



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**MEMO**

**DATE:** May 20, 2010  
**TO:** Planning Commission President Ron Miguel  
Members of the Planning Commission  
**FROM:** Lisa Gibson, Senior Planner, Major Environmental Analysis *LG*  
**RE:** Case No. 2007.0946E, Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard  
Phase II Development Plan Project  
June 3, 2010 EIR Certification

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

A joint Planning Commission-Redevelopment Agency Commission meeting is scheduled for June 3, 2010, at which meeting both Commissions will consider certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan Project. A draft EIR certification motion for the Planning Commission is attached.

In addition, attached for your information is a memorandum prepared by Redevelopment Agency staff to Agency Commissioners for the June 3, 2010 meeting. The memorandum summarizes the proposed project, variants to the project, alternatives to the project, the environmental review process, and the environmental impacts of the project. You may find this to be of interest.

Please contact me at (415) 575-9032 if you have questions regarding this matter or if I can be of assistance.



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Planning Commission Motion No. \_\_\_\_\_

HEARING DATE: June 3, 2010

*Date:* May 20, 2010  
*Case No.:* 2007.0946E  
*Project:* **Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II  
Development Plan**  
*Location:* **Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard**  
*Staff Contact:* Lisa Gibson – (415) 575-9032  
lisa.gibson@sfgov.org  
*Recommendation:* **Adopt the EIR Certification Findings**

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

### ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATED TO THE CERTIFICATION OF A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR A PROPOSED CANDLESTICK POINT-HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD PHASE II DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

MOVED, that the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Planning Commission") hereby CERTIFIES the Final Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "FEIR") identified as Case No. 2007.0946E, Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan (hereinafter "Project"), based upon the following findings:

1. The City and County of San Francisco, acting through the Planning Department (hereinafter "Department"), together with the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (hereinafter "Agency"), acting as a joint lead agencies, 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 and the Agency determined that an Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "EIR") was required and on September 1, 2007, published a Notice of Preparation of an EIR and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings (hereinafter "NOP"), and provided public notice thereof by publication in a newspaper of general circulation on September 1, 2007.
  - B. On September 1, 2007, the Department and the Agency mailed the NOP to local, state, and federal agencies and other interested parties, initiating a 30-day public comment period that extended through September 2007.
  - C. The Department and the Agency filed a Notice of Completion of the NOP with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on August 31, 2007.
  - D. The Department and the Agency held public scoping meetings on September 17, 2007, and September 25, 2007 in order to receive public input regarding the proposed scope of the EIR

analysis. Attendees were provided an opportunity to voice comments or concerns regarding potential effects of the Project.

- E. On November 12, 2009, the Department and the Agency 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 and Redevelopment Agency Commission (hereinafter "Agency Commission") public hearings on the DEIR.
  - F. On November 10 and 11, 2009, notices of availability of the DEIR or copies of the DEIR were mailed or otherwise delivered to a list of persons requesting such items, to those noted on the distribution list in the DEIR, and to government agencies, the latter both directly and through the State Clearinghouse.
  - G. Notice of Completion of the DEIR was filed with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on November 12, 2009.
  - H. Notices of availability of the DEIR and of the date and time of the public hearing were posted near the project site by the project sponsors on November 18, 2009.
2. The Planning Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on said DEIR on December 17, 2009, and the Agency Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on said DEIR on December 15, 2009, and January 5, 2010. At each of the aforementioned public hearings, opportunity for public comment was given and public comment was received on the DEIR. The period for acceptance of written comments on the DEIR ended January 12, 2010.
  3. The Department and the Agency prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the 60-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 May 13, 2010 and mailed or otherwise delivered to the Planning Commission, all parties who commented on the DEIR, and other interested parties, and made available to others upon request at Department offices.
  4. A FEIR has been prepared by the Department and the Agency, 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 Planning Commission and the public. These files are available for public review at the Department offices at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, and are part of the record before the Planning Commission.
  6. On June 3, 2010, the Planning 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 project sponsors have indicated that the Project identified in Chapter II of the FEIR, as modified by Variant 3D (hereinafter "the Candlestick Tower Variant D") and Variant 5 (hereinafter "the 49ers/Raiders Shared Stadium Variant") as described in Chapter IV of the FEIR, constitute the Project if the stadium is constructed. If the stadium is not constructed, the Project as described in Chapter II of the FEIR together with the Candlestick Tower Variant D and either Variant 1 (hereinafter "the R&D Variant") or Variant 2A (hereinafter "the Housing/R&D Variant") constitute the Project. In addition, if the stadium is not constructed, the Project includes Subalternative 4A (hereinafter "CP-HPS Phase II Development Plan with Historic Preservation") as described in Chapter VI of the FEIR; the developer will determine the ultimate feasibility of its implementation at a later time.
8. The Planning Commission hereby does find that the FEIR concerning File No. 2007.0946E 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.
9. The Planning Commission, in certifying the completion of said FEIR, hereby does find that the Project described in the EIR and the Project preferred by the project sponsors, described above under Finding 7, above:
  - A. Will have project-specific significant effects on the environment including:<sup>1</sup>
    - a. **Impact TR-1: Effect of Project Construction on Vehicle Traffic and Roadway Construction on Transportation System.** The Project would impact the transportation system through construction vehicle traffic and roadway construction and contribute to cumulative construction impacts in the vicinity of the Project.
    - b. **Impact TR-2: Effect of Project on Traffic Volumes.** The Project would cause an increase in traffic that would be substantial relative to the existing and proposed capacity of the street system.
    - c. **Impact TR-3: Effect of Project Traffic at Certain Area Intersections.** The Project would have significant impacts on nine intersections in the Project vicinity, and would contribute to cumulative traffic conditions at these intersections: Third Street at Oakdale, Revere, Carroll, Jamestown, Jerrold and Williams/Van Dyke; and Bayshore Boulevard at Paul, Cortland and US 101 Northbound Off-ramp/Cesar Chavez.
    - d. **Impact TR-4: Effect of Project Traffic at Tunnel/Blanken.** The Project would result in significant Project AM peak hour traffic impacts and contribute to cumulative PM peak hour traffic impacts at the intersection of Tunnel/Blanken.

---

<sup>1</sup> Impacts listed under Finding 9A are project-specific impacts, with the exception of impacts related to transportation and circulation (denoted with the alpha-numeric code "TR-"), which, as described, include both project-specific and cumulative impacts.

- e. **Impact TR-5: Project Contribution to Traffic at Degraded Intersections.** The Project would contribute significant traffic to intersections in the Project vicinity that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 No Project conditions. The Project contributions to cumulative traffic conditions would be significant in twenty intersections in the Project vicinity, and at sixteen of these intersections no feasible mitigation measures were identified. These sixteen intersections are: Third Street at 25th Street, Cesar Chavez Street, Cargo Way, Evans Avenue, Palou Avenue and Paul Avenue; Bayshore Boulevard at Visitacion Avenue, Alemany Boulevard/Industrial Street, Blanken, Bacon Street and Sunnydale Avenue; San Bruno Avenue at Paul Avenue, Silver Avenue and Mansell Avenue/US 101 Southbound Off-ramp; Cesar Chavez Street at Pennsylvania/I 280; and Evans Avenue at Napoleon Avenue/Toland Street. (The other four intersections are discussed below, under Impacts TR-6, TR-7 and TR-8.).
- f. **Impact TR-6: Project Traffic at Freeway Ramps.** The Project would contribute significant traffic at the intersections of Geneva/US 101 Southbound Ramps and Harney/US 101 Northbound Ramps, which would operate at LOS F under 2030 No Project conditions.
- g. **Impact TR-7: Project Traffic at Amador/Cargo/Illinois.** The Project would contribute significant traffic to the intersections of Amador/Cargo/Illinois, which would operate at LOS E under 2030 No Project conditions;
- h. **Impact TR-8: Project Traffic at Bayshore/Geneva.** The Project would contribute significant traffic to the intersection of Bayshore/Geneva, which would operate at LOS F under 2030 No Project conditions.
- i. **Impact TR-10: Project Traffic Effects.** The Project would result in increased traffic volumes on area roadways, and most substantially on key north/south and east/west streets, which would also experience cumulative traffic growth. As a result, the existing residential streets could be used as “cut-throughs,” shortcuts, or bypasses by non-neighborhood traffic. Substantial amounts of cut-through traffic can result in impacts such as noise, safety impacts to pedestrians, impaired driveway access, interference with emergency vehicle access, increased dust, exhaust, and litter, and similar annoyances that adversely affect neighborhood character.
- j. **Impact TR-11: Project Traffic at Freeway Segments.** The Project would contribute cumulatively considerable amounts of traffic to four freeway segments expected to operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 No Project conditions, specifically, US 101 northbound from Sierra Point to Alana/Geneva/Harney; US 101 southbound from the I 80 Merge to Cesar Chavez; US 101 southbound from Third/Bayshore to Alana/Geneva/Harney; and US 101 southbound from Alana/Geneva/Harney to Sierra Point.
- k. **Impact TR-12: Project Traffic Impact at Freeway Ramps.** The Project would cause four ramp junctions to deteriorate from acceptable LOS D or better to LOS E or F conditions

or from LOS E to LOS F conditions, specifically, the US 101 northbound on-ramp from Alemany Boulevard; US 101 northbound on-ramp from Harney Way; US 101 northbound on-ramp from Bayshore Boulevard/Cesar Chavez Street; US 101 southbound on-ramp from Harney Way/Geneva Avenue.

- l. **Impact TR-13: Project Traffic Contribution to Cumulative Impacts at Freeway Ramps.** The Project would contribute to significant cumulative traffic impacts at 12 freeway ramp locations. The Project would contribute cumulatively significant traffic increases at ramp junctions projected to operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 No Project conditions, specifically: US 101 northbound on-ramp from Sierra Point Parkway; US 101 northbound on-ramp from Harney Way; US 101 northbound on-ramp from Alemany Boulevard; US 101 northbound on-ramp from Bayshore Boulevard/Cesar Chavez Street; US 101 southbound off-ramp to Bayshore Boulevard/Cesar Chavez Street; US 101 southbound on-ramp from Third Street/Bayshore Boulevard; US 101 southbound on-ramp from Harney Way/Geneva Avenue; US 101 southbound on-ramp from Sierra Point Parkway; I 280 northbound off-ramp to Cesar Chavez Street; I 280 northbound on-ramp from Indiana Street/25th Street; I 280 southbound off-ramp to Pennsylvania Avenue/25th Street; and I 280 southbound on-ramp from Pennsylvania Avenue/25th Street.
- m. **Impact TR-14: Project Traffic Impact to Diverge Queue Storage at Harney/US 101 Northbound Off-ramp.** The Project would result in significant impacts related to freeway diverge queue storage at the Harney/US 101 Northbound Off-ramp. The Project would result in increases in traffic volumes that would cause the US 101 northbound off-ramp to Harney Way to experience queues that may extend back to the upstream freeway mainline segment which could result in unsafe conditions on the freeway mainline, resulting in significant traffic impacts at this location.
- n. **Impact TR-15: Project Traffic Contribution to Diverge Queue Storage Impacts.** The Project could contribute to significant cumulative traffic impacts related to freeway diverge queue storage at some off-ramp locations: US 101 northbound off-ramp to Harney Way and Bayshore/Cesar Chavez; US 101 southbound Off-ramp to Harney Way/Geneva Avenue and Sierra Point/Lagoon; and I-280 northbound off-ramp at Cesar Chavez.
- o. **Impact TR-21: Project Traffic Impacts to 9-San Bruno Transit Line.** The Project would increase congestion and contribute to cumulative conditions at intersections along San Bruno Avenue, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 9-San Bruno. Project-related transit delays due to traffic congestion and passenger loading delays associated with increased ridership would result in significant impacts on the operation of the 9-San Bruno, which would add up to 8 minutes of delay per bus during peak hours.
- p. **Impact TR-22: Project Traffic Impacts to 23-Monterey, 24-Divisadero, 44-O'Shaughnessy Transit Lines.** The Project would contribute traffic to cumulative conditions at intersections along Palou Avenue, which would increase travel times and

impact operations of the 23-Monterey, 24-Divisadero, and the 44-O'Shaughnessy. Project-related transit delays due to traffic congestion and passenger boarding delays associated with increased ridership would result in significant impacts on the operation of the 23-Monterey, 24-Divisadero, and 44-O'Shaughnessy along Palou Avenue, which would add up to 7 minutes of delay per bus during peak hours.

- q. **Impact TR-23: Project Traffic Impacts to 29-Sunset Transit Line.** The Project would increase congestion at intersections along Gilman Avenue and Paul Avenue, which would increase travel times and would impact operations of the 29-Sunset. Project-related transit delays due to traffic congestion and passenger loading delays associated with increased ridership would result in significant impacts on the operation of the 29-Sunset, particularly at Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard. Overall, the Project-related congestion would add up to 17 minutes of delay per bus during peak hours.
- r. **Impact TR-24: Project Traffic Impacts to 48-Quintara-24<sup>th</sup> Street Transit Line.** The Project would increase congestion at intersections along Evans Avenue, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 48-Quintara-24th Street. Project-related transit delays due to traffic congestion and passenger loading delays associated with increased ridership would result in significant impacts on the operation of the 48-Quintara-24th Street along Evans Avenue, particularly at intersections of Third Street, Napoleon/Toland Streets and at Cesar Chavez Street. Overall, the Project-related congestion would add up to 3 minutes of delay per bus during peak hours.
- s. **Impact TR-25: Project Traffic Impacts to 54-Felton Transit Line.** The Project would increase congestion at several intersections in the area, and make a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts that would increase travel times and impact operations of the 54-Felton. The Project would create traffic congestion resulting in significant impacts to the operations of the 54-Felton, adding up to 6 minutes of delay per bus, particularly during the PM peak hour.
- t. **Impact TR-26: Project Traffic Impacts to T-Third Transit Line.** The Project would increase congestion at intersections along Third Street, and make a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts that would increase travel times and impact operations of the T-Third. Project-related transit delays due to traffic congestion on Third Street and passenger loading delays associated with increased ridership would result in significant impacts on the operation of the T-Third, particularly in the segment between Thomas Avenue and Kirkwood Avenue, resulting in overall delays of up to 3 minutes per bus during peak hours.
- u. **Impact TR-27: Project Traffic Impacts to 28L-19<sup>th</sup> Avenue/Geneva Limited Transit Line.** The Project could increase congestion at the intersection of Geneva Avenue and Bayshore Boulevard, increasing travel times and impacting operations of the 28L-19th Avenue/Geneva Limited. Increased congestion associated with Project vehicle trips would impact the operations of the 28L-19th Avenue/Geneva Limited, resulting in delays of 4 minutes per bus during peak hours.

- v. **Impact TR-28: Project Traffic Impacts to 9X, 9AX, 9BX-Bayshore Expresses and 14X-Mission Express Transit Lines.** The Project would increase congestion on US 101 mainline and ramps, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 9X, 9AX, 9BX-Bayshore Expresses, and 14X-Mission Express. The Project would also contribute to cumulative impacts on these transit routes on US 101.
- w. **Impact TR-30: Project Traffic Impacts to SamTrans Bus Lines.** The Project would increase congestion and contribute to cumulative congestion on US 101 and on Bayshore Boulevard, which would increase travel times and adversely affect operations of SamTrans bus lines on these facilities.
- x. **Impact TR-32: Project Traffic Impacts to Bicycle Routes.** Implementation of the Project's proposed transit preferential treatments and significant increases in traffic volumes on Palou Avenue could result in impacts on bicycle travel on Bicycle Routes #70 and #170 between Griffith Street and Third Street. The combination of the proposed transit preferential treatment and the substantial increase in traffic volumes and congestion would result in potentially significant impacts on bicycle travel on Bicycle Route #70 and Bicycle Route #170 on Palou Avenue.
- y. **Impact TR-38: 49ers Game Site Access and Traffic Impacts.** Implementation of the proposed 49ers stadium would result in significant impacts on study area roadways and intersections, for as many as 12 times a year.
- z. **Impact TR-39: Stadium 49er Game Transit Impacts.** Implementation of the Project with existing game day service and Project transit improvements would not be adequate to accommodate projected transit demand. It is estimated that there would be a capacity shortfall of approximately 3,640 passengers per hour during game days.
- aa. **Impact TR-46: Stadium Secondary Event Site Access and Traffic Impacts.** Weekday evening secondary events at the stadium would result in increased congestion at intersections, freeway mainline, and freeway ramps already operating at unacceptable LOS under Project conditions without a secondary event, and result in significant impacts at nine additional intersections and one additional freeway off-ramp.
- bb. **Impact TR-47: Stadium Secondary Event Transit Impacts.** With implementation of the Project, the existing transit service and Project improvements would not be adequate to accommodate projected transit demand during secondary events with attendance of 37,500 spectators. In addition, transit lines serving the area would experience additional delays due to traffic generated by the secondary event.
- cc. **Impact TR-51: Project Site Access and Traffic Impacts from Arena Uses.** With implementation of the Project, weekday evening events at the arena would exacerbate congestion at intersections, freeway mainline, and freeway ramps already operating at unacceptable LOS under Project conditions without an arena event, and result in significant traffic impacts at Harney Way and Jamestown Avenue, which would be operating acceptably under Project conditions without an arena event. Overall, since



local streets and freeway facilities would experience increased congested without an arena event, traffic impacts associated with the new arena would be significant.

- dd. **Impact TR-52: Transit Impacts from Arena Uses.** With implementation of the Project, the existing and proposed transit service would be affected by sell-out weekday evening events at the arena. With the stadium use at HPS Phase II, transit capacity would be adequate to accommodate projected transit demand, but because of traffic congestion in the area, impacts to transit would result. With the implementation of Variants 1 or 2A at the stadium site, traffic congestion would impact transit service and in addition, events at the arena might cause transit capacity impacts.
- ee. **Impact AQ-4: Criteria Pollutants from Project Operations.** Operation of the Project would violate the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)'s CEQA significance thresholds for mass criteria pollutant emissions from mobile and area sources, and contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation at full build-out in the year 2029. Project emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> would exceed the BAAQMD CEQA thresholds and the ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> proposed BAAQMD CEQA thresholds.
- ff. **Impact NO-2: Groundborne Vibration Impacts from Construction.** Construction activities associated with the Project would create excessive groundborne vibration levels in existing residential neighborhoods adjacent to the Project site and at proposed on-site residential uses should the latter be occupied before Project construction activities on adjacent parcels are complete.
- gg. **Impact NO-3: Increase in Ambient Noise Levels from Construction.** Construction activities associated with the Project would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. Construction activities occurring within the Project site and in the Project vicinity for roadway and infrastructure improvements would involve demolition, grading, and excavation activities, followed by construction and external finishing of the proposed facilities and associated parking areas, as well as roadway and landscaping improvements. These activities would involve the use of heavy equipment.
- hh. **Impact NO-6: Noise Impacts from Project Traffic.** Operation of the Project would generate increased local traffic volumes that would cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in existing residential areas along the major Project site access routes. The increase in traffic resulting from implementation of the Project and ambient growth over the next 20 years would increase the ambient noise levels at noise-sensitive locations along the major vehicular access routes to the Project site, particularly along sections of Jamestown Avenue, Carroll Avenue, and Gilman Avenue.
- ii. **Impact NO-7: Noise Impacts from Stadium Events.** Noise during football games and concerts at the proposed stadium would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels that could adversely affect surrounding residents for the duration of a game or concert. There would be significant noise impacts during football game days and concert

days on the existing residential uses closest to the proposed stadium and possibly for the new residential uses closest to the proposed stadium.

- jj. **Impact CP-1b: Impacts to Historic Resources from Construction Activities.** Construction at HPS Phase II could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource. Implementation of the Project could result in the demolition of Buildings 211, 224, 231, and 253, which have been identified as historic resources in the potential Hunters Point Commercial Dry Dock and Naval Shipyard Historic District; and

B. Will have significant cumulative effects on the environment including:<sup>2</sup>

- a. **Cumulative Contribution of Criteria Pollutants from Project Operation.** Operation of the Project would violate BAAQMD CEQA significance thresholds for mass criteria pollutant emissions from mobile and area sources and contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation at full build-out.
- b. **Cumulative Contribution to TAC and PM<sub>2.5</sub> Impact Under the Proposed Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines.** The Project may result in a considerable contribution to a cumulative air quality impact regarding TACs and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions under proposed BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines.
- c. **Cumulative Contribution to Noise from Construction Activities.** Construction activities such as use of heavy equipment and pile driving associated with development of cumulative projects could contribute to a cumulative impact from increased noise levels for both off-site and on-site sensitive receptors.
- d. **Cumulative Contribution to Pile-Driving Activities.** Construction of the Project would include pile-driving activities that may overlap with other nearby construction activities during Project development and make a considerable contribution to cumulative construction-related temporary increases in ambient noise levels.
- e. **Cumulative Contribution to Traffic Noise Levels.** Project operation would make a considerable contribution to a substantial, permanent increase in cumulative traffic noise levels that would affect existing and future residential uses along all Project site access roads.
- f. **Cumulative Contribution to Ambient Noise During Stadium Events.** Project operation would make a considerable contribution to a substantial increase in cumulative noise during stadium events.

---

<sup>2</sup> Finding 9B lists cumulative impacts of the project, with the exception of cumulative impacts related to transportation and circulation, which are reflected under Finding 9A (see impacts listed therein denoted with the alpha-numeric code "TR-").

- g. **Cumulative Contribution to Vibration Effects During Construction Activities.** Pile-driving activities during construction could make a considerable contribution to cumulative vibration effects if pile driving would occur and/or heavy construction equipment would operate on multiple sites and collectively result in vibration impacts in excess of 85 VdB at nearby sensitive receptors.
- h. **Cumulative Contribution to Impacts on Historic Resources.** The Project would make a considerable contribution to a cumulative impact on significant historical resources, including residential, commercial, and civic properties that are listed or eligible for listing on national, state, or local registers.
- i. **Cumulative Contribution to Demand for Police Services.** Development of cumulative projects within the City of San Francisco would result in increased population and employment-generating uses and associated increased demand for police protection. While the Police Department considers population growth projections in its annual budgeting process to determine equipment and staffing needs for the coming year, it is possible that cumulative growth in the City could exceed the capacity of existing or planned staffing and facility improvements, and could require construction of one or more stations, resulting in a significant impact. Because the Project would require new or physically altered police facilities in order to maintain acceptable police services, the Project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a potential significant cumulative impact on police services.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting of June 3, 2010.

Linda Avery  
Commission Secretary

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: [Date]

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Agency Commissioners

**FROM:** Fred Blackwell, Executive Director

**SUBJECT:** Certifying a Final Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan Project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Bayview Hunters Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Areas

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

On May 15, 2007, the Commission, and subsequently the San Francisco Board of Supervisors (the “Board”), endorsed the Conceptual Framework that sets forth goals and principles to govern the proposed Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II development plan project (the “Project”), which includes the possible development of a new 49ers stadium on Hunters Point Shipyard. Following the Board’s action, Agency staff has been working with staff of the San Francisco Planning Department (“Planning Department”) on an Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) on the proposed Project. Completion of the EIR includes the preparation of a Draft EIR, a public review period for the Draft EIR, and preparation of responses to all substantive comments received on the Draft EIR and revisions of the Draft EIR text in a Comments and Responses document (the “C&R”).

The Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II EIR is a Redevelopment Plan EIR and a project EIR. This EIR evaluates the environmental effects of the proposed Project at a project level of detail and examines all phases of the Project, including planning, construction, and operation, as well as the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that might result. The Project includes the proposed development of Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II, the proposed amendments of the Bayview Hunters Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plans, and the proposed amendments of the San Francisco *General Plan* and the San Francisco *Planning Code*.

Prior to consideration of the proposed Project, the Redevelopment Agency Commission and the Planning Commission must certify that the Final EIR is adequate, accurate, and objective and has been completed pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and the State CEQA Guidelines. The Agency Commission and Planning Commission have received the C&R under separate cover on May 13, 2010. The Commissions have previously received the Draft EIR. The C&R, together with the DEIR, constitutes the Final Environmental Impact Report (“Final EIR”) for the proposed Project.

*Agency staff recommends the certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report on the Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II redevelopment plan project as adequate,*

*accurate and objective, finding that it has been completed in compliance with applicable provisions and requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act and the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act.*

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Proposed Project**

The Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II development plan project is located on approximately 702-acres east of U.S Highway 101 in the southeastern portion of San Francisco. It occupies the waterfront area from south of India Basin to Candlestick Cove. The proposed Project, as described in the Draft EIR, includes a development project component that would create a mixed-use community with a wide range of residential, retail, office, research and development, civic and community uses, and parks and recreational open space. A major part of the development project would be a new stadium for the San Francisco 49ers National Football League team. Additionally, new transportation and utility infrastructure would serve the Project including a bridge across Yosemite Slough for transit and football game day traffic.

The proposed Project is located in two Redevelopment Project Areas governed by two redevelopment plans: the Hunters Point Shipyard (“HPS”) Redevelopment Plan and the Bayview Hunters Point (“BVHP”) Redevelopment Plan. The HPS Redevelopment Plan includes policies and development controls for the HPS Phase II portion of the Project site. The BVHP Redevelopment Plan includes policies and development controls for the Candlestick Point portion of the Project site. Additionally, a comprehensive set of development policies and objectives specific to the development project was included in Proposition G, which was approved by San Francisco voters in June 2008. The Project includes amendments of the BVHP Redevelopment Plan and the HPS Redevelopment Plan and Design for Development, as well as revisions to the San Francisco *General Plan*, *Planning Code*, and the *Zoning Maps*.

The development project component of the proposed Project includes development of 10,500 residential units with an associated population of 24,465 residents; 885,000 gross square feet (gsf) of retail; 150,000 gsf of office; 2.5 million gsf of Research & Development (“R&D”) uses; a 220-room, 150,000 gsf hotel; 255,000 gsf of artist live/work space; 100,000 gsf of community services; 251.3 acres of new parks, sports fields, and waterfront recreation areas, as well as 84 acres of new and improved State parkland; a 69,000-seat 49ers stadium; and a 75,000 gsf performance arena. The permanent employee population associated with the Project would be 10,730.

In addition, a 300-slip marina would be provided on HPS Phase II. Shoreline improvements would also be provided to stabilize the shoreline. The Project would include structured and on-street parking and various infrastructure improvements to support the development.

Development in the Alice Griffith district of Candlestick Point would include up to 1,210 new homes on approximately 20 net acres and include redevelopment of the San Francisco Housing Authority (“SFHA”) Alice Griffith public housing site along with development of adjacent non-SFHA property. Housing would include one-for-one replacement of 256 public housing units currently on the site, and 954 market-rate and below-market for-sale and rental units.

Redevelopment of the Alice Griffith public housing site would proceed in phases and would not displace existing residents.

The Project analyzed in the Draft EIR proposed demolishing Buildings 208, 211, 224, 231, and 253 at HPS. These buildings are identified in the Draft EIR as potential historic resources. As described in the C&R, Building 208 would now be retained, but would not be occupied. The retention of Building 208 would reduce the severity of the historic resources impact and slightly reduce the construction-related impacts of the Project as described in the Draft EIR, as less building area would be demolished. Because the land use plan would not be changed, this refinement would not result in new significant impacts or an increase in the severity of impacts, as described in Section F of the C&R.

The C&R also adds a refined development schedule for the proposed Project based on recent economic forecasts, as well as updated entitlement, Navy transfer, and permitting schedules. Site preparation activities, including demolition and infrastructure construction, would begin one to two years later than originally planned, and the completion of building construction has been extended from 2029 to 2031, with full occupancy by 2032. Full build-out of HPS Phase II would occur by 2027 and full build-out of Candlestick Point would occur in 2031, with final occupancy in 2032. Total development remains the same as identified in the Draft EIR.

The updated development schedule takes advantage of recent market analyses to refine the Project housing program and provide a steady, deliberate buildup of research and development space. As with the original development schedule, the updated development schedule jump-starts the housing program with the construction of over 3,000 homes in the first phase. The current schedule then provides for the construction of 2,000, 2,500, and 2,800 homes over the following three phases, respectively.

Similarly, research and development space is now anticipated to steadily build over each of the first three development phases, whereas the original schedule front-loaded over 2,275,000 sf of research and development construction in the first phase of development.

### **Variants to the Proposed Project**

The Draft EIR included five variants to the proposed Project, which were also evaluated at a project level. Following are the Variants to the proposed Project that are included in the EIR:

- Variant 1: San Francisco 49ers move outside the project area (no football stadium constructed at HPS Phase II)—Research and Development Variant.

This variant addresses the scenario of the San Francisco 49ers moving to the City of Santa Clara with no football stadium constructed at HPS Phase II, and includes a different land use program at the HPS Phase II site. Compared to the Project, the development program at HPS Phase II would include increases in R&D space with this No Stadium-Additional Research and Development Variant.

- Variant 2: San Francisco 49ers move outside the project area (no football stadium constructed at HPS Phase II)—Housing Variant.

Variant 2 also addresses the scenario of the San Francisco 49ers moving to the City of Santa Clara with no football stadium constructed at HPS Phase II, and includes a different land use program at the HPS Phase II site. Compared to the Project, the development program at HPS Phase II would relocate residential units from Candlestick Point to HPS Phase II with this No Stadium-Housing Variant.

- Sub-variant 2A: San Francisco 49ers move outside the project area (no football stadium constructed at HPS Phase II)—Housing/Research and Development Variant.

The C&R added a Housing/R&D sub-variant to the Housing Variant that adds an additional amount of R&D space (500,000 square feet) at the stadium site at HPS Phase II. Also, 275 residential units would be relocated from the Jamestown district of Candlestick Point to HPS Phase II and another 50 residential units would be redistributed from the Jamestown district to elsewhere within Candlestick Point.

- Variants 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D: The Tower Variants would have the same land use program and overall description as with the Project, but would have different locations and heights for residential towers at Candlestick Point. Tower Variant 3D would also increase tower floor plates.

The Draft EIR included three options for this variant (Tower Variants A, B, and C). Since publication of the Draft EIR, the Design for Development documents have been refined to encourage certain locations for towers based on a variety of tower location principles, such as clustering towers near the center of the development, formation of skylines, adjacency to transit stops, reducing shadow impacts, maintaining view corridors, and limiting adverse wind effects. Accordingly, the C&R includes Tower Variant D, which is a fourth option for the residential towers at Candlestick Point that is based on height, bulk, and massing requirements for vertical development within the Project site as described in the Design For Development. Tower Variant D also includes a 12,500-square-foot maximum floor plate for high-rise towers, in place of the 10,500-square-foot maximum floor plate for the towers analyzed in the Draft EIR. The larger floor plate of Tower Variant D would enable greater efficiency and flexibility in design of floor plans but would not change the proposed size of the podiums analyzed in the Draft EIR. Therefore, the overall “footprint” of the towers would remain the same, and the amount of impermeable surface would not be increased. The total number of dwelling units proposed with the Project would not change.

- Variant 4: A Utilities Variant would include an automated solid waste collection system, decentralized wastewater treatment, and district energy.
- Variant 5: A shared stadium where both the San Francisco 49ers and Oakland Raiders would play at the stadium at HPS Phase II.

Most of the features of the variants would be similar to the features of the Project. All variants would be consistent with the Project Objectives, which are provided in detail in Chapter II of the Draft EIR. Any of the variants of the Project either individually or in combination with elements of the Project could be approved by City decision-makers. The variants are analyzed at a project level of detail, which is equal to the Project analysis.

The Housing/R&D sub-variant and Tower Variant D have been analyzed in the C&R and determined to not result in any new significant environmental impact or an increase in the severity of any impact identified in the Draft EIR.

### **Alternatives to the Proposed Project**

Five alternatives, including the No Project Alternative, were included in the Draft EIR. Aside from the No Project Alternative, four alternatives were selected because they could reduce one or more of the significant impacts of the Project, while meeting Project objectives. Each alternative differs from the Project in one or more of the following ways:

1. In the treatment of the Yosemite Slough bridge, either by changing the design or removing the bridge proposal from the project and substituting an alternative transportation component.
2. In the intensity of development.
3. In the location and type of land uses.
4. In the treatment of the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA), either by changing the reconfiguration proposed or removing the CPSRA from the project.
5. In the treatment of the 49ers Stadium, either by changing the location of the Stadium or removing the Stadium from the project.

Following are the alternatives to the Project:

- Alternative 1: No Project.

The No Project Alternative, is required by CEQA, and assumes that no new development would occur at Candlestick Point and that HPS Phase II would be developed with new uses consistent with the existing HPS Redevelopment Plan.

- Alternative 2: Candlestick Point-HPS Phase II Development, HPS Phase II Stadium, State Parks Agreement, and without the Yosemite Slough Bridge.

This alternative would have the same land use program proposed with the Project, including the State Parks agreement but would not include the Yosemite Slough bridge.

- Alternative 3: Reduced Candlestick Point-HPS Phase II Development, San Francisco 49ers Stay at Existing Candlestick Park Stadium, with Limited State Parks Agreement, and Yosemite Slough Bridge Serving Only Transit, Bicycles, and Pedestrians.



Alternative 3 would be a reduced development alternative. Total housing with this alternative would be 5,210 units, about half of the units proposed with the Project. At Candlestick Point, residential development would be decreased and retail and arena uses would not be developed. Replacement of the Alice Griffith Public Housing site would occur and consist of 1,210 housing units. Minor improvements would be made to the CPSRA under the Limited State Parks Agreement. At HPS Phase II, housing would be increased; other uses at HPS Phase II would be similar to the Project. A new Yosemite Slough bridge would serve only transit, bike, and pedestrian traffic and would not be used for 49er games, which would continue to be held at the existing Candlestick Park stadium. There would be no new stadium at HPS Phase II.

- Alternative 4: Reduced Candlestick Point-HPS Phase II Development, Historic Preservation, No HPS Phase II Stadium, Marina, or Yosemite Slough Bridge.

Alternative 4 would also be a reduced development alternative. Total housing with this alternative would be 7,350 units, about 30 percent less than proposed with the Project. The proposed floor areas for most uses would be approximately 30 percent smaller at full build-out in comparison to build-out of the Project. This alternative includes preservation of four potentially historic structures at HPS Phase II. The C&R corrects a typographical error in the Draft EIR that listed three buildings to be preserved rather than four buildings. No Yosemite Slough bridge, stadium, or marina would be built. The State Parks agreement would occur.

- Subalternative 4A: Candlestick Point-HPS Phase II Development Plan with Historic Preservation.

The C&R includes a sub-alternative to Alternative 4 that includes historic preservation while keeping all other Project components the same. In addition to retaining Building 208 as described above for the proposed Project, this sub-alternative would preserve Buildings 211, 224, 231, and 253 (i.e., all five historically eligible structures identified in the Draft EIR). The potential environmental effects of the historic preservation component of Alternative 4 would not change regardless of whether that element is combined with a variant, another alternative, or the Project. Subalternative 4A is not a substantially different alternative, but one that combines the Project's development plan with preservation of the historically eligible buildings, both of which were analyzed in the Draft EIR. Similar to Alternative 4, Subalternative 4A would retain the four historic buildings (Buildings 211, 224, 231, and 253) that would otherwise be demolished under the Project. In order to accommodate the historic preservation component in the Project's development plan, some adjustments in the location and intensity of some of the Project's land uses and a more cost-effective approach for providing sea level rise protection for the historic resources area have been included in this sub-alternative. In all other respects, Subalternative 4A assumes a development plan that is identical to the Project.

- Alternative 5: Reduced Candlestick Point-HPS Phase II Development, No HPS Phase II Stadium, No State Parks Agreement, and Without the Yosemite Slough Bridge.

Alternative 5 would be a third reduced development alternative that would have the same land use program proposed with the Project, except that the new stadium at HPS Phase II and the Yosemite Slough bridge would not be constructed and the 49ers would continue to utilize Candlestick Park. The total number of housing units would be the same as for the Project; however, because this alternative would not include the CPSRA boundary reconfiguration, the land area available for development would be smaller.

Approximately 1,350 units would be shifted from Candlestick Point to HPS Phase II. This alternative assumes a State Parks agreement does not occur and there is no agreement with the 49ers for a stadium at the Project site.

### **CEQA Process**

Agency and Planning Department staff published a Notice of Preparation of an EIR (“NOP”) on September 1, 2007. This initiated a 30-day public review period for the NOP. The NOP was distributed to responsible or trustee agencies and sent to organizations, companies, and/or individuals that the Agency and the City believed might have an interest in the Project. In response to the NOP, nine comment letters were submitted to the City by public agencies, organizations, and individuals.

In addition to the written comments, the Agency and the Planning Department held two public scoping meetings for the EIR, on September 17, 2007, and September 25, 2007. The scoping meetings provided the public and affected governmental agencies with an opportunity to present environmental concerns regarding the Project.

The Draft EIR for the Project was published and distributed on November 12, 2009, for review and comment to the public, other interested parties, agencies that commented on the NOP, and surrounding jurisdictions for a 45-day public review period that was to conclude on December 28, 2009. However, at the Agency Commission public hearing conducted on December 15, 2009, the Commission voted to extend the comment period to January 12, 2010 (60-day public review period), and scheduled a second public hearing on the Project for January 5, 2010. At its meeting on December 17, 2009, the Planning Commission concurred with the Agency Commission’s decision to extend the comment period.

The Draft EIR was circulated to State agencies for review through the State Clearinghouse. In addition, the Draft EIR was also circulated to federal, regional, or local agencies that have discretionary authority over some aspect of the Project, as well as organizations and individuals that requested a copy of the Draft EIR or those who might have an interest in the Project. Copies of the Draft EIR were also available for public review during normal business hours at the Agency and Planning Department. The EIR was also posted for public review at the Agency and Planning Department websites.

A total of 117 comment letters were received on the Draft EIR and 150 individuals spoke at the three public hearings that were held on the Draft EIR between December 2009 and January 2010. As further required by CEQA, written responses have been provided in the C&R document for all substantive comments. The C&R was published on May 13, 2010. The comment letters and public hearing transcripts, and the responses to the comments comprise three-fourths of Volumes VII, VIII, and IX of the C&R document.

The C&R document also includes text changes to the Draft EIR. The text changes either clarify information or make minor changes and corrections to the document. This chapter of the document repeats text changes specified in the responses to comments, which added to the bulk of the document but enables the reader to easily review all document changes organized in the order of the Draft EIR chapters. Other changes were due to refinements to the Project, many of which have been prompted in response to comments received on the Draft EIR.

### **Commission Action**

The Agency and Planning Commissions will consider certification of the Final EIR, consisting of the Draft EIR and the C&R, on June 3, 2010. Certification of the Final EIR is not an action to approve the project itself, but just a decision on the Final EIR document. The certification action before the Commission is a statement that the Agency finds that the Final Environmental Impact Report reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Agency, is adequate, accurate and objective, that it has been completed in compliance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, and that the Comments and Responses document contains no significant revisions to the Draft EIR.

The Agency, in certifying the completion of the Final EIR, finds the project described in the EIR to have the following potential unavoidable significant environmental impacts that could not be mitigated to a less than significant level:

#### Project and cumulative construction impacts

- Effect of project construction on vehicle traffic and roadway construction on transportation system (Impact TR-1).
- Groundborne vibration impacts from construction (Impact NO-2).
- Cumulative contribution to vibration effects during construction activities.
- Increase in ambient noise levels from construction (Impact NO-3).
- Cumulative contribution to noise from construction activities.
- Cumulative contribution to pile-driving activities.
- Impacts to Historic Resources from Construction Activities (Impact CP-1b).
- Cumulative contribution to impacts on historic resources.

#### Project and cumulative traffic impacts

- Traffic Volumes (Impact TR-2, TR-10).
- Traffic at Intersections (Impact TR-3, TR-4, TR-5, TR-7, TR-8).
- Traffic at Freeway Ramps (Impact TR-6).

#### Project and cumulative freeway traffic impacts

- Traffic at freeway segments (Impact TR-11, TR-15).
- Traffic at freeway ramps (Impact TR-12, TR-13, TR-14).

#### Project and cumulative transit impacts

- Traffic impacts on MUNI lines (Impact TR-21, TR-22, TR-23, TR-24, TR-25, TR-26, TR-26, TR-28).
- Traffic impacts to SamTrans bus lines (Impact TR-30).

Project bicycle impact

- Traffic impacts to bicycle routes (Impact TR-32).

Event traffic impacts

- 49ers game site access and traffic impacts (Impact TR-38).
- Stadium secondary event site access and traffic impacts (Impact TR-46).
- Project site access and traffic impacts from arena uses (Impact TR-51).

Event transit impacts

- Stadium 49er game transit impacts (Impact TR-39).
- Stadium secondary event transit impacts (Impact TR-47).
- Transit impacts from arena uses (Impact TR-52).

Project and cumulative air quality impacts

- Criteria pollutants from project operations (Impact AQ-4).
- Cumulative contribution of criteria pollutants from project operation,
- Cumulative contribution to TAC and PM<sub>2.5</sub> impact under the proposed Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines.

Project and cumulative noise impacts

- Noise impacts from project traffic (Impact NO-6).
- Cumulative contribution to traffic noise levels.
- Noise impacts from stadium events (Impact NO-7).
- Cumulative contribution to ambient noise during stadium events.

Cumulative police services impact

- Cumulative contribution to demand for police services.

Future actions on the proposed Project are scheduled for consideration by the Agency and Planning Commissions at the meeting on June 3, 2010. The Commissions will also be asked to consider adoption of environmental findings pursuant to CEQA, including findings related to the mitigation measures and alternatives discussed in the Final EIR, a Statement of Overriding Considerations that explains how the benefits of the Program outweigh the unavoidable significant environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR, and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program that sets for the implementation mechanism for mitigation measures that are found to be feasible.

*Originated by Stanley Muraoka, Environmental Review Officer*

Fred Blackwell  
Executive Director