TABLE V-1
COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT TO ALTERNATIVES B AND C**

	Proposed Project	Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development	Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	CP-1 Operation and design associated with the <i>2010 Community Plan's</i> Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement at the BART Station would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-1.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-1.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-1.
	CP-2 Construction activities resulting from the pedestrian access and bus loop improvements at the BART Station would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource. Less than significant with Mitigation Measures M-CP-2 A, M-CP-2B, and M-CP-2C.	Less than significant with Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A, M-CP-2B, and M-CP-2C.	Less than significant with Mitigation Measures M-CP-2 A, M-CP-2B, and M-CP-2C.
	CP-3 Future construction activities associated with the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> area would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-3.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-3.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-3.
	CP-4 Future construction activities associated with the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-4.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-4.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-4.
	CP-5 Future construction activities associated with the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would substantially disturb human remains. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-5.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-5.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-5.
	C-CP The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> , in combination with other foreseeable development, would result in potentially significant cumulative impacts to cultural and paleontological resources. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures M-CP-3, M-CP-4, and M-CP-5.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures M-CP-3, M-CP-4, and M-CP-5.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures M-CP-3, M-CP-4, and M-CP-5.

**TABLE V-1
COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT TO ALTERNATIVES B AND C**

	Proposed Project	Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development	Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix
Transportation	TR-1 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would cause the level of service (LOS) at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM and PM peak hours. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A and M-TR-1B.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
	TR-1A The infill development would cause the LOS at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to degrade to unacceptable levels. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
	TR-1B The addition of the proposed pedestrian scramble phase to the infill development would cause the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-TR-1B.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
	TR-2 The <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would cause the LOS at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection to deteriorate from acceptable levels to unacceptable levels during the AM peak hour. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
	TR-2A The infill development plus transportation improvements or transportation improvement variants would cause the LOS at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM peak hour. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
	TR-12 Implementation of the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> could result in construction activities that interfere with local circulation and access over extended periods of time. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A.
	TR-12A A simultaneous construction of two or more major components	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A.

**TABLE V-1
COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT TO ALTERNATIVES B AND C**

Proposed Project	Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development	Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix
(bus loop, roundabout, or widening of northbound approach of Diamond Street) of the transportation improvements or transportation improvement variants would interfere with local circulation and access as a result of construction activities over extended periods of time. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-TR-12A.		
C-TR-13 The 2010 Community Plan in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the LOS at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the AM and PM peak hours. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A and M-TR-13B.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
C-TR-13A The infill development in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to degrade to unacceptable levels during the PM peak hours and significantly contribute to unacceptable operating conditions in the AM peak hour. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
C-TR-13B The addition of the proposed transportation improvements to the infill development, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would cause the intersection level of service at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection to deteriorate to unacceptable levels during the PM peak hour and significantly contribute to unacceptable operating conditions in the AM peak hour. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-TR-13B.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
C-TR-13C The implementation of the transportation improvement variants, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would not contribute to cumulative traffic conditions at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection. Significant and Unavoidable with	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.

**TABLE V-1
COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT TO ALTERNATIVES B AND C**

	Proposed Project	Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development	Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix
	Mitigation Measure M-TR-1A.		
	C-TR-14 The proposed project in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps during the AM peak hour. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
	C-TR-14A The infill development plus transportation improvements or transportation improvement variants in combination with other foreseeable projects would cause the LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable levels at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps during the AM peak hour. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-TR-2A.	Less than Significant.	Less than Significant.
Noise	NO-4 Operation of the proposed project would expose residents of the BART parking lot infill development to excessive groundborne vibration. Less than significant with Mitigation Measure M-NO-4.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-NO-4.	Less than significant with Mitigation Measure M-NO-4.
Air Quality	AQ-3 Equipment used for construction activities associated with the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would result in short-term emission increases of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B.
	AQ-6 Construction equipment associated with the proposed development under the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> would emit PM _{2.5} and other TACs that exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A.
	AQ-7 Motor vehicles and stationary sources operating in and near the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> area would emit PM _{2.5} and other TACs. Given that project implementation	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7.

TABLE V-1
COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT TO ALTERNATIVES B AND C

Proposed Project	Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development	Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix
would introduce new residential sensitive receptors in locations exposed to high levels of PM _{2.5} and other TACs, resultant health risks would exceed the 1999 and the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7.		
C-AQ-1 Construction activity associated with the proposed development under the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> and with other development in the area would generate criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors that would exceed the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A and M-AQ-3B.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A, and M-AQ-3B.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A, and M-AQ-3B.
C-AQ-2 Construction and operational activities associated with the proposed development under the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> and with other development in the area would emit PM _{2.5} and other TACs. Although construction emissions would be temporary for each separate project, given the close proximity of sensitive receptors in the <i>2010 Community Plan</i> area to the project and other development sites, resultant cumulative health risks would be significant. Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3A.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A.	Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3A.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	No significant effects.	No significant effects.
	No significant effects.	

Source: PBS&J, 2011.

D. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The potentially significant and unavoidable impacts identified under the proposed project in this EIR would result from the direct impacts associated with the addition of traffic generated by the new uses at the infill sites and the exposure of sensitive receptors (i.e. residential) to poor air quality.

The significant and unavoidable impacts identified under the proposed project associated with transportation and circulation would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels under Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development, and Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix. The significant and unavoidable impacts associated with air quality remain significant and unavoidable under both Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development, and Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix.

Under the No Project Alternative, the potential significant and unavoidable impact associated with air quality would not occur. Similarly, the *2010 Community Plan's* less-than-significant (with mitigation) potential impact associated with noise and vibration would not occur. The project's less-than-significant aesthetic, land use, and greenhouse gas emissions impacts would also not occur under this alternative.¹ When a No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, CEQA requires an EIR to identify the environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

As such, Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development, and Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix have less environmental impacts than the proposed project. Alternative B and Alternative C are both environmentally superior compared to the proposed project.

As described in the *2010 Community Plan*, housing, as well as commercial space, is a key contributing element to the vitality and character of Glen Park. Specifically, the *2010 Community Plan* encourages mixed-uses, including residential and commercial uses on the BART parking lot infill site. Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low

¹ However, the No Project Alternative would not include any of the transportation improvements that are part of the proposed project. As a result, two of the study intersections would experience higher vehicle delay under the No Project Alternative as compared with the proposed project. Additionally, conditions for non-motorized transportation (i.e., pedestrians, bicyclists) in the plan area under the No Project Alternative would be worse than with the proposed project, due to the fact that many of the proposed project's transportation improvements would slow vehicular traffic and reduce potential vehicle conflicts throughout the plan area.

Retail Development, would include up to 31 residential units and 2,000 gsf of commercial in the BART infill site, where as Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix, would include only up to 19 residential units and 5,000 gsf of commercial. Because Alternative B offers a higher number of residential units (than Alternative C) and still proposes commercial space, Alternative B best meets the project objectives of providing mixed-used development.

Based on this analysis, Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development would have the least environmental impacts and would best meet the project objectives, as set forth by the *2010 Community Plan*. As a result, the environmentally superior alternative is Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development.

E. OTHER ALTERNATIVES AND PHYSICAL IMPROVEMENTS CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

Prior to finalizing the physical improvements described in Chapter II, Project Description, a range of other physical improvements were examined to address the objectives of the *2010 Community Plan*. This section focuses specifically on the infill sites and the transportation improvement measures that were considered and rejected.

INFILL SITE ALTERNATIVE

One of the alternatives initially considered included developing the infill sites with only commercial uses, as opposed to a mix of both commercial and residential uses. This alternative was developed and designed to avoid the significant and unavoidable impact associated with transportation and air quality. The distribution of the commercial space would be as follows:

- 5,700 gsf at the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street intersection infill site; and
- 10,000 gsf at the BART parking lot infill site.

This alternative would provide a total of 15,700 gsf of commercial space within the plan area.

The all-commercial space scenario alternative would reduce two significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project. The significant and unavoidable impact identified for Intersection #10 Bosworth Street/Diamond Street (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM and PM Peak Hour) would be reduced to a less-than-significant level due to the decrease of population density and, therefore, vehicular trips associated with an all-commercial space development at the infill sites. In addition, significant and unavoidable impacts associated with Intersection #16 Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM Peak Hour), would also be

reduced to a less-than-significant level due to the decrease of population density. In addition, the significant and unavoidable air quality impact associated with residential receptors would be reduced to a less-than-significant level because no residential dwelling units would be constructed (only commercial space).

However, while this alternative would reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts identified under air quality and transportation analysis, it fails to meet basic project objectives regarding encouraging the development of mixed use infill projects that take advantage of proximity to transit. This alternative only considers commercial opportunities and excludes the potential for residential development. As such, this alternative was not considered for further analysis.

REDUCED DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES

In addition to the infill site alternatives described above, other reduced development alternatives were considered but rejected because they did not achieve the basic project objective of providing mixed-use development. The alternatives listed below did not provide a balanced mix of housing and commercial space. Therefore, these alternatives were not considered for further analysis.

The alternatives considered but eliminated from further analysis in this EIR include:

Maximum Residential

- The development at the infill site at the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street would include 15 residential units and no ground-floor commercial space.
- The development at the infill site at the BART parking lot would include a maximum of 38 residential units and no ground floor commercial space.

High Retail/Low Residential Mix

- The development at the infill site at the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street would include one residential unit and up to 3,000 gsf of ground floor commercial space.
- The development at the infill site at the BART parking lot would include six residential units and up to 8,000 gsf of ground floor commercial space.

“50/50” Residential /Retail Mix

- The development at the infill site at the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street would include 2 residential units and up to 2,800 gsf of ground floor commercial space.
- The development at the infill site at the BART parking lot would include 19 residential units and up to 5,000 gsf of ground floor commercial space.

TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

The transportation improvement measures considered but rejected were evaluated based on criteria related to engineering feasibility or they did not meet the intent of the *2010 Community Plan*. All of the transportation measures improvements listed below did not move forward either because they were not feasible or did not meet the plan’s objective.

Traffic Calming

- A roundabout at Lyell Street

Bosworth/Diamond Intersection Improvements

- Widening of Diamond Street with restriping and no protected turn phases

Pedestrian Access

- Pedestrian Bridge from Muni Metro J-Church Platform to Concourse-Level Plaza
- Pedestrian Bridge from Muni Metro J-Church Platform to BART Entry above Concourse-Level
- Pedestrian Bridge from Muni Metro J-Church Platform to Concourse-Level Plaza and Extended Ramp
- Pedestrian Bridge connecting Muni Metro J-Church Platform Using Existing BART Entry Plaza
- Pedestrian Bridge connecting Muni Metro J-Church Platform with Elevated San Jose Avenue Crossing
- Pedestrian Tunnel connecting Muni Metro J-Church Platform under San Jose Avenue
- Pedestrian Tunnel connecting Muni Metro J-Church Platform under San Jose Avenue with Concourse-Level BART Entry
- Retrofit of Existing Pedestrian Bridge with Elevators or Ramps

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

● VI. COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

A. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE COMMENTS AND RESPONSES DOCUMENT

This Comments and Responses document responds to comments on the Glen Park Community Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). This document was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (*CEQA Guidelines*) and presents all comments received on the DEIR, the City's responses to comments, copies of the letters received, and a transcript of the public hearing. Responses are provided to all comments regarding whether the DEIR identifies and analyzes the possible environmental impacts and identifies appropriate mitigation measures. The DEIR, together with this Comments and Responses document, will be considered by the Planning Commission in an advertised public meeting, and then certified as a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) if deemed adequate.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

A Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and an Initial Study for the Glen Park Community Plan was distributed on July 1, 2009. Written comments on the scope of the EIR were accepted until July 31, 2009. Comments regarding the scope of the EIR were addressed in the DEIR. The DEIR was distributed for public review and comment in accordance with CEQA on April 27, 2011. The public review period for the DEIR began on April 27, 2011 and ended June 13, 2011. During the public comment period, the document was reviewed by various State, regional, and local agencies, as well as by interested organizations and individuals. Thirteen comment letters or e-mail messages were received from four agencies, one organization, and seven individuals. A public hearing before the City's Planning Commission was held on June 2, 2011 to obtain oral comments on the DEIR. During the public hearing, oral comments were offered by two individuals and one Planning Commissioner. The FEIR will be reviewed by the Planning Commission for certification on November 10, 2011.

ORGANIZATION OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

This document contains the public comments received on the Glen Park Community Plan DEIR, and responses to those comments. Also included in this document are changes to the DEIR.

Following this introduction, Section B presents a list of all agencies, organizations, and individuals that provided written comments, and the date of their communications, or oral

testimony at the public hearing on the DEIR before the San Francisco Planning Commission held on June 2, 2011.

Section C presents the 2010 Glen Park Community Plan (*2010 Community Plan*) refinements made in response to community comments and suggestions following release of the DEIR. This section also describes potential environmental effects of the refinements.

Section D contains comments on the DEIR made orally during the public hearing and received in writing during the public comment period, from April 27, 2011 through June 13, 2011. The comments presented in this section consist of verbatim excerpts from the written comments and public hearing transcript; in some cases, minor typographical errors have been corrected. Comments are grouped by environmental topic and generally correspond to the table of contents of the DEIR; comments that do not address a particular topic appear under the General Comments section of this document. The name of the commenter, the format of the comment (letter, transcript, e-mail, etc.), and the date of the comment are indicated following each comment. Each comment is coded by topic, as indicated below:

• General Comments	GC
• Initial Study	IS
• Project Description	PD
• Land Use	LU
• Aesthetics	AE
• Cultural and Paleontological Resources	CP
• Transportation and Circulation	TR
• Air Quality	AQ

The comment letters received and the transcript of the public hearing are reproduced in Appendices D and E, respectively, and are marked with the comment codes to indicate where each discrete comment is addressed in Section D.

Section E contains text changes to the DEIR made by the EIR preparers subsequent to publication of the DEIR to correct or clarify information presented in the DEIR, including changes to the DEIR text made in response to comments. Text additions are shown in double underline and deletions are shown in ~~striketrough~~.

Several comments made both in writing and at the public hearing were directed towards the perceived merits or demerits of the project. Responses to these comments are brief, as they do not concern the adequacy or accuracy of the EIR.

These comments and responses will be incorporated into the FEIR as a new chapter. Text changes resulting from comments and responses will also be incorporated in the FEIR, as indicated in the responses.

B. LIST OF PERSONS COMMENTING

STATE, REGIONAL, AND LOCAL AGENCIES

State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research

Scott Morgan, Director, written comments, June 13, 2011

California Department of Transportation

Gary Arnold, District Branch Chief, written comments, June 7, 2011

San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District

Jeffrey P. Ordway, Manager of Property Development, written comments, June 13, 2011

Historic Preservation Commission

Charles Edwin Chase, President, written comments, May 24, 2011

San Francisco Planning Commission

Ron Miguel, Vice President, public hearing comments, June 2, 2011

ORGANIZATIONS

The Glen Park Association

Nicolas Dewar, Chairman, written comments, June 13, 2011

INDIVIDUALS

Lesley Kinnear, written comments, May 23, 2011

Maria Hekker, written comments, May 25, 2011

Philip Siepert, written comments, June 2, 2011

Philip Siepert, written comments, June 3, 2011

Daniel O'Keefe, written comments, June 5, 2011

Diane Grant, written comments, June 7, 2011

Tania Treis, written comments, June 13, 2011

Ric Lopez, written comments, June 13, 2011

Sally Ross, public hearing comments, June 2, 2011

Nicolas Dewar, public hearing comments, June 2, 2011

C. PLAN REFINEMENTS


Subsequent to publication of the DEIR, the Planning Department further refined the *2010 Community Plan* in response to community comments and suggestions.¹ This section provides a summary of the proposed refinements. These refinements include rezoning selected properties on portions of Diamond Street, Chenery Street, and Castro Street to better reflect existing uses and character. In addition, the Planning Department has revised the height districts in the *2010 Community Plan* to more closely reflect the height of existing development. The refinements also include modifications to policy and supporting language to reflect the use and height district changes, to express support for carsharing, to acknowledge community concerns regarding daylighting of Islais Creek, and to clarify the plan language. Finally, the refinements include changes to the Implementation Program to clarify that the San Jose Avenue Redesign project actions will focus on feasibility analysis during the plan timeframe. All other aspects of the *2010 Community Plan* remain as described in Chapter II, Project Description, of the DEIR. As discussed below, none of the refinements result in new significant environmental impacts not already identified in the DEIR or an increase in the severity of impacts identified in the DEIR.

Use District Refinements

2928-2958 Diamond Street


The plan refinements include rezoning six residential apartment buildings on the west side of Diamond Street (2928-2958), between Bosworth Street and Joost Avenue, from Residential House, Three Family (RH-3), as shown in Figure VI-1, p. VI-6, to Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT), as shown in Figure VI-2, p. VI-6. As shown in the figures, the six parcels on Diamond Street are across the street from the Glen Park BART Station and are situated between mixed-use commercial and residential uses on either side. The current RH-3 zoning allows up to three dwelling units per 1,000 gross square feet (gsf) of lot area with a conditional use permit. The six parcels are currently occupied by three-story residential structures with ground-floor garages. Rezoning these six parcels to Glen Park NCT would be consistent with the rezoning of the parcels to the north and south along Diamond Street in Glen Park's commercial core already proposed as part of the *2010 Community Plan*.

¹ The City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Glen Park Community Plan Refinements Subsequent to Draft EIR Publication*, Memorandum from Jon Swae to Lisa Gibson, September 23, 2011. See Appendix F.



SOURCE: CCSF Planning Department, 2011.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE VI-1: EXISTING ZONING IN GLEN PARK



SOURCE: CCSF Planning Department, 2011.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE VI-2: PROPOSED ZONING UNDER THE 2010 COMMUNITY PLAN

605 Chenery Street and 3121-3125 Castro Street


In addition to the properties on Diamond Street, the plan refinements include rezoning two residentially zoned properties, 605 Chenery Street and 3121-3125 Castro Street, from Residential House, Two Family (RH-2) to Glen Park NCT, as shown in Figure VI-1 and Figure VI-2, p. VI-5 and VI-6, respectively. The property at 3121-3125 Castro Street is not currently in the plan area and the *2010 Community Plan* area boundary would be adjusted to include this parcel, as shown in Figure VI-1 and Figure VI-2. The two parcels at 605 Chenery Street and 3121-3125 Castro Street are zoned residential, but are currently occupied by commercial uses. The building at 605 Chenery Street is one story and operates as a commercial use. The property at 3121-3125 Castro Street is occupied by a two-story mixed use building with a bakery on the ground floor and residential uses on the second floor. The current zoning designation, RH-2, allows up to two dwelling units per 1,500 gsf of lot area. Under the proposed Glen Park NCT zoning, these properties would be formally recognized as part of Glen Park's commercial district.

Height District Refinements

All height limits within the plan area are 40-X with the exception of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) easement, which is designated as an Open Space (OS) district (no limits apply), as shown in Figure VI-3, p. VI-8. As detailed in the DEIR, p. II-13, under the proposed Glen Park NCT zoning the height limit would be increased to 45 feet to encourage active ground-floor uses. However, the recommended height district refinement includes reducing the maximum height of new construction along portions of Wilder Street, Diamond Street, Castro Street, and Chenery Street in the Glen Park NCT District from a range of 40 to 45 feet to a range of 30 to 35 feet, as shown in Figure VI-4, p. VI-9.


Plan Boundary

As noted above, the *2010 Community Plan* area boundary would be adjusted to include the property at 3121-3125 Castro Street. The fronting street and intersection would be included within the boundary adjustment, as show in Figure VI-1 and Figure VI-2, p. VI-6 and VI-7, respectively.



SOURCE: CCSF Planning Department, 2011.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE VI-3: EXISTING HEIGHT LIMITS IN GLEN PARK



SOURCE: CCSF Planning Department, 2011.

GLEN PARK COMMUNITY PLAN
FIGURE VI-4: PROPOSED HEIGHT LIMITS UNDER THE 2010 COMMUNITY PLAN

Policy and Supporting Language

The refinements to the *2010 Community Plan* include modifications to policy and supporting language in the following elements:

- Land Use and Urban Design – Revised and new policies to reflect the above-described zoning modifications and to clarify language regarding building design;
- Transportation – A new policy to support carsharing in Glen Park; and
- Open Space – Revision of policy language regarding daylighting of Islais Creek to acknowledge community concerns that should be assessed as part of any future study.

Implementation Program

Finally, the refinements include a revision to the Implementation Program to reflect that the action item for the San Jose Avenue Redesign will focus on assessing the feasibility of this project.

Effects of the Plan Refinements

The refinements to the *2010 Community Plan* made subsequent to publication of the DEIR require minor changes to the DEIR. Any changes in the environmental analysis as a result of these refinements, including graphic illustrations, are reflected in the Staff-Initiated Text Changes in Section E, Draft EIR Revisions, starting on p. VI-89. Text in the Summary, Introduction, Project Description, Land Use, Aesthetics, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Transportation and Circulation, Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Other CEQA Considerations, and Alternatives sections have been revised to reflect the plan refinements. No revisions have been made to the Noise and Vibration section, because the plan refinements would not affect the environmental analysis in this section. As discussed below, none of the refinements result in new significant environmental impacts not already identified in the DEIR or an increase in the severity of impacts identified in the DEIR.

Summary, Project Description, Land Use, and Aesthetics

As noted above, the *2010 Community Plan* area boundary would be adjusted to include the property at 3121-3125 Castro Street. Accordingly, the project boundary (referred to in the EIR as the “plan area”) has been revised to include this property and the fronting street and intersection. As such, nine figures in the DEIR have been revised to reflect this revision. The

revised figures are included in Section E, Draft EIR Revisions, under Staff-Initiated Text Changes, starting on p. VI-89.

The proposed rezoning of the six parcels on Diamond Street (2928-2958) would increase the commercial development potential within the plan area. Given the existing residential uses, it is not yet known at this time if commercial development would occur on the ground floor of these six parcels. However, it is expected that commercial development could occur through the year 2030, the planning horizon for the purpose of this EIR. The rezoning of the six parcels on Diamond Street to Glen Park NCT could potentially allow the conversion of ground-floor garages into commercial spaces at some future time while allowing existing residential units to remain. Assuming that half of the garages would redevelop by 2030 in response to the zoning change, the amount of commercial space that could be created was estimated to be approximately 5,250 square feet (sf).² To acknowledge the increase in commercial development potential at these six parcels, changes have been made to the Summary, Project Description, Land Use, and Aesthetics as shown in Section E, Draft EIR Revisions, under Staff-Initiated Text Changes, starting on p. VI-89. The proposed rezoning of 605 Chenery Street and 3121-3125 Castro Street is not anticipated to change the development potential of these parcels, considering their current commercial uses.

As described above, the height district refinement would reduce the maximum height of new construction along portions of Wilder Street, Diamond Street, and Chenery Street in the Glen Park NCT District from a range of 40 to 45 feet to a range of 30 to 35 feet. For the purpose of this EIR, a height limit of 45 feet in areas rezoned to Glen Park NCT is still analyzed to present a conservative estimate of impacts. As shown in Section E, Draft EIR Revisions, under Staff-Initiated Text Changes, starting on p. VI-89, revisions have been made to the Project Description, pp. II-3 and II-13, and Land Use section, p. III.B-12, to explain what is being analyzed. The parcels being downzoned from a range of 40 to 45 feet to a range of 30 to 35 feet are currently developed as residential and commercial uses in the Glen Park commercial core. Since none of the existing buildings is above 35 feet, none would become nonconforming structures with the implementation of the *2010 Community Plan*. The downzoning would not

² Atkins, *Glen Park Community Plan EIR – Additional Retail on Diamond Street Associated with Plan Refinements Subsequent to DEIR Publication*, memorandum from Gui Shearin to Lisa Gibson, September 28, 2011. This memorandum is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004!. Based on an aerial photograph, the buildings are approximately 25 feet wide and 65 to 70 feet deep. The total ground-floor area of the six residential properties is approximately 10,500 sf. For this analysis, it was estimated that up to half, or 5,250 sf, of the property ground-floor garages would be developed into commercial space.

alter existing conditions and, thus, it would not have a physical effect on the environment. The downzoning would reduce future development that might have occurred under the existing zoning (up to 40 feet). Under the existing 40-X height limit, there has not been an incentive for property owners to demolish existing structures and construct new taller ones. Under the reduced height limits, there would be even less incentive to alter land uses in the Glen Park commercial core.

The Aesthetics section, p. III.C-7, has been slightly revised to address all the properties under the plan refinements that would be rezoned to Glen Park NCT with implementation of the *2010 Community Plan*. The revisions to the text can be found in Section E, Draft EIR Revisions, under Staff-Initiated Text Changes, starting on p. VI-89. As noted above for Land Use, these plan refinements are recommended in large part to better reflect existing uses and building heights in selected locations of the plan area. Since these refinements would not result in changes to the existing conditions of these properties, there would be no adverse aesthetic effects from the refinements.

The plan refinements to policy and supporting language do not require revisions to the Summary or Project Description chapters of the DEIR, because those sections focus on and describe the primary objectives of the *2010 Community Plan* and not the specific policies intended to carry out the over-arching objectives. Similarly, the Summary and Project Description chapters do not describe the Implementation Program in any detail. Since these refinements would not require changes to the project description, and because they would not alter the physical environmental effects of the project, they would not alter the analysis or conclusion of the DEIR regarding land use and aesthetic effects.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

As noted above, the proposed rezoning of the six parcels on Diamond Street (2928-2958) would increase the commercial development potential within the plan area by approximately 5,250 sf. To acknowledge the increase in commercial development potential at these six parcels, revisions have been made to the Cultural and Paleontological Resources section as shown in Section E, Draft EIR Revisions, under Staff-Initiated Text Changes, starting on p. VI-89.

The 605 Chenery Street parcel is currently in the plan area and was previously evaluated in the Historic Resources Evaluation (HRE) conducted by Carey & Co., Inc. on December 21, 2010.³ The HRE evaluates the resources' significance under the relevant California Register eligibility criteria: Criterion 1 (Events); Criterion 2 (Persons); and Criterion 3 (Design/Construction). The HRE determined that 605 Chenery Street did not meet the criteria to qualify for inclusion on either federal, State, or local registers of historical resources.

The parcel at 3121-3125 Castro Street is located on the northeast corner of Chenery Street and Castro Street, just outside the DEIR plan area boundary and, thus, was not evaluated in the DEIR. On August 15, 2011 the Planning Department conducted a historical resource evaluation survey to determine the property's eligibility.⁴ The survey concluded that 3121-3125 Castro Street is not eligible for the California Register because it was determined to be not associated with events that have made a significant contribution to history (California Register Criterion 1), nor is it associated with the lives of significant persons in the past (California Register Criterion 2), nor does it embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction (California Register Criterion 3). Revisions to text to clarify its ineligibility in the Cultural Resources section, p. III.D-9, can be found under Staff-Initiated Text Changes in Section E, Draft EIR Revision, starting on p. VI-89. In addition, Atkins determined that there are no archeological resources present in the vicinity of the 3121-3125 Castro Street property.⁵ As such, there would be no new or more severe impacts to archeological resources in the plan area, and revisions to the Cultural and Paleontological Resources section of the DEIR are not required.

Transportation and Circulation

As explained above, the amount of commercial space that could result from the rezoning of the six parcels on Diamond Street (2928-2958) is up to approximately 5,250 sf. The Transportation

³ Carey & Co., Inc., *Historic Resources Evaluation, Draft Glen Park Community Plan, San Francisco, California*, December 21, 2010. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

⁴ San Francisco Planning Department, *Historic Resources Evaluation Response, Glen Park Community Plan – July 2011 Refinements*. August 16, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

⁵ Atkins, *Glen Park Community Plan EIR – Archeological Resources Response Memorandum*, from Denise Jurich to Randall Dean and Lisa Gibson, August 9, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

and Circulation section of the DEIR, p. III.E-30, explains that the traffic analysis used a conservative estimate of development potential in the plan area. There are approximately 7,000 sf of existing commercial uses at the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site. This commercial floor area and the associated trips would be displaced by new infill development at this site. The EIR assumed 8,582 sf of new additional commercial space at this infill site, without crediting the 7,000 sf of existing commercial uses (as typical in project level trip generation analysis) that could be removed to accommodate the new infill development. Although this was appropriate for the program-level analysis of this potential future development, this overestimate of commercial floor area (7,000 sf) and the associated trips (approximately 1,050 existing person trips, 95 of those in the PM peak hour, and 14 PM peak hour vehicle trips) would be considered conservative for the traffic analysis in the DEIR. As a result, even though the recommended rezoning of the six parcels on Diamond Street south of Bosworth Street would yield additional potential commercial floor area of about 5,250 sf and a greater number of trips in the Glen Park commercial core, the commercial space and associated trips are already accounted for with the conservative assumptions and analysis performed for the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site in the DEIR. Therefore, no new analysis is necessary to address the rezoning of these parcels to Glen Park NCT.

It should be noted that the 7,000 sf of existing commercial uses are located on the northwest side of the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection, while the potential 5,250 sf of new commercial uses are on Diamond Street south of the intersection. The difference in locations was determined to have little effect on the overall circulation and traffic effects identified in the DEIR because more trips would go south on Diamond Street than north from the new commercial development due to the accessibility and proximity to I-280 to the south, avoiding the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection, as compared to the trips from the existing commercial space. Because the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection is a critical intersection in the area, the existing commercial space (7,000 sf) would have a relatively greater effect on this intersection than those from the potential commercial uses on the six parcels on Diamond Street (5,250 sf). Thus, the analysis of this critical intersection in the DEIR reflects a worse-case condition than if the existing 7,000 sf and associated trips were removed and the 5,250 sf and associated trips were included.

To disclose changes and clarify how these potential trips have been accounted for in the DEIR transportation analysis, revisions to the Transportation and Circulation, p. III.E-30, sections have been made. These changes can be found under Staff-Initiated Text Changes in Section E, Draft EIR Revisions, starting on p. VI-89. The zoning refinements at 605 Chenery Street and

3121-3125 Castro Street would not generate any additional trips from commercial land use since the parcels are already developed with commercial uses (legal, non-conforming) and are not anticipated to change. Consequently, no additional analysis is necessary for the DEIR. As discussed above, the height district downzoning (from existing 40 feet to 35 feet) would not alter existing conditions and, thus, would not have a physical effect on the environment. If anything, the height reduction could reduce future development that might have occurred under the existing zoning (up to 40 feet), that was analyzed in the DEIR.

The plan refinement adding policy language that encourages carsharing does not affect the DEIR transportation and circulation impact analysis. Though a carshare parking space could be used by multiple households rather than a single household, it still functions as a parking space. For this reason, the policy encouraging carshare parking spaces in the plan area does not require adjusting the mode split, trip generation, or parking demand assumptions used in the transportation analysis.

Air Quality

The plan refinements would potentially increase commercial floor area in the plan area by 5,250 sf. As a result, the maximum commercial floor area would increase from 23,495 sf to 28,745 sf, as shown in the revision to Table II-2, p. II-19, under Staff-Initiated Changes in Section E, Draft EIR Revisions, starting on p. VI-89. As a result, the URBEMIS modeling results were updated to reflect the increase in commercial floor area. Based on URBEMIS modeling results,⁶ the increase in construction-related and on-site operational emissions associated with the additional 5,250 sf of commercial uses would be negligible. Table III.G-6, p. III.G-25, and Table III.G-7, p. III.G-29, have been updated to reflect the revised model results. These revisions can be found under Staff-Initiated Changes in Section E, Draft EIR Revisions, starting on p. VI-89. As shown in the table, emissions would still be below BAAQMD thresholds and, thus, would not result in a significant air quality impact.

Introduction, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Other CEQA Considerations, and Alternatives

As noted above, the plan refinements would potentially increase the commercial floor area in the plan area by 5,250 sf. In addition to the sections noted above, the Introduction, Greenhouse

⁶ Atkins, *Glen Park Community Plan EIR – Urbemis Update Associated with Plan Refinements Subsequent to DEIR Publication*, memorandum from Kimberly Comacho to Lisa Gibson, October 12, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as a part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

Gas Emissions, Other CEQA Considerations, and Alternatives sections have been slightly revised to acknowledge that 5,250 sf of ground-floor commercial uses could potentially be built on the six parcels on Diamond Street (2928-2958) that would be rezoned to Glen Park NCT with implementation of the *2010 Community Plan*. The revisions to the text can be found in Section E, Draft EIR Revisions, under Staff-Initiated Text Changes, starting on p. VI-89. Since these refinements only require minor changes to the Introduction, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Other CEQA Considerations, and Alternatives sections, and because they would not alter the physical environmental effects of the project, they would not alter the analysis or conclusion of the DEIR in these sections.

Noise and Vibration

The Noise and Vibration section has been reviewed to determine if the plan refinements would have an environmental effect on this environmental topic. Overall, the plan refinements would not alter the environmental analysis for this topic. Thus, the refinements would not result in any new significant environmental impacts or increase the severity of previously identified environmental impacts. No changes to this section are required.

Summary of New Effects and CEQA Conclusion

As described above, none of the plan refinements would result in a new significant environmental impact not already identified on the DEIR or increase the severity of previously identified environmental impacts. *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15088.5 requires that a lead agency recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice for public review of the DEIR, but prior to certification. "Information" can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project, or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project proponents have declined to implement. "Significant new information" requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented;
- A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance;

- A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt it; and/or
- The DEIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

If the revision is limited to a few chapters or portions of the EIR, the lead agency need only recirculate the chapters or portions that have been modified (*CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 (c)*). As described above, the refinements to the *2010 Community Plan* are minor changes to the DEIR and would not result in any of the circumstances triggering recirculation pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5*.

D. COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

GENERAL COMMENTS

Comment GC-1: *The DEIR complies with CEQA.*

"The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on June 10, 2011, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State - Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project's ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

"Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

'A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation.'

"These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

"This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process." (*Scott Morgan, State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Letter, June 13, 2011*)

Response GC-1

The comment acknowledges that the Glen Park Community Plan DEIR complies with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to CEQA. Accordingly, no further response is needed.

Comment GC-2: *The DEIR was not listed as being available at the Main Branch of the SF Public Library and the public review period should be extended.*

"I need to study the draft EIR further at the Main Branch of the SF Public Library using their digital magnification equipment.

"However, the Main Branch was not listed as a place where a copy can be found.

"And the Glen Park Branch doesn't have that equipment. Only the Main Branch does.

"So please continue this matter until a month after copy has been delivered to the Main Branch and you have notified me by e-mail." (*Philip Siepert, Resident, E-Mail, June 2, 2011*)

Response GC-2

The commenter is concerned that Glen Park Library did not have equipment for the visually impaired to view the DEIR. During the public review period, the DEIR was available for review at the San Francisco Main Library, 100 Larkin Street, from April 27, 2011 to June 13, 2011. Notification of this availability was posted on the Glen Park Community Plan website (<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1666>). After Mr. Siepert sent his email on June 2, 2011, the City replied the same day by email that the document could be viewed at the Main Library, which has facilities for the visually impaired, until June 13, 2011. Since there were 11 days remaining in the public review period, the City considers this sufficient time to review the DEIR and did not extend the public review period.

Comment GC-3: *The public meetings on the DEIR and 2010 Community Plan provided opportunities to offer input.*

"I wanted to thank the Planning Department, especially John Swae and John Billovits, for the attention that they've been paying to input from the community. And we've noticed, as this plan has been rolling forward, that it's changing to reflect the community's concerns; and we appreciate that very much. I think there's further to go on that, obviously, as it gets closer to your attention; and there will be plenty of time for you to decide on when it gets in front of you.

"So thank you very much for this opportunity to address you; and I look forward to sending in the written comments in a couple of weeks." (*Nicolas Dewar, The Glen Park Association, Public Hearing, June 2, 2011*)

"Yes. I had the pleasure of attending either two or three -- I think possibly three -- of the community meetings in this area prior to the development of the EIR. I found them very well attended, as I believe I mentioned before, and very interactive in the Q-and-A sessions with the participation of the community there. And then I think that's the way these types of area developments should go forward." (*Vice President Miguel, San Francisco Planning Commission, Public Hearing, June 2, 2011*)

Response GC-3

The commenters express appreciation for the public outreach efforts. City staff is making concerted efforts to ensure that as many opportunities as possible are afforded to the community to participate in planning efforts that affect their neighborhoods.

Comment GC-4: Comments on the DEIR are forthcoming and will be submitted in writing.

"Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name's Nicholas Dewar. I'm a resident of Glen Park; and I am on the Glen Park Association. I chair the association's zoning and planning committee.

"The association is going to submit comments in writing before the 13th of June, so I won't go into that right now. But I do want to tell you that they are coming and we are working hard on them already." (*Nicolas Dewar, The Glen Park Association, Public Hearing, June 2, 2011*)

Response GC-4

The commenter's statement that the Glen Park Association will be submitting comments in writing does not raise concerns about the DEIR; therefore, no further response is necessary. Responses are, however, provided in this Responses to Comments document to individual comments in the letter submitted by the commenter on June 13, 2011.

Comment GC-5: Alternative B presented in the DEIR is preferable.

"Finally, there are three development options. And I support Plan B with the little denser housing and less impact from traffic and so forth. That's my suggestion for the Commission, yes." (*Sally Ross, Resident, Public Hearing, June 2, 2011*)

Response GC-5

The commenter's support for Alternative B is acknowledged. The Planning Commission will consider such comments during the hearings on the merits the *2010 Community Plan*. Accordingly, no further response to this comment is necessary.

Comment GC-6: The DEIR impact methodology considers the effects of the maximum potential development and the transportation effects have been well considered.

"Just so the public understands, what an EIR considers are the maximums. It doesn't mean that everything is going to go to that maximum. But the EIR has to consider it so that anything up to that, but less is still okay when it's considered; and any developments or anything will have to come before the department and Commission in the future.

"In particular, in the summary section, although previous testimony regarding this program when it came before the Commission concentrated a bit on the absence of exact plans from BART for their property, if you will note, particularly as I say, in the summary section on S-4 and S-5 the possible maximum developments on the BART site are fully covered; and so whatever happens there is already considered within this EIR and properly so.

"As to the comments that just came before from the public, what is contained here are possibilities and suggestions. It doesn't, obviously, mean any of it is going to happen in that exact manner; and there can be a little bit of pick-and-choose by the time you get to the final.

"I find it interesting that, basically of in-fill development, we are talking of an absolute maximum of 150, which is not massive. But this is a very, very tight community and a very tight area, if anyone is familiar with it. And 90 of those are the possibility for the BART parking lot itself. So when you take that away, we're not talking of a lot of development.

"The transportation and movement section is probably the most important. That is the biggest consternation in that area of how anyone gets around, whether it be pedestrian, bicycle, motor vehicle, or BART, for that matter. And I think they are very, very well considered.

"I find this EIR a little different than some I've criticized before. It does not sound like a PR project and written by a developer; and I am very glad to see that." (*Vice President Miguel, San Francisco Planning Commission, Public Hearing, June 2, 2011*)

Response GC-6

The commenter offers information about the methodological approach used in EIR impact assessments. Specifically, the commenter notes the need to evaluate the maximum amount of development, even if that is not what may eventually be built, and explains that this approach was followed in the DEIR. The commenter also acknowledges the objectivity of the DEIR. Accordingly, no further response is necessary.

Comment GC-7: *The impact methodology, significance criteria, and assumptions presented in the DEIR may not be appropriate for projects for which BART may act as the lead agency.*

"This letter provides the comments of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District ('BART') on the draft environmental impact report ('draft EIR') prepared for the Glen Park Community Plan pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ('CEQA') (Footnote: Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et. seq. CEQA is implemented through the State CEQA Guidelines ('Guidelines'), 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15000 et seq.). The draft EIR studies the potential environmental effects associated with the adoption of the 2010 Community Plan for the Glen Park neighborhood, in particular related to land use and urban design, transportation

improvements, and creation of open space. As particularly relevant to BART, the draft EIR analyzes the potential environmental effects of allowing mixed commercial and residential infill development on the BART parking lot currently serving BART's Glen Park Station. The draft EIR considers a maximum build-out scenario of 90 residential units, 14,913 square feet of commercial space, and 123 parking spaces.

"BART appreciates the City's efforts in preparing the 2010 Community Plan and the draft EIR, as well as the opportunity to comment on the draft EIR. BART believes the City has done an excellent job in preparing the draft EIR and creating a vision for the Glen Park neighborhood that includes a strong transit-oriented development ('TOD') opportunity for the BART parking lot. To this end, BART's comments on the draft EIR do not concern any alleged inadequacies with the environmental analysis. To the contrary, BART believes the draft EIR is legally adequate for purposes of adopting the 2010 Community Plan and supporting future TOD in the Glen Park neighborhood.

"Instead, BART's comments focus on three policy determinations the City has made in the draft EIR concerning (i) the modeling of trip generation and transportation mode splits for TOD projects considered in the Plan, (ii) the significance criteria used for assessing the 2010 Community Plan's impacts on BART service, and (iii) the identification of the BART's Glen Park Station as an historic resource that might be effected by implementation of the 2010 Community Plan. BART recognizes that the City, as the CEQA lead agency for the draft EIR, has the discretion to establish the methodology for analyzing, and the criteria for assessing the significance of, the environmental effects of the 2010 Community Plan, provided the methodology and significance criteria are supported by substantial evidence. The City also has discretion to identify the significant effects of the 2010 Community Plan, again subject to support by substantial evidence in the record. As noted in its comments below, BART does not question the City's exercise of discretion, or the sufficiency of the evidence supporting such exercise, in these areas.

"Rather, the sole purpose of these comments is to recognize that, while the methodology, significance criteria, and assumptions used in the draft EIR may be appropriate for purposes of assessing the impacts of the 2010 Community Plan, the same methodology, criteria and assumptions might not be appropriate for other projects, including particularly projects for which BART might act as the lead agency. BART therefore is going on record here concerning these issues in order to reserve the right to exercise its discretion on these and other issues in manner different than, and perhaps even directly contrary to, the City's determinations in the draft EIR, subject, as with all discretionary determinations, to support by substantial evidence." (*Jeff Ordway, BART, Letter, June 13, 2011*)

Response GC-7

This comment states that the City has done an excellent job in creating a vision for strong transit-oriented development and that the DEIR is legally adequate. BART's statement that it reserves the right to exercise its discretion on its methodology,

significance criteria, and assumptions on future projects within Glen Park where BART might act as the lead agency is acknowledged. No further response is necessary.

Comment GC-8: *The daylighting of Islais Creek raises a number of potential impacts that require further consideration in the DEIR.*

“The Idea of ‘daylighting’ Islais creek is a really really BAD IDEA!!! If the creek is daylighted along Kern Street:

1. Who pays for the Flood insurance for the residents and home owners! You will be creating a flood plain.
2. Who will keep the grates where the creek goes underground CLEAN AND FREE OF DEBRIS! Every time it rains, we need to clean the grates at the low point on Chilton Ave.
3. Who controls the mosquitoes when the creek forms standing water and wetlands.
4. When the city has financial problems creating more expense in the form of a worker to maintain the creek seems not so bright an idea.

As a homeowner I am very much against the creating of water problems in my neighborhood.”
(Lesley Kinnear, Resident, Letter, May 23, 2011)

“Problems Related to Failure by the City of San Francisco to Maintain this Land - We have lived in this house for almost 13 years. During that time, the undeveloped city land and the land owned by St. John's School that surrounds our house have been very poorly maintained. Despite many repeated requests neither the City nor St. John's School has ever taken responsibility for maintaining it. (Instead, the neighbors have had to organize neighborhood cleanups.) Here are some examples:

- **Hazardous Trees** - The greenbelt that runs between my house and Bosworth Street is filled with dead and dying trees (which all seem to be riddled with the same fungus). I reported them to the City on September 9, 2011. About a month after that call, the Department of Public Works posted a tree removal sign outside my house. I found the name of Robert Stafford on that posting and called him. He informed me that the DPW would only remove the one tree that was closest to my house. (That operation occurred on October 21, 2010.) In our phone call, Mr. Stafford told me that since the other dead trees did not threaten houses they would be addressed later. He also told me that my request to trim tree limbs that extend over my house would be put off until a later time. On March 20, 2011, one of the trees that the DPW declined to cut down in September fell across a footpath frequently used by residents of Glen Park (and prominently featured in the Draft EIR) and landed dangerously close to both my back yard and the St. John's School play yard (each places where many children play daily). The tree fell into the standing water on the footpath (caused by the rains that came with the storm that felled the tree). I immediately called 311 and sent emails to the DPW and Mr. Swae requesting that the City promptly remove ALL of the dead trees in that area and trim back the heavy limbs reaching over my house (and the

house of my neighbors at 45 Chilton Avenue). To date none of these actions have taken place.

- **Trash Dumping** - Homeless live out in the high bushes of the greenbelt during most of the year. They leave lots of trash and start fires. In addition, many folks dump their trash down off Bosworth Street. Finally, all of the trash from St. John's schoolyard blows down into that area. Despite my many, many requests that the City and St. John's clean up this land, it remains riddled with trash.
- **Fire Hazard** - The 8 to 10 foot high weeds that grow annually in this area create an enormous fire hazard. I have contacted the City many, many times about this problem. They have sent crews to clear the land only twice in the last 13 years.
- **Flooding** - As noted in the first bullet above, this land FLOODS every time it rains. St. John's School has covered its entire yard with tarmac but has not provided any drainage for it. The yard slopes downhill and water runs off the tarmac to the natural streambed below. We have repeatedly asked St. John's to comply with the law and provide adequate drainage for their property but those requests have been ignored. We have also asked the City to force St. John's to comply with the law. Those requests have also been ignored. After years of having half a foot to a foot of water sitting next to our foundation, we finally worked with our neighbors to lease the land north of our house from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. We then landscaped, graded and added drainage to the land all at our own (and not insignificant cost) - merely to protect our foundations. The land behind and to the west of our house still floods and remains flooded for several months each year - even after years of drought. Given that the City does not clean up fallen trees or dumped garbage or require St. John's to properly drain its land, you can only imagine what a mess it becomes.
- **Mosquitoes** - In addition to the property damage, the standing water also results in horrible mosquito problems in warm weather.

"Given this track record, I have very little faith that the city can maintain Islais Creek if it ever brings its water above ground. I am concerned that the flooding will get worse and that the trash, weeds and homeless will only increase. On top of all of that, the trash and weeds would then exist in a wet marshy area - making an even larger mess and attracting even more mosquitoes. Therefore, I request that the EIR require the City to fully address all of these problems and concerns.

- **Public Safety Concerns** - The Draft EIR cites creek bed and bank erosion as the chief concerns related to daylighting Islais Creek. This is a very real concern that I expect you will address. I was surprised, however, to find that the Draft EIR does not seem to cite any other concerns. In addition to the very real risk of erosion and the flooding, trash, falling trees and fire hazards cited above, I would like for the City to also consider:
- **Hazardous Waste** - As described above, chemical, biological and other waste gets dumped into the greenbelt and former streambed on a regular basis. I am surprised that the that the Draft EIR did not require testing of the greenbelt and former streambed for toxic chemicals and other waste (from the animals that are walked in the area, the cars that use the St. John's

lot and the trash and other waste dumped in the area). Please include this sort of testing in your study.

- **Sewage Back Up** - On several occasions during large storms, sewage has backed up and out of sewers and toilets in the neighborhood. This has mostly occurred further east of our block but it has also occurred on our block. Since it has happened more than once in my almost 13 years here, these are not the 200 year storms referenced in the Draft EIR. Rather, it seems to be a due to inadequate sewage and storm water drainage. I fear that these inadequate systems would cause a daylighted Islais Creek and the greenbelt around it to become a swampy sewer. I would like for the Draft EIR to require testing on the adequacy of these infrastructural systems to see if they can support the proposed daylighting project.
- **Children and Pets** - Several small children live, play and go to school in this area. Many folks also use it to walk their dogs. I have many concerns about the daylighted creek - especially where it would come above and go back under the ground and the safety of the areas children and pets. I would like for the City to fully account for these concerns in any future proposals." (*Maria Hekker, Resident, Letter, May 25, 2011*)

"I am submitting these comments for inclusion in the DEIR proposal to the Planning Commission. It outlines my very serious concerns regarding the day lighting of Islais Creek.

"I live at 56 Chilton Avenue, which abuts the easement through which the creek could theoretical flow. Maria Hekker and Jeff Tyce own the house at 88 Chilton Avenue, which is on the other side of the easement.

"I must point out that the concerns I am raising in this letter are concerns that the neighbors of Chilton Avenue have raised repeatedly in the past. It is with consternation and a great sense of confusion that I raise the question of why these issues continue to go unaddressed. They certainly are relevant to the Draft Environmental Impact Report. Many of the residents of Chilton Avenue have sent written comments to both you and John Swae regarding this creek issue. The neighbors on Chilton Avenue (i.e the people who would be directly impacted by this proposal) have had a meeting with John at my house to discuss this issue. There is not a single person on this block who is not adamantly opposed to this idea for a number of reasons. We have voiced our concerns over and over again, but they go unaddressed as this plan continues to evolve. I am copying our District Supervisor Scott Weiner on this letter in the hope that his involvement might help bring some focus to our concerns.

"From the highest level, let me just comment on what is being proposed here. We are talking about voluntarily introducing a body of moving water between two houses that sit less than twenty-five feet apart. Water damages foundations. Water erodes soil. Moreover, we are talking about houses that sit in an earthquake zone where liquefaction is already an issue. We are in effect talking about voluntarily introducing unnecessary structural risks to people's houses. I notice that the Draft EIR does cite creek bank erosion as an area of study, but does not mention the risks posed to our houses. Should there not be a full seismic review performed to assess the increased seismic risks to our houses?

"I was surprised to read that none of the other concerns that my neighbors and I have repeatedly raised have been addressed. They are:

- **Garbage:** The creek would flow through a valley situated between St. John's School and Bosworth Avenue. There is a tremendous amount of trash that blows down from both areas, trash that does not ever get cleaned up unless the neighbors take the initiative to do so. If we put a creek through that location, it will be constantly filled with litter and trash.
- **Hazardous Waste:** Why is there nothing in the draft EIR to study the soil quality and the water quality in the easement. Not only do people dump all kinds of waste back in that area, but also there is a tremendous amount of run-off from St. John's School. St. Johns has almost a whole city block of asphalt with absolutely no drainage provisions. The tarmac simply runs off into that land and has likely accumulated all kinds of toxic chemicals. Moreover, what is the water quality that already runs through Islais Creek? Does it already have chemicals in it?
- **Flooding:** Because of the run-off from St. Johns and the lack of drainage, the easement behind our houses is flooded during rainy season. This would be exacerbated with a creek running through it.
- **Maintenance:** The City does not maintain the land as it is. It is currently overgrown with weeds. Moreover, the city easement runs between land that is owned by St. John's School on both sides. How feasible is it to deal with issues of upkeep and safety when the area in question is owned by two separate parties, neither of whom takes any responsibility for its maintenance.
- **Insects:** Insects are already a problem when the weather is warm. This would only be worse if we introduce more water. This increases the risk to my family and the families in the area of insect born diseases." (*Daniel O'Keefe, Resident, Letter, June 5, 2011*)

"The 'daylighting' of Islais Creek is noted as being covered at a program level of analysis in the EIR on page II-5, however, the analysis throughout the EIR is sparse and insufficient to inform decision-making about this proposal. The Initial Study identified mitigation to address potential hydrology and water quality impacts, including the preparation of a Hydraulics and Hydrology Study; however, without that study it is unclear as to whether daylighting could have significant unavoidable effects or not. The EIR should have addressed to a more detailed level the aesthetic, geologic, hydrologic, land use, noise, air quality and hazard (e.g., mosquito pathogens) impacts associated with daylighting. Although a specific proposal for daylighting has not been made, enough is known about how it could work to provide more meaningful analysis of both the construction of a daylighted stream and the long-term operational impacts of it. Additional analysis should be presented in the EIR, even though it is only addressed at the program level, in order to adequately frame future project level CEQA analysis, similar to the analysis of the BART lot development." (*Nicolas Dewar, The Glen Park Association, Letter, June 13, 2011*)

Response GC-8

The commenters state a variety of concerns regarding flooding, fire hazards, trash, and insects associated with existing conditions of Islais Creek. Under CEQA, an EIR is required to analyze future impacts to the environment, rather than the impacts of existing conditions on the environment. These comments, along with other comments concerning maintenance, safety for pets and children, and exposure to contamination, will inform the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and the San Francisco Planning Department in the future when the merits of daylighting Islais Creek are considered.

Some of the commenters' concerns are addressed in the Initial Study, which was based on the 2003 Glen Park Community Plan Summary (*2003 Community Plan Summary*). As noted on p. 30 of the Initial Study, the *2003 Community Plan Summary* included strategies and design measures for daylighting Islais Creek, which would minimize drainage impacts, including potential flooding impacts. Additionally, according to the Initial Study, daylighting the creek would be accompanied by localized stormwater management programs and the creation of stormwater detention features designed according to the City's *Better Streets Plan*.⁷ For further information on biological resources, hydrology and water quality, hazards and hazardous materials analyzed in the Initial Study, please refer to Appendix A of the DEIR.

At this time, there are no specific plans to daylight Islais Creek. The *2010 Community Plan* includes Policy 11.4 which states "the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and the Planning Department should conduct a study to assess the feasibility, benefits, and impacts of daylighting a portion of Islais Creek through Glen Park." Should the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and the Planning Department choose to pursue the daylighting of Islais Creek, additional studies are necessary to determine how daylighting could occur and whether the concept is feasible and desirable. Thus, the likelihood, timing, and general definition for a daylighting proposal at this stage are

⁷ The *Better Streets Plan* provides design guidance for improvement of San Francisco streets and public areas. This program is described on p. 43 of the Initial Study.

uncertain. The *2010 Community Plan's* Implementation Program targets 1 to 5 years as the timeframe for conducting a study to determine engineering feasibility, benefits, and impacts of daylighting portions of Islais Creek. While it may be possible to conduct a more detailed analysis of daylighting impacts related to aesthetics, geology, hydrology, land use, noise, air quality, and hazards, such assessments would require making broad assumptions.

For the purpose of this DEIR, daylighting the creek is recognized as part of the Open Space improvements, as shown in the Project Description, p. II-35, but it is clear that further studies would need to be conducted to assess the feasibility of daylighting. As such, daylighting Islais Creek along with other open space recommendations are evaluated at a program level. As stated in the Introduction, p. I-22, "Program EIRs are typically prepared for agency plans, policies or regulatory programs, and generally analyze broad environmental effects of the program with the acknowledgement that site-specific environmental review may be required for particular aspects of the program when those aspects are proposed for implementation." The *2010 Community Plan* would provide long-term guidance to decision makers and public agencies to ensure future infrastructure projects and land use changes in the Glen Park neighborhood are carried out with sensitivity to the neighborhood's concerns, needs, and desires. Since there is no proposal to daylight the creek and further environmental analysis would need to take place before any plans are approved, the information provided in this DEIR is sufficient to inform decision makers on whether to move forward with adopting the *2010 Community Plan*.

INITIAL STUDY

Comment IS-1: *The DEIR does not adequately discuss biological impacts.*

"Nonetheless, I believe there are deficiencies in the report, for instance, in the summary, section II, I saw no mention of urban wildlife study or impacts." (*Philip Siepert, Resident, E-Mail, June 2, 2011*)

"For instance, where is the biological component?"

"There is significant public space with flora and fauna that would have significant irreversible impacts, yet as far as I can see, the EIR dismisses this in a summary fashion." (*Philip Siepert, Resident, E-Mail, June 3, 2011*)

Response IS-1

The commenter believes that the DEIR contains deficiencies and states that there was no mention of an urban wildlife study or impacts in the Summary chapter. The project was first evaluated in the Initial Study, the purpose of which was to determine whether an EIR was warranted and then to identify those topics that required further or more detailed investigation. In the Initial Study, which is contained as Appendix A of the DEIR, urban wildlife impacts are addressed under Topic 12, Biological Resources, beginning on p. 81. The Initial Study determined that impacts to biological resources would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-BI-1: Pre-Construction Nesting Bird Survey. This mitigation measure, which is included in the DEIR Summary, p. S-38, would require that any construction avoid the February 1 through August 31 bird nesting period to the extent feasible. If this is not feasible, a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist. The Initial Study determined that no further analysis of biological resources was required and that, therefore, the topic would not be discussed in the EIR.

See also the plan boundaries that show the primary area of study to be the urbanized portions of the Glen Park community. The EIR does not focus on areas outside this plan area, because effects of the development and transportation improvements proposed in the *2010 Community Plan* would occur primarily within the plan area. Thus, expansive public open space areas, like the Glen Park natural area that encompasses significant flora and fauna resources, would not be affected and are not discussed.

Comment IS-2: *The DEIR does not adequately discuss the wind and shadow impacts associated with the proposed rezoning.*

"I have emailed pictures to representatives in the planning department to demonstrate how much shadow such buildings create, suggested that higher wind speeds would result (based on experience from other areas in SF) and mentioned that the increased density changes the unique

character of our "village". The hills surrounding this neighborhood give it the valley feel and the views of those hills minimize the feeling of cramped city living.

"But please don't surround us with sky-blocking vertical structures!

"As you can see from the attached photos, even a 40-foot building blocks the sun beginning in the early afternoon." (*Diane Grant, Resident, Letter, June 7, 2011*)

Response IS-2

The commenter expresses concerns over increasing the height limit to 45 feet, including the potential for shadows, increased wind speeds, and changes to the unique character of Glen Park. Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would increase the height limit from 40 feet to 45 feet in some areas zoned Glen Park NCT to encourage active ground-floor uses. It is important to understand that CEQA requires the City to identify substantial physical changes to the environment. Substantial changes are generally defined by the standards of significance. It is recognized that all projects will change the neighborhood to some extent; the EIR must identify those changes that are substantial and result in a significant impact. Accordingly, although the proposed *2010 Community Plan* and the NCT zoning may create shadows, the Initial Study, Appendix A, pp. 66 to 67, determined that the proposed infill development is sufficiently distant from the public parks and open spaces under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department (RPD) that shadows cast by the proposed height limit would not result in an impact. In the case of shadows, Section 295 of the Planning Code restricts new shadows upon public parks and open spaces under the jurisdiction of RPD during the period of one hour after sunrise to one hour before sunset, at any time of the year by any new structure exceeding 40 feet in height unless the Planning Commission, in consultation with the General Manager of RPD and the Recreation and Park Commission, finds the impact to be insignificant.

The *2010 Community Plan* would increase the height limit to 45 feet in some areas zoned to Glen Park NCT. Therefore, future development under the plan has the potential to be over 40 feet in height and is located in close proximity to Glen Canyon Park and Dorothy Erkin Park, and thus it is subject to Section 295. The Initial Study concluded

that while the implementation of the draft *Community Plan* would involve modification of zoning districts and height and bulk controls, the distance of existing RPD-owned parks from the proposed infill development is too far to create a shadow impact.

Additionally, as stated in the Initial Study, Appendix A, p. 66, the City's wind standards do not apply in the plan area because existing structures are less than 40 feet tall, and proposed height limits in the Glen Park NCT District would be 45 feet. As stated on p. 65 of the Initial Study, wind impacts are generally caused by buildings over 80 feet tall in high-density areas, which would not apply to the plan area. Thus, the Initial Study concluded that development anticipated under the draft *Community Plan* would not substantially affect the existing wind environment according to the City's standards.

Implementation of the 2010 *Community Plan* would involve revisions to the existing Planning Code use and height districts in the plan area, as described in the DEIR, Project Description, p. II-13. As explained in Section III.B, Land Use, p. III.B-12, future development in the plan area could be higher in density and scale than the low-density, single-family housing surrounding the plan area; however, the scale and character in the surrounding areas would remain intact because future development would be focused in the commercial core of the Glen Park community. Currently, the neighborhood's commercial core is centered on Diamond Street and Chenery Street. Under the NCT District, development could occur up to 45 feet, a 5-foot increase from what is currently allowed in the commercial core area. The intent of the revised height and bulk controls is to encourage active ground floor uses. It is not intended to allow another floor of development and, thus, new development in accordance with the 2010 *Community Plan* would not substantially contrast with uses nearby. In addition, the 2010 *Community Plan* includes land use and urban design policies that build on established land use patterns in the Glen Park neighborhood, and would not have a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity. Policy 2.4 of the 2010 *Community Plan* encourages that the design of the new buildings should be consistent with the neighborhood's existing plan and should reinforce the character of Glen Park. Thus, the scale of new development would be compatible with the surrounding uses and changes in density

would not be expected to substantially alter the neighborhood character and scale of the Glen Park community.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Comment PD-1: *The project boundaries presented in the DEIR are unclear.*

“Also the map of the boundaries proposed for the affected area seemed to extend beyond the area as described in narrative.” (*Philip Siepert, Resident, E-Mail, June 3, 2011*)

Response PD-1

The narrative of the project location in the Project Description, starting on p. II-6 of the DEIR, is a general description of the major streets that border the plan area and is not an exact list of all the streets that define the boundaries of the plan area, as shown in Figure II-1, p. II-7, Regional and City Project Location, of the DEIR. The narrative is not intended to describe the precise plan area boundaries in areas where, for example, the boundary lies between properties and not along a street. As a result, there are portions of the plan area that extend beyond the area described in the text. Nonetheless, the description of the project location in the DEIR is adequate and is clearly illustrated in Figure II-1.

Comment PD-2: *The logic behind the design of the bicycle lanes is unclear in the DEIR.*

“I don't have to explain to you how unique Glen Park is. And I can't fathom the logic behind some of your bicycle lane designs, so I won't even try to discuss that.” (*Diane Grant, Resident, Letter, June 7, 2011*)

Response PD-2

The commenter's statements regarding the bicycle lane designs are acknowledged. As noted in the Project Description, p. II-29 of the DEIR, the *2010 Community Plan* includes policies proposed in the San Francisco Bicycle Plan to implement bicycle network improvements for the Glen Park neighborhood. Approved in June 2009, the bicycle lane improvements proposed in the San Francisco Bicycle Plan are more comprehensive than the bicycle improvements identified in the *2010 Community Plan*. As such, the Bicycle

Plan improvements would supersede any bicycle lane improvements identified in the *2010 Community Plan*.

Comment PD-3: *The Community Plan should include additional transportation improvements on Bosworth Street.*

“Other Changes on Bosworth Street

“The DEIR does not evaluate certain changes in Bosworth Street that could meet transportation goals, provide open space improvements, and address parking concerns. The EIR should analyze reconfiguration of Bosworth Street. Bosworth Street is one travel lane in each direction east of Arlington, two travel lanes between Arlington and Elk, and then becomes O’Shaughnessy with one lane in each direction. The Community Plan should consider re-configuring Bosworth Street between Diamond and Elk to one westbound lane. Turning lanes and bus stop space should be retained as needed. The right-of-way change should provide a 15-foot wider, more level open space corridor contiguous with the existing steeply sloped green space on the north side of Bosworth Street. In addition, diagonal parking on the north side of Bosworth between Diamond and Lippard may be feasible, and would increase the number of short-term spaces available to visitors to the center of Glen Park. The wider open space would continue west of Lippard. If diagonal parking were not feasible, the open space corridor would extend to Diamond. While the EIR must analyze the traffic operations effects of this change, the reduced lanes and diagonal parking could have a traffic-calming effect on this artery...

“TRANSPORTATION

“We generally support any measures that calm traffic in the Glen Park core.

“The Community Plan, as analyzed in the EIR, shows many instances where the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists is weighed against the speed of automobile traffic through the neighborhood. We support the measures that improve pedestrian and bicycle safety and access even if they result in slower speeds for automobiles. Level of service for automobiles is less important than pedestrian safety in Glen Park.

“The Plan should include certain changes on Bosworth Street that would meet Transportation goals, open space improvements, and possible parking changes. The Community Plan should consider re-configuring Bosworth Street between Diamond and Elk to one westbound lane. Turning lanes, and bus stop space should be retained as needed. The right-of-way change should provide a 15-foot wider, more level open space corridor contiguous with the existing steeply sloped green space on the north side of Bosworth Street. In addition, diagonal parking on the north side of Bosworth between Diamond and Lippard may be feasible, and would increase the number of short-term spaces available to visitors to the center of Glen Park. The wider open space would continue west of Lippard. If diagonal parking were not feasible, the open space corridor would extend to Diamond. The reduced lanes and diagonal parking could have a traffic-calming effect on this artery.” (*Nicolas Dewar, The Glen Park Association, Letter, June 13, 2011*)

Response PD-3

This comment addresses transportation improvements beyond those identified in the *2010 Community Plan*, rather than the DEIR. While this improvement was not considered in this DEIR, future improvements in the plan area could occur at a later date. Any future improvement would be subject to subsequent environmental review. This comment will be available to the Planning Commission as it deliberates on the merits and contents of the *2010 Community Plan*.

Comment PD-4: *The Community Plan should include additional transportation improvements at the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 off-ramp intersection.*

“Additional Improvements

“In addition to the intersection analyzed, the Department recommends analyzing and proposing improvements to the Monterey Avenue/Circular Avenue/I-280 off-ramp intersection in a future phase of the Glen Park Community Plan that might improve transit and vehicular operations within the area.” (*Gary Arnold, Caltrans, Letter, June 7, 2011*)

Response PD-4

The concern regarding the Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 off-ramp intersection is noted and SFMTA will consult and inform the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) on the monitoring of this intersection over time. The DEIR, on pp. III.E-40 and III.E-41 and pp. III.E-81 and III.E-82, acknowledges that the potential infill development and cumulative conditions would cause the LOS at this intersection during the AM peak hour to deteriorate from LOS D to LOS E, and identifies a mitigation measure (M-TR-2A, Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps Intersection Signal Timing Modifications, p. III.E-41) calling for SFMTA to monitor operations at this intersection and, in relation to the project, potentially extend the cycle to mitigate the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Prior to the preparation of the DEIR, the signalization at this intersection was improved with the addition of a southbound left turn phase, which reduced the queuing of southbound vehicles on Circular Avenue waiting to turn onto the northbound I-280 on-ramp. Currently the intersection operates at LOS D in the AM and PM peak hours, with

total peak-hour traffic volumes of about 2,600 to 2,700 vehicles per hour. The major problem remaining today is the oblique angle at which the I-280 ramps intersect with Circular Avenue, which leads to awkward right and left turns to and from the ramps and Circular Avenue north of Monterey Boulevard. In particular, the configuration necessitates wide turns by large vehicles such as the private shuttle buses that access the Glen Park BART Station from the I-280 southbound off-ramp.

Any improvement, such as widening of the right-turn lane, would require modification of the off-ramp structure. SFMTA may, at any time, recommend additional improvements to this intersection, above the signal timing adjustments related to this project; however, any additional improvements would require further environmental review, as appropriate. Caltrans would continue to be informed and consulted on any changes proposed at this intersection.

Comment PD-5: *The Community Plan should include design guidelines.*

“AESTHETICS

“The previous version of the Community Plan included Design Guidelines for in-fill development. These guidelines have been excluded from the current draft of the Plan. We recommend that design guidelines be incorporated in the current Plan.

“Smaller-scale development is more consistent with the existing community feel of the Glen Park village. Any design restrictions that will help preserve or enhance the existing small-scale aesthetic are supported.” (*Nicolas Dewar, The Glen Park Association, Letter, June 13, 2011*)

Response PD-5

This comment addresses the contents of the *2010 Community Plan*, rather than the DEIR. The commenter’s request for design guidelines in the *2010 Community Plan* is acknowledged. Under CEQA, the EIR analyzes the project as proposed and design guidelines are not included in the *2010 Community Plan*. Since this comment does not request information about the DEIR or raise questions regarding its contents or the CEQA process, no further response is necessary. However, this comment will be available to the Planning Commission as it deliberates on the merits and the contents of the *2010 Community Plan*.

Comment PD-6: *The Community Plan should include a goal for utility undergrounding.***“UTILITY UNDERGROUNDING**

“The Community Plan should identify a goal for the entire area in the plan to have any remaining overhead utilities undergrounded, particularly as the major in-fill sites are developed.” (*Nicolas Dewar, The Glen Park Association, Letter, June 13, 2011*)

Response PD-6

This comment addresses the contents of the *2010 Community Plan*, rather than the DEIR. Since this comment does not request information about the DEIR or raise questions regarding its contents or the CEQA process, no further response is necessary. However, this comment will be available to the Planning Commission as it deliberates on the merits and contents of the *2010 Community Plan*.

Comment PD-7: *The Community Plan should include the creation of a new zoning district for areas near freeway access and some family housing.*

“I hope you will accept this public comment for Glen Park Draft EIR. Any new zoning in Glen Park, a special commercial/residential transit area, should have a new ZONE description to signify an area close to Freeway access. This will allow future building to continue a 1 car parking space per unit built.

“It is imperative to keep this as a minimum so the business district can survive and continue to be an asset to the community at large.

“One more thing, can we please have some family housing. (3bds or more)” (*Ric Lopez, Resident, E-mail, June 13, 2011*)

Response PD-7

The comments regarding creation of a zoning designation close to freeway access and the inclusion of family housing are acknowledged. The DEIR is intended to evaluate the potential physical environmental effects of the project that is proposed - in this case, the *2010 Community Plan*. Alternative proposals are explored and discussed (see Chapter V), when those proposals may substantially reduce impacts identified for the proposed project. Since the commenter’s suggestions would not substantially reduce an environmental impact, the comments relate to the merits or definition of the project and do not address the adequacy of the DEIR. Accordingly, no further response is necessary.

However, these comments will be available to the Planning Commission as it deliberates on the merits, contents, and means to implement the *2010 Community Plan*.

LAND USE

Comment LU-1: *The rezoning under the Glen Park NCT district could result in commercial development on Joost Avenue.*

“My comment is a general comment regarding commercial development on Joost Avenue under the new neighborhood commercial transit (NCT) zoning. While the southern side of the first block of Joost Avenue up to the intersection with Lippard Street is currently zoned commercial, the actual usage is predominantly residential. The southern side of the street is zoned commercial where lots front both Joost Avenue and Monterey Blvd; however, existing commercial frontage is on Monterey Blvd. The Community Plan rezoning may promote in-fill development and the replacement of the current residential units on Joost Ave with commercial developments and storefronts. The expansion of commercial development on this residential street could have significant impacts on the aesthetic character of Joost Avenue.

“Spreading commercial development onto previously residential streets also has a potential to dissipate the positive effect of a concentrated commercial village. Joost Avenue should not be transformed from a quiet residential street into a mixed-use block with minimal controls on the types of commercial uses present. The fragile residential quality of this block of Joost Avenue has recently been reinforced by the structural and aesthetic improvements of some of the housing stock. The introduction of commercial storefronts could have negative impacts on the aesthetic and residential character of the street. The EIR should include design guidelines in the form of mitigation on the proposed rezoning of existing commercial lots facing Joost to either prevent them from fronting onto Joost or limiting their uses and storefronts to fit with the residential character of the street (i.e., low traffic professional businesses such as real estate or architectural design offices).” (*Tania Treis, Resident, Letter, June 13, 2011*)

Response LU-1

The commenter is concerned about additional commercial development on Joost Avenue that could result from the implementation of the *2010 Community Plan*. The *2010 Community Plan* would introduce a new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit (Glen Park NCT) District, which would apply to parcels along Diamond Street, Chenery Street, Joost Avenue, and Wilder Street currently zoned NC-2 (Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial). The current NC-2 zoning allows public/institutional uses up to 9,999 gsf; commercial uses over 10,000 gsf; and residential uses at a density of one unit per 800 gsf of lot area. In addition, this district is designed to preserve small-scale shopping districts that provide goods and services to surrounding neighborhoods. The

Glen Park NCT District rezoning would permit changes such as modifications to density controls, increased heights, setbacks, façade treatments, and minimization of curb cuts. The DEIR assumes that the rezoning of these sites would not result in a change of land use from residential to commercial. It is anticipated that the change in land use controls would not be a substantial enough incentive to prompt such a change in development. Furthermore, the *2010 Community Plan* encourages commercial uses on Diamond Street and Chenery Street as identified in Policy 1.1. This policy identifies these streets as the commercial core of Glen Park and recognizes the need to concentrate commercial uses and retail activity along these streets. Should the parcels on Joost Avenue be proposed for development as commercial uses in the future, development would need to be consistent with the design policies in the *2010 Community Plan* and the policies of the Urban Design Element of the General Plan. Both these plans stress integration of proposed buildings with existing buildings, protection of visual relationships and transitions, and maintenance of the streetscape. For further information on design guidelines in the *2010 Community Plan*, please refer to Response PD-5, p. VI-35.

AESTHETICS

Comment AE-1: *Implementation of the 2010 Community Plan could result in negative visual impacts at the infill sites.*

"Good afternoon. My name's Sally Ross. I live at 201 Joost Avenue. Thank you for the opportunity to address you.

"I was impressed with the draft EIR when it stated that the new development would be appropriately scaled and designed to consider the established patterns of the community. And it went on to establish patterns within the historic survey and so forth, very nicely presented.

"I am a little taken aback by their then offered proxy of the sort of buildings that might take -- might be placed on the infill development, both on the BART parking lot and on the Bosworth and Diamond Street area. Both of these are looking pretty large. And, obviously, they just drew blocks in; they're not building plans. But they do seem rather intimidating, especially the NCT transit rezoned areas of the BART parking lot, which is not really part of this but it's considered throughout, is the -- would allow any building to be some 25 feet taller than its neighbors. Most of the existing Glen Park village is only built to a standard -- well, it's built to a standard height limit of 40 feet; and the buildings there are less than 45 feet." (*Sally Ross, Resident, Public Hearing, June 2, 2011*)

"Increasing the height limit has not received support and has generated some very angry discussions during those meetings. But it sounds from your Public Notice letter that it is still being considered.

"Increasing the height limit to 45 feet would create an undesirable atmosphere in our neighborhood. And the phrase "set-back" is a feeble attempt to spin the effort.

"I trust you will make every effort to preserve our neighborhood character by keeping the height limit to 40 feet or less." (*Diane Grant, Resident, Letter, June 7, 2011*)

"Visual Impacts of New Height Limits

"The proposed Land Use and Planning Code Amendments, summarized on DEIR Table II-1, p. II-3 and DEIR p. 11-13 include increasing the 40-X height limit by 5 feet to allow for increased ceiling heights on ground floors in the new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit (Glen Park NCT) District. DEIR Section III.C, Aesthetics, presents visual simulations (mass and bulk), an analysis of the effects of the new height limit, pp. III.C-7 to II.C-17, and concludes that the impacts on visual character would be "less than significant."

"Glen Park is a small-scale neighborhood. Most buildings in the village core are approximately 30 feet or less in height. The EIR should address the effects of the proposed zoning in comparison with existing building heights. It is our view that the proposed zoning change could have a potentially significant impact on visual character. To minimize potentially significant visual impacts, we recommend that the Final EIR include mitigation measures that define design guidelines to reduce aesthetic impacts of new buildings taller than the existing pattern in Glen Park. These design guidelines should include, but may not be limited to, set-backs above the second floor of new buildings so that the bulk of buildings above 25 feet is reduced as viewed from the street.

"The construction of buildings that take maximum advantage of height limits on available in-fill lots could also have significant aesthetic impacts on neighboring residential lots whose yards or homes could abut essentially a 45-foot tall wall. We also recommend that the aforementioned design guidelines take into account the bulk of 45 foot structures on other frontages and limit the visual impacts through additional design guidelines.

"We recognize that the 5-foot incremental increase in height in the NCT zoning is intended to improve retail viability and pedestrian access to street-level businesses. The sidewalks in Glen Park's business district are currently insufficient for pedestrian access to businesses. We recommend that the design guidelines for new in-fill development also include street-level setbacks on Diamond Street and Bosworth Street so that new sidewalks would be at least 12 feet wide to improve both the appearance and the functionality of the space in front of new buildings."

"Visual Impacts of BART Lot Development

"Section III.C includes an analysis of a hypothetical "worst-case scenario" of up to 65 foot tall development on the BART lot as shown in Figures II.C-5 and III.C-6. Given that development of

up to 45 feet could potentially have a significant visual impact, we believe that the impact of a 65 foot building on the BART lot would not be "less than significant," and we recommend that the DEIR Chapter V. analyze explicitly the impacts of a 45 foot high building on that site.

"Given that the new zoning (Glen Park NCT) height limit is proposed at 45 feet, the EIR should consider a 45 foot alternative for the BART lot. While EIR Alternatives B and C include reduced development alternatives, the alternatives do not address height limits for the BART site. The DEIR does not include an alternative that considers the impacts of a 45-foot high building on the BART site

"Consistent with previous comments regarding design guidelines for in-fill development taller than the existing buildings, the DEIR should identify mitigation with design guidelines for the BART site to minimize visual impacts of bulk or box-type development that would be out of character with the existing development and feel of the village core. Setbacks on Bosworth Street should also insure at least 12-foot wide sidewalks." (*Nicholas Dewar, The Glen Park Association, Letter, June 13, 2011*)

Response AE-1

These comments express concern over the height limits being analyzed in the DEIR and the visual effects that could result from the scale of development proposed at the infill sites. The DEIR provides a program-level analysis of the environmental impacts associated with potential development of two infill sites and the broader plan area to present a conservative analysis of the maximum buildout potential. As stated throughout the DEIR, implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would introduce a new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit (Glen Park NCT) District, which would apply to parcels along Diamond Street, Chenery Street, Joost Avenue, and Wilder Street currently zoned NC-2 (Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial). The Glen Park NCT District rezoning would permit new physical changes such as modifications to density controls, increased heights, setbacks, façade treatments, and minimization of curb cuts. While most of the plan area would retain the prevailing height limit of 40-X, the height limit would be increased to 45 feet in areas rezoned to Glen Park NCT to encourage active ground-floor uses. It is anticipated that the additional height would be added to the ground floor and not allow for another floor of development. An increase of 5 feet would allow for storefronts with more space.

As mentioned earlier in the Plan Refinements section, p. VI-4, the height district refinements would reduce the maximum height of new construction along portions of Wilder Street, Diamond Street, and Chenery Street in the Glen Park NCT district from a range of 40 to 45 feet to a range of 30 to 35 feet. However, for the purpose of this EIR, a height limit of 45 feet in areas rezoned to Glen Park NCT is still being analyzed to present a conservative estimate of impacts. Thus, any analysis pertaining to height limits would remain the same in the DEIR and would not need to be modified. Minor edits have been made to the Project Description and Land Use section to clarify that the EIR would still analyze a height limit of 45 feet.

As stated in the DEIR Project Description, p. II-15, the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site and the BART parking lot were recognized in the *2003 Community Plan Summary* as the two sites most likely to be developed in the near term. It is important to note that the *2010 Community Plan* does *not* propose rezoning the BART parking lot site; it is explained on p. II-35 that subsequent environmental review would be needed for this site and, for the time being, the *2010 Community Plan* proposes that the site retain its existing Public zoning. Nevertheless, for analytical purposes, the site is studied as if it were proposed for rezoning to investigate how the Glen Park commercial core would be altered with more intense development at this identified infill site. By presenting the potential physical impacts associated with development of these two infill sites, the DEIR discusses potential foreseeable environmental impacts; however, the *2010 Community Plan* would not result in development of these sites. The maximum development potential is used for the environmental analysis to provide a conservative estimate of impacts that could occur. The DEIR does not necessarily assume that this is a feasible or desirable development scenario nor should this scenario convey an endorsement of a particular development strategy or design by the Planning Department or any other department or agency of the City and County of San Francisco.

At the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site, as stated in the Aesthetics section, p. III.C-14, the existing street trees would help reduce the bulk and mass along Bosworth Street; however, the mass and bulk of the eastern elevation facing Diamond Street

would be highly visible and portions of the ridgeline would be obstructed by the potential infill development. The height, bulk, and mass of the potential infill development would be greater than those of existing buildings, but that development would need to be consistent with the design policies in the *2010 Community Plan* and the policies of the Urban Design Element of the General Plan. Both these plans stress integration of proposed buildings with existing buildings, protection of visual relationships and transitions, and maintenance of the streetscape. As future development applications are considered in the new NCT zoning district, adherence to these design policies would reduce potential visual impacts associated with the new development and would reduce the visual differences with the adjacent structures. Thus, development associated with the implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surrounding, to the degree that a significant impact under CEQA would occur and mitigation measures, such as design guidelines, would not be needed.

Under the *2010 Community Plan*, the BART parking lot site would retain its existing zoning and the existing 40-foot height limit. However, to present a future picture, the EIR assumes that the site potentially could be rezoned to a 65-X Height and Bulk District. As stated on in the Aesthetics section, p. III.C-16 of the DEIR, although a new building placed on the BART parking lot could be substantially taller and of greater bulk and mass, the existing street trees would help reduce the bulk and mass. Additionally, the parking lot site has a lower elevation than the surrounding area and, thus, any building constructed to a height of 65 feet on the lower portion of site would not substantially exceed the heights of surrounding structures. Furthermore, compliance with the design guidelines and policies of the *2010 Community Plan* and the General Plan's Urban Design Element would ensure that visual impacts would be less than significant. For further information on design guidelines in the *2010 Community Plan*, please refer to Response PD-5, p. VI-35. Alternatives are only required to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of a project, while substantially reducing any significant impacts. Since this is not a significant impact, it is not necessary to consider an alternative addressing

aesthetic effects. As such, there is no need for an additional alternative that analyzes a 45-foot height limit on the BART parking lot site.

CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Comment CP-1: *The DEIR should further clarify M-CP-1 and the conclusion that the entire BART Station, including the exterior plazas, has historic merit should be reconsidered.*

“The HPC concurs with the findings on the properties identified as eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and/or California Register of Historical Resources, and as City Landmarks.

“The HPC suggests further clarification for M-CP-1 (Page III.D-30) to ensure review for SOI (Secretary of the Interior's) Standard compliance be conducted by Preservation Staff of the Planning Department.” (*Charles Edwin Chase, Historic Preservation Commission, Letter, May 24, 2011*)

“The draft EIR concludes that the Glen Park BART Station is likely eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion 3 - Design/Construction. This conclusion is based on a December 21, 2010 Historic Resources Evaluation, Draft Glen Park Community Plan, San Francisco, California prepared by Carey & Co., Inc. Based on this determination, the draft EIR identifies several potentially significant environmental effects that would result from implementation of the 2010 Community Plan, and proposes mitigation measures that lessen these potential impacts to less-than significant. As with the draft EIR's treatment of potential impacts to BART's transit service, BART believes the analysis and conclusion in the draft EIR concerning potential impacts to BART's Glen Park Station are supported by substantial evidence.

“However, BART does not necessarily agree that the entirety of the Glen Park Station is eligible for listing on the California Register as concluded in the Carey & Co. evaluation. While BART recognizes that some individual components of the BART station may have some architectural significance, and while BART is committed to preserving the historic resources within its ownership and control, the Carey & Co. evaluations conclusion that the entire Glen Park Station, including the plaza, is an historic resource seems overly broad. BART reserves the right to undertake a future historic resources evaluation of the Glen Park Station and, depending on the results of such evaluation, reach a different determination regarding the Glen Park Station's eligibility for listing on the California Register, when and if BART undertakes any independent projects involving the Glen Park Station.” (*Jeffery Ordway, BART, Letter, June 13, 2011*)

“Historic Resources

“DEIR Section III.D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources, reports that the Glen Park BART Station is recognized for its architectural significance and appears to be eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Places and as a City Landmark (DEIR p. III.D-12). The proposed Community Plan Transportation Improvements include options and variants that would

require parts of the BART Station to be modified in order for it to serve its purposes as a rail station at an intermodal transit point. The DEIR further concludes that the potential J-Church connections and the bus loop would, in a conservative analysis, have a significant adverse effect on this historic resource.

“The DEIR lists elements of the station and the plaza as contributory to qualifications for the California Register (DEIR Section III.D-12). The circular plaza sitting area at the corner of Bosworth and Diamond Streets, labeled as a ‘courtyard’ in the EIR, is identified as one of the character defining features of the station’s architecture and history.

“The record of development of the Glen Park Station shows that the circular plaza at Diamond and Bosworth was designed and completed after the rest of the station. The design and materials differ from the features of the main elements of the station. Therefore, the evaluation of the BART station in Section III.D should be revised to state that the circular plaza is not one of its character-defining features. Attached to this letter are plans and records that document the status of the circular plaza.

“We note that the Widening of Diamond Street - Variant, DEIR p. 11-27, shown in Figure 11-7, would require reconfiguration of part of the BART plaza. The DEIR does not appear to address whether the Variant would have an adverse effect on the defining features of the BART station. On the basis of the documents noted above, the EIR should conclude that the alteration of the plaza area to implement the Variant or any other changes to the plaza, would not adversely affect a character-defining feature of the BART station as an historic resource, and the BART station would retain its integrity as a resource eligible for the California Register

“Overall, we recommend that the EIR address the necessity of finding a balance between the maintenance or enhancement of the functionality of the BART Station and the preservation of its defining design features. Because the BART station is a large site with a number of character-defining features, the EIR should discuss more completely how future changes, required to improve the functionality of the transit system in general, and the Glen Park Station in particular, would be evaluated in terms of historic resources. Changes in one part of the station could result in a conclusion that the remainder of the station, with its architectural design and materials, still possess sufficient integrity such that the site as a whole would maintain its eligibility for the California Register of Historic Resources.” (*Nicolas Dewar, The Glen Park Association, Letter, June 13, 2011*)

Response CP-1

The comment recommends modifications to Mitigation Measure M-CP-1 to explicitly recognize the role of Preservation staff within the City Planning Department to review matters involving compliance with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards. In response to this comment, the text changes below have been made to p. III.D-30 in Section III.D,

Cultural and Paleontological Resources, of the DEIR, the second full sentence of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1:

Prepared materials will be submitted to the Planning Department for review by staff who meet the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualification Standards. ~~The Planning Department~~ Such staff will review and the Historic Preservation Commission shall approve the project for compliance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.*

The comment also expresses support for the findings on the properties identified as eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and/or California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), and as City Landmarks, as identified in the Glen Park Community Plan Draft EIR. Since this comment raises no other points regarding the DEIR or its adequacy, no further response is necessary.

The evaluation of the Glen Park BART Station for National and California Register eligibility followed the prescribed methodologies for evaluating properties for their historic significance. For a property to qualify for the California Register, it must meet one of four criteria for listing by being associated with an important historic context and it must retain historic integrity of those features necessary to convey its significance. The property also must be classified as a district, site, building, structure, or object for inclusion in the California Register. A resource less than 50 years old may be considered for listing in the California Register if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance.⁸ Although not over 45 years old, the BART Station is identified for its architectural significance. The Glen Park BART Station was classified as a building that appears eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3 (Design/Construction) and was found to retain several character-defining features that convey its historic significance. These features, or "individual components," would not be singled out for separate evaluations apart from how they

⁸ <http://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/1069/files/Technical%20Assistance%20Bulletin%206%202011%20Update.pdf>. Accessed on September 28, 2011.

contribute to the historic significance of the building. The design and execution of the Glen Park BART Station must be looked at and evaluated in its totality.

Properties may also be classified as structures or objects. Structures are properties whose purpose is usually not related to creating human shelter. Examples include bridges, bandstands/gazebos, silos/grain elevators, lighthouses, and dams. Objects are primarily artistic in nature, small scale, and simply constructed. Examples include fountains, statuary, street lamps/lights, and fixed furniture. Related individual components of a building are not usually classified as either structures or objects and are not evaluated separately.

The entirety of the BART Station appears eligible for listing in the California Register, as stated above. However, the Glen Park BART power station, which stands on a parcel a block north of the BART Station between Arlington Street and Wilder Street and was designed by the same team and employs some similar design forms, does not appear to possess the same architectural merit as the Glen Park BART Station. Therefore, the power station does not appear to be individually-eligible for the California Register, for the National Register, or as a City Landmark as a structure less than 45 years old.

The comment notes that the circular plaza, or courtyard, is identified as “one of the character defining features of the station’s architecture and history,” but points out that the “circular plaza at Diamond and Bosworth was designed and completed after the rest of the station... Therefore, the evaluation of the BART Station in Section III.D should be reviewed to state that the circular plaza is not one of its character defining features.” Three drawings were submitted in support of this comment. The drawing sheets dated December 1, 1966 show a plaza design proposal that is rectangular in nature. The drawing dated May 18, 1970 shows plans for a circular plaza element labeled “plaza circle.” Also submitted was a birds-eye, aerial photograph with the caption “Station shell structure for Glen Park Station. Contract 1M0043 – Glen Park Station Shell” with a handwritten date of July 1970.

The evaluation of the Glen Park BART Station correctly includes the identification of the present circular plaza design as a character-defining feature for the following reasons. The process of designing and constructing the BART Station took place over a number of years. For a project of this type, there are often design changes made, sometimes even during construction. The drawing from May 1970 shows that the design of the plaza as actually constructed changed from the earlier 1966 design proposal. However, as shown throughout the different stages of the plan, a plaza was always intended to be included as a part of the BART Station. Thus, rather than the circular plaza being “designed and constructed after the rest of the station,” the plaza was designed and constructed *as part of* the overall project. The birds-eye photograph clearly shows that the 1966 design proposal was never constructed; however, plans dated May 18, 1970 show that the circular plaza design was drafted before completion of the entire station complex. The final completed project, which was concluded after the July 1970 photograph, included the circular plaza and is what was evaluated in the EIR. Therefore, the circular plaza, as part of the final completed BART Station, is appropriately regarded as a character-defining feature of the station. The Glen Park BART Station is confirmed to appear eligible for the California Register under Criterion 3.

As noted in the comment, the Widening of Diamond Street Variant would include modifications to the BART Station plaza, including alterations to the exterior plazas. The exterior plazas, and in particular the circular courtyard, were identified as character-defining features. Any alteration to the BART Station plazas and circular courtyard could potentially result in a significant impact; however, this impact would be mitigated through implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CP-1, M-CP-2A, M-CP-2B, and M-CP-2C, as identified in Section III.D, Cultural Resources, pp. III.D-34 and III.D-35. In order to clarify that the Widening of Diamond Street Variant would contribute to the already identified significant impact, Impact CP-1, p. III.D-26 of the DEIR, and would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by the already identified mitigation measures, the DEIR has been revised as indicated below. As a result of this text addition, the Proposed Muni Metro J-Church Pedestrian Bridge Improvement analysis on p. III.D-29,

last paragraph, has been shifted to follow M-CP-1, p. III.D-30. The text pertaining to this improvement remains the same, except for minor revisions required to shift its location to follow the new Widening of Diamond Street Variant discussion.

Note that the DEIR revisions shown below include the previously identified revisions to Mitigation Measures M-CP-1 in order to provide a comprehensive description of the modifications to that mitigation measure.

In addition to the Widening of Diamond Street Variant, the BART Station Plaza Improvements project component would also include modifications to the exterior plazas of the BART Station and, therefore, could potentially contribute to the already identified significant impact under Impact CP-1. This potential impact would be mitigated through implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CP-1, M-CP-2A, M-CP-2B, and M-CP-2C, as identified in Section III.D, Cultural Resources, pp. III.D-34 and III.D-35, and described in the text below.

Page III.D-26, 2nd paragraph from the bottom of the page:

CP-1 Operation and design associated with the 2010 Community Plan's Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements~~access~~, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement at the BART Station would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Page III.D-29, paragraph 3:

The 2010 Community Plan proposes transportation improvements that could affect the physical characteristics of the BART Station that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register. As described further below, ~~these plan transportation improvements include: s the Diamond Street widening variant; the two options for changes to the BART Station in order to enhance pedestrian access by~~ improving the connectivity between the BART Station station and the Muni Metro J-Church stop on San Jose Avenue; the BART Station plaza improvements; and the bus loop improvement at the BART Station.

Widening of Diamond Street Variant. The proposed Diamond Street widening variant would consist of widening Diamond Street with a northbound right-turn lane. If this variant were implemented, the Glen Park BART Station plaza, including portions of the exterior plazas, would be modified to include a sloped landscaped area, a ramp accessible to persons with disabilities, an elevator connecting the street level to the plaza level, stairs down to plaza from the sidewalk, bench seating, bicycle lockers, bicycle parking, a bicycle ramp, and ticket machines. These modifications would alter portions of the exterior plazas of the BART Station, which are character-defining features. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed project. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes the Diamond Street Widening variant would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact of the proposed Diamond Street widening variant would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, described below. (As discussed on pp. III.D-30 through III.D-31, this mitigation measure also addresses significant impacts resulting from construction of the Muni Metro J-Church pedestrian connectivity improvements, the BART Station plaza improvements, and the bus loop improvement.)

~~Proposed Muni Metro J Church Pedestrian Bridge Improvement.~~ The first pedestrian access option is to rebuild the existing pedestrian bridge and to construct an elevator between Diamond Street and the BART Station entry plaza, which would alter the BART Station. Rebuilding the existing pedestrian bridge would not directly impact the station or have a significant impact on its setting. The proposed pedestrian bridge would replace the existing structure, which is not readily visible from the station due to a row of trees lining the southwest corner of the parcel containing the station. Consequently, the reconstructed bridge would have no impact on the BART Station. However, the elevator would be located at the station's north elevation just south of the existing BART ticket machines. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed elevator, so it is not known if its design or scale would be compatible

~~with the design of the BART Station. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes the design and operation of the elevator would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.~~

~~This significant impact of the elevator associated with the proposed Muni Metro J Church Pedestrian Bridge improvement on the BART Station would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, as described below. (As discussed on page III.D-31, this mitigation measure also addresses significant impacts resulting from construction of the bus loop improvement.)~~

M-CP-1 Verification of Compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), in cooperation with BART and any other agency that may have jurisdiction, will prepare materials describing and depicting the widening of Diamond Street variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement at the BART Station, including but not limited to plans, drawings, and photographs of existing conditions. Prepared materials will be submitted to the Planning Department for review by staff who meet the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualification Standards. ~~The Planning Department~~ Such staff will review and the Historic Preservation Commission shall approve the project for compliance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. If any aspect of the design of the widening of Diamond Street variant, pedestrian bridge connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and/or bus loop improvement at the BART Station is determined to be inconsistent with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall pursue and implement a redesign of those

elements, consistent with the goals and objectives of the project, such that consistency with the standards is achieved.

Proposed Muni Metro J-Church Pedestrian Bridge Improvement. The first pedestrian access option is to rebuild the existing pedestrian bridge and to construct an elevator between Diamond Street and the BART Station plaza, which would alter the BART Station. Rebuilding the existing pedestrian bridge would not directly impact the station or have a significant impact on its setting. The proposed pedestrian bridge would replace the existing structure, which is not readily visible from the station due to a row of trees lining the southwest corner of the parcel containing the station. Consequently, the reconstructed bridge would have no impact on the BART Station. However, the elevator would be located at the station's north elevation just south of the existing BART ticket machines. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed elevator, so it is not known if its design or scale would be compatible with the design of the BART Station. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes the design and operation of the elevator would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact of the elevator associated with the proposed Muni Metro J-Church Pedestrian Bridge Improvement on the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, described above, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*.

Muni Metro J-Church At-Grade Crossing Variant. The second pedestrian access option is to construct a new pedestrian ramp between the Muni Metro J-Church platform and the BART Station at the station's south, or rear, elevation. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed pedestrian ramp, so it is not known if its design or scale would be compatible with the design of the BART Station. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes the design and operation of this at-grade crossing variant would result in

a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact of the pedestrian ramp associated with the Muni Metro J-Church At-Grade Crossing Variant on the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, described above, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*.

BART Station Plaza Improvements. The redesign of the BART Station plaza concept would consist of removing walls and fences, expanding at-grade access, and linking Muni passenger areas to improve pedestrian access in the BART Station plaza. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed redesign of the BART Station plaza, so it is not known if its design or scale would be compatible with the design of the BART Station. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes the design and operation of the BART Station plaza improvements would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact associated with the redesign of the BART Station plaza would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, described above, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties.

BART Station Bus Loop Improvement. The proposed BART Station Bus Loop Improvement would consist of a bus loop around the Glen Park BART Station with a new concourse-level entry to the station at its south elevation. This improvement would construct a concourse-level entry at the Glen Park BART Station's south elevation and a walk-through bridge through the station to the north-end plaza to reconfigure the staircase at the north plaza. These modifications would alter the station's character-defining features, including its interior space and the exterior plazas.

Specifically, the bus loop improvement could significantly impact the design and character of the interior space, including, but not limited to the relationship of the roof form, the interior tile mosaic, and the fenestration. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed project. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes the bus loop improvement ~~it~~-would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact of the proposed BART Station Bus Loop around the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, described above, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*.

No Bus Loop Variant. The No Bus Loop Variant would consolidate existing private vehicle drop-off areas on Bosworth Street and on Diamond Street. This variant would not directly impact the BART Station. It would not materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the Glen Park BART Station that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register. The impact of the No Bus Loop Variant would therefore be considered less than significant.

Page III.D-32, paragraph 2:

CP-2 *Construction activities resulting from the Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements—~~access~~, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvements at the BART Station would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

Page III.D-33, paragraph 4:

Transportation Improvements. Construction activities at the BART Station would be associated with the Diamond Street widening variant, ~~Muni Metro J Church~~ pedestrian connectivity improvements—~~bridge~~, BART Station plaza improvements, and the bus loop improvement.

Widening of Diamond Street Variant. The proposed Diamond Street widening variant would consist of widening Diamond Street with a northbound right-turn lane. Inadvertent damage to the BART Station plaza could occur during construction due to heavy machinery use, vibration, and other construction activity. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes construction altering the BART Station plaza would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact of the proposed Diamond Street widening variant would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, p. III-30, which requires compliance with Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties, together with Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A through M-CP-2C, described below.

~~Proposed Muni Metro J Church Pedestrian Bridge Improvement.~~ Construction activities associated with the proposed bridge would occur towards the southwest corner of the parcel containing the station, far enough way to not significantly impact the BART Station. However, the elevator would be located at the station's north elevation just south of the existing BART ticket machines. Inadvertent damage to the BART Station could occur during the construction of the elevator due to heavy machinery use, vibration, and other construction activity, which would be considered a significant impact. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes construction of the elevator would result in a potentially significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

~~This significant impact of the proposed Muni Metro J Church Pedestrian Bridge elevator on the BART Station would be reduced to a less than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, p. III.D 30, which requires compliance with Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties, together with Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A through M-CP-2C, described below.~~

Page III.D-36, first paragraph:

Proposed Muni Metro J-Church Pedestrian Bridge Improvement. Construction activities associated with the proposed bridge would occur towards the southwest corner of the parcel containing the station, far enough way to not significantly impact the BART Station. However, the elevator would be located at the station's north elevation just south of the existing BART ticket machines. Inadvertent damage to the BART Station could occur during the construction of the elevator due to heavy machinery use, vibration, and other construction activity, which would be considered a significant impact. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes construction of the elevator would result in a potentially significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact of the proposed Muni Metro J-Church Pedestrian Bridge elevator on the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*, together with Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A through M-CP-2C, pp. III.D-34 to III.D-35. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2A, calls for the protection of historical resource during construction by following a specific plan while working near these intersections. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2B calls for historical resource ~~and~~ documentation and protection, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-2C calls for verification of historic preservation. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of construction activities on the BART Station to a less-than-significant level.

Muni Metro J-Church At-Grade Crossing Variant. Inadvertent damage to the BART Station could occur during the construction of the pedestrian ramp due to heavy machinery use, vibration, and other construction activity. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes construction of the pedestrian ramp would be a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical

characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact of the proposed elevator on the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through incorporation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*, and Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A through M-CP-2C, pp. III.D-34 to III.D-35. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2A₇ calls for the protection of historical resource during construction by following a specific plan while working near these intersections. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2B calls for historical resource ~~and~~ documentation and protection, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-2C calls for verification of historic preservation. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of construction activities on the BART Station to a less-than-significant level.

BART Station Plaza Improvements. The redesign of the BART Station plaza would consist of removing walls and fences, expanding at-grade access, and linking Muni passenger areas to improve pedestrian access in the BART Station plaza. Inadvertent damage to the BART Station could occur during construction altering the BART Station plaza due to heavy machinery use, vibration, and other construction activity. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes construction altering the BART Station plaza would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact of the proposed BART Station Plaza Improvements would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*, and Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A through M-CP-2C, pp. III.D-34 to III.D-35. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2A calls for the protection of historical resource during construction by following a specific plan. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2B calls for historical resource documentation and protection, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-2C calls

for verification of historic preservation. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of construction activities on the BART Station to a less-than-significant level.

BART Station Bus Loop Improvement. Inadvertent damage to the Glen Park BART Station could occur during the construction of the concourse level entry and the walk-through bridge associated with the proposed BART Station Bus Loop Improvement. The damage could occur due to heavy machinery use, vibration, and other construction activity, which would be considered a significant impact. This significant impact on the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*, and Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A through M-CP-2C, pp. III.D-34 to III.D-35. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2A, calls for the protection of historical resources during construction by following a specific plan while working near these intersections. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2B calls for historic resource ~~and~~ documentation and protection, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-2C calls for verification of historic preservation. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of construction activities on the BART Station to a less-than-significant level.

No Bus Loop Variant. The No Bus Loop Variant would consolidate existing private vehicle drop-off areas on Bosworth Street and on Diamond Street. This variant would not directly impact the BART Station and would have minor construction impact on its exterior plazas. It would not materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the Glen Park BART Station that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register. The impact would therefore be considered less than significant.

Comment CP-2: *The mitigation measure for paleontological resources is inappropriate given the limited potential to uncover important fossils.*

"Paleontological Resources

"The mitigation measure presented on pages III.D-41 seems inconsistent with the analysis and too onerous for the very limited potential for occurrence of fossils, which could unnecessarily add costs to new development. Radiolarians are fairly common in the chert in this region and

would likely be out of context in the village. We recommend removal of this mitigation measure.” (Nicolas Dewar, *The Glen Park Association, Letter, June 13, 2011*)

Response CP-2

The commenter requests that Mitigation Measure M-CP-4 be removed from the DEIR. As stated in the DEIR, p. III.D-40, “In the unlikely event that paleontological resources are discovered in the area during construction activities, potential significant impact on paleontological resources could occur.” As such, Mitigation Measure M-CP-4 is needed to reduce potential impacts. However, in response to this comment, the following text change has been made to pp. III.D-40 and III.D-41 in Section III.D, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, of the DEIR to clarify the mitigation measure:

Page III.D-40, last paragraph:

The slope debris in the plan area may contain fossils eroded from the Franciscan rocks, but such fossils would have been transported from their original locations and would lack stratigraphic context and, therefore, would be of limited scientific value. For the same reason, no valuable fossils are likely to occur in the artificial fill. In the unlikely event that paleontological resources are discovered in the area during construction activities extending into previously undisturbed soil or rock, ~~a potential~~ significant impact on paleontological resources could occur. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-4 would reduce impacts of the 2010 *Community Plan* to paleontological resources to a less-than-significant level. This mitigation would apply if excavation in the plan area is expected to extend into previously undisturbed soil or rock.

Page III.D-41, first paragraph:

M-CP-4 Paleontological Resources Monitoring Plan. If excavation in the plan area is expected to extend into previously undisturbed soil or rock, ~~t~~The SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall retain the services of a qualified paleontological consultant having expertise in California paleontology to design and implement a monitoring and mitigation program. The program shall include a description of when and where construction monitoring would be

required; emergency discovery procedures; sampling and data recovery procedures; procedures for the preparation, identification, analysis, and curation of fossil specimens and data recovered; preconstruction coordination procedures; and procedures for reporting the results of the monitoring program. If potentially important paleontological resources (fossilized invertebrate, vertebrate, plant, or micro-fossil) are encountered during excavation, work shall cease within 25 feet of the feature, the ERO shall be notified, and the paleontologist shall identify and evaluate the significance of the potential resource, documenting the findings in an advisory memorandum to the ERO...

TRANSPORTATION

Comment TR-1: The City's capacity utilization significance threshold may not be appropriate for future projects evaluated by BART.

"The draft EIR uses the City's Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review ('SF Guidelines') for purposes of establishing thresholds of significance for impacts on transit services. The SF Guidelines provide that a project will result in an impact on BART service if the project will add riders so as to cause BART trains to exceed 135% capacity utilization threshold during peak hours. The draft EIR then concludes that implementation of the 2010 Community Plan, including the anticipated TOD project on the BART parking lot, would not add sufficient riders to BART to trigger this threshold. BART acknowledges that, as lead agency for purposes of the 2010 Community Plan, the City has discretion to use the 135% utilization threshold of significance, and that the analysis and conclusion regarding impacts to BART service is supported by substantial evidence.

"BART notes, however, that, while the City has discretion to establish the threshold of significance to be used for its projects, and that the 135% capacity utilization threshold appears to be supported by substantial evidence, BART does not necessarily agree that the 135% capacity utilization is the appropriate threshold of significance for all BART projects, including other BART TOD projects. BART reserves its discretion to utilize different thresholds of significance for future projects, or to establish generally applicable thresholds of significance pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.7, provided such thresholds are supported by substantial evidence." (Jeff Ordway, BART, Letter, June 13, 2011)

Response TR-1

BART's statement that it reserves its discretion to utilize different thresholds of significance for transit impacts of future projects, or to establish generally applicable

thresholds of significance pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7, provided such thresholds are supported by substantial evidence, is acknowledged. The Planning Department acknowledges that the 135 percent threshold contained in the San Francisco Planning Department's *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review (SF Guidelines)* for transportation analysis is based on a threshold to account for seated passengers only. The Planning Department is currently coordinating with BART to potentially update the established capacity utilization thresholds for future environmental review analyses. Nonetheless, ridership and capacity utilization data presented by the City and by BART would not alter the analysis or the less-than-significant impact on BART service identified in the DEIR, pp. III.E-87 and III.E-88.

Comment TR-2: *The DEIR utilizes a conservative trip generation/mode split methodology.*

"Table III.E-6 of the draft EIR sets forth the 'Person Trip Generation for Plan Area Buildout' and concludes that the 92 residential units planned for the BART parking lot would result in 920 weekday daily trips, and the 14,913 square feet of retail space would result in 2,238 weekday daily trips. Initially, BART notes that, while it understands the City's decision to utilize a conservative approach to analysis which assumes the maximum buildout of both the residential and retail components of the BART parking lot, it is highly unlikely that both the residential and retail components will be builtout to the maximum scenario. More importantly, BART believes the trip generation methodology used in the draft EIR is very conservative, such that it overstates the amount of trips that will result from a TOD project on the BART parking lot. BART's experience with other TOD projects on its property indicates that the City's trip generation methodology may be overstating the number of trips that would be generated by a factor of three. This may result in part from an assumption that the retail component of the TOD project would generate trips at a rate similar to a suburban strip center rather than as an incidental, infill retail service in an established urban area. Similarly, the mode split information presented in Table III.E-7 makes certain assumptions different than BART has made for similar TOD projects. BART believes that residential trips should first be divided between work and non-work before any mode splits are applied. BART typically uses 25/75 percent work/non-work in undertaking this analysis.

"As noted above, we do not question the City's discretion to use the more conservative trip generation and mode split methodology for purposes of assessing impacts. BART notes, however, that it has used and will continue to use different, less conservative methodologies for other TOD projects on its property." (*Jeff Ordway, BART, Letter, June 13, 2011*)

Response TR-2

BART's statement that it has used and will continue to use different, less conservative trip generation and mode split methodologies for other transit oriented development (TOD) projects on its property is acknowledged. The conservative trip generation methodology in the DEIR reflects the City's *SF Guidelines* methodology and analyzes the maximum development potential in the plan area, since the actual development plan is not known. Similarly, and as discussed in the DEIR, conservative estimates regarding trip generation, in the absence of specific information such as the potential mix of residential unit sizes or retention of existing retail uses, were made. As identified in the Project Description, pp. II-17 to II-18, the DEIR acknowledges that it is unlikely that full buildout, as analyzed under the plan, would occur due to many factors including that the BART parking lot site is constrained and might not have enough capacity to support the maximum development potential. Similarly, the DEIR acknowledges that the development mix of residential, retail, and parking would likely be less; however, for the purpose of this EIR, the high range of all uses for the potential development was evaluated.

The City's trip generation rate for retail development is expressed in terms of person trips (150 daily or 14 PM peak hour person trips per 1,000 square feet), not vehicle trips as is more typical for suburban-type development. Automobile person trips, and more specifically vehicle trip rates, vary by Superdistrict and are based on the Citywide Travel Behavior Study, as further discussed below. The *SF Guidelines* retail person trip generation rate is regarded by the Planning Department as applicable for a typical retail development in San Francisco, including for a mixed-use development.

Pursuant to the *SF Guidelines*, the DEIR based mode splits on localized Census tract data for the residential commute patterns and Citywide Travel Behavior Study information for the retail commute patterns. The *SF Guidelines* apply different mode shares for work and non-work related trips (see Appendix E of the *SF Guidelines*). While for any individual development project, this area-wide data could underestimate or overestimate the amount of transit or vehicle use of residents, workers, or visitors, the

specific amount or percentage of this difference is uncertain. The City is willing to consider using alternate trip generation, mode split, and trip distribution methodologies or adjustments on a case-by-case basis for projects with uses or circumstances not addressed in the *SF Guidelines*. Any alternate methodology would need to be supported by applicable data and/or comparable development sources for the project location.

Comment TR-3: *The DEIR needs to consider the traffic conditions on Alemany Boulevard and surrounding streets.*

“Alemany Boulevard Conditions

“The DEIR describes traffic conditions at the Bosworth/Lyell intersection, and the Transportation Improvements include a Variant that would signalize that intersection. This improvement appears to be the right solution for that location. However, the DEIR should address morning and evening peak hour westbound traffic back-ups into the eastbound left lane of Alemany at Rousseau (traffic from Silver). The cross-town route and from Alemany to Bosworth Street along Rousseau, Still and Lyell Streets are not adequately addressed in the DEIR. The actual back-ups occur beyond the boundaries of the plan area but are caused by current controls at the intersection of Lyell and Bosworth. There is no discussion of the positive impacts of the proposed roundabout or traffic light on the current back-up to and into Alemany. The new traffic controls at the intersection of Lyell and Bosworth need to be designed to favor the traffic from Lyell because of the unequal traffic load at that intersection.” (*Nicolas Dewar, The Glen Park Association, Letter, June 13, 2011*)

Response TR-3

The DEIR did examine the operations of both the unsignalized intersections at Bosworth Street/Lyell Street and Still Street/Lyell Street and the signalized intersection at Alemany Boulevard/Lyell Street, the latter being outside the *2010 Community Plan* boundary. The intersection of Rousseau Street with Alemany Boulevard noted by the commenter is an uncontrolled intersection located approximately 1,000 feet from the Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersection and outside the *2010 Community Plan* boundary. There is a left-turn vehicle and bicycle lane on Alemany Boulevard onto Rousseau Street, which is one-way northbound street that becomes Still Street before ending at Lyell Street. The comment mentions traffic back-ups into the eastbound left lane of Alemany Boulevard at Rousseau Street, which are likely the result of left-turn demand occasionally exceeding the two-vehicle storage capacity of the short left-turn bay while waiting for a break in the oncoming Alemany Boulevard traffic.

Observations and analysis performed for the DEIR, pp. III.E-42 through III.E-44, for the 2010 *Community Plan* indicate that existing queues from Bosworth Street/Lyell Street extend approximately 400 feet south of the intersection, which operates at LOS F under AM and PM peak hour conditions. These queues do not extend beyond the intersection of Lyell Street and Still Street, and therefore would not influence traffic on Rousseau Street. Furthermore, the Alemany Boulevard/Lyell Street intersection operates at LOS B during the AM and PM peak hours under existing conditions and LOS D under 2030 cumulative conditions, both considered acceptable operating conditions.

While implementation of the 2010 *Community Plan* would not substantially alter traffic patterns on Rousseau Street, signalization of Bosworth Street and Lyell Street intersection, as shown on pp. III.E-35 and III.E-77 of the DEIR, would reduce vehicle delays and improve existing operating conditions to LOS B under both AM and PM peak hours and LOS B (AM) and LOS C (PM) with 2030 cumulative traffic. With signalization, average queues on Lyell Street would be reduced to an estimated 200 to 340 feet, depending upon the peak hour and year (higher queues and traffic occur under future conditions). However, the queues would typically clear on each cycle of the signal rather than standing at approximately 400 feet as currently occurs during peak hours. As a result, both Lyell Street and Still Street south of the plan area would be expected to experience less queuing and delay with the proposed signalization of the Bosworth Street/Lyell Street intersection than without. Nonetheless, the specific concern related to the operation of the left-turn movement from Alemany Boulevard onto Rousseau Street is noted, and has been relayed to SFMTA for future consideration when improvements to or repaving of Alemany Boulevard occur.

Comment TR-4: *The DEIR should evaluate the effects of the Bosworth Street Improvements on local circulation.*

“Bosworth Street Improvements

“The EIR evaluates the effects of the proposed improvements to Bosworth Street at its intersections with Arlington and Lyell Streets (DEIR pp. III.E-52 to III.E-56). This section of Bosworth is also part of a designated Bicycle Route in addition to being heavily used by pedestrians. The EIR should evaluate the impacts of the proposed improvements (roundabout

or speed tables) on pedestrian and bicycle safety. It is not clear how bicycle movements through the Arlington intersection would be routed without conflicts with vehicle traffic.

“Bosworth Street/Diamond Street Intersection Improvements

“The proposed changes would affect pedestrian, bicycle and automobile circulation (DEIR pp. III.E-38 to III.E-40). However, there is insufficient analysis of the pedestrian safety impacts of the various alternatives. For example, the EIR does not provide sufficient comparative analysis for the assessment of the impacts on pedestrian safety of a right-turn lane from Diamond Street onto Bosworth Street outside of the BART Station. We recommend further analysis to distinguish between the effects of the variants on pedestrian safety.” (*Nicolas Dewar, The Glen Park Association, Letter, June 13, 2011*)

Response TR-4

The commenter is correct that Bosworth Street and Lyell Street are part of Bicycle Routes 45 and 55, described in the Transportation and Circulation section, pp. III.E-20 and III.E-21, of the DEIR. The DEIR does address impacts of the proposed transportation improvements and variants on bicycles and pedestrians, including the roundabout and other traffic calming improvements on pp. III.E-52 through III.E-59. Specifically, the description of the *2010 Community Plan* in the Project Description, p. II-25 of the DEIR, shows a diagram of the potential traffic calming and roundabout improvements and adjacent bicycle lanes, including the separated bicycle path adjacent to the pedestrian sidewalk for the proposed roundabout. Pages III.E-57 through III.E-59 present the evaluation of bicycle safety with the proposed improvements, describe the path of bicycle movements through the roundabout and traffic calming elements, and for the roundabout, further discusses potential conflicts with vehicle movements. As noted in the referenced pages of the DEIR, there would be potential conflicts, and bicyclists would either have to merge to the right of vehicle traffic or use pedestrian pathways and crossings, yielding to motorists. This was identified as a less-than-significant impact on bicycle safety in the DEIR, p. III.E-58, generally due to the low volumes of bicycle traffic on these streets. The specific design of the roundabout would be required to meet state and federal design and safety standards.

The commenter states that there is insufficient analysis of the pedestrian safety impacts of the various alternatives, specifically referencing the right-turn conflict from Diamond

Street onto Bosworth Street. The Transportation and Circulation section of the DEIR, pp. III.E-54 through III.E-56, presents the evaluation of pedestrian safety with the proposed improvements. Consistent with the Project Objectives, stated on p. II-4 of the Project Description of the DEIR, pedestrian conflicts with vehicular movements, including the vehicle right-turn from Diamond Street onto Bosworth Street, as well as conflicts throughout the study area, were considered in the design of the proposed transportation improvements. Improvements such as the proposed pedestrian scramble, traffic calming, and elements of other improvements which improve upon or add to existing pedestrian crossings, would improve overall pedestrian conditions in the study area. For example, under the proposed project there would be no substantial impact on pedestrian safety from the proposed right-turn lane from Diamond Street to Bosworth Street over existing conditions because the proposed scramble phase would eliminate conflicts between pedestrians and right-turning vehicles. Nevertheless, the DEIR discloses less-than-significant pedestrian safety impacts from the project and variant improvements, including the discussion of additional conflicts with transit and roundabout improvements; pedestrian wait and movement analysis; lengths of pedestrian pathways; perception of safety with the removal of parking; and impacts to sidewalks and other pedestrian facilities. For more detail of the background analysis summarized in the DEIR, please see pp. 91 through 99 of Section 4.2.3, *Pedestrian Impacts*, of the *Glen Park Community Plan EIR Transportation Impact Study, Final Report*.⁹

⁹ Atkins, *Glen Park Community Plan EIR Transportation Impact Study, Final Report*. December 3, 2010. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as a part of Case No. 2005.1004!.

Comment TR-5: *The proposed Bus Loop Improvement needs to comply with Caltrans standards and creates circulation impacts.*

“Proposed BART Station Bus Loop Improvements

“Due to the short distance between the entrance into the proposed Bus Loop and the realigned Interstate (I) 280 southbound on-ramp, the improvement may cause confusion to drivers. Please provide appropriate signage to direct drivers.

“The proposed Bus Loop will violate the curb return distance requirement of minimum 400 feet required under the Highway Design Manual Section 504.3(3). As a result, a Design Exemption would be required from the Department.

“The realignment of the southbound I-280 would require extensive work within State right-of-way, we recommend the City to coordinate with the Department as soon as funding and plans are available. A Transportation Management Plan may also be necessary if detours and closures are required.” (*Gary Arnold, Caltrans, Letter, June 7, 2011*)

“BART Station Bus Loop

“The design proposal described in the EIR is difficult to understand. How would non-BART passengers using the bus loop platform access nearby streets? Would the BART fare gates need to be moved or new gates added on the bus platform? How does the bus loop support bus transfers among the 44 and 52 lines and the 23, 35, and 36 lines on the loop? While street crossings would be somewhat reduced, the route through the BART station would add distance for pedestrians to travel to reach the buses, which could contribute to pedestrian congestion. The 44 line is heavily used by transfer passengers.

“While it is noted on p. III.E-54 of the DEIR that pedestrian conflicts could occur at the intersection of the proposed bus loop with Bosworth Street and Diamond Streets, we request further analysis of the impacts of the proposed improvements on pedestrian and bicycle safety versus the benefits of the bus loop, including left turns by buses to the loop from Bosworth and from the loop to Diamond.

“Does the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection Level of Service (LOS) analysis take into account the bus loop operation? If not, it should be considered to ensure that the loop would not decrease LOS.

“We note that the bus loop involves a 14 percent exit grade. Could this grade constitute a design hazard? We recommend that the EIR discuss the operational aspects of this steep grade and any potential design hazards and include mitigation, if appropriate.” (*Nicolas Dewar, The Glen Park Association, Letter, June 13, 2011*)

“Another item I would like to address is the possible bus loop that was suggested for moving around behind the BART station itself. I think it's a really good idea.” (*Sally Ross, Resident, Public Hearing, June 2, 2011*)

Response TR-5

Regarding the transportation improvement locations, design, and coordination with Caltrans, the City is aware of the concerns noted in the comment and that additional coordination would be required should the project elements proceed to design. Caltrans was part of the stakeholder group that helped to develop and select the project elements, and such design concerns were voiced at those meetings. Furthermore, concerns about the project design elements, Caltrans property, and required consultations, review, and permits were further discussed in a preliminary meeting held with Caltrans in September 2009. If the proposed bus loop is advanced to project design, SFMTA will contact Caltrans to further coordinate on design, the need for a Design Exception or other approvals (for example, an encroachment permit), the appropriate signage to avoid driver confusion between the Bus Loop entrance and the adjacent I-280 on-ramp entrance from Bosworth Street, and initiate coordination with Caltrans to develop a Transportation Management Plan to address potential impacts during the construction period.

Regarding clarification of the proposed BART Station bus loop design improvement, as described in the Project Description, p. II-32 of the DEIR, "The concourse-level entry would include a walk-through bridge through the BART Station over the down escalator that would provide access from the bus platform to the current BART entry plaza." The entry walk-through bridge and exit to the BART entry plaza would be separated from the paid area of BART, so that non-BART passengers, while passing through the BART Station to the rear bus loop, would not pass through the BART fare gates or have access to the paid area. Although the walk-through bridge would be at the height of the concourse level, there is no concourse level in the station at this location, effectively separating it from the paid area. Similarly, Muni patrons entering from the bus loop on the south side of the station would proceed through the BART Station using the new bridge. They would then choose to either enter the station paid area through the current fare gates, as no new gates are proposed as part of the project, or go toward the

Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection. No fare gates are proposed for the south side of the station as a part of project design.

Transfers to and from the 35 Eureka, southbound 36 Teresita, and outbound 23 Monterey would be made on the bus loop platform since each of these lines would be relocated to utilize the proposed bus loop. Transfers to other Muni lines would be made at their stops on Bosworth Street, including those to the inbound 23 Monterey stop relocated to Bosworth Street. Transfers to and from the outbound 44 O'Shaughnessy and the northbound 36 Teresita would continue to cross Bosworth Street, as under existing conditions, but all others would be on the sidewalk adjacent to the BART entry plaza.

The walk-through bridge and associated entry plaza areas would be designed to accommodate planned pedestrian levels (based on existing and planned transit ridership and pedestrian counts in and around the BART Station area). The walking distances for some passengers would increase slightly, as noted by the commenter, e.g., transfers between the outbound 23 Monterey and outbound 44 O'Shaughnessy. On the whole, however, walking distance would decrease for the majority of passengers transferring to BART. As noted in the comments, the number of street crossings required in order for pedestrians to reach their desired transit service would be reduced.

The bus loop grade of 14 percent would not constitute a design hazard. Muni diesel buses currently operate on grades up to 23 percent. The bus loop exit ramp was designed to meet the feasibility requirement of limiting grades to 12 to 15 percent, and SFMTA would continue to consider this feasibility requirement in more detail if the bus loop is advanced as a project.

Regarding the resulting pedestrian and bicycle safety impacts of the proposed bus loop, p. III.E-20 of the DEIR states that "...cyclists can experience a high level of conflict with other modes while traveling through Glen Park, because they must share the roadway with vehicular traffic and because of the substantial amount of pedestrian traffic in this area." As described on p. III.E-58, the addition of the bus loop would not substantially

change this conflict, replacing the conflict of buses pulling to the curb, loading/unloading, and pulling away from the curb with movements that cross the bicyclists' paths, such as the buses entering and exiting the proposed bus loop driveways. In general, the driveway maneuvers would be less disruptive to bicyclists than buses parked at the curb, because at driveways, the bus is required to yield to cyclists, pedestrians, and other vehicles and the movement in general is more predictable to bicyclists. Additionally, when buses are parked at the curb, bicyclists must maneuver around the buses, which can require merging into higher speed vehicular traffic.

Page III.E-54 of the DEIR states that the number of pedestrians that could conflict with buses entering and exiting the bus loop at existing sidewalks (two new conflict areas), including left turn transit movements noted in the comment, would be offset by a greater reduction in pedestrian conflicts with transit vehicles from the relocation of bus stops behind the BART Station and away from vehicle traffic on Diamond Street. The conflict at the sidewalk entrance and exit of the bus loop was estimated to consist of 9 to 12 buses crossing per hour, which would be required to yield to pedestrians before entering or exiting the driveway. Although drivers on Diamond Street and Bosworth Street are also required to yield to pedestrians, the volume of vehicular traffic turning through the crosswalks is much greater and the potential for pedestrian conflicts is higher than with the bus loop. The design and selection of the project transportation improvement components, including the bus loop, did consider the benefits to pedestrians, consistent with the project objectives. However, the consideration of beneficial effects of projects is not part of CEQA analysis. Rather, per CEQA requirements, EIRs focus on identifying substantial adverse changes to the environment from project elements. Consistent with Section 15043 of the CEQA Guidelines, benefits of projects may be considered when considering the approval of projects with significant environmental impacts, which could be included in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

The DEIR transportation analysis did include the bus loop operations in its evaluation of intersection LOS operations, including at Bosworth Street and Diamond Street. Although the effects are not individually measureable since it reflects a decrease of four scheduled buses per hour going through the intersection, the overall effects would be positive and would not degrade the LOS at the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street intersection.

As noted on p. II-21 of the DEIR, whether or not the bus loop and other proposed transportation improvements are implemented remains to be determined. Their ultimate implementation depends upon a variety of factors, including decision-makers, funding, and community interests and priorities.

Comment TR-6: *The DEIR should consider other alternatives to the proposed Muni Metro J-Church access.*

“Also, close by that area would be an integration or a better integration and improved access to the J-Church line. And I would like it if the – if the proposal or the demonstrations more clearly address the interaction of these two items. It seems to me that the diagrams that were given show the progress walking across the area where the bus driveway would go. I'm not sure if that's desirable or not. The way to avoid the bus line seems to be either go over it or go under it. Either way is kind of expensive.” (*Sally Ross, Resident, Public Hearing, June 2, 2011*)

“Access to J-Line

“The J-Church access options, DEIR p II-30 and Figure II-8, show circuitous plans. Both plans would appear to conflict with the bus loop plan and the practicality of the plans is questionable. It is difficult to conclude that either would provide a practical improvement to access to the J-Church line, particularly given the physical infrastructure required. We recommend that other alternatives for access to the J-Line be developed and analyzed. We suggest that, as an alternative for analysis, the platforms at the J-Line stop be moved northward along San Jose Avenue so that the ADA compliant ramp from the platform to the BART station is a straight ramp rather than a switch-back ramp.” (*Nicolas Dewar, The Glen Park Association, Letter, June 13, 2011*)

Response TR-6

The DEIR considered a range of concepts to enhance access between BART and the adjacent Muni Metro J-Church stop, with many of those involving structures at the north end of the BART Station to separate the Muni Metro J-Church pedestrian access from the bus loop and other traffic ways. See the Summary, p. S-56, of the DEIR for a list

of pedestrian access improvements that were considered but rejected. None of the structures to the north were found to be feasible due to the difficulty of going over or under the adjacent highway structures while maintaining accessible grades. Pedestrian bridges that went over the off ramp from San Jose Avenue were too high in the air to connect at the BART Station, while those that went under could not clear the I-280 on ramp. Tunnels were generally rejected because of safety security concerns and area constraints.

The topography and highway structures around the BART Station limit the feasibility of many options. The proposed access options described in the Project Description, pp. II-30 and II-31, meet the plan's objective of creating an accessible connection between BART and the Muni Metro J-Church stop. The current Muni Metro J-Church stop is not accessible to persons with disabilities, and both the proposed and variant pedestrian access improvements would improve upon these conditions.

The proposed and variant pedestrian access improvements would not conflict with the bus loop. The DEIR states on p. II-30, "The pedestrian ramp could be configured to be compatible with other proposed improvements and variants, such as the 'bus loop improvement' or the 'no bus loop variant.'" The bus loop exit would cross the pedestrian path and existing sidewalk on Diamond Street at grade and the entrance (for the variant) would cross the Bosworth Street sidewalk, but buses would be required to yield to pedestrian and bicycle traffic. The DEIR, on p. III.E-55, discusses that the Transportation Improvement Variant accessible improvement with the pathway to the south side of the BART Station would be longer than the improvements proposed with the project and would require the installation of a pedestrian crossing on San Jose Avenue. The DEIR did not investigate relocating the Muni Metro J-Church stop and platform northward along San José Avenue, as suggested in the comment, but this concept could be explored if the project is advanced, although this could result in a longer pedestrian pathway. Steep grades and limited lateral space for the platforms may limit the feasibility of moving the platform north, but moving the platforms northward

up the hill could potentially allow a straight ramp connecting the station to the existing pedestrian overpass.

Comment TR-7: *The roundabout design needs to consider traffic at the I-280 southbound on-ramp.*

“Roundabout Variant

“On page 11-25, it is important to note that any queuing on the I-280 Southbound on-ramp will reduce the roundabout's capacity since it would affect other movements that otherwise would not be impacted by signalization.” (*Gary Arnold, Caltrans, Letter, June 7, 2011*)

Response TR-7

In preliminary design considerations for the roundabout, SFMTA considered the potential reduction in roundabout capacity due to queuing on I-280 southbound on-ramp. Given that the I-280 ramp is over 2,000 feet long in this location, the analysis concluded that on-ramp queuing events onto the I-280 that would affect roundabout traffic are rare, and that if they occurred, as under existing conditions, vehicles would choose to wait and indeed reduce the capacity of adjacent roadways, or choose to detour to another route. While signalization at this location would cause fewer intersection movements to be blocked than a roundabout in case of on-ramp traffic spilling back into the intersection, signalization was not considered because the unsignalized intersection operates at a satisfactory level of service and the draft *Community Plan* called for a roundabout to calm traffic at this location.

AIR QUALITY

Comment AQ-1: *The EIR should consider the expansion of corporate shuttle buses in the air quality analysis.*

“The corporate shuttle bus use of the BART Station probably impacts air quality. We recognize that the shuttle buses are part of the existing conditions in the project area; however, the Community Plan may encourage additional use of corporate shuttle buses. We recommend that the existing air impacts from shuttle buses be separately calculated, as well as general impacts from expanded use of shuttle buses in the future.

“Given the baseline air quality in the Glen Park village is poor due to its proximity to Highway 280, Bosworth, and San Jose Avenue, any additional pollutant sources adds to the impacts. The EIR could also consider placing restrictions on the future growth of corporate shuttle bus use

and limiting the idling of the buses as part of the mitigation under potential impact AQ-7 on page III.G-34. The measure could also be added to the construction analysis. Limitations on the use and idling of the shuttle buses during construction would also reduce overall air emissions.” (Nicolas Dewar, *The Glen Park Association, Letter, June 13, 2011*)

Response AQ-1

The comment refers to potential air quality impacts that could result from corporate shuttle bus expansion at the Glen Park BART Station. There are no identified plans for shuttle bus expansion at the Glen Park BART Station and such expansion is not called for in the *2010 Community Plan*. As such, this issue is not evaluated in the DEIR. Furthermore, it is not anticipated that implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would result in a substantial increase in corporate shuttle buses at the BART Station because the loading and unloading zones at the Glen Park BART Station are not expected to be expanded. Thus, shuttle buses will remain as a part of the existing conditions and will not be analyzed separately.

E. DRAFT EIR REVISIONS

This section contains revisions to the DEIR in response to public comments that have been made on the DEIR, as well as revisions initiated by Planning Department staff. Deletions to the DEIR text are shown with ~~striketrough~~ and additions are shown with double underline.

TEXT CHANGES IN RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Page III.D-26, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, 2nd paragraph from the bottom of the page, has been modified as follows:

CP-1 *Operation and design associated with the 2010 Community Plan's Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements~~access~~, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement at the BART Station would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

Page III.D-29, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, paragraph 3, has been modified as follows:

The 2010 Community Plan proposes transportation improvements that could affect the physical characteristics of the BART Station that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register. As described further below, these plan transportation improvements include: s the Diamond Street widening variant; the two options for changes to the BART Station in order to enhance pedestrian access by improving the connectivity between the BART Station station and the Muni Metro J-Church stop on San Jose Avenue; the BART Station plaza improvements; and the bus loop improvement at the BART Station.

Widening of Diamond Street Variant. The proposed Diamond Street widening variant would consist of widening Diamond Street with a northbound right-turn lane. If this variant were implemented, the Glen Park BART Station plaza, including portions of the exterior plazas, would be modified to include a sloped landscaped area, a ramp accessible to persons with disabilities, an elevator connecting the street level to the plaza level, stairs down to plaza from the sidewalk, bench seating, bicycle lockers, bicycle parking, a bicycle ramp, and ticket machines. These modifications would alter portions of the exterior plazas of the BART Station, which are character-defining features. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed project. In order to provide a cautious

disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes the Diamond Street widening variant would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact of the proposed Diamond Street widening variant would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, described below. (As discussed on pp. III.D-30 through III.D-31, this mitigation measure also addresses significant impacts resulting from construction of the Muni Metro J-Church pedestrian connectivity improvements, the BART Station plaza improvements, and the bus loop improvement.)

Proposed Muni Metro J-Church Pedestrian Bridge Improvement. ~~The first pedestrian access option is to rebuild the existing pedestrian bridge and to construct an elevator between Diamond Street and the BART Station entry plaza, which would alter the BART Station. Rebuilding the existing pedestrian bridge would not directly impact the station or have a significant impact on its setting. The proposed pedestrian bridge would replace the existing structure, which is not readily visible from the station due to a row of trees lining the southwest corner of the parcel containing the station. Consequently, the reconstructed bridge would have no impact on the BART Station. However, the elevator would be located at the station's north elevation just south of the existing BART ticket machines. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed elevator, so it is not known if its design or scale would be compatible with the design of the BART Station. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes the design and operation of the elevator would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.~~

~~This significant impact of the elevator associated with the proposed Muni Metro J-Church Pedestrian Bridge improvement on the BART Station would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, as described below. (As discussed on page III.D-31, this mitigation measure also addresses significant impacts resulting from construction of the bus loop improvement.)~~

Page III.D-30, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, paragraph 3, has been modified as follows:

M-CP-1 Verification of Compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), in cooperation with BART and any other agency that may have jurisdiction, will prepare materials describing and depicting the widening of Diamond Street variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements measures, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement at the BART Station, including but not limited to plans, drawings, and photographs of existing conditions. Prepared materials will be submitted to the Planning Department for review by staff who meet the Secretary of Interior's professional qualification standards. ~~The Planning Department~~ Such staff will review and the Historic Preservation Commission shall approve the project for compliance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. If any aspect of the design of the widening of Diamond Street variant, pedestrian bridge-connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and/or bus loop improvement at the BART Station is determined to be inconsistent with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall pursue and implement a redesign of those elements, consistent with the goals and objectives of the project, such that consistency with the standards is achieved.

Proposed Muni Metro J-Church Pedestrian Bridge Improvement. The first pedestrian access option is to rebuild the existing pedestrian bridge and to construct an elevator between Diamond Street and the BART Station plaza, which would alter the BART Station. Rebuilding the existing pedestrian bridge would not directly impact the station or have a significant impact on its setting. The proposed pedestrian bridge would replace the existing structure, which is not readily visible from the station due to a row of trees lining the southwest corner of the parcel containing the station. Consequently, the reconstructed bridge would have no impact on the BART Station. However, the elevator would be located at the station's north elevation just south of the existing BART ticket machines. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed elevator, so it is not

known if its design or scale would be compatible with the design of the BART Station. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes the design and operation of the elevator would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact of the elevator associated with the proposed Muni Metro J-Church Pedestrian Bridge Improvement on the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, described above, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties.

Muni Metro J-Church At-Grade Crossing Variant. The second pedestrian access option is to construct a new pedestrian ramp between the Muni Metro J-Church platform and the BART Station at the station's south, or rear, elevation. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed pedestrian ramp, so it is not known if its design or scale would be compatible with the design of the BART Station. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes the design and operation of this at-grade crossing variant would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

Page III.D-31, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, paragraph 2, has been modified as follows:

This significant impact of the pedestrian ramp associated with the Muni Metro J-Church At-Grade Crossing Variant on the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, described above, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*.

BART Station Plaza Improvements. The redesign of the BART Station plaza concept would consist of removing walls and fences, expanding at-grade access, and linking Muni passenger areas to improve pedestrian access in the BART Station plaza. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed redesign of the BART Station plaza, so it is not known if its design or scale would be compatible with the design of the BART Station. In order to provide a

cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes the design and operation of the BART Station plaza improvements would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact associated with the redesign of the BART Station plaza would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, described above, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties.

BART Station Bus Loop Improvement. The proposed BART Station Bus Loop Improvement would consist of a bus loop around the Glen Park BART Station with a new concourse-level entry to the station at its south elevation. This improvement would construct a concourse-level entry at the Glen Park BART Station's south elevation and a walk-through bridge through the station to the north-end plaza to reconfigure the staircase at the north plaza. These modifications would alter the station's character-defining features, including its interior space and the exterior plazas. Specifically, the bus loop improvement could significantly impact the design and character of the interior space, including, but not limited to the relationship of the roof form, the interior tile mosaic, and the fenestration. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed project. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes the bus loop improvement ~~it~~ would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact of the proposed BART Station Bus Loop around the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, described above, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*.

No Bus Loop Variant. The No Bus Loop Variant would consolidate existing private vehicle drop-off areas on Bosworth Street and on Diamond Street. This variant would not directly impact the BART Station. It would not materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the Glen Park BART

Station that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register. The impact of the No Bus Loop Variant would therefore be considered less than significant.

Page III.D-32, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, paragraph 2, has been modified as follows:

CP-2 *Construction activities resulting from the Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements~~access~~, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvements at the BART Station would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

Page III.D-33, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, paragraph 4, has been modified as follows:

Transportation Improvements. Construction activities at the BART Station would be associated with the Diamond Street widening variant, ~~Muni Metro J Church~~ pedestrian connectivity improvements~~bridge~~, BART Station plaza improvements, and the bus loop improvement.

Widening of Diamond Street Variant. The proposed Diamond Street widening variant would consist of widening Diamond Street with a northbound right-turn lane. Inadvertent damage to the BART Station plaza could occur during construction due to heavy machinery use, vibration, and other construction activity. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes construction altering the BART Station plaza would result in a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact of the proposed Diamond Street widening variant would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties and Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A through M-CP-2C, described below.

~~Proposed Muni Metro J Church Pedestrian Bridge Improvement.~~ Construction activities ~~associated with the proposed bridge would occur towards the southwest corner of the parcel containing the station, far enough way to not~~

~~significantly impact the BART Station. However, the elevator would be located at the station's north elevation just south of the existing BART ticket machines. Inadvertent damage to the BART Station could occur during the construction of the elevator due to heavy machinery use, vibration, and other construction activity, which would be considered a significant impact. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes construction of the elevator would result in a potentially significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.~~

~~This significant impact of the proposed Muni Metro J Church Pedestrian Bridge elevator on the BART Station would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties, together with Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A through M-CP-2C, described below.~~

Page III.D-36, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, first paragraph, has been modified as follows:

Proposed Muni Metro J-Church Pedestrian Bridge Improvement. Construction activities associated with the proposed bridge would occur towards the southwest corner of the parcel containing the station, far enough way to not significantly impact the BART Station. However, the elevator would be located at the station's north elevation just south of the existing BART ticket machines. Inadvertent damage to the BART Station could occur during the construction of the elevator due to heavy machinery use, vibration, and other construction activity, which would be considered a significant impact. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes construction of the elevator would result in a potentially significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact of the proposed Muni Metro J-Church Pedestrian Bridge elevator on the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties, together with Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A through

M-CP-2C, pp. III.D-34 to III.D-35. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2A₇ calls for the protection of historical resource during construction by following a specific plan while working near these intersections. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2B calls for historical resource ~~and~~ documentation and protection, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-2C calls for verification of historic preservation. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of construction activities on the BART Station to a less-than-significant level.

Muni Metro J-Church At-Grade Crossing Variant. Inadvertent damage to the BART Station could occur during the construction of the pedestrian ramp due to heavy machinery use, vibration, and other construction activity. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes construction of the pedestrian ramp would be a significant impact, because it could materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact of the proposed elevator on the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through incorporation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*, and Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A through M-CP-2C, pp. III.D-34 to III.D-35. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2A₇ calls for the protection of historical resource during construction by following a specific plan while working near these intersections. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2B calls for historical resource ~~and~~ documentation and protection, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-2C calls for verification of historic preservation. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of construction activities on the BART Station to a less-than-significant level.

BART Station Plaza Improvements. The redesign of the BART Station plaza would consist of removing walls and fences, expanding at-grade access, and linking Muni passenger areas to improve pedestrian access in the BART Station plaza. Inadvertent damage to the BART Station could occur during construction altering the BART Station plaza due to heavy machinery use, vibration, and other construction activity. In order to provide a cautious disclosure of impacts on the BART Station, this analysis assumes construction altering the BART Station plaza would result in a significant impact, because it could materially

impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register.

This significant impact of the proposed BART Station Plaza Improvements would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, p.III.D-30, which requires compliance with Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties, and Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A through M-CP-2C, pp.III.D-34 to III.D-35. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2A calls for the protection of historical resource during construction by following a specific plan. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2B calls for historical resource documentation and protection, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-2C calls for verification of historic preservation. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of construction activities on the BART Station to a less-than-significant level.

BART Station Bus Loop Improvement. Inadvertent damage to the Glen Park BART Station could occur during the construction of the concourse level entry and the walk-through bridge associated with the proposed BART Station Bus Loop Improvement. The damage could occur due to heavy machinery use, vibration, and other construction activity, which would be considered a significant impact. This significant impact on the BART Station would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-1, p. III.D-30, which requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*, and Mitigation Measures M-CP-2A through M-CP-2C, pp. III.D-34 to III.D-35. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2A, calls for the protection of historical resources during construction by following a specific plan while working near these intersections. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2B calls for historic resource ~~and~~ documentation and protection, and Mitigation Measure M-CP-2C calls for verification of historic preservation. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact of construction activities on the BART Station to a less-than-significant level.

No Bus Loop Variant. The No Bus Loop Variant would consolidate existing private vehicle drop-off areas on Bosworth Street and on Diamond Street. This variant would not directly impact the BART Station and would have minor construction impact on its exterior plazas. It would not materially impair those physical characteristics, such as the exterior plazas, of the Glen Park BART Station that

justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register. The impact would therefore be considered less than significant.

Page III.D-40, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, last paragraph, has been modified as follows:

The slope debris in the plan area may contain fossils eroded from the Franciscan rocks, but such fossils would have been transported from their original locations and would lack stratigraphic context and, therefore, would be of limited scientific value. For the same reason, no valuable fossils are likely to occur in the artificial fill. In the unlikely event that paleontological resources are discovered in the area during construction activities extending into previously undisturbed soil or rock, ~~a potential~~ significant impact on paleontological resources could occur. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-4 would reduce impacts of the *2010 Community Plan* to paleontological resources to a less-than-significant level. This mitigation would apply if excavation in the plan area is expected to extend into previously undisturbed soil or rock.

Page III.D-41, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, paragraph 1, has been modified as follows:

M-CP-4 Paleontological Resources Monitoring Plan. If excavation in the plan area is expected to extend into previously undisturbed soil or rock, ~~t~~The SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall retain the services of a qualified paleontological consultant having expertise in California paleontology to design and implement a monitoring and mitigation program. The program shall include a description of when and where construction monitoring would be required; emergency discovery procedures; sampling and data recovery procedures; procedures for the preparation, identification, analysis, and curation of fossil specimens and data recovered; preconstruction coordination procedures; and procedures for reporting the results of the monitoring program. If potentially important paleontological resources (fossilized invertebrate, vertebrate, plant, or micro-fossil) are encountered during excavation, work shall cease within 25 feet of the feature, the ERO shall be notified, and the paleontologist shall identify and evaluate the significance of the potential resource, documenting the findings in an advisory memorandum to the ERO...

STAFF-INITIATED TEXT CHANGES

Changes to Clarify Project Components and Associated Impacts

Page S-7, Summary, Table S-2, has been modified as follows:

Pedestrian Access		
Pedestrian Connectivity between Muni Metro J-Church Light Rail Platform and Glen Park BART Station	New pedestrian bridge from existing Muni Metro J-Church light rail platform to the intersection of San Jose Avenue off-ramp, Diamond Street, and Monterey Boulevard. ^d	New at-grade ramp (with or without bus loop)
<u>BART Station Plaza Improvements</u>	<u>Plaza alterations to improve pedestrian access and access for persons with disabilities in the BART Station plaza.</u>	<u>No variants</u>
Pedestrian Improvements under Overpasses	Improvement of pedestrian experience under I-280 and San Jose Avenue.	No variants

Page S-11, Summary, Table S-3, has been modified as follows:

Cultural and Paleontological Resources	CP-1 Operation and design associated with the 2010 Community Plan's <u>Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements access, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement</u> at the BART Station would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource.	S	<i>M-CP-1 Verification of Compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.</i> San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), in cooperation with BART and any other agency that may have jurisdiction, will prepare materials describing and depicting the <u>widening of Diamond Street variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements measures, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement at the BART Station</u> , including but not limited to plans, drawings, and photographs of existing conditions. Prepared materials will be submitted to the Planning Department <u>for review by staff who meet the Secretary of Interior's professional qualification standards.</u> ~~The Planning Department~~ Such staff will review and the Historic Preservation Commission shall approve the project for compliance with the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> . If any aspect of the design of the <u>widening of Diamond Street variant, pedestrian bridge connectivity improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, or and bus loop improvement at the BART station</u> is determined to be inconsistent with the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> , SFMTA, BART, and any other agency that may have jurisdiction shall pursue and implement a redesign of those elements, consistent with the goals and objectives of the project, such that consistency with the standards is achieved.	LTS/ MM

Page S-41, Summary, Table S-5, has been modified as follows:

Cultural and Paleontological Resources	CP-1 Operation and design associated with the <i>2010 Community Plan's Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity improvements access, BART Station plaza improvements, and bus loop improvement</i> at the BART Station would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-1.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-1.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-1.

Page II-22, Project Description, Table II-3, has been modified as follows:

Pedestrian Access		
Pedestrian Connectivity between Muni Metro J-Church Light Rail Platform and Glen Park BART Station	New pedestrian bridge from existing Muni Metro J-Church light rail platform to the intersection of San Jose Avenue off-ramp, Diamond Street, and Monterey Boulevard. ^d	New at-grade ramp (with or without bus loop)
<u>BART Station Plaza Improvements</u>	<u>Plaza alterations to improve pedestrian access and access for persons with disabilities in the BART Station plaza.</u>	<u>No variants</u>
<u>Pedestrian Improvements under Overpasses</u>	Improvement of pedestrian experience under I-280 and San Jose Avenue.	No variants

Page II-30, Project Description, a new paragraph 1 has been inserted as follows:

BART Station Plaza Improvements. The 2010 Community Plan suggests alterations to the BART Station plaza that could improve the pedestrian experience between transit services, the commercial district, and the BART Station. The improvements include removing walls and fences, expanding at-grade access, and linking Muni passenger areas.

Page III.D-12, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, 2nd paragraph, has been modified as follows:

Glen Park BART Station

The Glen Park BART Station appears to be eligible for the California Register under Criterion 3 (Design/Construction) for possessing high artistic value, for representing the work of a master, and for embodying the distinctive characteristics of a period. Its character-defining features are the exterior plazas, in particular the circular courtyard; interplay of building materials including BART rails for the roof structure, rusticated concrete, marble mosaic, slate cladding, painted concrete materials; and roof form. It does not yet appear to be eligible for the National Register, since it does not appear to meet the higher threshold of Criterion Consideration G for buildings that are less than 50 years old. Although the station was completed in 1970 and is not yet 45 years old, the building is able to express its historical significance for listing in the California Register. While the BART Station does not appear to be eligible for the National Register under Criterion Consideration G, it is eligible for listing as a City Landmark.

Page V-6, Alternatives, last paragraph regarding Alternative B, has been modified as follows:

Transportation improvements would also be implemented as proposed under the 2010 *Community Plan*. Because the transportation improvements are the same under the proposed project, all impacts discussed under the proposed project apply for Alternative B. As discussed for the 2010 *Community Plan*, the Diamond Street widening variant would alter portions of the exterior plazas of the BART Station, which are character-defining features. ~~The~~ existing pedestrian bridge would be rebuilt and an elevator would be constructed between Diamond Street and the BART Station ~~entry~~ plaza that would alter the BART Station. The BART Station plaza improvements would modify the BART Station by removing walls and fences, expanding at-grade access, and linking Muni passenger areas to improve access. ~~This~~ ~~These improvements~~ could materially impair those physical characteristics, including the exterior plazas, of the station that justify the BART Station's eligibility for inclusion in the California Register. In addition, the BART Station loop improvement would construct the concourse level entry at the Glen Park BART Station's south elevation and the walk-through bridge through the station to the north-end plaza. This modification would reconfigure the staircase at the north plaza which would alter the station's character-defining features, including its interior space and the exterior plazas. Alternative B, like the proposed project, could

significantly impact the design and character of the interior space, including, but not limited to the relationship of the roof form, the interior tile mosaic, and the fenestration. Detailed drawings have not been prepared for the proposed project.

Page V-14, Alternatives, last paragraph regarding Alternative C, has been modified as follows:

Transportation improvements would also be implemented as proposed under the 2010 *Community Plan*. Because the transportation improvements are the same under the proposed project and Alternative B, all impacts discussed under the proposed project apply for Alternative C. In addition, impacts associated with the Diamond Street widening variant, pedestrian connectivity bridge improvements, BART Station plaza improvements, and the bus loop improvement would be the same as described under Alternative B and Mitigation Measure M-CP-1 would apply. ~~Please refer to the discussion presented under Alternative B, Cultural Resources above, for the impact discussion associated with the Muni Metro J Church Pedestrian Bridge improvement and the BART Station loop improvement and the associated Mitigation Measure M-CP-1.~~ Mitigation Measure M-CP-1 described in Section III.D, Cultural Resources, p. III.D-30, requires compliance with *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties*.

Page V-15, Alternatives, 1st paragraph:

A paragraph break has been inserted in front of the sentence beginning with “As with Alternative B, Alternative C...”

Page V-20, Alternatives, Table V-1, has been modified as follows:

Cultural and Paleontological Resources	CP-1 Operation and design associated with the 2010 <i>Community Plan's</i> <u>Diamond Street widening variant</u> , pedestrian <u>connectivity improvements</u> ~~access~~ , <u>BART Station plaza improvements</u> , and bus loop <u>improvement</u> at the BART Station would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the BART Station, a historical resource. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-1.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-1.	Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure M-CP-1.

Plan Refinements Changes

Page S-3, Summary, 3rd paragraph, has been modified as follows:

Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would involve modification of Planning Code land use controls. A new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit (Glen Park NCT) District would incorporate parcels along Diamond Street, Chenery Street, Joost Avenue, and Wilder Street currently zoned NC-2 (Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial) and RH-3 (Residential House, Three Family). In addition, 605 Chenery Street and 3121-25 Castro Street would be rezoned from RH-2 (Residential House, Two Family) to Glen Park NCT. The Glen Park NCT District rezoning would permit new physical changes such as modifications to density controls, increased heights, setbacks, façade treatments, and minimization of curb cuts. This EIR recognizes that physical impacts could occur as a result of subsequent development resulting from rezoning, and considers such impacts within this EIR.

Page S-5, Summary, Table S-1, has been modified as follows:

TABLE S-1 SUMMARY OF MAXIMUM DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL			
	Residential	Commercial	Parking
Diamond Street/ Bosworth Street	47	8,582	26
BART Parking Lot	90	14,913	123
Other Development	13	~~05,250~~	0
Total	150	~~23,495~~ 28,745	149

Page S-41, Summary, Table S-5, has been modified as follows:

TABLE S-5 COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT TO ALTERNATIVES B AND C			
	Proposed Project	Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development	Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix
Description	Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street	Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street	Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street
	Up to 47 residential units	Up to 10 residential units	Up to 15 residential units
	Up to 8,582 gsf ground-floor commercial	Up to 1,000 gsf ground-floor commercial	No ground-floor commercial
	Up to 26 private parking spaces	Up to 11 private parking spaces	Up to 15 private parking spaces
	BART Parking Lot	BART Parking Lot	BART Parking Lot
	Up to 90 residential units	Up to 31 residential units	19 residential units
	0 to 14,913 gsf commercial uses	Up to 2,000 gsf commercial uses	Up to 5,000 gsf commercial uses
	Up to 123 private parking		Up to 22 private parking spaces

TABLE S-5
COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT TO ALTERNATIVES B AND C

Proposed Project	Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development	Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix
spaces	Up to 33 private parking spaces	Other Development
Other Development	Other Development	13 residential units
13 residential units	13 residential units	<u>5,250 gsf ground-floor commercial</u>
<u>5,250 gsf ground-floor commercial</u>	<u>5,250 gsf ground-floor commercial</u>	Proposed Transportation Improvements
Proposed Transportation Improvements	Proposed Transportation Improvements	Traffic Calming
Traffic Calming	Traffic Calming	Bicycle Networks
Bicycle Networks	Bicycle Networks	Pedestrian Access
Pedestrian Access	Pedestrian Access	Transit Improvements
Transit Improvements	Transit Improvements	

Source: PBS&J, 2011.

Page S-49, Summary, 2nd and 3rd paragraph, has been modified as follows:

As described under the proposed project, other development potential within the Glen Park NCT District would be expected to occur over the life of the *2010 Community Plan*. The maximum development potential in the plan area, excluding development potential associated with the two infill sites, would be 13 residential units and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses, the same as under the proposed project. ~~No increase in commercial floor area is anticipated outside of the two infill sites.~~

In summary, the development at the infill sites under Alternative B would be reduced to 54 residential units compared to 150 under the proposed project. In addition, the total commercial space would be limited to 3,000 gsf compared to approximately ~~24,000~~ 28,745 gsf proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*.

Page S-51, Summary, last paragraph, has been modified as follows:

Other development potential within the Glen Park NCT District would be expected to occur over the life of the *2010 Community Plan*. The maximum development potential in the plan area, excluding development potential associated with the two infill development sites would be 13 residential units and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses, the same as under the

proposed project. ~~No increase in commercial floor area is anticipated outside of the two infill sites.~~

Page S-52, Summary, first paragraph has, been revised as follows:

In summary, the development at the infill sites would be reduced to 47 residential units compared to 150 under the proposed project. In addition, the total commercial space would be limited to 5,000 gsf compared to approximately ~~24,000~~ 28,745 gsf proposed under the 2010 *Community Plan*.

Page II-2, Project Description, paragraph 3, has been modified as follows:

The 2010 *Community Plan* includes a draft implementation program that outlines follow up actions that are recommended to take place in order to make the plan's vision a reality. Actions include updating the Planning Code to reflect the zoning change of Neighborhood Commercial (NC-2), Residential House, Three Family (RH-3), and Residential House, Two Family (RH-2) zoned properties 605 Chenery Street and 3121-25 Castro Street to Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT) District; considering rezoning the BART parking lot; preserving historic resources by the Historic Preservation Commission (HCP) and nominating eligible properties to the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register); developing a greenway design for greenway path; conducting technical studies of daylighting portion of Islais Creek through Glen Park; and promoting other open space in the area.

Page II-3, Project Description, Table II-1, has been modified as follows:

**TABLE II-1
COMPARISON OF 2003 AND 2010 COMMUNITY PLANS**

Plan Component	2003 Community Plan Summary ^a	2010 Community Plan ^{b, c, d}
Land Use Policies and Planning Code Amendments		
Revised Land Use Districts	Rezoning of small-scale Neighborhood Commercial (NC-2) zoning to Glen Park NCT zoning.	Same, <u>except for the additional rezoning of Residential House, Three Family (RH-3) and Residential House, Two Family (RH-2) zoned properties at 605 Chenery Street and 3121-25 Castro Street to Glen Park NCT zoning.</u>
	Rezoning of BART parking lot infill site, Public (P) zoning to Glen Park NCT and Residential, Two Family (RH-2) zoning.	Removed. BART parking lot site is not proposed to be rezoned as part of the Community Plan process.
	Rezoning of Diamond/Bosworth infill site from NC-2/RH-2 to Glen Park NCT zoning.	Same

**TABLE II-1
COMPARISON OF 2003 AND 2010 COMMUNITY PLANS**

Plan Component	2003 Community Plan Summary^a	2010 Community Plan^{b, c, d}
Revisions to Height and Bulk Controls	Rezoning of parcels to Glen Park NCT to increase height from 40 to 45 feet.	Same, <u>except for portions of Wilder Street, Diamond Street, and Chenery Street which would decrease in height from a range of 40 to 45 feet to a range of 30 to 35 feet under the Glen Park NCT zoning.</u>
	Rezoning of parcels to Glen Park NCT, at the BART parking lot site, to increase height from 40 to 65 feet.	Removed
Historic Preservation Policies	Not included	Policies encouraging the preservation of historic resources in the Glen Park neighborhood.
Design Guidelines		
Public Realm (Streetscape) Guidelines	Streetscape design guidelines for public realm improvements.	Removed
Architectural Design Guidelines	Architectural design guidelines for the commercial core.	Removed
Infill Site Design Guidelines	Site-specific design guidelines for infill sites.	Removed
Transportation Improvements		
Traffic Calming	Traffic calming improvements along Bosworth Street and at the intersection of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street.	Same
Bicycle Networks	San Francisco Bicycle Plan improvements 5-7a and 5-7b.	Same
Pedestrian Access	Pedestrian connection to the Muni Metro J-Church stop.	Same
Transit Improvements	Connection between Muni bus service and the Glen Park BART Station.	Same
Parking	Suggested methods to better utilize on-street parking.	Same
Greenway Improvements		
Linear greenway	Development of linear greenway connecting Glen Canyon Park to Downtown Glen Park.	Policies encouraging the greenway connection of Glen Canyon Park to Downtown Glen Park.
Daylighting of Islais Creek	Strategies and design measures for daylighting of Islais Creek.	Policies encouraging the daylighting of Islais Creek.

Sources: SFMTA, City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, PBS&J, 2011.

- a. City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, Glen Park Community Plan Summary, November 2003. Available at: <http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/planning/citywide/pdf/gpdplowres.pdf>.
- b. City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, Glen Park Community Plan, Working Draft for Community Discussion, (Appendix B), September 2010. Available at: http://www.sflanning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Glen_Park/Glen_Park_Community_Plan_091310.pdf
- c. City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, Glen Park Community Plan (2010) Text Changes, Memo from Jon Swae to Lisa Gibson, March 22, 2011. See Appendix C.
- d. City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, Glen Park Community Plan Refinements Subsequent to Draft EIR Publication, Memorandum from Jon Swae to Lisa Gibson, September 23, 2011. See Appendix F.

Page II-13, Project Description, 1st and 3rd paragraphs, has been modified as follows:

Revisions to Use Districts

Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would introduce a new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit (Glen Park NCT) District to reflect the area's proximity to abundant transit service. The new Glen Park NCT District would incorporate parcels along Diamond Street, Chenery Street, Joost Avenue, and Wilder Street currently zoned NC-2 and RH-3, and 605 Chenery Street and 3121-3125 Castro Street currently zoned RH-2, as shown in Figure II-3, p. II-14. The *2010 Community Plan* does not propose rezoning the BART parking lot, which currently is in the Public (P) District. This EIR, however, analyzes the potential environmental effects that would result from infill development on this site under a potential future rezoning scenario, described on p. II-17.

Revisions to Height and Bulk Districts

Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would involve modification of height and bulk controls in the San Francisco Planning Code. While most of the plan area would retain the prevailing height limit of 40-X, the height limit would be increased to 45 feet in areas rezoned to Glen Park NCT to encourage active ground-floor uses.⁸ An increase in five feet would allow for storefronts with more space and provide easy access for pedestrians. The increase, however, does not allow for an additional floor of development. The *2010 Community Plan* does not propose rezoning the BART parking lot, which would remain in the 40-X Height and Bulk District.

⁸ Subsequent to the publication of the DEIR, height districts in the *2010 Community Plan* were revised to more closely reflect the heights of existing development in the Glen Park village core. The height district refinement would reduce the maximum height of new construction along portions of Wilder Street, Diamond Street, Castro Street, and Chenery Street in the Glen Park NCT district from a range of 40 to 45 feet to a range of 30 to 35 feet. A map showing the proposed height district revision is contained in Appendix F. However, for the purpose of this EIR, a height limit of 45 feet in areas rezoned to Glen Park NCT is still being analyzed to present a conservative estimate of impacts.

Page II-18, Project Description, last paragraph, has been modified as follows:

The maximum development potential in the plan area, excluding development potential associated with the two infill sites discussed above, is estimated to be 13 residential units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses at 2928-2958 Diamond Street. The exact location of ~~these~~ the 13 units is unknown at this time.

Therefore, they are not shown in Figure II-3, p. II-14. No increase in ~~commercial floor areas or~~ parking is anticipated.⁴⁰

An increase in commercial floor area could potentially occur on six residentially zoned parcels on Diamond Street (2928-2958) that are proposed to be rezoned from RH-3 to Glen Park NCT. The proposed rezoning would increase the development potential within the plan area. Given the existing residential uses, it is not yet known at this time if commercial development would occur on these six parcels. However, for the purpose of this EIR, it is expected that over the life of the 2010 Community Plan commercial development could occur. The rezoning of the parcels on Diamond Street to Glen Park NCT could potentially allow the conversion of ground-floor garages into commercial spaces at some future time while allowing existing residential units to remain. Assuming that half of the garages would redevelop by 2030 in response to the zoning change, the amount of commercial space that could be created is approximately 5,250 sf.¹⁰

⁴⁰ ~~All of the existing buildings within the parcels that would be rezoned currently contain ground floor commercial uses. Because the Glen Park NCT District limits commercial uses to the ground floor, commercial uses would be replaced at a 1:1 ratio.~~

¹⁰ Atkins, Glen Park Community Plan EIR – Additional Retail Space on Diamond Street Associated with Plan Refinements Subsequent to DEIR Publication, memorandum from Gui Shearin to Lisa Gibson, September 28, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004!. Based on an aerial photograph, the buildings are approximately 25 feet wide and 65 to 70 feet deep. The total ground floor area of the six residential properties may be as much as 10,500 sf, depending upon the depth of the buildings. For this analysis, it was estimated that up to half, or 5,250 sf, of the properties ground-floor garages could be developed into commercial space.

Page II-19, Project Description, Table II-2, has been modified as follows:

TABLE II-2 SUMMARY OF MAXIMUM DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL			
	Residential	Commercial	Parking
Diamond Street/ Bosworth Street	47	8,582	26
BART Parking Lot	90	14,913	123
Other Development	13	~~0~~ 5,250	0
Total	150	~~23,495~~ 28,745	149

Page III.B-10, Land Use, 3rd paragraph, has been modified as follows:

Infill Development. The 2010 Community Plan includes policies recognizing the potential for mixed-use development at two sites within the plan area, including the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street and the BART parking lot. In

addition, it is expected that over the life of the *2010 Community Plan*, development of an additional 13 residential units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses within the proposed Glen Park NCT District could occur. Changes in land use at the two infill sites and for the 13 additional units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses would be consistent with goals of the General Plan related to increased housing and neighborhood services within walking distance to transit centers (the Glen Park BART Station). Consistency with other aspects of the General Plan, and other adopted plans, policies and regulations, would be addressed when detailed development proposals and improvements are subsequently considered for approval. Overall, future development of the two infill sites and the additional 13 units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses would not conflict with General Plan land use policies.

Page III.B-12, Land Use, 1st full paragraph, has been modified as follows:

Implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would involve revisions to the existing Planning Code use and height districts in the plan area, as described in Chapter II, Project Description, p. II-13. The proposed zoning changes would occur in the commercial core area where active ground-floor retail would be encouraged and would modify parking regulations and residential densities. Existing and proposed zoning districts are illustrated in Figure II-2, p. II-10, and Figure II-3, p. II-14. Overall, implementation of the *2010 Community Plan* would increase height limits. While most of the plan area would retain the prevailing height limit of 40 feet, the height limit for areas rezoned to Glen Park NCT would be increased to up to 45 feet,⁸ and the height limit at the BART parking lot is assumed to be increased to 65 feet.

⁸ As described in the Project Description, p. II-13, the height district refinement would reduce the maximum height of new construction along portions of Wilder Street, Diamond Street, Castro Street, and Chenery Street in the Glen Park NCT district from a range of 40 to 45 feet to a range of 30 to 35 feet. A map showing the proposed height district revision is contained in Appendix F. However, for the purpose of this EIR, a height limit of 45 feet in areas rezoned to Glen Park NCT is still being analyzed to present a conservative estimate of impacts.

Page III.B-13, Land Use, last two paragraphs, have been revised as follows:

Infill Development. The *2010 Community Plan* contains policies recommending consideration of new development on two infill sites and development of 13 residential units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses near existing

transit, and would not propose changes to established residential neighborhoods surrounding the plan area. Figure II-3, p. II-14, identifies the two infill sites in the plan area. The additional 13 residential units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses at 2928-2958 Diamond Street could be developed within the Glen Park NCT District; however, the exact location of ~~these~~ the 13 units is unknown at this time. Therefore, these units are not shown in Figure II-3, p. II-14.

The potential infill site on the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street would consist of mixed-use development, including residential and commercial uses. The maximum building height at this site would be up to 45 feet. Accordingly, the site could be developed with three- to four-story mixed-use residential and commercial (ground-floor commercial and upper-floor residential) buildings.

Page III.C-7, Aesthetics, 1st paragraph, has been modified as follows:

General Impacts. The Initial Study for the 2003 *Community Plan Summary* concludes that the proposed zoning modifications could have a potentially significant impact on existing visual resources due to the increase in building height limits (see Appendix A, pp. 43-44). The 2010 *Community Plan* proposes modifications to existing zoning but does not include any specific development proposals. The proposed zoning modifications would introduce a new Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit (Glen Park NCT) District for parcels along Diamond Street, Wilder Street, Joost Avenue, and Chenery Street currently zoned NC-2 and RH-3, and 605 Chenery Street and 3121-3125 Castro Street currently zoned RH-2. As described previously, the NCT District would introduce a new 45-X height limit, which would moderately raise the prevailing height limit by five feet and encourage active ground-floor uses. Currently, structures in the plan area range from one to four stories with some structures approaching the existing 40-foot height limit. Future development under the NCT District has the potential to include structures five feet higher; however, it is anticipated this additional height would be added to the ground floor and would not allow for another floor of development. This would allow for storefronts with more space and provide easy access for pedestrians. Thus, the continuity of the existing streetscapes would be maintained and the visual character would remain consistent with existing uses.

Page III.C-8, Aesthetics, last paragraph, has been modified as follows:

Infill Development. The 2010 *Community Plan* includes policies for potential mixed-use development at two sites within the plan area, including the northwest corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street and the BART parking lot. In addition, it is

expected that over the life of the *2010 Community Plan*, development of an additional 13 residential units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses within the proposed Glen Park NCT District could occur. Figure III.C-3, p. III.C-9, depicts four viewpoint locations within the plan area. Figure III.C-4 through Figure III.C-7, pp. III.C-10 to III.C-13, depict visual simulations showing existing conditions and potential building envelopes under the revised land use controls from each of the four viewpoint locations, respectively. These viewpoints were chosen because they best represent the character of the....

Page III.D-9, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, 3rd paragraph, has been modified as follows:

The plan area contains ~~159~~160 parcels with structures over 45 years old. In addition, two parcels contain the Glen Park BART Station (BART Station) and power station constructed in 1970 (~~161~~162 parcels total). Although not over 45 years old, the BART Station is recognized for its architectural significance. Of the ~~161~~162 parcels, Carey & Co. surveyed 110 parcels east of Lippard Avenue, while the Planning Department surveyed 51 parcels west of Lippard Avenue and 1 parcel east of Lippard Avenue.^{7,8} Each structure over 45 years old and the BART Station and power station were recorded on State of California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Primary Record (523A) forms. The forms from the Carey & Co. survey are located in Appendix C of the Carey & Co. HRE;⁹ ~~and the forms from the Planning Department survey are located in Appendix A of the HRE completed by the Planning Department;~~^{10,11} and the form from the Planning Department evaluation of the one property east of Lippard Avenue is attached to the Planning Department Historic Resource Evaluation Response.¹² These background documents are available for review by the public at the Planning Department.

⁷ San Francisco Planning Department, *San Francisco Glen Park Area Plan HRE: West of Lippard and NCT*, January 12, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

⁸ San Francisco Planning Department, *Historic Resources Evaluation Response, Glen Park Community Plan – July 2011 Refinements*. August 16, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

⁹ Carey & Co., Inc., *Historic Resources Evaluation, Draft Glen Park Community Plan, San Francisco, California*, December 21, 2010. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

¹⁰ San Francisco Planning Department, *San Francisco Glen Park Area Plan HRE: West of Lippard and NCT*, January 12, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

¹¹ San Francisco Planning Department, *Historic Resources Evaluation Response, Glen Park Community Plan – July 2011 Refinements*. August 16, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

Page III.D-11, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, 1st paragraph, has been modified as follows:

The Planning Department completed an additional HRE, dated March 24, 2011, which documents the Departments' survey of historic-age (built in or before 1964) properties west of Lippard Avenue (51 total).¹³ In addition, the Planning Department completed an HRER of one historic-age property east of Lippard Avenue.¹⁴ The Department found two properties to be eligible for the California Register. These properties are located at:

¹³ San Francisco Planning Department, *San Francisco Glen Park Area Plan HRE: West of Lippard and NCT*, January 12, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

¹⁴ San Francisco Planning Department, *Historic Resources Evaluation Response, Glen Park Community Plan – July 2011 Refinements*. August 16, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

Page III.D-19, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, 1st and 2nd paragraphs, have been modified as follows:

Evaluation of Historic Districts

No local, State, or national register-eligible historic districts were identified within the areas surveyed by Carey & Co. or the Planning Department. Six areas were evaluated for potential districts, but none met the thresholds of significance.^{14,15} In general, surveyed parcels contain buildings designed in a range of architectural styles and massing and are interspersed with newer development and buildings with a low threshold of integrity. Therefore, none of the ~~161~~162 parcels surveyed appear to qualify as districts.

Previous Evaluations

None of the surveyed resources in the plan area have been previously listed as a California Point of Historical Interest, as a California Historical Landmark, on the California Register, or on the National Register. They also have not been listed as a San Francisco Structure of Merit or Landmark, or as a contributing building to a historic or conservation district in the City. Lastly, previous local surveys such as the 1968 Junior League of San Francisco Survey, the 1976 Planning Department Citywide Architectural

Survey, the 1978 San Francisco Architectural Heritage Survey, and the 1990 Unreinforced Masonry Building Survey did not identify any of the ~~461~~162 parcels surveyed.^{16,17,18} The Glen Park BART Station is included in the US/Northern California Chapter's Northern California Modern Register¹⁹ of notable modern buildings in the Bay Area.

¹⁴ Carey & Co., Inc., *Historic Resources Evaluation, Draft Glen Park Community Plan, San Francisco, California*, December 21, 2010. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

¹⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, *San Francisco Glen Park Area Plan HRE: West of Lippard and NCT*, January 12, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

¹⁶ Olmsted, Roger and T.H. Watkins, *Here Today San Francisco's Architectural Heritage*, 1968.

¹⁷ Corbett, Michael R., *Splendid Survivors San Francisco's Downtown Architectural Heritage*, 1979.

¹⁸ A context statement and architectural/historical survey of unreinforced masonry building (UMB) construction in San Francisco from 1850 to 1940 submitted by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, San Francisco Department of City Planning. Published 1990 by Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board in San Francisco.

¹⁹ Northern California Chapter of the international DOCOMOMO, Documentation and Conservation of the Modern Movement. Available at: http://www.docomomo-us.org/chapters/northern_california. Accessed January 10, 2011.

Page III.D-28, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, 2nd paragraph, has been modified as follows:

Infill Development. The 2010 *Community Plan* encourages consideration of infill development at two sites: the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street site and the BART parking lot site. In addition, it is expected that over the life of the 2010 *Community Plan*, development of additional 13 residential units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses at 2928-2958 Diamond Street within the proposed Glen Park NCT District could occur. Neither of the two infill sites contain historical structures and the 2010 *Community Plan* does not include any specific development proposals for either site. While the additional 13 residential units could be developed on a site with an existing historical structure, the location of these units is not known at this time. As described in the Project Description, p. II-1, the scale of development potential at the Bosworth Street/Diamond Street infill site and at the additional 13 residential units would be 45 feet. The additional 5-foot increase (from existing 40-foot height limit) would not physically impair any surrounding historical resource, and would be compatible with adjacent historical resources.

Page III.D-32, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, last paragraph, has been modified as follows:

Infill Development. The *2010 Community Plan* does not include any specific development proposals for the infill sites, or any of the additional 13 residential units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses at 2928-2958 Diamond Street that could be constructed within the plan area. Therefore, construction-specific information at this time is unknown. However, construction associated with future development in the plan area could involve subsurface soil-disturbing activities such...

Page III.D-43, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, 2nd paragraph, has been modified as follows:

Infill Development. Ground disturbance associated with future development of the infill sites and the 13 residential units, at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses, including construction of building foundations, have potential to remove or disturb human remains. This would be a significant impact. Infill development would be subject to independent study and environmental review in the future. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-5, above, would reduce potential adverse impacts to human remains to a less-than-significant level.

Page III.E-30, Transportation and Circulation, 1st paragraph, has been modified as follows:

Trip Generation

The person-trip generation rates include residents and visitors of the residential units, plus employees and visitors of the commercial uses, and are based upon weekday daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trip generation rates expressed in number of trips per residential unit and number of trips per 1,000 square feet of retail space.¹³ These rates were applied to the infill development to obtain the person-trips for the project. Based on information presented in Chapter II, Project Description (see Table II-2, p. II-19), the traffic analysis uses conservative estimates of development potential in the plan area; i.e., assuming the maximum potential development and no credits for existing uses proposed to be replaced by the near-term development. There are approximately 7,000 sf of existing commercial uses at the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site. The transportation analysis of future commercial uses at the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site utilized the conservative assumption that, although this existing commercial floor area and the associated trips would likely be added to or replaced by new infill development, the analysis assumed 8,582 sf of additional commercial space at

this infill site, without crediting the 7,000 sf of existing commercial uses. As a result, even though the potential rezoning of the six parcels on the west side of Diamond Street south of Bosworth Street from RH-3 to Glen Park NCT could yield additional commercial floor area of approximately 5,250 sf and correspondingly additional person trips in the Glen Park commercial core, the commercial space and associated trips are accounted for in the analysis performed for the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site in this DEIR. The zoning refinements at 605 Chenery Street and 3121-3125 Castro Street would not generate any additional trips from increased commercial development since the parcels are already being used for commercial uses (legal, non-conforming) and are not anticipated to change. There are currently no proposals for development of private property, and actual projects, if pursued, would likely be of a smaller scale and the estimate of trips from the new use at the site would net out (subtract) those trips associated with the existing land use that would be displaced. If individual property owners pursued development, additional project-level review of the actual proposals would be required.

¹³ Although the *2010 Community Plan* contains policy recommendations for “commercial” land uses, there are also a number of references to retail uses, which are a type of commercial use. In particular, Policy 2.2 mentions infill commercial opportunities and then characterizes these opportunities as small-scale retail development. For the purposes of this EIR, retail trip generation rates are used to estimate travel demand, since retail uses typically exhibit a greater number of trips per square foot than other commercial uses, and thus yield a more conservative (greater) assessment.

Page III.G-25, Air Quality, Table III.G-6, has been modified as follows:

TABLE III.G-6 CONSTRUCTION CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANT EMISSIONS				
Emission Source	ROG (lbs/day)	NOX (lbs/day)	Exhaust PM ₁₀ (lbs/day)	Exhaust PM _{2.5} (lbs/day)
BART Parking Lot Infill Development	50	43	2.6	2.4
Diamond and Bosworth Infill Development	32	37	2.3	2.2
<u>2928-2958 Diamond Street^a</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.1</u>
Transportation Improvements				
Intersection and Traffic Calming Improvements (each improvement)	3	23	1.2	1.1
Pedestrian Bridge	3	23	1.2	1.1
Bus Loop	4	42	1.8	1.7
Roundabout	3	23	1.2	1.1
2010 BAAQMD Significance Threshold	54	54	82	54
Any Individual Components Exceed 2010 BAAQMD Threshold?	No	No	No	No
Combined Components Exceed 2010 BAAQMD Threshold?	Yes	Yes	No	No

Source: PBS&J, 20112010. Based on URBEMIS 2007 Version 9.2.4, and compliance with BAAQMD Regulation 8, Rule 3.

a. Atkins, Glen Park Community Plan EIR – URBEMIS Update Associated with Plan Refinements Subsequent to DEIR Publication, memorandum from Kimberly Comacho to Lisa Gibson, October 12, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as a part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

Page III.G-29, Air Quality, Table III.G-7, has been modified as follows:

TABLE III.G-7 PROJECT DAILY OPERATIONAL AIR POLLUTANT EMISSIONS ^a				
Emissions Source	Project Emissions (Pounds per Day)			
	ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
BART Parking Lot Infill Site				
Stationary	6.87	1.37	0.2	0.2
Vehicle	9.03	10.82	18.22	3.48
Diamond and Bosworth Infill Site				
Stationary	4.37	0.86	0.01	0.01
Vehicle	5.46	6.51	10.96	2.09
<u>2928-2958 Diamond Street^b</u>				
<u>Stationary</u>	<u>0.13</u>	<u>0.19</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Vehicle</u>	<u>4.52</u>	<u>5.96</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	<u>25.73</u> ~~30.38~~	<u>19.56</u> ~~25.71~~	29.39	5.78
BAAQMD Significance Thresholds	54.0	54.0	82.0	54.0
Exceeds BAAQMD Thresholds?	No	No	No	No

Source: PBS&J, 20112010.

Note:

a. *Emissions are based on maximum development potential for the plan area, as described in Chapter II, Project Description.*

b. Atkins, Glen Park Community Plan EIR – URBEMIS Update Associated with Plan Refinements Subsequent to DEIR Publication, memorandum from Kimberly Comacho to Lisa Gibson, October 12, 2011. This report is on file for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as a part of Case No. 2005.1004E.

Page III.H-1, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, 1st paragraph, has been modified as follows:

This section provides a description of global climate change, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, the existing regulatory framework governing GHG emissions, and an analysis of the potential impacts related to GHGs associated with implementation of the proposed *2010 Community Plan* including the proposed transportation infrastructure improvements, the anticipated development on the two infill sites, and for the 13 residential units developed any place within the plan area, 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses at 2928-2958 Diamond Street, and future open space improvements. The proposed project is evaluated for compliance with San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, recognized as meeting the criteria of a qualified GHG Reduction Strategy by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD).

Page III.H-27, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, 1st Paragraph, has been modified as follows:

Infill Development. The two infill sites, ~~and the 13 additional residential units,~~ at-large in the plan area, and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses at 2928-2958 Diamond Street that could potentially be developed ~~at any location~~ within the plan area are program-level proposals for which design details are unknown at this time. As such, a GHG Compliance Checklist has not yet been completed for the two infill sites, ~~and the 13 additional residential units,~~ or the 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses. However, as stated above new development and renovations/alterations for private projects and municipal projects are required to comply with San Francisco's ordinances that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, as applicable. Therefore, because this development would be required to comply with the City's GHG reduction strategy, the potential GHG impacts would be less than significant. Once specific proposals for the infill development, ~~or any of the 13 residential units,~~ at-large in the plan area, or the potential 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses at 2928-2958 Diamond Street have been designed, a GHG Compliance checklist would be submitted to the San Francisco Planning Department for review and a determination of compliance.

Page IV-1, Other CEQA Considerations, 2nd paragraph, has been modified as follows:

The *Glen Park Community Plan (2010 Community Plan)* is a planning effort that aims to enhance the positive existing features of the neighborhood, while encouraging infill development near transit opportunities and improving accessibility. The fundamental objectives of the *2010 Community Plan* are to guide future infrastructure improvements, update zoning, design guidelines, and other city policies for future development in the Glen Park neighborhood. Development anticipated under the *2010 Community Plan*

would result in the construction of up to 150 dwelling units and up to ~~23,495~~28,745 gsf of retail space. As a result, population in the plan area would increase up to 314 residents² and up to ~~678~~2 employees.³ No population or employment increases would be anticipated as a result of proposed transportation improvements. The project would increase the overall residential population of the City and County of San Francisco by less than 0.1 percent.⁴ Therefore, the *2010 Community Plan* would not induce substantial population growth.

² U.S. Census Bureau, DP-4. "Profile of Selected Housing Characteristics 2000: Census Tract 218, San Francisco County, California." Based on information for Census Tract 218, the average household population was 2.09 persons/household. 150 units x 2.09 persons/unit = approximately 314 residents.

³ Based on San Francisco Transportation Review Guidelines, retail/commercial uses have about 350 to 450 gsf per employee. (~~23,495~~28,745 gsf/350 gsf/employee = ~~678~~2 employees).

⁴ The calculation is based on the ABAG estimated total population of 795,800 persons in the City and County of San Francisco in 2005.

Page IV-2, Other CEQA Considerations, 1st full paragraph, has been modified as follows:

The existing BART parking lot does not have employees and the number of employees currently working at the commercial and retail portions of the Diamond Street/Bosworth Street infill site is unknown, but presumed to be about ten. The proposed project would provide permanent on-site employment for to up to ~~678~~2 persons. The employment generated by the proposed project would result in a net increase of approximately ~~577~~2 employees, which would result in a corresponding demand for approximately ~~435~~4 new housing units.⁶ However, this demand would not be substantial in context of citywide housing growth over the next 20 years.

⁶ According to ABAG Projections 2007, the employees per household ratio in the City of San Francisco in 2000 was 1.33 (437,533 employed residents/329,700 households = 1.33 employees per household). Therefore, ~~577~~2 new employees/1.33 employees per household = approximately ~~435~~4 new housing units.

Page V-4, Alternatives, 2nd and 3rd paragraphs after bullet list, have been revised as follows:

Development potential within the Glen Park NCT district would be expected to occur over the life of the *2010 Community Plan*. The maximum development potential in the plan area, excluding development potential associated with the two infill sites, would be 13 residential units and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses, the same as under the proposed project. ~~No increase in commercial floor area is anticipated outside of the two infill sites.~~

In summary, the development at the infill sites under Alternative B would be reduced to 54 residential units compared to 150 under the proposed project. In addition, the total commercial space would be limited to 3,000 gsf compared to approximately ~~24,000~~28,745 gsf proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*.

Page V-5, Alternatives, 2nd paragraph, has been modified as follows:

The maximum development potential in the plan area, excluding development potential associated with the two infill sites, would be 13 residential units and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses. The development at the infill sites would be reduced compared to potential development under the *2010 Community Plan*. For the infill sites there would be potential for 54 residential units compared to 150 proposed under the project. In addition, the total commercial space would be limited to 3,000 gsf compared to approximately ~~24,000~~28,745 gsf proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*. Overall, the development at the infill sites anticipated in the plan area under Alternative B would be less than the *2010 Community Plan* and would not have significant adverse impacts on the land use character of the plan area and vicinity. The land use impacts under Alternative B would be less-than-significant as under the proposed *2010 Community Plan*.

Page V-6, Alternatives, 3rd paragraph, has been modified as follows:

Alternative B would result in a less intense use of the plan area than the proposed project. The residential component of Alternative B would consist of 54 residential units, as compared with 150 residential units under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately 64 percent. The retail component of Alternative B would consist of 3,000 gsf, as compared with ~~23,495~~28,745 gsf of retail space under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately ~~87~~89 percent. No historical, archeological, or paleontological resources would be affected by the reduced development component. As such, no impacts to cultural resources are anticipated as a result of the reduced development.

Page V-8, Alternatives, last paragraph, has been modified as follows:

Alternative B would result in a less intense use of the plan area than the proposed project. The residential component of Alternative B would consist of 54 residential units, as compared with 150 residential units under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately 64 percent. The retail component of Alternative B would consist of 3,000 gsf, as compared with ~~23,495~~28,745 gsf of retail space under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately ~~87~~89 percent. As such, fewer retail and residential trips would be generated, which would reduce the demand for vehicle parking, bicycle parking, pedestrian space, and on and off-street freight loading/unloading. The significant and unavoidable impacts identified for Intersection #10 Bosworth Street / Diamond Street (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM and PM Peak Hour), would likely not occur with Alternative B. In addition, the impacts identified for Intersection #16 Monterey Boulevard/Circular Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM Peak Hour), would also likely not occur with Alternative B. The project contributions to these affected intersections would be less than with the proposed project. Thus, Mitigation Measures M-TR-1A, M-TR-1B, and M-TR-2.2A would not be necessary.

Page V-12, Alternatives, last two paragraphs, have been revised as follows:

In addition, all of the transportation improvements included under the proposed project would be included under this alternative. These include traffic calming measures at the Bosworth Street and Bosworth Street/Diamond Street intersection; bicycle networks improvements; pedestrian access improvement measures including the connection to the Muni Metro J-Church Line; transit improvements such as the proposed BART Station bus loop improvement; and parking management strategies. As described under the proposed project and Alternative B above, other development potential within the Glen Park NCT district would be expected to occur over the life of the *2010 Community Plan*. The maximum development potential in the plan area, excluding development potential associated with the two infill sites would be 13 residential units and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses, the same as under the proposed project. ~~No increase in commercial floor area is anticipated outside of the two infill sites.~~

In summary, the development at the infill sites would be reduced to 47 residential units compared to 150 under the proposed project. In addition, the total commercial space would be limited to 5,000 gsf compared to approximately ~~24,000~~28,745 gsf proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*.

Page V-13, Alternatives, 3rd paragraph, has been modified as follows:

The maximum development potential in the plan area, excluding development potential associated with the two infill sites would be 13 residential units and 5,250 gsf of ground-floor commercial uses. The infill development would be reduced compared to potential development under the *2010 Community Plan*. For the infill development sites there would be potential for 47 residential units compared to 150 proposed under the project. In addition, the total commercial space would be limited to 5,000 gsf compared to approximately ~~24,000~~28,745 gsf proposed under the *2010 Community Plan*. Overall, the infill development anticipated in the plan area under Alternative C would not have significant adverse impacts on the land use character of the vicinity. The land use impacts under Alternative C would be less-than-significant as under the proposed *2010 Community Plan*.

Page V-14, Alternatives, 3rd paragraph, has been modified as follows:

Alternative C would result in a less intense use of the plan area than the proposed project. The residential component of Alternative C would consist of 47 residential units, as compared with 150 residential units under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately 69 percent. The retail component of Alternative C would consist of 5,000 gsf, as compared with ~~23,495~~28,745 gsf of retail space under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately ~~79~~83 percent. No historical, archeological, or paleontological resources would be affected by the reduced development component. As such, no impacts to these resources are anticipated.

Page V-16, Alternatives, 2nd paragraph, has been modified as follows:

Alternative C would result in a less intense use of the plan area than the proposed project. The residential component of Alternative C would consist of 47 residential units, as compared with 150 residential units under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately 69 percent. The retail component of Alternative C would consist of 5,000 gsf, as compared with ~~23,495~~28,745 gsf of retail space under the proposed project – a reduction of approximately ~~79~~83 percent. As such, fewer retail and residential trips would be generated, which would reduce the demand for vehicle parking, bicycle parking, pedestrian space, and on and off-street freight loading/unloading. The significant and unavoidable impacts identified for Intersection #10 Bosworth Street / Diamond Street (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM and PM Peak Hour) would likely be reduced to a less-than-significant level with Alternative C. In addition, the impacts identified for Intersection #16 Monterey Boulevard/Circular

Avenue/I-280 Ramps intersection (Existing Conditions and Cumulative Conditions – AM Peak Hour), would also likely be reduced with Alternative C. The project contributions to these affected intersections would be less than with the proposed project, which would negate the use of the identified mitigation measures. The project contributions to these affected intersections would be less than with the proposed project.

Page V-19, Alternatives, Table V-1, has been modified as follows:

**TABLE V-1
COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT TO ALTERNATIVES B AND C**

Description	Proposed Project	Alternative B - Reduced Development - High Residential/Low Retail Development	Alternative C - Reduced Development - Hybrid Mix
	Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street	Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street	Northwest Corner of Diamond Street and Bosworth Street
	Up to 47 residential units	Up to 10 residential units	Up to 15 residential units
	Up to 8,582 gsf ground-floor commercial	Up to 1,000 gsf ground-floor commercial	No ground-floor commercial
	Up to 26 private parking spaces	Up to 11 private parking spaces	Up to 15 private parking spaces
	BART Parking Lot	BART Parking Lot	BART Parking Lot
	Up to 90 residential units	Up to 31 residential units	19 residential units
	0 to 14,913 gsf commercial uses	Up to 2,000 gsf commercial uses	Up to 5,000 gsf commercial uses
	Up to 123 private parking spaces	Up to 33 private parking spaces	Up to 22 private parking spaces
	Other Development	Other Development	Other Development
	13 residential units	13 residential units	13 residential units
	<u>5,250 gsf ground-floor commercial</u>	<u>5,250 gsf ground-floor commercial</u>	<u>5,250 gsf ground-floor commercial</u>
	Proposed Transportation Improvements	Proposed Transportation Improvements	Proposed Transportation Improvements
	Traffic Calming	Traffic Calming	Traffic Calming
	Bicycle Networks	Bicycle Networks	Bicycle Networks
	Pedestrian Access	Pedestrian Access	Pedestrian Access
	Transit Improvements	Transit Improvements	Transit Improvements

Nine figures have been revised to update the plan area boundary to include 3121-3125 Castro Street and the fronting street and intersection. These figures include:

- Figure II-1, p. II-7, Regional and City Project Location
- Figure II-2, p. II-10, Existing Use Districts and Height Limits
- Figure II-3, p. II-14, Use Districts and Height Limits Under the Proposed Project
- Figure II-4, p. II-23, Transportation Improvement Locations
- Figure III.B-1, p. III.B-16, Cumulative Projects for Glen Park Community Plan
- Figure III.D-1, p. III.D-13, Existing Historical Resources with the Plan Area
- Figure III.E-1, p. III.E-7, Community Plan Area and Study Intersections
- Figure III.E-2, p. III.E-10, Existing Transit Network
- Figure III.E-3, p. III.E-19, Existing Bicycle Conditions
- Figure III.F-1, p. III.F-8, Noise Monitoring Locations

Revisions to Figure III.D-1, p. III.D-13, were also made to reflect that 3121-3125 Castro Street was surveyed by the Planning Department.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank.

VII. REPORT PREPARERS

LEAD AGENCY

Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco
Major Environmental Analysis
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Environmental Review Officer: Bill Wycko
Environmental Coordinator: Lisa Gibson
Assistant Environmental Coordinator: Chelsea Fordham
EIR Transportation Planner: Susan Mickelsen
Archeologist: Randall Dean
Air Quality and Noise Specialists: Jessica Range and Debra Dwyer
Historic Preservation Technical Specialists: Tim Frye, Moses Corrette, and Sophie Hayward

PROJECT SPONSORS

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
1 South Van Ness, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Manager, Capital Systems Planning: Darton Ito
Project Manager: Kim Walton
Deputy Project Manager: Sam Fielding

Citywide Planning, City and County of San Francisco
Plan Director: John Billovits
Plan Manager: Jon Swae

EIR CONSULTANTS

Atkins (formerly PBS&J)

475 Sansome Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Rod Jeung, AICP, Project Director
Tom Biggs, Project Manager
Carolina Morgan, CEQA/NEPA Task Leader
Kimberly Comacho, Task Leader
Chad Mason, AICP, Land Use Specialist
Natalie Irwin, Air and Noise Specialist
Denise Jurich, Cultural Resources Specialist
Amber Grady, Architectural Historian
Richard Brandi, Architectural Historian
Shadde Rosenblum, Transportation Planner
Anthony Ha, Word Processing and Graphics

Merrill Morris and Partners (Aesthetics)

249 Front Street

San Francisco, CA 94111

Cathy Merrill

Mary Burger

Carey & Company (Cultural Resources)

130 Sutter Street, Suite 468

San Francisco, CA 94104

Hisashi B. Sugaya

Erica Schultz

AECOM (Transportation Impact Study)

2101 Webster Street, Suite 1900

Oakland, CA 94612

Ryan Park

Jeffrey Chan