



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

Memorandum

Date: October 1, 2018
Case No: 2015-012094GEN
Prepared by: Rachel Schuett, Colin B. Clarke
Reviewed by: Wade Wietgreffe, Manoj Madhavan
RE: **Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines Update, Driving Hazards**

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

INTRODUCTION

The Environmental Planning Division within the San Francisco Planning Department reviews projects for potential impacts on the environment, a process known as environmental review. The department conducts reviews pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. As part of environmental review, the department reviews background technical studies, such as transportation impact studies, to assess a project's effects on the physical environment. These background technical studies support the conclusions of the environmental impact evaluation and guide decision-makers during the project approval process. To assist in the preparation of transportation impact studies, the department provides to consultants and city staff a guidance document, the Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines. The department periodically updates the guidelines, with the last update in 2002.

This memorandum updates the guidance provided in the guidelines prepared in 2002 for the topic of hazards to people driving. The prior guidelines did not identify vehicle-to-vehicle hazards as a separate topic; instead, the prior guidelines included vehicular driveway access impacts as part of the parking topic. The department prepared this memorandum in consultation with stakeholders (e.g., city and county agencies, consultants). The department will issue memoranda that provide updates to other topics (e.g., transit, loading) within the guidelines. When the department issues a memorandum about a topic, it will supersede existing guidance regarding that topic.

The guidance provided herein assumes a land use development project located outside of an area plan that requires a transportation impact study. Guidance on other types of projects is included below under the "Other" subsection. The department may use this guidance for multiple projects, but the department has discretion on applying the guidance on a project by project basis.

The organization of the memorandum is as follows:

- 1) Project Description
- 2) Significance Criterion
- 3) Methodology – Existing and Existing plus Project
- 4) Existing Baseline
- 5) Impact Analysis – Existing plus Project
- 6) Methodology – Cumulative
- 7) Cumulative
- 8) Impact Analysis – Cumulative
- 9) Other (covers different types of projects)

Appendices are under separate cover. The department may update the appendices to the memoranda more frequently than the body of the memoranda.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This section describes project description features, figures, and tables as it relates to people driving. This section also describes approvals from agencies other than the department that a project sponsor may need to obtain for those features.

Basics

This sub-section describes the typical physical, additional physical, and programmatic features for existing and project conditions, as applicable. The geographic extent of these features must, at a minimum, include the project's frontage and may include the entirety of the project's block. This sub-section also indicates in bracketed text [] whether the presentation of typical physical features could occur in text, a figure, and/or a table.

Typical Physical Features

The project description must include the following typical physical features to the extent applicable:

- Whether the existing site is vacant, partially occupied, or fully occupied, by use [text, figure, table]
- Type, location, and square footage (gross and total) by land use, building, and total amount [text, figure, table]
- For residential, number of units by bedroom type (number of bedrooms) and percentage of on-site affordable units by income level and/or age [text, table]
- For hotel, number of rooms [text, table]
- For student housing, number of rooms [text, table]
- For entertainment uses, number of seats and/or standing capacity (maximum occupancy) [text, table]
- For schools and child care facilities, capacity by age [text, table]
- Location and number of off-street vehicular parking spaces [text, figure, table]
- Location, number, and dimensions of off-street freight or delivery service loading spaces [text, figure, table]
- Location and dimensions of driveways, including the throat (i.e., area between property line and internal vehicular circulation system) and associated control devices (e.g., gates, stop sign, right turn in/out) [text, figure]
- Location (e.g., distance and direction from intersection), number, and dimension of curb cuts [text, figure]
- Typical dimensions of paved areas between the curb line and property line (i.e., sidewalks), including identifying any curb dimension changes (e.g., bulb-ins, bulb-outs) [text, figure]
- Location and dimensions of on-street passenger (e.g., paratransit, for-hire vehicles) and freight loading spaces and/or transit boarding zones [text, figure]

Additional Physical Features

The project description may include, among others, the following additional physical features to the extent applicable:

- Location and type of new traffic control devices (e.g., stops signs, signals) [text, figure]
- Location and dimensions of new publicly-accessible rights-of-ways (e.g., new street, mid-block alley) [text, figure]
- Sightlines along the project frontage (e.g., due steep slopes or obstructions such as parking spaces, transit stops) [text, figure]

The department will determine applicability of the additional physical features based upon whether the project would change some of these features and the extent to this information may be necessary to inform the impact determination. For example, a 100 dwelling unit project located on a gently sloping lot with 20 off-street vehicular parking spaces would not need to identify sightlines along the project frontage.

Programmatic Features, if applicable

The project description may include the following additional programmatic features, to the extent applicable. The department will determine project description applicability based upon whether these features are inherent features of the project, which may typically be considered, or whether they are actions related to project operations that are used to avoid a significant impact (e.g., funding mechanisms), which may typically not be considered:

- Hours of operation of land use [text]
- Hours of operation of parking garage and/or on-site loading facility [text]
- Valet operations and location within the garage [text, figure]
- Operations of vehicle stackers, elevators, turning tables, etc. [text]

Approvals

The following is a non-exhaustive list of approvals from agencies other than the planning department that a project sponsor may need to obtain for the project description features described above.

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

- Changes that involve establishing a new sidewalk, shared streets, bulb-ins, reductions in the official sidewalk width, or sidewalk widening in excess of one linear block
- Major encroachment permits or any non-standard improvements beyond the limits of the subject property frontage and or/beyond the centerline within the public right-of-way

San Francisco Public Works

- New curb cut, or closure of an existing curb cut
- Sidewalk bulb-outs, corner bulb-outs, or sidewalk widenings not in excess of one linear block
- Tree removal, replanting, and landscaping in the public right-of-way
- Installation of physical structures in the public right-of-way (e.g., street furniture, sidewalk seating) along the project frontage
- Compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) required for every project.

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

- Changes to transit stop locations including changes to transit shelters
- Changes to traffic signals, traffic calming (e.g., islands, bulb-outs, and daylighting), speed limits, and lane striping
- Changes to on-street parking
- Changes in color curb designation on streets bordering the project site and/or in the immediate vicinity

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERION

San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 31 directs the department to identify environmental effects of a project using as its base the environmental checklist form set forth in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. As it relates to hazards, Appendix G states: “would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?”¹ The department uses the following significance criterion to evaluate that question: A project would have a significant impact if it would create potentially hazardous conditions² for people driving.

METHODOLOGY – EXISTING AND EXISTING PLUS PROJECT

This section describes the typical geography, period, and methodology required to address the significance criteria. The methodology section identifies the collection, generation, and approach to analyze data. The department will determine the appropriate methodology as necessary to inform the analysis. For example, a 100 dwelling unit project would focus on the streets adjacent to the project site.

Basics*Geography*

The methodology will typically focus on the sidewalks and streets adjacent to the project site and the intersections within one block (e.g., 275 to 800 feet) of the project site. For projects that require a transportation study and are greater than 300 dwelling units, 100,000 square feet, and/or 50 off-street vehicular parking spaces, the department may typically extend the methodology to a two to five block radius, depending on the size of the blocks and the size of the project. When a project may impact a wide area, the department will select the streets and intersections most impacted by the project to represent the impacts that may occur at other locations.

¹ The Appendix G language shown reflects the California Natural Resources Agency, *Amendments and Additions to the CEQA Guidelines*, January 2018.

²For the purposes of this memorandum, “hazard” refers to a project-generated vehicle potentially colliding with a person driving that could cause serious or fatal physical injury to the person driving, accounting for the aspects described below. Human error or non-compliance with laws, weather conditions, time-of-day, and other factors can affect whether a collision could occur. However, for purposes of CEQA, hazards refer to engineering aspects of a project (e.g., speed, turning movements, complex designs, substantial distance between street crossings, sightlines) that may cause a greater risk of collisions that result in serious or fatal physical injury than a typical project. This significance criterion focuses on hazards that could reasonably stem from the project itself, beyond collisions that may result from aforementioned non-engineering aspects or the transportation system as a whole.

Period

In San Francisco, the weekday extended p.m. peak period (Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday, 3 p.m. to 7p.m.) is typically the period when the most overall travel happens.³ Although a substantial amount⁴ of travel occurs throughout the day and impacts from projects would typically be less during other periods, the methodology should typically focus on this period (including limiting the hours within the extended p.m. peak period) as changes in travel demand or public right-of-way would be acute compared to other times of the day and days of the week. In some instances, the most overall travel may occur at different periods (a.m., midday, post p.m. peak, and/or weekend) for smaller geographic areas (e.g., a segment of a street) in existing conditions or as a result of the project, or the project may result in substantial disparity in travel demand at different periods (e.g., special events). In these instances, the methodology may substantiate the use of periods in addition to or other than the weekday p.m. peak.

Data Collection

This sub-section describes the typical methodology for data collection for existing and existing plus project conditions. This sub-section also indicates in bracketed text [] whether the presentation of typical methodological elements in other sections of the transportation analysis (e.g., baseline, impact analysis) could occur in text, a figure, and/or a table.

Existing Conditions

The following identifies the methodology for typical projects. The department will determine the appropriate methodology as necessary to inform the impact determination:

Counts

The methodology should include counts of people driving. The methodology may include prior counts collected from other studies or sources combined with (e.g., an average of three different dates with counts at the same intersection, global positioning system user data) or in isolation of counts collected for the project. The use of prior counts must be justified, in consultation with the department. Typically, the use of prior counts may occur if amounts have not changed substantially (e.g., due to lack of new development, circulation changes, or travel patterns). [text, table]

Visual Analysis with Recorded Observations

The methodology should include a site visit for a visual analysis, with recorded observations of slope, topography, physical structures, and other conditions that may affect sightlines for people driving or speeds or turning. In addition, the site visit must record any existing potential or observed hazards at

³ Examples that illustrate this statement: within the San Francisco County Congestion Management Program network transit and vehicular travel speeds are lower during the p.m. peak period (4:30-6:30 p.m.) than during the a.m. peak period (7-9a.m.) as documented in San Francisco County Transportation Authority, *Congestion Management Program*, December 2015; demand at transit stations is consistent and generally higher throughout the p.m. peak period relative to demand at transit stations during the a.m. peak period, as documented in the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, *Core Capacity Transit Study Briefing Book*, July 2016; the weekday peak period for for-hire vehicles occurs from 6:30 p.m. to 7 p.m., as documented in San Francisco County Transportation Authority, *TNCs Today: a Profile of San Francisco Transportation Network Company Activity*, June 2017.

⁴ Throughout this memo, the term “substantial amount” is used but not defined. This is because what constitutes a substantial amount of people, vehicles, etc., depends on the context in which the project is being evaluated (e.g., existing conditions, proposed land uses, and other variables).

locations in the study area for people driving (e.g., conditions that lead to potentially hazardous speeds or turning movements). [text, figure]

Street Characteristics

The methodology should obtain the following general characteristics of streets within the study area:

- Location and type of traffic control devices (e.g., stop signs, signals, crosswalks, countdown signals, audible warning devices) and intersections [text, figure]
- Number of travel lanes by type (e.g., mixed flow, parking, bicycle, transit-only, etc.) [text, figure]
- Posted speed limit and recorded or inferences about observed speeds [text]
- Presence of High-Injury Network [text, figure]
- Locations of nearest driveways (driveways that are the closest to the project driveway on both the same and the opposite side of the street) [text, figure]

The methodology should obtain the following additional characteristics of streets within the study area to the extent applicable:

- Signal timing and phasing of traffic control devices [text]
- Width of travel lanes [text, figure]
- Number of travel lanes by type at intersections (if different from midblock) [text, figure]
- Data regarding the location and causes of collisions (e.g., particular turning movements) [text, figure]
- Nearby transit stations/stops amenities (e.g., shelters) and service information (e.g., frequency) [text, figure, table]

Existing plus Project Conditions

The following identifies the typical methodology:

Travel Demand

The methodology will estimate the amount of people driving to and from the project site. [text, table] In addition, the methodology will distribute and assign the project's vehicle to roadways, intersections, loading zones, and driveways to the extent applicable. [text, figure]

Potentially Hazardous Conditions

The methodology will use the travel demand analysis and project elements to determine if the project would cause potentially hazardous conditions. The methodology should assess to the extent applicable:

- the amount, movement type, sightlines, and speed of project vehicle trips in and out of project facilities based upon the design of such facilities (e.g., curb cut dimensions, roadway speeds) in relation to the amount of people driving at those locations [text, figure]
- the amount, type (e.g., left turn, right turn), sightlines, and speed of project vehicle turning movements at intersections, including any changes to the public right-of-way that facilitate vehicular movement (e.g., channelized turns) in relation to the amount of people driving at those movement locations [text, figure]

EXISTING BASELINE

The existing baseline⁵ must include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced (e.g., department notification of project receiving environmental review), from both a local and regional perspective. While the existing baseline subsection may repeat existing conditions features described in the project description, the baseline will also present (text, figure, or table) the applicable elements included in the methodology as it relates to those features. For example, the project description describes the physical location and dimensions of an existing curb cut. The existing baseline conditions refers to the physical location of an existing curb cut and describes any existing potential or observed hazardous conditions for people driving associated with the curb cut. In addition, the existing baseline conditions must indicate the date and time that counts, visual observations, etc. occurred.

IMPACT ANALYSIS – EXISTING PLUS PROJECT

This section ties the project description, methodology, and existing baseline together to address the significance criteria for existing plus project conditions. This section addresses the typical approach for the impact analysis and provides more details related to hazards for people driving. The impact analysis section should present a format (text, figure, or table) consistent with earlier sections for easy comparison.

Basics

The purpose of the impact analysis is not to exhaustively repeat information from elsewhere. Instead, the impact analysis presents the findings of the analysis, based upon the methodology(ies) applied to gather information. The impact analysis must only provide information that is relevant to the significance criteria. For each significance criterion (see below for more details), the analysis must (in the order presented):

- 1) Address the project's direct and indirect physical changes to the existing baseline condition. Describe the intensity (e.g., amount of vehicle trips), location (e.g., driveway, particular street), and other project features that may be relevant to address the significance criterion. Be specific (e.g., the project would generate 120 vehicle trips into the driveway during the p.m. peak hour), do not generalize (e.g., the project would generate a modest amount of vehicle trips). The impact analysis shall assume the project would comply with laws and regulations and the analysis shall describe how compliance would occur, what it would entail, and how it may lessen impacts.
- 2) Identify an impact finding without mitigation: no impact, less-than-significant impact, or a significant impact. Ensure that step 1 substantiates the rationale for that impact finding.
 - 2.A) If the project would result in a less-than-significant impact, the impact analysis is complete.
 - 2.B) If the project would result in no impact or a significant impact, if applicable, introduce the title of a mitigation measure in paragraph form to reduce the impact. Briefly describe the nexus and rough proportionality to the extent applicable between the mitigation measure and the impact. Briefly describe how the measure would reduce the impact and briefly analyze whether it would have any environmental impacts of its own.
- 3) If the impact requires mitigation, begin the text of the mitigation measure with its title. Measure text should clearly explain who is responsible for what and where and when. Mitigation measure

⁵ Other baselines (e.g., future baseline) will be described in another memo, that is part of the Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines update.

text should attempt to reduce the impact below the threshold of significance. If the mitigation measure does not reduce the impact below the threshold of significance, but it still reduces the impact, explain qualitatively how is the impact reduced, and why it is not reduced below the threshold of significance.

- 4) If the project would result in a significant impact, identify the conclusion impact finding: less than significant with mitigation, significant and unavoidable, or significant and unavoidable with mitigation.
- 5) Introduce analysis provided for informational purposes (e.g., code compliance, see later section regarding details).

Potentially Hazardous Conditions

The impact analysis must address whether the project would create potentially hazardous conditions for people driving. The department does not provide a quantitative threshold for determining significance. Too many factors mentioned in the methodology affect the potential for hazardous conditions. Instead, the department will determine significance on a project-by-project basis. However, the following examples are some of the circumstances, which may result in potentially hazardous conditions to people driving. This is not an exhaustive list of circumstances, under which, potentially hazardous impacts would occur:

- a project would construct or be located on a lot with physical obstructions (e.g., trees, utilities, an adjacent curb cut used by a substantial amount of people driving, or on-street parking directly adjacent to the curb cut or transit stop) or slopes that would obstruct sightlines between a substantial amount of people driving, exiting, or reversing into an off-street facility and a substantial amount of people driving at high speeds in travel lane(s) next to the off-street facility
- a project would add a substantial number of vehicle trips to an uncontrolled or stop-sign controlled turning movement (e.g., left-turn) across multiple lanes used by a substantial amount of people driving at high speeds
- a project would add a substantial amount of trucks (e.g., based on counts or projections) to a turning movement such that those trucks would encroach into oncoming travel lane(s) used by a substantial amount of people driving (e.g., based on counts or projections)
- a project would be unable to accommodate⁶ vehicle trips, including freight and delivery service vehicle trips into its off-street facilities, thereby blocking a travel lane at a location with inadequate sightlines for a substantial amount of people driving (e.g., based on counts or projections) in that blocked travel lane
- a project would include an off-street loading dock adjacent to a garage driveway entrance/exit that would result in blocking the driveway for ingress vehicles (entering), resulting in queuing within the public right-of-way

METHODOLOGY – CUMULATIVE

This section describes the typical geography, period, and methodology required to address the significance criteria. The section for cumulative only needs to expand upon the methodology section for existing and existing plus project to the extent the methodology differs. The planning department will determine the appropriate methodology as necessary to inform the impact determination.

⁶ “Accommodate” refers to design of the facility (e.g., can vehicles be accommodated without queuing based upon throat length, gate location, etc.) and not the capacity (e.g., does the number of spaces accommodate the demand) of the facility as many variables affect the demand to and from a facility.

Basics*Geography*

The geography for the cumulative impact analysis will typically be the same as that used for existing and existing plus project conditions given a project would typically only contribute considerably to cumulative impacts to people driving in that geographic area.

Period

The period for cumulative is typically the same as that used for existing and existing plus project conditions except projected out to a future year based upon reasonably foreseeable projects (see below for more details). Future year estimates should typically be between 10 and 25 years. In some instances, the most overall travel may occur at different periods (a.m., midday, post p.m. peak, and/or weekend) as a result of a cumulative project (e.g., an event center), or the project may result in substantial disparity in travel demand at different periods. In these instances, and in consultation with the department, the methodology may substantiate the use of periods in addition to or other than the weekday p.m. peak.

Cumulative Projects

This sub-section describes the typical methodology for cumulative conditions. This sub-section also indicates in bracketed text [] whether the presentation of typical methodological elements in other sections of the transportation analysis (e.g., baseline, impact analysis) could occur in text, a figure, and/or a table.

List Approach or Projections

The methodology should include future estimates of people driving. To arrive at the future estimates, the methodology may qualitatively describe them, rely on estimates from other studies or sources in combination with the project's study, use a list of cumulative projects in the project study area or vicinity or use travel demand models, such as the San Francisco County Transportation Authority's San Francisco Chained Activity Modeling Process (SF-CHAMP). The methodology must identify which approach the analysis uses and may include a modified approach. [text, figure, table]

The department will decide whether the methodology should use a list-based, projections-based, or modified approach. For these approaches, the department typically defines reasonably foreseeable projects as:

List-Based:

- An infrastructure project listed in the latest adopted region's Sustainable Communities Strategy
- An infrastructure project listed in San Francisco's Countywide Transportation Plan, Capital Plan, or a San Francisco agency's (e.g., San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency) Capital Improvement Program
- An infrastructure, private development project, or area plan project is actively undergoing environmental review, recently completed environmental review, or is anticipated to undertake environmental review in the near future because sufficient project definition is established

Projections-Based:

- Land use growth based upon estimates of projections developed in preparation of region's Sustainable Communities Strategy

Modified:

- Any combination of the types of projects described under the list-based and projections-based project types (although projections are typically a compilation of the list-based projects).

Street Characteristics

The methodology must adjust projections or street conditions based on reasonably foreseeable projects. [text, figure] The methodology must document rationale for adjustments and describe changed conditions, in consultation with the department. Examples include:

- an agency proposes changes to service and line stop location on a transit line, which may affect the location of walking trips to and from the project site to nearby transit stations/stops or change the number of walking trips from the project site
- a project proposes widening a sidewalk that would be used for people walking to and from the project site
- a project proposes placement of a structure that closes off or renders existing facilities for people walking to and from the project site challenging to use, which then requires walking trips to and from the project site to be rerouted
- a substantially large development project proposes entrance and exit locations for people walking and driving along the route of travel for people walking from the project site

CUMULATIVE

The cumulative subsection will present (text, figure, or table) the applicable elements included in the methodology.

IMPACT ANALYSIS – CUMULATIVE

This section ties the methodology and description of cumulative conditions together to address the significance criteria for cumulative conditions.

Basics

For each significance criterion for which the project has some impact⁷, the analysis must (in the order presented):

- 1) Address whether the project in combination with the reasonably foreseeable projects (i.e., cumulative projects) results in a significant impact. The discussion shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided for the existing plus project impact analysis. The discussion of cumulative impacts shall focus on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute (e.g., the examples provided in the methodology – cumulative section) rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impact. The impact analysis shall assume the project would comply with laws and regulations and the analysis shall describe how compliance would occur, what it would entail, and how it may lessen impacts.
- 2) Identify an impact finding without mitigation for the cumulative projects: less-than-significant impact or a significant impact. Ensure that step 1 substantiates the rationale for that impact finding. Cumulative impacts to people driving should use the same methodology as existing plus project conditions, which includes a combination of a quantitative and qualitative approach.

⁷ No cumulative analysis is required if the existing plus project impact analysis found no impact. However, if the analysis found less-than-significant impacts, then an analysis of cumulative impacts is required.

- 2.A) If the cumulative projects would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact, the impact analysis is complete.
 - 2.B) If the cumulative projects would result in a significant cumulative impact, identify whether the project's contribution is cumulatively considerable.
 - 2.C) If the project would not contribute considerably to the significant cumulative impact, the impact analysis is complete.
 - 2.D) If the project would contribute considerably to the significant cumulative impact, if applicable, introduce the title of a mitigation measure in paragraph form to reduce the impact. Briefly describe the nexus and rough proportionality to the extent applicable between the mitigation measure and the impact. Then, determine an appropriate mitigation measure considering the project's fair share contribution to impact, after consulting with the department on the appropriate fair share amount methodology. Briefly describe how the measure would reduce the impact, and briefly analyze any potential environmental impacts from the mitigation measure itself.
- 3) If the impact requires mitigation, begin the text of the mitigation measure with its title. Measure text should clearly explain who is responsible for what and where and when. Mitigation measure text should attempt to reduce the impact below the threshold of significance. The mitigation measure should also describe the project's fair share contribution.
 - 4) If the project would contribute considerably to the significant cumulative impact, if applicable, identify the conclusion impact finding: less than significant with mitigation, significant and unavoidable, or significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

Potentially Hazardous Conditions

The impact analysis must address whether the cumulative projects would create potentially hazardous conditions for people driving. The same examples as provided for existing plus project conditions apply here, except for cumulative conditions.

OTHER

The guidance provided in this memorandum assumes a land use development project located outside of an area plan that requires a transportation impact study. This section describes the type of additional or different information that may be necessary to address walking/accessibility impacts for the following circumstances: land use development project located within an area plan, an area plan, or infrastructure project. In addition, this section describes the extent to which a code compliance analysis and/or a discussion of policy inconsistencies may be necessary.

Land Use Development Project Located within an Area Plan

For projects that are consistent with an area plan, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15183, the assessment must limit its analysis to such conditions specified in that section. The assessment must include a project description, discussion of existing baseline conditions (including infrastructure changes), and analysis of existing plus project and cumulative conditions. Typically, the assessment will use the significance criteria and approach identified herein and identify if there are any mitigation or improvement measures applicable from the area plan environmental impact report that should apply to the project. Cumulative impact analysis shall be limited to assess if new cumulative projects that were not known at the time of the environmental impact report (EIR) certification and, if applicable, whether any new impacts would occur from those cumulative projects.

As of September 2018, the Planning Commission certified the following area plan EIRs (in order of certification): Central SoMa, Rincon Hill, Market & Octavia, Visitation Valley, Balboa Park, Eastern Neighborhoods (Mission, Showplace Square/Potrero, Central Waterfront, East SoMa), Treasure Island, Glen Park, Transit Center District Plan, Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Western SoMa, and Central SoMa. No mitigation and improvement measures from these abovementioned EIRs related to potentially hazardous conditions to people driving.

Area Plans

For area plans, the assessment will typically use the significance criteria identified herein. The following sub-sections describe the type of additional or different information that may be necessary to address walking/accessibility impacts for project description, methodology, and impact analysis. For area plans that also include infrastructure changes (e.g., street redesigns), please see the Infrastructure Project sub-section for additional or different information that may be necessary.

Project Description

Typically, the department conducts an analysis to estimate the amount of future development that could occur in the plan area as a result of its implementation. The department typically does not have all the project description details described herein. However, the project description may include policies that may relate to the methodology and impact analysis (e.g., curb cut restrictions).

Methodology

The assessment will typically use the same methodology identified herein, except the methodology will use a larger geographical study area and require less site-specific information (e.g., driveway locations at each site) except to document circumstances where vehicles may not be allowed (e.g., curb cut restrictions). While an individual project may not require some elements listed in the Methodology – Existing and Existing plus project section, area plans typically will include all of these elements. The department should select sidewalks, streets, and intersections most impacted by the area plan to represent the impacts that may occur at other locations.

Impact Analysis

For analysis of area plans, assess the projected amount of growth and infrastructure changes associated with the rezoning within the area plan boundaries. The analysis of potentially hazardous conditions and accessibility impacts should be similar to that described under the Impact Analysis - Existing plus Project and Impact Analysis - Cumulative sections. If the area plan includes infrastructure changes (e.g., street redesigns), given the potential time gap between land use development and completion of infrastructure changes, the analysis should discuss the potential short-term effects of that potential time gap in a lesser level of detail than that provided for overall effects. However, the analysis should assume individual land use development projects within the area plan would be subject to property specific infrastructure changes (e.g., Better Streets Plan).

Examples of circumstances that would result in significant impacts are described under Impact Analysis – Existing Plus Project.

Infrastructure Project

For infrastructure projects (e.g., new roads, bridge repair, sewer line, rail service, roadway modifications, etc.), the assessment of the project description, significance criteria, and impact analysis should be similar

to private development projects. The analysis typically does not require trip generation analysis as infrastructure projects usually do not generate trips.⁸ However, some infrastructure project may induce trips, such as the addition of through lanes on existing or new highways or streets.⁹ In addition, infrastructure projects may generate short-term trips due to construction workers and vehicles accessing the project site.

Project Description

The project description must describe the typical physical, additional physical, and programmatic features for existing and project conditions, as applicable. The project description must provide the geographic boundaries of the project and street cross sections.

Methodology

The assessment will typically use the same methodology identified herein.

Impact Analysis

The analysis of potentially hazardous conditions should be similar to that described under the Impact Analysis - Existing plus Project and Impact Analysis - Cumulative sections.

Potentially Hazardous Conditions

Examples of circumstances that would result in significant impacts are described under Impact Analysis – Existing Plus Project.

⁸ Governor's Office of Planning and Research, *Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA*, January 20, 2016.

⁹ Generally, minor transportation projects would not result in additional trips. Examples include, but are not limited to, rehabilitation, maintenance, and repair of transportation infrastructure; installation, removal or reconfiguration of non-through traffic lanes and traffic control devices; removal of through lanes; installation of traffic calming measures and wayfinding; removal of on- or off-street parking. Governor's Office of Planning and Research, *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA*, November 2017.