

### SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

### **Executive Summary** Amendments to Design-for-Development

HEARING DATE: MARCH 3, 2016

February 25, 2016
2015-013111CWP
Candlestick Point
Candlestick Point Activity Node Special Use District
4884/024, 028-036, 039; 4886/09; 4917/001-003, 4918/ 001-008, 021-025,
4934/002, 003; 4935/001-003; 4956/003-014; 4960/ 027; 4977/008; 4983/001;
4984/ 001, 002; 4991/276; 5000/002-024; 5005/001-005; 5023/008, 010,
5025/028, 011; 5027/015; 5076/008, 010, 011; 8803/001, 8804/001, 8811/001,
8812/001
Kofi Bonner
Lennar Urban
1 Sansome, Suite 3200
San Francisco, CA 94104
Mat Snyder – (415) 575-6891
Mathew.snyder@sfgov.org

Recommendation: Approval

### APPROVAL BEING SOUGHT

The Project Sponsor proposes to amend the Design for Development for the Candlestick Point portion of the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Project (Project). The Planning Commission is required to approve all amendments to the Design for Development per both the Commission's initial action approving the D4D (Planning Commission Motion No. 18104) and per the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan (Section 4.3).

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### Full Project

The full Candlestick Point / Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Plan ("CP HPS II Plan") is to completely redevelop Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard from the underutilized sites that they are currently into a series of mixed-use, high-density, and amenity-rich neighborhoods. While Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard were planned together, they have separate schedules for implementation. The CP HPS II Plan is within two active Redevelopment Project Areas and is therefore implemented by the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure ("OCII") and not by the Planning Department. The table below compares the land use program between the 2010 approval and the current proposal:

Table 1: Candlestick Point Land Use – Approved vs. Proposed			
Candlestick Point Land Use	2010 Approved	2016 Proposed	
Housing Units	6,225 units	No change	
Neighborhood Retail	125,000 sf	131,000 sf (125,000 SF + 6,000 SF converted from 15,500 sf office)	
Community Facilities	50,000 sf	50,000 sf (Inclusive of floor space for a Fire Station, Safety Hub, International African Market Place, and CPSRA Welcome Center)	
Office	150,000 sf	134,500 sf (Reduction of 15,500 sf due to conversion to 6,000 SF retail )	
Performance Venue/Arena	10,000 seats 75,000 sf	1,200 Seats 42,000 sf Film Arts Center 4,400 Seats 33,000 sf Performance Venue	
Hotel	220 Rooms 150,000 sf	No Change	

### **Design-for-Development**

The Candlestick Point Design-for-Development ("D4D") acts as the Planning Code for the Candlestick Point project. While the CP HPS II Project is generally implemented by OCII, amendments to the D4D require approval by the Planning Commission ("Commission").

The D4D provides development controls that will create a mixed-use, mid-to-high density urban environment characterized by well-proportioned urban streets and parks and aligning buildings. For the entire master development, the D4D provides controls for street and block layout; building height, bulk and massing; setbacks and street activation; open space, building type, modulation, parking, loading, and signage among other topics. The D4D generally restricts buildings to low-rise (up to 65 feet) and mid-rise (up to 85-feet), but allows for up to 12 towers (buildings above 105-feet tall) at specific locations. Further height restrictions are provided for specific contexts, such as where buildings align the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area ("CPSRA"), narrow alleys, and existing neighborhoods.

The D4D originally included controls for three possible build-out scenarios (Project variants) with a focus on the scenario that included the construction of a stadium at Hunters Point Shipyard. The D4D includes specific provisions for five neighborhoods, "Alice Griffith", "Candlestick North", "Candlestick South", "Candlestick Center" and "Jamestown". Of the five neighborhoods, four are being developed under the

DDA by Lennar Urban. The fifth neighborhood, "Jamestown", would be developed separately. It should be noted that the D4D does not provide specific controls for actual land use; land use controls are provided in the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan and other implementing documents.

#### Proposed Project Amendments

The Project Sponsor is now proposing to amend the Project, which will require amending several implementing documents, including the D4D. The Project Sponsor describes the proposed Project changes in three tiers of amendments. Tier One includes substantive changes; Tier Two includes refinements and clarifications to the implementing documents; Tier Three includes editorial changes to the D4D that reflect the elimination of the stadium from the proposal and moving provisions for the Jamestown neighborhood to a stand-alone chapter, among other topics. Attached to the Draft Motion as Exhibits A and B are detailed lists of proposed Project changes and how the changes will need to be reflected in the different implementing documents. Of these changes to the proposed documents, the D4D needs Planning Commission approval. Below is a summarized list of Project changes are also listed separately for informational purposes.

Tier One changes (denoted in the attached D4D with yellow highlights) to the D4D include:

- Relocation of three of the twelve tower locations;
- Height increases from 85 to 120 feet for the "landmark" building (proposed Film Arts Center) at the Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue;
- Height increases for buildings along Harney Way between Arelious Walker Drive and Ingerson Avenue, and along Ingerson Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Harney Way from 65 feet to 80 feet; and
- Relocation of 269 parking spaces originally proposed for the street to the parking garage.

Tier One changes to the Project that do not require changes to the D4D include:

- Inclusion of an additional 6,000 square feet of local serving retail and the elimination of 15,500 square feet of office;
- Revision of Harney Way off-site phasing; and
- Revision of the design of the off-site portion of Gilman Avenue, maintaining current sidewalk widths and eliminating a travel lane, among other aspects.

Tier Two changes (denoted in the attached D4D with blue highlights) to the D4D include:

- Additional signage provisions;
- Clarifications on height limits for building podiums;
- Greater ground floor height requirements (from 12 to 15 feet) for non-residential uses;
- Relocation and change in requirements for garage entries and curb cut widths;
- Reconfiguration of CP Center internal circulation and access;
- New guidelines and standards for the newly proposed pedestrian and vehicular entry plaza to CP Center off of Arelious Walker Drive;
- Refinement to blank façade provisions recognizing situations where floor plates are below grade;
- Removal of parking space dimension requirements;

- Addition of parking ratio maximums for grocery stores and cinemas consistent with the Planning Code;
- Provisions that recognize the newly proposed hotel location at Harney Way and Arelious Walker;
- New requirements for minimum width of pedestrian paths within the mid-block breaks;
- Additional guidelines that encourage outdoor seating at key locations within the Alice Griffith neighborhoods;
- Adjustment of required setbacks at Alice Griffith from 10 feet to 9 feet for properties fronting Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue, and G Street;
- Adjustment of boundary and block depth for blocks facing Harney Way on the south side; and
- New provisions that clarify boundaries of height zones.

Tier 2 changes to the Project that do not require changes to the D4D include:

- Phasing of the construction of Wedge Park, and timing and grading for Jamestown Avenue Improvements;
- Adjustments to the streetscape plan including elimination of bulb-outs to accommodate Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") and Fire requirements; and
- Inclusion of two performance venues, one at the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue, the "Landmark" building site; and another integrated into the hotel location at Harney Way and Arelious Walker Drive.

<u>Tier Three changes (denoted as grey highlights) to the D4D include:</u>

- Removal of all references to the stadium;
- Relocation of standards and guidelines for the Jamestown neighborhood to its own Chapter (Chapter 7);
- Clarifications throughout that provide consistent interpretations of certain standards, update graphics, images, tables, and text to reflect the latest proposal.

### BACKGROUND

#### **Previous Actions**

On June 3, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Agency Commission Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Project ("Project") with the following actions:

- By Planning Commission Motion 18096 Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") and by Planning Commission Motion 18097 Adoption of California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") Findings. The certification of the FEIR was confirmed by the Board of Supervisors on July 14, 2010;
- 2. Adoption of General Plan amendments, which among other elements, created a new Sub-Area Plan for Candlestick Point, and a new Area Plan for Hunters Point Shipyard;
- 3. Adoption of Planning Code amendments; (3) Zoning Map amendments;

- 4. Adoption of Redevelopment Plan amendments for both the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan and the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan;
- 5. Approval of a Cooperation Agreement between the Redevelopment Agency and the Planning Department; and
- 6. Adoption of separate Design for Development documents for Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard.

Other aspects of the project that were approved at the same time, but for which the Planning Commission was not an approving body, include the following: (1) Interagency Cooperation Agreements ("ICA") for interagency review of horizontal (infrastructure) improvements; (2) Health Code, Public Works Code, Building Code, and Subdivision Code amendments; (3) Disposition and Development Agreement ("DDA"), which included (among other documents) as attachments a Project Phasing Plan, a Transportation Plan, and an Infrastructure Plan; (4) Real Property Transfer Agreement; (5) Public Trust Exchange Agreement; (6) Park Reconfiguration Agreement; and (7) Tax Increment Allocation Pledge Agreement.

### Phasing Plan

The Project Phasing Plan (an attachment to the DDA), divides the sites into Major Phases (four major phases for Candlestick) and Sub-phases within the Major Phases. In addition to including the Project Phasing Plan, the DDA also establishes a Schedule of Performance in which the Project Sponsor is required to submit applications for Major Phase and Sub-Phase approval, and deliver infrastructure and community benefits. Given the complexity of the project, the DDA also includes provisions by which the Project Phasing Plan can be amended.

#### Subsequent Approvals

So far, the Project Sponsor has received approvals from the OCII Commission for the first Major Phase at Candlestick Point, and the first Sub-Phase within that major phase. The major phase (identified as Major Phase I) consists of the "Candlestick Center" neighborhood, or the central retail center, and portions of the "Candlestick South" and "Candlestick North" neighborhoods, which are immediately across the street from Candlestick Center; and a portion of the Alice Griffith neighborhood. The first Sub-Phase approval included four blocks of the Alice Griffith Public Housing Replacement Project, which includes 325 affordable housing units (of which, 209 are replacement Housing Authority units), ("Sub-Phase CP-01"). Sub-Phase CP-01 was approved by OCII's Executive Director in March 2014. Its first buildings are expected to be completed by fall of 2016.

Along with the approval of the First Major Phase, the following actions were also taken: (1) amendments to the Project Phasing Plan including the schedule of transportation improvements; (2) approval of a Master Streetscape Plan, (3) approval of Master Signage Plan; and (4) issuance of an Addendum (Addendum 1) to the FEIR.

### Approvals Currently Being Sought

The Project Sponsor is currently seeking approval of three additional Sub-Phases within Major Phase 1, which generally include Candlestick Center ("Sub-Phase CP-02"), the portion of Candlestick South that is immediately across Harney Way from Candlestick Center ("Sub-Phase CP-03") and the portion of Candlestick North that is immediately across Ingerson Avenue from Candlestick Center ("Sub-Phase CP-04", collectively, "Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04"). At the same time, the Project Sponsor is seeking approval for schematic design for portions of Sub-Phase CP-02. These Sub-Phases include 635,000 square feet of regional retail, 131,000 square feet of local-serving retail, 150,000 square feet of hotel space, 134,500 square feet of office use, and up to 75,000 square feet of entertainment uses. The Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04

Application also includes up to 1,565 units of housing, including 290 stand-alone affordable units and up to 129 inclusionary units.

In conjunction with these applications, the Project Sponsor is now proposing changes to the Project that would require amendments to the initial Major Phase approval, the Streetscape Master Plan, and the D4D.

### SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD

The Project site is located along the City's southeastern waterfront. The site is east of Executive Park, with the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood to the north, the Hunters Point Shipyard to the northeast, and adjacent to the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area along the Bay frontage generally to the east.

### ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The OCII staff, in consultation with the Planning Department, has prepared Addendum 4 to the Project EIR, which OCII staff issued on **Date**. Addendum 4 evaluates the proposed Project changes in the applications for Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04, including the D4D changes. Addendum 4 reflects the changes in the D4D and address all aspects of the proposed changes listed in Exhibits A and B of the Draft Motion.

In Addendum 4, OCII staff has determined that the proposed Project modifications will not cause new significant impacts not identified in the EIR, will not increase the severity of significant impacts identified in the EIR, and will not require new mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts. Addendum 4 among other considerations, identifies and discusses recommended modifications to two previously adopted transportation-related mitigation measures: 1) Mitigation Measures TR-16, which provides for improvements to Harney Way, and 2) TR-23.1, which provides mitigation to maintain headways for the 29-Sunset transit line. Addendum 4 concludes that the proposed modifications to the mitigation measures would not result in new or more severe impacts. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the modifications to Mitigation Measures TR-16 and TR-23.1 as set forth in Addendum 4. Other than as described in the Addendum 4, no Project changes have occurred , and no changes have occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the proposed Project that will cause significant environmental impacts to which the Project will contribute considerably, and no new information has become available that shows that the Project will cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, no supplemental environmental review is required beyond the Addendum.

### HEARING NOTIFICATION

Hearing notification outside of posting of the Commission's Agenda is not required.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

Staff of OCII presented the proposed Project changes to the Planning and Development Subcommittee of the Hunters Point Shipyard Citizens Advisory Committee ("CAC") on May 14, 2015 and September 10, 2015; and to the full CAC on September 14, 2015. The proposed Project changes received unanimous support.

### ISSUES AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Below is a discussion and analysis of the D4D Amendments.

Substantive Changes (Tier One)

Heights

The developer proposes to increase the height limits for the mixed-use buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue, and the "landmark structure" which is intended to be developed as a Film Arts Center.

#### Mixed-use Building Heights (Item 2 of the Tier 1 Revision List)

The 2010 D4D prescribed a height limit of 65 feet for the mixed-use buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue. The developer proposes to increase this height limit to 80 feet, mandate a minimum floor-to-floor height for the ground floor retail to 20 feet, and limit development to five residential stories above the ground floor retail space.

Staff believes this height increase will have the following significant benefits on the Candlestick Center neighborhood:

- An increased height limit will ensure 20 foot high retail spaces at the ground floor along Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way can be accommodated. A 65 foot height limit results in retail spaces that are only 15 feet high. Given the importance and scale of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue, requiring 20 foot tall retail is appropriate.
- An increased height limit will allow for more architectural variety in the neighborhood. An 80 foot height limit gives architects the space they need to differentiate the design of the buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue. This architectural differentiation is more difficult to achieve under a 65 foot height limit as architects must design for a viable program within a smaller building envelope.
- An increased height limit will create a strong streetwall for Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue at Candlestick's core. An 80 foot height limit on Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue will help to create a strong statement that will anchor future development at Candlestick Point.

#### Landmark Structure Height (Item 3 of the Tier 1 Revision List)

The developer proposes an increase in the permitted height for an anchor landmark structure (currently proposed as a Film Arts Center) from 85 feet to 120 feet. Staff believes the increased height at this location will create a strong corner presence for the most critical intersection at Candlestick Point: Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue.

#### **Tower Locations**

The Final EIR Tower Variant 3D included specific locations within the tower zones identified in the D4D. Section 4.2.1, Table 4.1, and Figure 4.3 of the D4D provides the allowed tower locations. Modifications to three towers locations are proposed for Tower J, Tower K, and Tower G.

#### Tower J and Tower K (Item 1 of the Tier 1 Revision List)

Towers J and K are located within the Candlestick South neighborhood (D4D Section 5.4) They are proposed as parts of Sub-Phases CP-11 and CP-10, respectively. With the proposed Project amendments, the two towers move approximately 100 feet south-east, immediately adjacent to the approved locations. Tower K remains within the approved allowable high rise location zone. These changes result from the proposed increase in the depth of the blocks in Sub-Phase CP-04.

The approved Sub-Phase CP-04 block depths are substantially less than other blocks at Candlestick Point as they were originally expected to accommodate predominantly retail development with a service alley (the mid-block break) along the back of these blocks. The current development plan proposes townhomes lining the mid-block break and thus proposes to increase the block boundaries to accommodate the proposed land use program. This will increase the variety of housing types in Candlestick Center and increase the efficient use of land on these blocks. The increase in the depth of these blocks within SubPhase CP-04 results in an equivalent reduction in the depth of the blocks immediately behind them, thereby shifting the location of Towers J and K. Both Towers would move approximately 100 feet to the southeast from their current approved location. Tower K would continue to be located within an approved tower zone.

#### Tower G (Item 1 of the Tier 1 Revision List)

Tower G, as approved in 2010, was located in the middle of Candlestick Center (Sub-Phase CP-02). However, this location conflicts with the proposed new layout for CP Retail Center. The Project Sponsor has stated that the tower cannot be structurally integrated with the CP Retail Center garage as it will be constructed on a separate timeline.

The Developer worked with staff at OCII, Planning, and California State Parks to achieve a shift in the tower location that met the goals of the above mentioned agencies. The D4D now includes additional provisions to assure that care is taken to integrate the tower into the whole neighborhood. A pedestrian plaza and mews has been added to the designs to provide meaningful connectivity between the tower facing Jamestown and the internal circulation.

#### Other Changes of Note (Tiers 2 and 3)

In addition to the significant changes to the D4D discussed above, the following changes are proposed:

### CP Retail Center Reconfiguration (Items 4, 5, 6 on the Tier 2 Revisions List)

CP Retail Center is now proposed with internal circulation that features three north-south routes through the site that connect to the adjacent street network and have limited vehicular access. The illustrative example in the original D4D featured continuation of Earl Street and 8<sup>th</sup> Street through the site and featured an east-west route that connected through to Arelious Walker Drive (Bill Walsh Street). Along with the garage structure along Arelious Walker Drive, the current proposal now features a below grade parking structure for almost the full footprint of the CP Retail Center. While vehicular ingress and egress is still concentrated along Arelious Walker Drive, a new ingress and egress is now proposed for Ingerson Avenue and an egress-only is proposed for Harney Way.

#### Parking (Items 10 and 11, on the Tier 2 Revisions List)

Parking provisions now allow for the addition of 269 parking spaces to the CP Retail Center parking garage that had previously been proposed in the street network. Previously, parking was proposed on the internal streets in CP Retail Center; these streets are now designed with pedestrian emphasis and limited vehicular access. ADA, stormwater, and other utility requirements has reduced the number of on-street parking that can be provided on other, neighboring streets as well. The D4D parking standards now enable these previously planned parking spaces to be provided within the parking structure. Maximum parking ratios for cinemas and grocery stores that are consistent with the Planning Code have also been added. Consistent with the Planning Code, required dimensions for parking spaces has been eliminated. Allowance for parking entries have been minimally increased from 24 feet to 27 feet where such entries would serve both vehicular ingress and egress and loading.

Staff believes that these changes to the parking standards and access still meet the spirit of the original design to emphasize pedestrian, bicycle and transit access over vehicular access and is consistent with the General Plan. Other than along Arelious Walker Drive, where an adjacent above grade parking structure has always been proposed, parking will be completely below grade and/or wrapped with active uses. While additional parking ingress and egress are now proposed, additional standards and guidelines are proposed to make sure that they do not unduly degrade pedestrian safety and comfort and that the urban

streetwall and activation at the ground level is maintained. The net results of the changes to the parking provisions do not create an amount of parking greater than what would have otherwise been permitted by the Planning Code (Planning Code Section 151.1 – Parking Maximums). The additional width for combined vehicular ingress / egress and loading is consistent with the Planning Code. Other than the CP Center parking facility, parking entries are still limited to one per development.

### BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The increase in height within and surrounding CP Retail Center would allow greater flexibility for tenants, allow greater architectural variety and differentiation in the design of buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue, create a strong streetwall to anchor development at Candlestick Point, and allow the developer to use modular construction.
- The increase in height for the hotel will provide amenity space, facilitate an active ground floor use, and be consistent with the height increase for the adjacent buildings.
- The increase in height for the "Landmark Building" will create a strong corner presence for the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue, and facilitate a viable space for a critical anchor tenant at this high profile intersection.
- The relocation of Towers J and K will keep the towers within the approved tower zone and be consistent with the revised block depths to accommodate the development plan for townhomes to line the mid-block break.
- The relocation of Tower G will be accompanied by additional provisions to make sure it is well integrated into the CP Center neighborhood.
- The new signage provisions will ensure a well-designed signage program that will contribute to the high quality character of the new neighborhood.
- The minor D4D changes will ensure the D4D reflects current conditions and provides consistent, clear guidance for future development.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:** Approval

#### Attachments:

Draft Motion

Exhibit A - List of Substantive Changes

Exhibit B – List of Refinements, Clarifications, and Editorial Changes

Addendum 4 to the FEIR

Detailed Log of D4D Changes

Proposed Amended D4D

Executive Summary Hearing Date: March 3, 2016 CASE NO. 2015-013111CWP Candlestick Point

#### Attachment Checklist

 $\mathbb{X}$ 

Exec

**Executive Summary** 

Project sponsor submittal

Draft Motion

Revised D4D Log of Changes



Environmental Determination

MS

Planner's Initials

KG: I:\Citywide\Community Planning\Southeast BVHP\Candlestick HP Lennar\Post Approval Review\CP D4D Revissions\CP D4D - Ex Summary.doc

Exhibits above marked with an "X" are included in this packet

10



### **DRAFT Planning Commission Motion No. []**

HEARING DATE: MARCH 3, 2016

Date:	February 25, 2016
Case No :	2015_013111CWP
Cuse 110	
Project:	Candlestick Point Amendments to the Design for
	Development Agreement
Location:	Candlestick Point
Staff Contact:	Mat Snyder – (415) 575-6891
	mathew.snyder@sfgov.org
Recommendation:	Approval

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

Reception: 415.558.6378

Fax: 415.558.6409

Planning Information: 415.558.6377

### FORMULATING A MOTION TO APPROVE AMENDMENTS TO THE CANDLESTICK POINT DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT DOCUMENT AND AFFIRMING CEQA FINDING AND FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND THE EIGHT PRIORITY POLICIES OF THE PLANNING CODE, SECTION 101.1.

WHEREAS, The Planning Department ("Department"), the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure ("OCII"), the successor to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency ("Agency") among many other City Departments have been working to transform Candlestick Point and the Hunters Point Shipyard from their current underutilized nature into a vibrant high-density, mixed-use, and transitoriented neighborhoods that will provide public benefits to both the existing residents and the City as a whole (the "CP-HPS Project"). Candlestick Point is within the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area and is identified as "Zone 1", within the Redevelopment Project Area. OCII is charged with implementing the Redevelopment Plan for Zone 1 of the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan, along with the Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan.

On June 3, 2008, the San Francisco voters approved Proposition G, an initiative petition measure named The Bayview Jobs, Parks, and Housing Initiative, regarding plans to revitalize the Project site. As set forth in Proposition G, the project is designed to revitalize the Project Site consistent with the Conceptual Framework described above.

On June 3, 2010, the Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission made the following actions regarding the CP-HPS Project: (1) Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report (Planning Commission Motion No. 18096); (2) adoption of CEQA Findings (Planning Commission Motion No. 18097); adoption of master General Plan Finding and Planning Code Section 101.1 Finding (Planning Commission Motion No. 18101); (4) approval of General Plan amendments including the establishment of the Candlestick Point Sub-Area Plan (Motion No. 18098); (5) approval of Planning Code Text and Map amendments creating the Candlestick Point Activity Node SUD and allowed greater height per the Redevelopment Plan (Motion Nos. 18099 and 18100); (6) approval of amendments to the Bayview Hunters Point and Hunters Point Redevelopment Plans and adoption of office allocation findings for the office component of the Project (Resolution No. 18102); and (7) approving the Candlestick Point Design

Case No. Candlestick Point Candlestick Point Design for Development Approval

for Development Documents (Motion No. 18104). At the same hearing, the Redevelopment Commission also approved the following: (1) Interagency Cooperation Agreements (ICA) for interagency review of horizontal improvements; (2) Health Code, Public Works Code, Building Code, and Subdivision Code amendments; (3) Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA), which included (among other documents) as attachments a Project Phasing Plan, a Transportation Plan and an Infrastructure Plan; (4) Real Property Transfer Agreement; (5) Public Trust Exchange Agreement; (6) Park Reconfiguration Agreement; and (7) Tax Increment Allocation Pledge Agreement.

The CP-HPS Project approvals originally accommodated the following land uses: up to 10,500 residential units, of which approximately 32% will be below market rate; approximately 327-336 acres of improved open space and recreational areas; approximately 885,000 square feet of regional and neighborhood-serving retail space; approximately 2.65 to 5 million square feet of research and development and office space; an additional 150,000 square feet of office at Candlestick Point, 100,000 square feet of community services; a 69,000-seat football stadium; a 10,000-seat performance arena; a 220-room hotel; and 255,000 square feet of replacement artist studio space and arts center. Approval included variants that would remove the stadium from the land use plan; variant 2A, the non-Stadium housing variant, would redistribute the housing units between Candlestick and Hunters Point Shipyard, and result in 6,250 units at Candlestick Point.

On August 3, 2010, the Board of Supervisors took the following actions: (1) confirmation of the certification of the CP-HPS Project Final Environmental Impact Report; (2) approval of amendments to the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan and the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan; (3) approval of amendments to the General Plan described above; (4) approval amendments to the Planning Code described above.

The DDA, approved by the Redevelopment Commission, set forth a Phasing Plan, Schedule of Performance, and Design Review Development Application Procedure ("DRDAP"), among other implementing documents. The DRDAP, in turn, set forth a procedure by which the Project Sponsor would apply to OCII for approval of actual horizontal (infrastructure) and vertical (buildings) construction. The structure of approval includes three tiers: Major Phase approval, Sub-Phase Approval, and approval of vertical construction. Vertical construction is further divided into conceptual design approval, schematic design approval, and design development approval. The CP-HPS Phasing Plan identified four major phases for Candlestick Point.

Subsequent to the certification of the FEIR and the approvals listed above, the Project Sponsor sought approval of Major Phase 1 in the Candlestick Point area of the Project as well as a Master Streetscape Plan and Signage Plan. The Project Sponsor also sought changes in the previously approved Project Phasing Schedule, and the schedules for implementation of the Transportation Plan (including the Transit Operating Plan of the Infrastructure Plan), and of other public benefits. These changes were analyzed in Addendum No. 1 to the FEIR, published on December 11, 2013 (Addendum 1).

On January 7, 2014, OCII approved Major Phase I of the Candlestick Point project. The approved Major Phase 1 encompasses 16 blocks of new development in the Candlestick Park area of the project, including approximately 1,500 new homes and 1.1 million square feet of mixed commercial uses and approximately 50,000 square feet of community facilities. Major Phase 1 CP includes the entirety of the Alice Griffith replacement project and the Candlestick Point retail center destination featuring retail, housing and entertainment uses. Within the same year as approval for the Major Phase, approval was

Case No. Candlestick Point Candlestick Point Design for Development Approval

granted for the first Sub-Phase within the Major Phase, along with vertical construction for four blocks within the Alice Griffith neighborhood.

In the spring of 2015, the Project Sponsor submitted an application for Sub-Phases 02, 03, and 04 ("CP-02-03-04"), which generally encompass the following: (1) Candlestick Center ("CP Center") the retail core of Candlestick, (2) the four most northern blocks of the Candlestick South neighborhood ("CP South"), which are directly across Harney Way from CP Center, and (3) the four most western blocks of the Candlestick North neighborhood ("CP North"), which are directly across Ingerson Avenue from CP Center.

Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 would include approximately 1,565 residential units, approximately 635,000 square feet of regional retail at CP Center, approximately 50,000 square feet of community use, approximately 131,000 square feet of neighborhood retail, approximately 75,000 square feet of performance venue use distributed between two locations, approximately 220 hotel rooms, and approximately 134,5000 square feet of office use. A parking garage with approximately 2,700 spaces would be located below the CP Center and along Arelious Walker Drive.

Certain aspects of the proposal are not consistent with certain implementing documents as they were originally approved, including the initial approval of Major Phase 1, the Transportation Plan, the Streetscape Master Plan, and Candlestick Point Design for Development ("D4D"). Therefore, the Project Sponsor has also proposed amendments to these documents. An itemized list of proposed changes to the Candlestick portion of the CP-HPS Project is attached as Exhibit A and Exhibit B. The Project amendments are described in three different tiers. Tier One (Exhibit A) includes substantive changes; Tier Two describes refinements and clarifications that assure consistent interpretation across the D4D and other documents; Tier Three describes editorial and organizational changes to the D4D that reflect the elimination of the stadium from the CP-HPS Project, among other changes (Exhibit B).

The Commission has approval authority over amendments to the D4D pursuant to both the Commission initial Motion approving the D4D, and pursuant to Section 4.3 of the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan. The Commission does not have approval authority over amendments to the other implementing document described above.

The Planning Department and OCII staff have worked with the Project Sponsor on these amendments to make sure they meet with spirit of the original vision of the CP-HPS Project and are consistent with the General Plan, including the Candlestick Sub-Area Plan of the Bayview Hunters Point Area Plan. Planning Department staff has submitted a report to the Commission that analyzes the changes and concludes that they do meet the spirit of the original approvals and are consistent with the General Plan.

OCII, in consultation with Planning, prepared and on February 22, 2016 issued an Addendum 4 to the FEIR. (Addendums 2 and 3 analyzed proposed changes to the project, which are no longer being pursued.) OCII has determined that the proposed Project modifications will not cause new significant impacts not identified in the EIR, will not increase the severity of significant impacts identified in the EIR, and will not require new mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts. Addendum 4 among other considerations, identifies and discusses recommended modifications to two previously adopted transportation-related mitigation measures, Mitigation Measures TR-16, which provides for improvements to Harney Way, and TR-23.1, which provides mitigation to maintain headways for the 29-Sunset transit line. Addendum 4 concludes that the proposed modifications to the mitigation measures

Case No. Candlestick Point Candlestick Point Design for Development Approval

would not result in new or more severe impacts. Other than as described in the Addendum 4, no Project changes have occurred, and no changes have occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the proposed Project that will cause significant environmental impacts to which the Project will contribute considerably, and no new information has become available that shows that the Project will cause significant environmental impacts.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,** That the Planning Commission does hereby incorporate by reference the CEQA Findings adopted in Motion 18097. The Planning Commission has reviewed Addendum 1 and Addendum 4 and concurs with their findings. The Planning Commission additionally adopts the modifications to Mitigation Measures TR-16 and TR-23.1 as set forth in Addendum 4. The Commission further finds that the proposed subject amendments to the Candlestick Point Design for Development do not cause new significant impacts not identified in the Final Environmental Impact Reports and that no new mitigation measures are necessary to reduce significant impacts. Further, the Commission finds that no new information has become available showing that the project would cause significant environmental impacts and, therefore, no supplemental environmental review is required beyond the previously conducted environmental review.

**NOW, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** That the Planning Commission does hereby incorporate by reference General Plan Findings and Findings of Consistency with Planning Code Section 101.1 as provided in the original and subsequent approvals of the CP-HPS Project as provided in Planning Commission Motion 18101 and the subject Design for Development document as provided in Planning Commission Resolution 18104.

**NOW, BE IT FURTHER RESOLUVED,** That the Planning Commission does hereby approve the amended Candlestick Point Design for Development document, attached to this Motion as Exhibit C and incorporated herein by reference; and

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the San Francisco Planning Commission on March 3, 2016.

Jonas Ionin Commission Secretary

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

### Exhibit A: 02/05/16: Tier 1 Project Revisions

Date: February 5, 2016

### CANDLESTICK POINT Proposed Project Revisions Associated with Development Plan Application for Sub-Phase 02-03-03 and Updates to Project Documents, Including: CP Major Phase 1 Application, CP Design for Development (D4D), CP Streetscape Master Plan, CP-HPS-Phase 2 MMRP, CP Transportation Plan

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)	
		Revision	
TIER 1: Substantive Project Revisions			
<u>1. Tower Relocation</u> : The sub-phase application proposes relocating Towers G, J and K. Tower G would be relocated within CP-02, but outside the approved tower zone. Tower J and K would be moved approximately 100 feet southeast. Tower K would remain in an approved tower zone and Tower K would be in a new fixed location.	D4D located Tower G in the approved tower location in the center of CP-02. D4D located Towers J and K in CP-South, approximately 100 feet north of the proposed location.	Major Phase 1 Application • Section 1.1 • Figure 6.1 • Figure 6.5 • Figure 6.6 • Figure 6.7 • Figure 6.8 D4D:	
		<ul><li>Table 4.3</li><li>Figure 4.3</li><li>Figure 8.1</li></ul>	
2. <u>Height Increase – CP Center at corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue</u> : The sub-phase application proposes to increase the height of the building at CP Center on the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue from 85 feet to 120 feet. The Film Arts Center will be developed at this location.	D4D limits height at this location to 85 feet.	Major Phase 1 Application • Section 1.1 • Figure 6.1 • Figure 6.3 • Figure 6.4 • Figure 6.5 • Figure 6.6 • Figure 6.7 • Figure 6.8 D4D:	
		<ul><li>Figure 4.3</li><li>Figure 8.1</li></ul>	

### Exhibit A: 02/05/16: Tier 1 Project Revisions

3 Height Increase – CP Center at corner of Arelious Walker Drive and Harney Way. The sub-phase	D4D limits height at this location to 65 feet	Major Phase 1 Application
application proposes to increase the height of the CP center at the corner of Arelious Walker Drive and	D+D mints height at this location to 05 leet.	• Section 1.1
Harney Way from 65 feet to 80 feet. A building containing a hotel office and performance venue floor		• Section 1.1
space will be developed at this location.		D4D <sup>.</sup>
		• Figure 4.3
		• Figure 8.1
4. Height Increase – CP Center on both Sides of Harney Way & Ingerson Avenue at CP Center: The sub-	D4D limits height at this location to 65 feet.	Major Phase 1 Application
phase application proposes to increase the height of buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue		• Section 1.1
from 65 feet to 80 feet. These buildings will be developed with retail land uses at ground floor, with a		• Figure 6.1
maximum of five stories of residential or commercial uses above. The D4D defines a maximum		• Figure 6.3
percentage of the block's developable area that can be built within the 80 ft height zone, and includes		• Figure 6.4
additional guidelines encouraging buildings to be designed with varied height to add architectural interest		• Figure 6.5
to the streetscape.		• Figure 6.6
		• Figure 6.7
		• Figure 6.8
		D4D:
		• Section 4.2.2
		• Figure 4.3
		• Section 5.2.2
		• Figure 5.5
		• Section 5.3.2
		• Figure 5.7
		• Section 5.4.2
		• Figure 5.9
		• Figure 8.1
<u>5. Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail Space:</u> The sub-phase application proposes to	Project approvals provide for 150,000 square feet	Major Phase 1 Application
convert 15,500 square feet of entitled office space in Candlestick Point to 6,000 square feet of	of office and 125,000 Square feet of neighborhood	• Section 1.1
neighborhood retail space. This will result in the neighborhood retail floor space increasing from 125,000 square fact to	retail use at Candiestick Point	• Figure 6.1
134,500 square feet.		• Table 6.1
		Transportation Plan:
		• Table 4
		• Table 14
6. <u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u> : The sub-phase application proposes to relocate 269 on-street spaces	430 on-street spaces	Major Phase 1 Application
of the planned 430 on-street spaces to the CP Center garage.		• Section 1.1
		• Section 8.6
		• Figure 8.7

### Exhibit A: 02/05/16: Tier 1 Project Revisions

7. <u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing:</u> The sub-phase application proposes to divide construction of the off-site Harney Way roadway improvements into two phases: 1) from Arelious Walker Drive to Executive Park Boulevard East, and 2) from Executive Park Boulevard East to Thomas Mellon Drive. The sidewalk and cycle track along Harney Way would be completed as originally the planned from Arelious Walker Drive to Thomas Mellon Drive.	First phase of Harney Way improvements extended to Thomas Mellon Drive.	Major Phase 1 Application • Section 1.1 • Section 2.5 • Section 8.1 MMRP: • MM-TR-16
8. <u>Gilman Avenue Revised Cross Section</u> : The sub-phase application proposes to revise the cross section configuration to retain 15-foot sidewalks	Two lanes of travel in each direction; on- street parking on both sides of street; 12-foot sidewalks.	Infrastructure Plan: • Section 2.1.3 A • Figure 2.1.3 Major Phase 1 Application • Section 1.1
and on-street parking on both sides of street. Only one travel lane in each direction and a center turn lane would be provided. The intersections between Third Street and Arelious Walker would be signal controlled.	All-way stop sign at the intersections between Third Street and Arelious Walker.	<ul> <li>Section 8.1</li> <li>MMRP:</li> <li>MM-TR-23.1</li> <li>Transportation Plan:</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>Figure 7M</li> <li>Infrastructure Plan:</li> <li>Section 2.1.3 E</li> <li>Figure 2.1.5</li> </ul>

Date: February 5, 2016

### CANDLESTICK POINT

### Tier 2 and Tier 3 Revisions Associated with Development Plan Application for Sub-Phase 02-03-03 and Updates to Project Documents, Including: CP Major Phase 1 Application, CP Design for Development (D4D), CP Streetscape Master Plan, CP-HPS-Phase 2 MMRP, CP Transportation Plan

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s) Revision
TIER 2: D4D. Streetscape Plan. and Major Phase 1 Applica	tion Refinements and Clarificati	ions
1. <u>Additional Signage Provisions</u> : Provisions amended to provide a greater level of guidance for signage, specifically in relation to intent, variety, style, orientation, lighted signs, safety, new technology signs, temporary signage and prohibited signage. Specific standards for commercial and residential signage are removed.	D4D: • Existing provisions in Section 4.3.2 I	D4D: • Section 4.4, p. 138-139
2. <u>Podium Heights</u> : Add provisions to the D4D to clarify massing and bulk controls for tower podiums and add maximum podium heights for each tower.	D4D: • No existing provisions	D4D: • Table 4.3 (p. 84), • Section 4.3.2 (p. 87) • Table 4.5 (p. 87)
3. <u>Ground Floor Retail Height In Mixed Use Residential District</u> : Add provisions to the D4D minimum floor-to-floor height of 15 feet for non-residential uses.	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Figure 4.6 – Minimum retail height of 12 feet for Mixed Use High Rise</li> <li>Section 4.3.1 B – All retail spaces shall be a minimum of 12 feet height</li> </ul>	D4D: • Figures 4.7 to 4.12 (p 97 to 102) • Section 4.3.1 (A) (p. 110) • Section 4.3.1 (B) (p. 116) Major Phase 1 Application: • Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5) • Section 6.1 (p. 52)
4. <u>Parking Garage Entry</u> and <u>Curb Cuts Widths</u> : Revise D4D to allow a maximum of 27 foot width for garage entrance and curb cuts if needed to accommodate large service vehicles and emergency services.	<ul> <li>D4D</li> <li>Section 4.3.1 D (p. 128) – Maximum combined parking &amp; loading entry width 24 ft</li> <li>Section 4.4.3 (p. 152) – Maximum curb cut width 24 ft</li> </ul>	D4D:         • Section 4.3.1 D (p. 123)         • Section 4.4.3 (p. 144)         Major Phase 1 Application:         • Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5)         • Section 8.7 (p. 79)
5. <u>CP Center Internal Access</u> : Eliminate extension of Earl Street and 8 <sup>th</sup> Street into CP Center and eliminate Bill Walsh Street. Add four pedestrian only corridors. Allow service vehicles to use one pedestrian corridor.	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Various figures, images and location plans show the extension of Earl Street and 8<sup>th</sup> Street into CP Center, with a new Bill Walsh Street.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Figure 2.1 (p. 21)</li> <li>Image: Density of residential and services is clustered around transit stops (p. 23)</li> </ul>

### Exhibit B Page 1 of 10

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)
		Revision
		<ul> <li>Revision</li> <li>Image: Parks and Open Space Illustrative Plan (p. 24)</li> <li>Figure 2.2: Parks and Open Space Network (p. 25)</li> <li>Figure 2.3 (p. 27)</li> <li>Figure 2.4 (p. 29)</li> <li>Figure 2.5 (p. 33)</li> <li>Figure 2.6 (p. 37)</li> <li>Figure 2.7 (p. 39)</li> <li>Figure 3.1 (p. 47)</li> <li>Figure 3.2 (p. 49)</li> <li>Figure 3.2 (p. 49)</li> <li>Figure 3.3: Public Streets Network (p. 57)</li> <li>Figure 3.4: Parks and Open Space (p. 64)</li> <li>Figure 3.10: Conceptual Plan – Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (p. 72)</li> <li>Figure 4.1: Development Blocks (p. 77)</li> <li>Figure 4.2: Land Use Districts (p. 79)</li> <li>Figure 4.3: Building Heights (p. 85)</li> <li>Figure 4.4: Street Wall Conditions (p. 94)</li> <li>Figure 5.1: Character Neighborhoods (p. 155)</li> <li>Figure 5.6: Candlestick Center Illustrative Site Plan (p. 177)</li> <li>Figure 5.7: Candlestick Center Urban Design (p. 183)</li> <li>Figure 7.1: Block Plan (p. 201)</li> <li>Figure 7.2: Building Heights (p. 205)</li> <li>Figure 7.4: Iamestown Urban Design</li> </ul>
		(p. 209)

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)
		Revision
Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	<ul> <li>Project Document(s) Revision</li> <li>Figure 8.1: Building Heights – Shipyard South R&amp;D Option (p. 214)</li> <li>Figure 9.3: Candlestick Center Block Plan (p. 228)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 35)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 50)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 51)</li> <li>Image: Location of Retail Streets (p. 59)</li> <li>Image: Location of Boulevard Streets (p. 60)</li> <li>Image: Location of Local Streets (p. 61)</li> <li>Image: Location of Alice Griffith Community Park (p. 65)</li> <li>Image: Location of Candlestick Community Park – Final location to be determined in the future (p. 66)</li> <li>Image: Location of Mini-wedge Community Park (p. 68)</li> <li>Image: Location of Jamestown Hillside Community Park (p. 69)</li> <li>Image: Location of State Recreation Area and Bay Trail (p. 70)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 95)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 97)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 99)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 101)</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>Location Plan (p. 101)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 102)</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>Location Plan (p. 102)</li> </ul>
		• Location Plan (p. 104)

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)
		Revision
		• Image: Street block orientated at 45° to
		prevailing winds (p. 106)
		• Location Plan (p. 150)
		<ul> <li>Location Plan (p. 151)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 156)</li> </ul>
		• Location Plan (p. 150)
		<ul> <li>Location Plan (p. 104)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 174)</li> </ul>
		• Location Plan (p. 184)
		• Section 5.3.3: Candlestick Center –
		Urban Design (pp. 194-195)
		Major Phase 1 Application:
		• Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5)
		• Figure 2.1 (p. 10)
		• Figure 2.2 (p. 12)
		• Figure 2.3 (p. 14)
		• Figure 2.4 (p. 17)
		• Figure 2.5 (p. 18)
		• Figure 2.6 (p. 19)
		• Figure 2.7 (p. 20)
		• Figure 2.8 (p. 21)
		• Figure 2.9 (p. 22)
		• Figure 5.1 (p. 36)
		• Figure 5.2 (p. 37)
		• Figure 6.1 (p. 40)
		• Figure 6.2 (p. 42)
		• Figure 6.3 (p. 43)
		• Figure 6.4 (p. 44)
		• Figure 6.5 (p. 45)
		• Figure 6.6 (p. 46)
		• Figure 6.7 (p. 47)
		• Figure 6.8 (p. 48)
		• Figure 7.1 (p. 54)

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)
		Revision
		• Figure 8.1 (p. 67)
		• Figure 8.2 (p. 69)
		• Location Plan (p. 70)
		• Location Plan (p. 71)
		• Location Plan (p. 72)
		• Location Plan (p. 73)
		• Figure 8.3 (p. 74)
		• Figure 8.4 (p. 75)
		• Figure 8.5 (p. 76)
		• Figure 8.6 (p. 77)
		• Figure 9.1 (p. 83)
		• Figure 9.2 (p. 85)
		• Figure 9.3 (p. 86)
		• Figure 9.4 (p. 87)
		• Figure 9.5 (p. 88)
		• Figure 9.6 $(p, 89)$
		• Figure 9.7 (p. 90)
		• Figure 9.8 (p. 91)
		• Figure 10.1 (p. 94)
		• Figure 10.5 (p. 100)
		- I Iguie 10.5 (p. 100)
6. Arelious Walker Entry Plaza: Add D4D provisions encouraging a vehicle/pedestrian entry plaza.	D4D:	D4D
	No existing provisions	• Section 5.3.2 S8 and G5 (p. 182)
		• Figure 5.7: Candlestick Center Urban
7. CP Enter Parking Garage Entry and Curb Cuts Widths: Add D4D provisions to allow garage entry and curb cuts widths up to	D4D:	Design (p. 105)
50 feet. All one parking garage entry and associated curb cut larger than 27 feet on Ingerson. Provide for a safe and comfortable	• Section 4.3.1 D, p. 128 – Maximum	• Section 4.3.1 D: Parking Structure (p.
pedestrian and bicyclist crossing.	combined parking & loading entry	123)
	width 24 ft	• Section 4.4.3: Loading, Mechanical
	• Section 4.4.3, p. 152 – Maximum curb	Equipment and Meters (p. 144)
	cut width 24 ft	• Section 5.5.2 57. Farking Structure

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s) Revision
8. <u>Grocery Store Garage Door and Curb Cut Widths</u> : Add D4D provisions allowing a garage door and curb cut width greater than 27 feet for the grocery store to accommodate a loading dock. Incorporates requirements for screening and design features to ensure a safe and comfortable pedestrian and bicyclist crossing.	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Section 4.3.1 D (p. 128) – Maximum combined parking &amp; loading entry width 24 ft</li> <li>Section 4.4.3 (p. 152) – Maximum curb cut width 24 ft</li> </ul>	D4D: • Section 5.2.2 G3: Grocery Store (p. 171)
9. <u>Blank Building Facades</u> : Revise D4D provisions to allow blank facades where floor area is below grade or for essential building service area and to avoid blank facades along paseos.	<ul><li>D4D:</li><li>Blank facades prohibited.</li></ul>	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Section 4.3.1: Retail and Mixed Use (p. 116)</li> <li>Major Phase 1 Application:</li> <li>Section 6.6 (p. 52)</li> </ul>
10. <u>Remove Parking Space Dimensions</u> : Remove D4D minimum parking space dimension requirements.	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Parallel parking spaces shall be a minimum of 7 ft by 22 ft; angled parking spaces shall be a minimum of 9 ft by 18 ft.</li> </ul>	<ul><li>D4D:</li><li>Section 4.5.2: On-street Parking</li></ul>
11. <u>Cinema and Grocery Store Parking Ratio</u> : Update D4D to include off-street car parking ratios for Cinema and Grocery Store.	<ul><li>D4D:</li><li>No existing provisions</li></ul>	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Table 4.7 (p. 140)</li> <li>Major Phase 1 Application:</li> <li>Table 8.3 (p. 87)</li> <li>Transportation Plan</li> <li>Table 9 (p. 60)</li> </ul>
12. <u>Hotel Location</u> : Update D4D to reflect new hotel location at the corner of Harney Way and Arelious Walker.	<ul> <li>D4D:Hotel in location in middle of CP Center, but indicates the location may move.</li> <li>Maximum of two curb-cuts allowed on Earl Street or 8th Street for the provision of passage drop off and loading.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Section 4.3.1 B: Commercial – Hotel (p. 119)</li> <li>Figure 5.6: Candlestick Center Illustrative Site Plan (p. 177)</li> <li>Section 5.3.3 G3: Candlestick Center Urban Design (p. 195)</li> <li>Figure 5.10: Candlestick Center Urban Design (p. 197)</li> </ul>

## Exhibit B Page 6 of 10

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)
		Revision
		Major Phase 1 Application: • Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5) • Figure 2.2 (p. 12) • Figure 6.1 (p. 40) • Table 6.1 (p. 41) • Figure 6.6 (p. 45) • Figure 6.7 (p. 46)
		• Figure 6.8 (p. 47)
13. <u>Width of Pedestrian Path to Water Mews in Mid-Block Breaks</u> : D4D provision added to require a minimum 10 foot width for pedestrian path to water mews.	D4D: • No existing provisions	D4D: • Section 4.6.2: Mid-block Breaks (p. 147)
14. <u>Alice Griffith Outdoor Seating</u> : Add D4D provision to encourage outdoor seating in large sidewalk areas at the northern and southern ends of Egbert Avenue.	D4D: • No existing provisions	<ul><li>D4D:</li><li>Section 5.1.1: Alice Griffith General Description (p. 158)</li></ul>
15. <u>Alice Griffith Setbacks</u> : 9 foot setback to apply at Alice Griffith to properties fronting Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue and G Street	D4D: • 10 foot setback	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Section 5.1.2 S4: Setbacks to Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue &amp; G Street</li> </ul>
16. <u>Wedge Park Phasing</u> : Accelerate development of Wedge Park 2a to Major Phase 1. Wedge Park 2b would remain in Major Phase 2.	Major Phase 1 Application: • Figure 2.9	Major Phase 1 Application: • Section 2.5 (p. 22-23) • Figure 2.9 (p. 22)
17. <u>Timing and Grading for Jamestown Avenue Improvements</u> : Reconstruction of Jamestown Avenue will end approximately 1,000 feet sooner than originally contemplated in order to avoid significant grade differences between the road and adjoining properties. Resurfacing of this section of roadway will be occur in Major Phase 2 along with the resurfacing of Jamestown to Third Street originally planned for Major Phase 2.	<ul> <li>Major Phase 1 Application:</li> <li>Figure 2.9</li> <li>Infrastructure Plan:</li> <li>Section 2.1.3.C (no changes required)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Major Phase 1 Application:</li> <li>Section 2.5 (p. 22-23)</li> <li>Figure 2.9 (p. 22)</li> </ul>

18. Bulb-outs: Several bulb-outs along Ingerson and Harney have been removed to accommodate SFFD and SFPUC concerns.	CP Streetscape Master Plan:	Major Phase 1 Application:
	• Figure 5.3	• Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5)
	• Figure 5.4	
		CP Streetscape Master Plan:
		• Figure 5.4
		• Figure 5.5
19. Adjustment to CP-04 Boundary: The block depth in CP-04 would be increased to accommodate townhomes and this would	Major Phase 1 Application:	Major Phase 1 Application:
adjust the boundary of CP-04 approximately 100 feet southeast.	Major Phase 1 Application:	• Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5)
	• Section 1.1	• Figure 2.1 (p. 10)
	• Figure 2.1	• Figure 2.2 (p. 12)
	• Figure 2.2	• Figure 2.3 (p. 14)
	• Figure 2.3	• Figure 2.4 (p. 17)
	• Figure 2.4	• Figure 2.5 (p. 18)
	• Figure 2.5	• Figure 2.6 (p. 19)
	• Figure 2.6	• Figure 2.7 (p. 20)
	• Figure 2.7	• Figure 2.8 (p. 21)
	• Figure 2.8	• Figure 2.9 (p. 22)
	• Figure 2.9	• Figure 5.1 (p. 36)
	• Figure 5.1	• Figure 5.2 (p. 37)
	• Figure 5.2	• Figure 6.1 $(p, 40)$
	• Figure 6.1	• Figure 6.2 (p. 42)
	• Figure 6.2	• Figure 6.3 (p. 43)
	• Figure 6.3	• Figure 6.4 (p. 44)
	• Figure 6.4	• Figure 6.5 (p. 45)
	• Figure 6.5	• Figure 7.1 (p. 54)
	• Figure 6.6	• Figure 8.1 (p. 67)
	• Figure 6.7	• Figure 8.2 (p. 69)
	• Figure 6.8	• Location Plan (p. 70)
	• Figure 7.1	• Location Plan (p. 71)
	• Figure 8.1	• Location Plan (p. 72)
	• Figure 8.2	<ul> <li>Location Plan (p. 73)</li> </ul>
	• Figure 8.3	• Figure 8.3 (n. 74)
	• Figure 8.4	• Figure 8.4 (n. 75)
	• Figure 8.5	• Figure 8 5 (p. 76)
	• Figure 8.6	• Figure 8.6 (p. 77)
	• Figure 9.1	• Figure 9.1 ( $\mathbf{p}$ . 83)
	• Figure 9.7	• Figure 9.1 (p. 65)
	- Figure 9.2	

	<ul> <li>Figure 9.3</li> <li>Figure 9.4</li> <li>Figure 9.5</li> <li>Figure 9.6</li> <li>Figure 9.7</li> <li>Figure 9.8</li> <li>Figure 9.9</li> <li>Figure 9.10</li> <li>Figure 10.1</li> <li>Figure 10.5</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Figure 9.2 (p. 85)</li> <li>Figure 9.3 (p. 86)</li> <li>Figure 9.4 (p. 87)</li> <li>Figure 9.5 (p. 88)</li> <li>Figure 9.6 (p. 89)</li> <li>Figure 9.7 (p. 90)</li> <li>Figure 9.8 (p. 91)</li> <li>Figure 10.1 (p. 94)</li> <li>Figure 10.5 (p. 100)</li> </ul>
	• various Location Plans	
20. <u>Performance Venue Modification</u> : The CP Center performance venue square footage would be divided between two locations. Approximately 42,000 square feet would be located at Harney Way and Ingerson for a 1,200 seat Film Arts Center and approximately 33,000 square feet would be located on the lot with the hotel at the corner of Arelious Walker and Harney Way.	<ul> <li>Major Phase 1 Application:</li> <li>Section 2.2</li> <li>Table 2.1</li> <li>Figure 2.2</li> <li>Table 6.1</li> <li>Figure 6.6</li> <li>Figure 6.7</li> <li>Figure 6.8</li> <li>Depicts the 75,000 sf arena / performance venue entitlement</li> <li>Transportation Plan:</li> <li>Table 2, p. 3</li> <li>Table 4, p. 20</li> <li>Table 14, p. 64</li> </ul>	Major Phase Application: • Section 2.2 (p. 11) • Figure 2.2 (p. 12) • Figure 6.1 (p. 40) • Table 6.1 (p. 41) • Figure 6.6 (p. 45) • Figure 6.7 (p. 46) • Figure 6.8 (p. 47) Transportation Plan: • Table 2, p. 3 • Table 4, p. 20 • Table 14, p. 64
21. <u>Street Width Changes:</u> The width of right-of-ways at Candlestick Point were widened to ensure a 26 foot unobstructed access for SF Fire Department vehicles.	<ul> <li>Transportation Plan:</li> <li>Arelious Walker Drive between Ingerson Avenue and Gilman Avenue – 113 foot right-of-way</li> <li>Arelious Walker Drive between Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way – 109 foot right-of-way</li> <li>B Street – 51 foot right-of-way</li> <li>Gilman Avenue, east of Harney Way – 51 foot right-of-way</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Major Phase 1 Application:</li> <li>Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5)</li> <li>Section 8.2 (pp. 70-73)</li> <li>Transportation Plan:</li> <li>Arelious Walker Drive between Ingerson Avenue and Gilman Avenue – 84 foot right-of-way</li> <li>Arelious Walker Drive between Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way</li> </ul>

## Exhibit B Page 9 of 10

22. <u>Building Height Percentages for Blocks with Multiple Height Zones:</u> Clarify building height massing for blocks with multiple	<ul> <li>Harney Way between Egbert Avenue and Donner Avenue – 58 foot right-of- way</li> <li>Ingerson Avenue between Harney Way and West Harney Way – 51 foot right- of-way</li> <li>D4D:</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>B Street – 56 foot right-of-way</li> <li>Gilman Avenue, east of Harney Way – 59 foot right-of-way</li> <li>Harney Way between Egbert Avenue and Donner Avenue – 78.5 foot right- of-way</li> <li>Ingerson Avenue between Harney Way and West Harney Way – 70 foot right- of-way</li> <li>D4D:</li> </ul>		
height zones by including a percentage of the developable block area that the higher height zone(s) cannot exceed.	No existing provision	• Section 4.2.2		
		• Figure 4.3		
Tier 3: Editorial Revisions to the D4D, Streetscape Plan, and Major Phase 1 Application				
1. <u>D4D Updates/Approvals Since 2010</u> : Remove reference to stadium, reflect implementation of Variant 2A, updates to reflect	Refer to detailed attachment	D4D:		
changes analyzed in Addendum 1, add certain mitigation measures from the FEIR, add neighborhood retail parking ratio		• Refer to attached change logs		
2 DAD Relocation of Text: Jamestown provisions consolidated in new section 7. Shinyard South R&D variant consolidated in	Refer to detailed attachment	D4D:		
2. <u>D+D Refocation of Text</u> , satisfies to solution consolutated in new section 7. Singyard South R&D variant consolutated in new section 8. Block plans moved from section 5 to the Appendix	Refer to detailed attachment	<ul> <li>Defor to attached ahongo logo</li> </ul>		
new section 6. Block plans moved from section 5 to the Appendix.		• Refer to attached change logs		
3. Clarifying Changes to Text, Tables, Figures, and Images in D4D: Clarify descriptions of project elements, interpretations of	Refer to detailed attachment	D4D:		
certain standards, add cross-reference, update text and graphics to reflect current plan, delete repetition, add definitions and other		• Refer to attached change logs		
minor changes that do not affect the location, type, density, or intensity of the development. See attached change log sheet.				
4. Updates and Edits to the Streetscape Master Plan: See attached change log sheet, including street furnishings and paving	Refer to detailed attachment	Streetscape Master Plan:		
selections and the substitution of a deciduous rather than coniferous trees.		• Refer to attached change logs		
5. Updates and Edits to the Major Phase 1 Application: See attached change log sheet, including update of Affordable Housing	Refer to detailed attachment	Major Phase 1 Application:		
from 1025 units to 1560 units.		Refer to attached change logs		

Notes:

- 1. The Transportation Plan and Infrastructure Plan were updated in July 2014 to reflect modifications to street cross sections and these modifications were approved by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (8/3/14 letter from Edward Reiskin, Director of Transportation)., San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (11/7/2014 letter from Michael Carlin, Deputy General Manager), and the San Francisco Fire Department (7/31/2014 letter from Joanne Hayes-White) in accordance with the approval process in the Interagency Cooperation Agreement.
- 2. As part of approval, obtain authority to update as necessary the FEIR tables and figures for the non-stadium variant 2a.

### Exhibit B Page 10 of 10

San Francisco, California

Design for Development



San Francisco, California

Design for Development

Adopted June 3, 2010 by: San Francisco Planning Commission Motion No. 18104 San Francisco Redevelopment Commission Resolution No. 65-2010 Updated February 17, 2016

## **Table of Contents**

4

	Table	of Contents	4
1.	Introd	duction	6
	1.1	Summary of Document	
	1.2	Background	
	1.3	Site Location and Context	
	1.4	Candlestick Access and Ownership	
2.	Visio	n	.18
	2.1	Overall Concept	
	2.2	Goals and Objectives	
	2.3	Sustainability Design Principles	
3.	Prop	osed Plan for Candlestick	.44
	3.1	Plan Structure and Program	
	3.2	Public Streets	
	3.3	Public Parks and Open Space	
4.	Land	Use, Design Standards and Guidelines	.74
	4.1	Land Use	
	4.2	Height, Bulk and Massing	
	4.3	Building Design	
	4.4	Signage	
	45	Parking and Loading	

	Y.	4.6 Streets	a walk	Tella Contra
	5.	Neighborhood Standards a	and Guidelines	
the ort		5.1 Alice Griffith		
Pas-10-		5.2 Candlestick North		
and the		5.3 Candlestick Center		
		5.4 Candlestick South		
A TUBALLY IN	6.	Implementation		
		6.1 Design Review Process		
	7	lamestown		198
the second second	1.	71 General Description		
		7.2 Standards & Guidelines		
		7.3 Urban Design		
	1			una di Sara
1	8.	Shipyard South R&D Optio	'n	210
		8.1 General Description		
	9.	Appendix		216
		9.1 Appendix A – Term Defin	itions	
-		9.2 Appendix B – Block Plan	IS	
		9.3 Appendix C – Additional	Studies	



# Introduction

- 1.1 Summary of Document
- 1.2 Background
- 1.3 Site Location and Context
- 1.4 Access and Ownership

### 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Summary of Document

This Design for Development (D4D) document for Candlestick establishes the development standards and guidelines that will govern all future design and development at Candlestick. The D4D is the culmination of a multi-year community planning process. References throughout this document to the Shipyard are to Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard, the boundaries of which are shown in Figure 1.1.

On a macro-scale, the D4D is crafted to effectuate a specific urban form envisioned for Candlestick; on a finer scale, it outlines specific design regulations created to inspire attractive building architecture and functional public spaces as this new neighborhood comes to life over the coming decades. The Candlestick D4D document works in tandem with the D4D document for Phase 2 of the adjacent Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area. Taken together, the design regulations for both Project Areas aspire to fundamentally improve the built environment of Southeast San Francisco.

The Candlestick site lies within Zone 1 of the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area. The Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan (the BVHP Plan) has been amended to establish the allowable land uses for Candlestick. Thus, this Candlestick D4D is a companion document to, and authorized under, the BVHP Plan and was adopted by the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco (currently the Office of Community Investment & Infrastructure, successor to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency), the public agency responsible for oversight of development within the BVHP Project Area. The BVHP Plan, in general, provides a vision for the area that eliminates blight and environmental deficiencies while supporting market rate and affordable housing, economic development, small businesses, emerging commercial-industrial sectors, public transit service, publicly accessible open space and participation by residents in deciding the future of the area.

The design standards and guidelines contained in this D4D apply to all development within the Candlestick site, including both the public and private realms, with the objective of implementing the vision set forth both in the BVHP Plan and in this D4D.

#### **Companion Documents**

The Candlestick D4D addresses land use, building design, open space and street design within Zone 1 of the BVHP Plan. The D4D should be used in conjunction with a series of other companion documents that have been approved for the Candlestick and Shipyard sites. These documents include:

- Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan,
- Infrastructure Plan,
- Transportation Plan,
- Streetscape Plan,
- Signage Master Plan,
- Parks, Open Space and Habitat Plan,
- Sustainability Plan, and
- Design Review and Document Approval Procedure (DRDAP).

Together, these documents supersede the San Francisco Planning Code in its entirety, except as otherwise provided for in the BVHP Plan.

Maximum floor space entitlement for the various land uses is outlined in the Candlestick Point & Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 (CPHPS2) Disposition & Development Agreement (as amended) and the CPHPS2 Final Environmental Impact Report (and associated Addendums).

#### Organization

This document has nine sections as follows:

- 1. Introduction Provides a summary of the document, describes the general background to the Candlestick redevelopment, site location, context and current access and ownership.
- 2. Vision Presents the overall concept, community goals and objectives, urban design principles and sustainability principles for the project. These are described for both Candlestick and the Shipyard, since a consolidated plan has been prepared for these two areas to develop a mixed-use community with a connected street and transit network and a shared open space and trails system. The overall vision provides the context for the Candlestick development plan, which is described in Section 3. The design standards and guidelines that are specific to Candlestick are located in Sections 4 and 5.
- **3. Proposed Plan** Describes Candlestick's plan structure and program in terms of land uses, urban form, development program, the street network, and the parks and open space system.
- 4. Land Use, Design Standards and Guidelines Establishes the overall standards and guidelines that regulate the form and character of the development for elements that span across the Candlestick site. These include land use, height, bulk, massing, buildings, parking and loading, and streetscape. *Standards* are mandatory actions, generally described in absolute terms such as by measurement or location. *Guidelines* are encouraged actions, which if adhered to in spirit will result in projects that best fit the vision for the site.
- 5. Neighborhood Standards and Guidelines There are five distinct neighborhoods within the Candlestick site: Alice Griffith, Candlestick North, Candlestick Center, Candlestick South and Jamestown. Because the Jamestown neighborhood is not contemplated for development by the Master Developer of the Candlestick and Shipyard projects, its standards and guidelines are treated separately in Section 7. A unique physical character is envisioned for each neighborhood and thus specific standards and guidelines are set forth for achieving the desired characteristics of such elements as at-grade retail, tower locations, street walls, mid-block breaks, and more.
- **6. Implementation** Presents the required procedures for implementing development plans for the individual parcels, granting variances and amending this document.
- **7.** Jamestown Establishes overall standards and guidelines for the neighborhood.
- 8. Shipyard South R&D Option Describes an alternate land use scenario for the Shipyard and the resulting impacts on the Candlestick development.
- **9. Appendices** Including term definitions, block plans, and case studies.

The user of this D4D should be conscientious in cross-referencing sections of this D4D in cases where a design standard may be described in more than one section. As organized, Section 4 provides design standards and guidelines universally applied throughout Candlestick, while Section 5 will often provide more detailed or rigorous standards pertaining to a particular neighborhood within Candlestick. For example, Candlestick site Street Wall requirements are contained in Section 4.2.4. However, more specific Street Wall requirements are proscribed in Section 5.2.2 for Candlestick North. In summary, users should read and understand the D4D in its entirety before proceeding with design and related analyses of a particular parcel's development potential.

### 1.2 Background

The Candlestick and Shipyard areas along the Bayview waterfront total 702 acres of land in the southeast portion of San Francisco. Redevelopment of these two areas, which are largely underdeveloped and separated from the urban grid of the city, represents a rare opportunity to create an entirely new shoreline community within the Bayview Hunters Point community featuring: waterfront parks, a number of distinctive residential neighborhoods and a much needed injection of commercial and retail uses.

The combined project areas include: the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area; the site of a former NFL stadium owned by the City and County and former home of the San Francisco 49ers; the Alice Griffith public housing development; and a decommissioned Naval Shipyard with dilapidated structures for ship repair, piers and drydocks, and storage and administrative spaces. A number of former Navy buildings are currently being used as artist studios and by light industrial tenants.

While Candlestick and the Shipyard are geographically distinct, their adjacency to one another has fostered a combined redevelopment planning effort resulting in a cohesive community plan. This plan establishes the vision for transforming this large land area from blight to new, thriving neighborhoods ringing San Francisco's southeastern waterfront.

Bayview residents have been long at work in establishing the overall vision and goals for revitalization for the Bayview Hunters Point area, which includes both of these sites. This work produced the 1969 Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan, the 1969 India Basin Industrial Park Redevelopment Plan, the 1995 South Bayshore Area Plan, the 1997 Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan, and the 2006 Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan. The goals established in these plans include: the development of job creating uses; improvement of existing parks; and tangible physical and economic benefits for the Bayview Hunters Point community, a long underserved and physically isolated part of San Francisco. Now the City and the Bayview community have been afforded a unique chance to implement many of these goals. Hence, an integrated plan has been prepared working with resident committees and with a developer partner.



Candlestick – State Recreation Area in foreground, former stadium in mid-ground, Bayview Hill and Bayview neighborhood in background.



Candlestick - State Recreation Area at left, former stadium at center, Bayview Hill at right.



The Shipyard – Downtown San Francisco in background.



The Shipyard – Drydocks and piers in foreground, the Hunters Point Hilltop in background.



Site Location

### 1.3 Site Location and Context

The Candlestick and Shipyard project sites are located approximately five miles south of downtown San Francisco in the southeastern part of the city. The total acreage of the two sites is approximately 702 acres, excluding the Yosemite Slough restoration lands. As indicated on Figure 1.1, both sites have extensive shoreline frontage along the San Francisco Bay to the east and south, the South Basin and Yosemite Slough watershed which separates them, and India Basin to the north of the Shipyard. Hunters Point Hill and Bayview/Hunters Point neighborhood sits to the west of the Shipyard site. Whereas the same neighborhood and Bayview Hill Park are adjacent to the north and west sides of the Candlestick Point site.

Bayview Hill Park creates a natural geographic limit to development and a buffer to Highway 101 to the west of the Candlestick site. This City park has trails which overlook the entire Candlestick site and provide panoramic views of the Bay. Part of Hunters Point Hill is currently being developed as both the Hilltop and Hillside Phase I developments of the Hunters Point Shipyard project. The southeastern portion of the Hunters Point Hill is being developed as a park, which will link into the proposed Shipyard Phase II development.

Candlestick was the location of the former Candlestick Park (the former stadium of the San Francisco 49ers NFL team), the Candlestick Park State Recreation Area (CPSRA) and the Alice Griffith public housing development. The Shipyard is a former U.S. Naval Shipyard, which was operational between World War II and 1974, and is currently accommodating some artist studios and light industrial uses on a portion of the site.

The Shipyard provided the major source of employment for the Bayview/ Hunters Point neighborhood while it was operational. Subsequent to its closure, economic opportunity has declined in this part of the city as the site has remained largely unused since. Both the Candlestick and Shipyard projects will bring improved street and transit connections to the area, along with new employment uses that will substantially increase the community's economic activity.

To take advantage of this waterfront location, which provides the potential for some of the most significant open space area in the City, a major shoreline park will be created. New public connections to the waterfront will be provided. Further, a plan to restore the Yosemite Slough watershed, which feeds into the South Basin, will allow for an integrated park area to be created which extends from the CPSRA and includes the South Basin, Yosemite Slough and the southern shoreline of the Shipyard.



- € Bayshore Caltrain Station
- 2 Bayview Hill Park
- Hunters Point Shipyard Phase I Hilltop and Hillside
- Bayview Neighborhood
- Bayview Industrial Lands
- 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 India Basin
- Re-gunning Crane
- South Basin
- Yosemite Slough Watershed
- San Francisco Bay



State Recreation Area shoreline.



Alice Griffith housing.



Former Candlestick stadium



Existing State Recreation Area.



Unimproved State Recreation Area Lands



### 1.4 Candlestick Access and Ownership

The Candlestick site is shown in Figure 1.2.

Access to the site occurs primarily from Harney Way, which connects with Highway 101 approximately one half mile to the west. Local streets in the Bayview neighborhood, including Jamestown Avenue, Gilman Avenue and Carroll Avenue, link the site with 3rd Street to the north.

Current land ownership is divided among several entities: California State Parks which oversees the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA); the City and County of San Francisco which oversees the former stadium site; the San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA) which owns the Alice Griffith Housing site; and private property owners who own lands comprising the Jamestown parcel and several small parcels north of the former Stadium site.

At present there are three primary uses on the site. The CPSRA is used by local residents and regional visitors as a day use facility and is discussed further below. A former stadium site, including related surface parking lots, was the home for the San Francisco 49ers. The Alice Griffith site currently accommodates 256 residential units operated by the SFHA. The private parcels north of the former stadium site are used for an RV Park, and previously served as additional stadium parking.

#### Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA)

The State Recreation Area is the largest existing land use at Candlestick. It is unique in the California State Park system as the first park developed in an urban setting. Conceived in the late 1970's, the goals of the park are to bring the values of the State Park system to the city, to provide recreational and cultural facilities and to connect urban dwellers with the natural environment.

The land that the park sits on was created by fill during the construction of former Candlestick Stadium. The State of California purchased the landfill site creating a major new park to enhance the quality of urban life and to promote care for the environment. The total acreage of the CPSRA within the project site is 121 acres.

The 1978 CPSRA Master Plan has never been fully realized. The southern portion of the park is the most developed and actively used area, while the northern areas are largely undeveloped and under utilized.

Primary recreation activities on the southern portion of the park include walking, biking, picnicking, windsurfing and fishing. Developed facilities include, parking, rest rooms, fishing piers, picnic areas, public art and a network of trails including the Bay Trail. Landscaping consists of large berms and trees providing shelter from the wind, open lawn areas and unirrigated grasslands.



### Figure 1.2 Candlestick Access and Ownership

Legend

 $\square$ 

Property Boundaries





# 2 Vision



Community park.



State Recreation Area.





### 2.1 Overall Concept

The Shipyard and Candlestick will rejuvenate and integrate with the existing Bayview/Hunters Point neighborhood to create a vibrant mixed-use district that provides a major focal point to the shoreline area of southeast San Francisco.

Development will be compact, provide a mix of land uses and be oriented to the transit stops along the new bus rapid transit (BRT) line which will serve the area with frequent transit service. There will be market-rate and affordable homes, community services, regional and neighborhood commercial retail, research and development space (R&D), a hotel, a performance arena, and an expansive waterfront park system that extends along the entire shoreline of Candlestick and the Shipyard.

Identifiable neighborhood districts will be created that will each have distinctive characteristics. These neighborhoods will be woven together and to Bayview/Hunters Point by an open space network, pedestrian pathways and landscaped streets that connect to the existing Bayview/Hunters Point street grid. Thus, convenient access will be provided between the new neighborhoods, Bayview/Hunters Point and the waterfront park system. All development will be based on the principles of sustainable building.

The illustrative site plan that emerges from this vision is shown in Figure 2.1. The development program for the two sites will deliver 10,500 residential homes, regional retail space, neighborhood serving retail land uses, office and R&D space, a hotel, performance venue, artists' studios, community facilities, and an expansive open space network. Maximum floor space entitlement for the various land uses is outlined in the CPHPS2 Disposition & Development Agreement (as amended) and the CPHPS2 Final Environmental Impact Report (and associated Addendums).

The Jamestown neighborhood is not anticipated to be developed by the Master Developer for the Candlestick Shipyard project. Therefore, development standards and guidelines are described separately in Section 7 of this D4D.

A detailed description of the Candlestick plan and program is provided in Section 3. The detailed plan and program for the Shipyard are found in the Hunters Point Shipyard D4D (under separate cover).





### 2.2 Goals and Objectives

Nine goals and objectives have been identified to provide vision and direction for the overall concept for the Shipyard and Candlestick sites. The objectives relate to creating a series of mixed-use, transit oriented neighborhoods for both the residential and R&D options for the Shipyard South Neighborhood. These objectives should be viewed in the larger context of more specific land use and design standards and guidelines that are made for Candlestick in Sections 3, 4 and 5.

The development of compact, mixed-use neighborhoods drives many of the other development goals at the Shipyard and Candlestick – from the design of the transportation network, the amount and type of recreational and passive open space to be developed, to the location of compact residential sub-neighborhoods within both the Shipyard and Candlestick.

These objectives, which are discussed in the following pages, are:

- 1. Density Generates Vitality
- 2. Open Space and Natural Features
- 3. Street and Block Connectivity
- 4. Transportation Network
- 5. Pedestrian and Bicycle Network
- 6. Built Environment
- 7. Urban Placemaking
- 8. Character Neighborhoods
- 9. Retail Services



Candlestick mixed-use core including towers and mid-rise.



Mixed-use streets with neighborhood shops and services.

#### 1. Density Generates Vitality

The ultimate vision for Candlestick and the Shipyard is to develop a comprehensive community with a healthy balance of job and housing opportunities along with the accompanying local amenities such as retail shops, good transit service and open spaces, which includes the Bayview/Hunters Point neighborhood as part of that success. In order for this to happen, a critical mass of residents and jobs are needed to support the desired neighborhood amenities and create a lively appealing community.

The high residential densities proposed by the plan, ranging from approximately 15 to 285 units per acre, along with the significant amount of employment-generating space, will help achieve the critical mass to support the services planned for Candlestick and the Shipyard – public transit, an open space and recreation network, shopping and other community facilities – which are made feasible by virtue of a denser population center.

Equal in importance to sufficient density and a mix of land uses are the physical context and character of the neighborhood at build-out. The plan envisions a high quality environment in which people feel positive, easily oriented, safe and comfortable – where good urban design allows for the required level of density to be achieved at a human scale.



Retail main street with regional retail.



Higher densities allow for related amenities like community parks.



Density of residential and services is clustered around transit stops.



Precedent - Community park.



Precedent - Plaza



State Recreation Area.

#### 2. Open Space and Natural Features

The plan area has exceptional geographic features that include both the hills and the waterfront vistas for which San Francisco is famous. Bayview Hill and Hunters Point Hill act as bookends framing the western edges of the two sites, which also feature an inland watershed area – the Yosemite Slough – which leads to the South Basin between Candlestick and the Shipyard. The San Francisco Bay surrounds the northern, eastern and southern edges of the plan area, offering the opportunity to introduce new and improved access to existing major public spaces along the entire shoreline from south to north.

The Shipyard and Candlestick plan proposes to enhance the shoreline, the existing Candlestick Point State Recreation Area and other features, notably along the Shipyard's historic dry docks and its ancillary structures. A continuous series of open spaces are proposed along the shore. The plan will also extend the green space from the waterfront into the residential areas to form broad, wedge and rectangular shaped parks that introduce a strong sense of openness and connectivity to the Bay. Other open space linkages to the shore will be created with boulevards extending to the water from parks within inner neighborhoods.

Further description of the general character of the parks and open spaces is contained in Sections 3 through 5 of this document, while specific standards and guidelines are addressed in the companion report - 'Parks, Open Space and Habitat Concept Plan'.



Parks and Open Space Illustrative Plan.



### Figure 2.2 Parks and Open Space Network

#### Legend

Project Area Parks & Open Space

- Urban Parks
  Other Parks & Open Space
  Candlestick Point State Recreation Area
  Sports Fields, Waterfront Recreation & Education
- Parks & Open Space Outside Project Area
  - Urban Parks
    - Other Parks and Open Space
    - Candlestick Point State Recreation Area
    - Sports Fields, Waterfront Recreation & Education
  - Bay Trail
  - Bay Water Trail



Existing Bayview grid will be extended.



Precedent - Bicycle lanes.



Precedent - Boulevard 'Park' Street.

#### 3. Street and Block Connectivity

The Candlestick and Shipyard plan envisions a new community that will become an integral part of the city. This will be achieved, in large part, by the extension of the existing Bayview/Hunters Point neighborhood street grid pattern into the new development to achieve a strong physical connection between Candlestick and Hunters Point and the adjacent neighborhoods. The new street grid will allow for easy orientation and wayfinding and permit uninterrupted views from public thoroughfares to San Francisco Bay.

New streets will be extensions of the existing Bayview grid; streets will extend to the waterfront Candlestick Point State Recreation Area; paths will connect the streets to the waterfront; and the waterfront will have a new Bay Trail that completes the largest gap in this trail system. A critical element in the network is the connection of Candlestick and the Shipyard, which is achieved by means of a transit and pedestrian bridge over Yosemite Slough. These improvements are shown in Figure 2.3.

Bayview's existing grid of streets will be extended into Candlestick notably on Jamestown, Ingerson, Gilman, Egbert and Carroll Avenues. The culde-sac streets in the Alice Griffith Housing parcels will be removed so that the grid may continue unobstructed south into Candlestick. Harney Way will also be extended into Candlestick. Within the development itself, blocks will be divided by mid-block breaks (pedestrian mews or vehicular laneways), further promoting connectivity and walkability. At the Shipyard, Innes Avenue will linked to the grid in the Shipyard North neighborhood including Galvez Street, Robinson Avenue and Lockwood Street. In the west, Palou will be linked directly with Crisp, the main gateway street into the Shipyard. Also at the Shipyard, pedestrian trails provide additional connections between the project and HPS Phase I where steep topography precludes viable street connections.

Further description of the general character of the streets is provided in Section 3.2 of this document, while specific standards and guidelines are addressed in the companion Transportation Plan.



Connection of Bay Trail and Yosemite Slough Bridge (concept only - subject to detailed design).



- ⇉
  - Pedestrian Access into Site
  - Pedestrian Access to Parks/Open Spaces
  - Pedestrian mews/vehicular laneway
- 🗕 💻 🛛 Bay Trail



Muni bus and BRT.



Precedent - Easily accessible transit stations.



Precedent – Mixed-use development clustered around transit stops.

#### 4. Transportation Network

#### **General Discussion**

A vastly improved transportation network, to include both thoroughfares and transit, is essential to successful development at Candlestick and the Shipyard.

The transportation strategy builds upon the MTA's Transit Efficiency Project recommendations for the area, by adding robust new transit facilities. A new Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system will have its own right-of-way through the community, enabling efficient and predictable travel between BART, Caltrain, the T-Third light rail, the Shipyard and Candlestick.

Transit stops that provide BRT service are located at key intersections in both the Shipyard and Candlestick. As shown in Figure 2.4 most new development will be located within a five-minute walk of BRT stops, in addition to more frequent stops throughout the neighborhood.

Non-BRT Muni buses also service both sites. Primary access to Candlestick is along Gilman Avenue, with stops throughout the center of the development. At the Shipyard, Muni service extends along Palou Avenue from the south, and Innes Avenue from the north. Both routes terminate in the core of the development.

The BRT stops will encourage transit oriented development (TOD), meaning a mix of land uses of medium to high density that is compact in form and oriented to the street. With this compact development pattern, most residents and employees will be able to walk to a stop from home or their place of employment – which can significantly reduce auto trips in the neighborhood. Further, compact development promotes land conservation, which in this case means that almost half of the site can be used as open space for common enjoyment. TOD leads to more urban and vibrant neighborhoods and promotes sustainable city building.

By concentrating a mix of uses with the five-minute walking radius of BRT stops, residents also benefit from convenient access to other important daily needs including jobs, shopping, restaurants and other community services.





Bus Rapid Transit Route

Transit Stop

5 minute Walking Radius

Development Area

#### Yosemite Slough Bridge – Linking the Shipyard with Candlestick

A vital component to the transportation strategy is a convenient linkage between the Shipyard and Candlestick as a significant upgrade to the existing narrow and circuitous route around the Yosemite Slough. The Transportation Plan proposes to accomplish this by designating a right-ofway for transit, bicycles and pedestrians connecting the two destinations with an elegantly designed bridge across the Yosemite Slough.

The bridge would introduce a visible expression of the Shipyard and Candlestick's interdependence and offer a direct non-automobile route to the two neighborhoods. The bridge's design qualities, moreover, would become one of the community's identifying features and enable people to enjoy the Yosemite Slough from a new, elevated vantage point.

The Transportation Plan proposes that the bridge be limited to pedestrians, recreation uses (such as fishing) and public transportation. The bridge will play a crucial role in providing efficient, predictable transit that respects and highlights Yosemite Slough as a wonderful ecological resource that defines and links the community's two neighborhoods.

#### Harney Way – Vital Transportation Link

Harney Way is the main transportation entrance to the existing Candlestick Park. It borders the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area located along the shoreline and is the principal access point to Executive Park, an office complex now emerging as a significant residential neighborhood. Yet the appearance of this roadway has never measured up to its prominence. Harney Way will serve as a vital transportation route both for Executive Park and for the major new shopping and housing development planned for Candlestick.

Harney Way will be rebuilt to accommodate automobiles, bicycles, pedestrians and the planned bus rapid transit (BRT) line. Moreover, it will be recast as a City boulevard with landscaping appropriate to a street bordering a waterfront park. Similar to the bridge proposed at Yosemite Slough, dedicated lanes for the BRT system will be a distinguishing feature. Harney Way's auto lanes and BRT will be separated by a gracious, well-planted median strip.

Taken together, the BRT and median will constitute a desirable buffer between new development and the main roadways. The road will be built and designed as an attractive urban boulevard, providing a welcoming entry and gateway to the new Shipyard and Candlestick neighborhoods.



Location of Harney Way.



Harney Way with proposed BRT lanes, bike lane, pedestrian path, and boulevard median.



Precedent - Pedestrian trails.



Precedent - Generous sidewalks.



Precedent – Class 2 bicycle lanes on arterial and high traffic routes.



Precedent - Class 1 bike trails.

#### 5. Pedestrian and Bicycle Friendly

#### **Pedestrian Network**

Streetscape design focuses on pedestrian amenities to ensure that all residents can enjoy the streets with comfort and safety. Streets feature short block sizes, bulb-outs at intersections, slow and narrow traffic lanes, street trees, sidewalk plantings, lighting and benches. Boulevard Park Streets and Retail Streets provide additional interest and activities for pedestrians, while the park systems include miles of paths for strolling. Mid-block breaks with pedestrian access offer quiet, car-free walks connecting neighborhoods with each other and with the park system. Hillside walks connect to Phase I Hillpoint Park (Hillpoint Park) and enhanced streetscapes connect with the existing Bayview and the Shipyard neighborhoods. Off-site street improvements along Innes, Palou and Gilman Avenues will enhance pedestrian mobility throughout the Bayview neighborhood.

#### **Bicycle Network**

The street network is designed to provide easy access for cyclists throughout the Candlestick and Shipyard sites with connections to the City's existing and proposed bikeway network and destinations beyond. The San Francisco Bay trail forms a continuous off-street recreation route along the shoreline, connecting Candlestick and the Shipyard. Linkages between the Bay Trail and the development will be included in various locations to enhance access between the facilities. Additional off-street bicycle routes bordering the edges of the urban development and parks provide safe routes for cyclists of all abilities. Neighborhood streets are designed to emphasize slow auto speeds and encourage shared use of the street. Bicycle lanes follow arterial and high-traffic routes. These routes are shown in Figure 2.5. Bicycle racks are provided along the streetscape, with high concentrations near retail, parks, and transit stops.



- Bike Class I
- Bike Class II
- Bike Class III
- Bay Trail/Blue Greenway
- - Bay Trail/Blue Greenway



Tower as focal point to public plaza.



Retail streets with continuous storefronts.



Residential Streets – street facing entrances and patios within a landscape setback.



Residences with setback for patio, landscaping and unit entrances.

#### 6. The Built Environment

This D4D presents a compact urban environment that reflects the traditional growth patterns of many San Francisco neighborhoods, such as the Mission District, South of Market and North Beach. The development will have a unique identity with a sustainable, pedestrian friendly atmosphere resulting from building requirements that will promote active building frontages, attractively landscaped streets and setbacks, surrounded by a necklace of waterfront parks. Once a gated military base (Shipyard) and an under used State Park and former stadium site with vast surface parking (Candlestick), the area is planned to open up a vast new playground of outdoor activity, not only for new residents, but also for existing Bayview residents and all residents of San Francisco.

The overall vision places a high value on the public realm as this is the primary area where people experience the city and neighborhood. It is through the public realm elements – streets, sidewalks, building façades, adjacent small spaces, parks – that the neighborhoods derive much of their unique sense of place.

Streets will be more than just a means of mobility. Residential streets will feature landscaping and setbacks serving as a transition between the public and private realms. Street-facing patios, stoops, and primary and secondary entrances to ground floor homes will provide spaces for neighborly interaction while enhancing overall safety. Retail streets will be designed to have a continuous set of storefronts creating vibrant and animated streets, similar to many of San Francisco's neighborhood shopping areas.

This D4D has been developed with careful attention given to the location and size of residential towers, in relation to smaller buildings. Towers are placed to create a unified urban form when viewed from a distance. Special care has been taken to adequately separate tall buildings to ensure that streets and open spaces are not overwhelmed, especially by shadows. By including dense building types such as towers in the mix of buildings, more land can be allocated to open space.

Both residential and commercial buildings will be subject to scrutiny as they proceed through the Agency's design review process to ensure that they respect a human-scaled pedestrian environment and follow the standards and guidelines contained in this D4D.

Achieving an active, safe and engaging pedestrian experience is the objective for the design of building bases, whether the buildings are residential, retail or other uses. Rather than allowing the cold edifices of parking garages often found in new developments, an emphasis on multiple sidewalk-facing entries, maximizing windows, and opportunities for outdoor uses spilling onto the sidewalk are encouraged, and in many instances required.





 Candlestick looking southeast – Alice Griffith in foreground, Candlestick South and CPSRA in background.



2. Candlestick looking west – Lower and finer grained buildings near CPSRA.

Note: Towers shown are one example of allowable tower locations (see Section 4.2.2 for details)



Gateway locations reinforced by important buildings and public spaces.



Precedent – Focal Points located at important crossroads.



Landmark - Shipyard crane.



Precedent – Continuous streetwall edges to frame streets and parks.



Precedent - Protect sightlines to the Bay.

#### 7. Urban Placemaking

# Unique places will create identifiable character throughout the development.

Development within the Candlestick and Shipyard sites will have visually exciting and memorable places that are linked to the site's people, history and physical character.

Several elements provide the catalyst for creating unique and diverse places, including the strong influence and pull of the waterfront and the vast open spaces that surround the site, including the Bay, Candlestick Point State Recreation Area and the Bayview and Hunters Point Hills. These elements can be reinforced and woven into the fabric of the neighborhood through a number of urban design applications (see Figure 2.6).

#### Gateways

Major entrances to the Candlestick and Shipyard sites, considered gateway locations, should be marked by significant architecture and public realm treatments to reinforce their importance. Entrances at the Shipyard include Innes, Palou and Crisp and a possible ferry terminal at the south end of Drydock 4. Entrances to Candlestick include Harney Way in the southwest and several Bayview streets to the west notably Carroll, Egbert and Gilman.

#### **Focal Points**

Several important focal points occur at the intersections of key streets, pathways and open spaces. Accordingly, the buildings and civic spaces at these locations should be of significant scale and stature. Focal points at the Shipyard include the points where dense urban development meets the drydocks. At Candlestick the most significant is at the intersection of the two wedge-shaped parks and the two retail streets (Harney and Ingerson). This location marks the confluence of the parks, retail streets, and the center of the tallest buildings. Other secondary nodes that should be acknowledged are the main intersections along the retail streets and the BRT stops.

#### Significant Features

Significant features should be reinforced by building or landscape landmarks. Significant features at the Shipyard include the re-gunning crane, the Hillside, the drydocks, and the piers. Significant features at Candlestick include the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area spit which itself is a visual terminus of Ingerson Street, and the corner of the Candlestick Point Center which marks the terminus of both wedge-shaped parks and Bayview Hill.

#### Edges – Streetwall and Park

Continuous building streetwalls should frame all parks and streets in order to create 'outdoor rooms' for these public spaces. Wider spaces can have proportionally taller buildings. Edges between the community and the waterfront parks should be clearly delineated, either by continuous public paths or public roads.

#### **Sightlines and Viewsheds**

Sightlines from the community to the Bay and other important landmarks should be maintained and reinforced. These include connections to the larger landscape: between the Shipyard and Candlestick and from the Shipyard to downtown. At the Shipyard, the viewshed from the top of Hillside Park (HPS Phase I) should be protected. Sightlines can be created with streets, lanes, pedestrian mews and parks.



- C Gateway
- Focal Point
- \* Significant Feature
- Edge Streetwall and Park
- --> Sightline and Viewshed



Alice Griffith at Candlestick



Candlestick Center.



Shipyard North.

#### 8. Character Neighborhoods

# Neighborhoods will be defined by unique characteristics including identifiable parks, streets and building types.

The Candlestick and Shipyard project area has nine character neighborhoods. Each will have a distinctive mix of uses, building typologies and public realm attributes with a broad range of amenities within close walking distances of homes and workplaces. Easily identifiable characteristics will be found in each neighborhood – which will have either a predominantly residential or a commercial/employment orientation.

Character neighborhood design principles are described below. Specific descriptions, standards and guidelines are found in the following locations:

- For Candlestick neighborhoods Section 5 of this D4D;
- For Jamestown neighborhood Section 7 of this D4D; and,
- For the Shipyard neighborhoods the Hunters Point Shipyard D4D under separate cover.

#### **Character Neighborhoods Design Principles**

**Range of uses within close proximity** – Each character neighborhood contains a range of uses to enable daily activities to be accomplished within an easy walking distance from home or work. A mix of uses also contributes to a vital and flexible neighborhood, allowing a range of activities.

**Coherence** – Each character neighborhood will have coherence – an easily identifiable identity and sense of commonality. Identifiable local neighborhoods enable individuals to participate in community life and to maintain and improve their immediate surroundings by establishing a sense of ownership. Coherence can be achieved by the creation of distinct centers, edges and nodes.

**Scale** – To be understandable and manageable, character neighborhoods are limited in scale. The pedestrian shed, an approximate 5 to 10 minute walking distance, is a good guide. Character neighborhoods are sized to encourage community identification and management but still be large enough to encompass the variety of activities envisioned for these neighborhoods.

**Variety** – Each character neighborhood will have a variety of uses, spaces, housing types and tenures and workplaces. Character neighborhoods will not be defined by homogeneity but rather be interesting places with a fine-grained texture unified by well-defined common themes.

**Mix of Public and Private Space –** Each character neighborhood will be built up of both public spaces – parks, community spaces, and streets – and private spaces – homes, workplaces, and shops – providing places for both community and private life. The specific mix and makeup, and strategies for interfacing the private and public realms will be specific to the individual character neighborhood.



- ᡝ Shipyard North
- Shipyard Village Center
- 2 3 4 5 Research and Development
- Shipyard South
- Alice Griffith

Candlestick North

6

 $\overline{7}$ 

8

- Candlestick Center
- Candlestick South
- 9 Jamestown-refer to Section 7
  - Waterfront Open Space



Candlestick mixed-use streets



Vibrant retail precinct.

#### 9. Retail Services

The Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood has been served by only limited retail services on Third Street for decades. Now, with 10,500 residential units planned for Candlestick and the Shipyard (plus approximately 1,400 homes underway at the already approved Phase I of the Shipyard and another 2,800 units emerging at nearby Executive Park), a significant opportunity exists to fill this long-standing need. Thus a large shopping center is planned in the Candlestick site. The center accomplishes four important objectives: 1) it meets a retail demand in the City's southeast sector; 2) it helps to generate revenue needed in order to build the community's infrastructure; 3) it offers many job opportunities for residents and; 4) it will become the town center for this extensive new community.

The Candlestick Center neighborhood, described in Section 5, is planned as a vibrant mixed-use retail precinct. The anticipated design is decidedly in contrast to a conventional suburban mall. Shops will line two pedestrian oriented main streets – Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way. Additional interior streets, walkways and plaza areas are proposed to emphasize the Center's pedestrian nature. Housing, commercial, a hotel and entertainment uses are also planned in the neighborhood to reinforce the mixed-use character.

At the Shipyard, retail will be oriented to the neighborhood in a main street configuration on Fisher Avenue. It will have a unique overlay of character provided by the blending of artists studios that are planned for the area.



Candlestick's mixed-use center at the corner of Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way.



Precedent – Native and regionally appropriate planting on the streets.



Precedent - Green architecture.



Precedent – Storm water management practices.



Precedent – Green roofs help mitigate storm water runoff.

## 2.3 Sustainability Design Principles

Note: The general intent for the sustainability strategy is described below. For a more comprehensive description of the project's sustainability objectives, please consult the companion 'Sustainability Plan'.

#### Sustainability Plan Vision

The project's sustainability vision statement is the following:

The Candlestick and Shipyard will be a neighborhood that is vital, accessible and integrated into the San Francisco Bay area. It will provide opportunities for residents to live, recreate, earn a living wage, obtain a good education, and raise a family in a safe, affordable and healthy environment.

The Candlestick and Shipyard projects will be models of sustainable urban design that stimulates the local clean technology economy, and addresses global environmental challenges such as climate change, rising energy costs and increasing water scarcity.

A comprehensive sustainability strategy has been developed for Candlestick and the Shipyard to demonstrate how the project will provide the Bayview community with amenities that it has not historically enjoyed: opportunities for local jobs at all skill levels, local retail options, a safe walkable community, and a variety of parks and open spaces.

The sustainability strategy also describes measures that will minimize the impact of the development on local infrastructure, resources and the environment, and measures to preserve the unique culture and diversity that defines the area. Project sponsors will apply for and aspire to obtain a LEED–ND (Neighborhood Development) Gold certification for the entire Candlestick and Shipyard community.

A detailed Sustainability Plan has been prepared and is a companion document to this D4D. Its main points are summarized by the following seven sustainability focus areas.





- Economic Vitality
  Resource Efficiency
  Community Identity and Cohesion
   The Environment
   Public Wellbeing and Quality of Life
- Accessibility and Transportation
- Advanced Information Communication Technology

#### Sustainability Focus Areas

The following are seven focus areas for sustainability objectives at the Candlestick and Shipyard Projects.

- 1. **Economic Vitality and Affordability.** Enhance the competitiveness of the region and restore the vitality of the Bayview by fostering a vibrant local economy and supporting a mixed-income community.
- 2. **Community Identity and Cohesion.** Create a strong sense of community by integrating the new neighborhood with the rich culture and diverse history of the existing neighborhood.
- Public Well-Being and Quality of Life. Provide a healthy and safe neighborhood with sufficient community facilities, parks, essential services and public spaces to engender a high quality of life for residents of all ages and abilities.
- 4. Accessibility and Transportation. Significantly improve accessibility to the site and reduce traffic impacts on the surrounding area; promote walking and cycling as the primary modes of transportation within the development.
- 5. **Resource Efficiency.** Implement a whole-systems approach to energy conservation efficiency and sustainable supply that minimizes the need for fossil fuels.
- Significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions by residents and businesses.
- Provide an integrated urban water system that achieves maximum synergy between the three core water disciplines — potable water, wastewater, and storm water — and enables the community to live within its natural water budget.
- Reduce, reuse and recycle appropriate solid waste materials, with a special emphasis on reusing construction materials and recycling organic wastes in an effort to divert waste from landfills.
- 6. **Environment and Habitat.** Protect and, wherever possible, enhance parks, natural habitats, soils, water bodies, air and climate.
- 7. Utilize Advanced Information and Communications Technologies (ICT). Integrate Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) such as smart grid and cellular broadband infrastructure into the development to allow residents to better manage energy and water resources, bolster local economic activity, improve access to real time information, and facilitate community communications and activity.

2016 CANDLESTICK POINT DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT



# **Proposed Plan for Candlestick**

- 3.1 Plan Structure and Program
- 3.2 Public Streets
- 3.3 Public Parks and Open Space
## **3** Proposed Plan for Candlestick

## 3.1 Plan Structure and Program

Vision

The vision for the redevelopment of Candlestick, as shown in Figure 3.2, is for a compact, mixed-use community that rejuvenates and expands the existing Bayview neighborhood. This, in combination with planned development at the Shipyard, will create a significant new focal point for southeastern San Francisco.

Candlestick will be comprised of several unique neighborhoods, each characterized by local influences including the site's waterfront. The neighborhoods will be woven together and to the larger community by a large open space system comprised of parks, various greenways and trails, and a continuous waterfront park, part of which will be a refurbished Candlestick Point State Recreation Area.

#### Land Use

The BVHP Plan establishes Land Use Districts within Candlestick. Allowable land uses within each Land Use District are set forth in the BVHP Plan. The Land Use Districts established by the BVHP Plan are shown in Figure 4.2.

The proposed land uses at Candlestick Point include a substantial waterfront open space network, regional and neighborhood retail mixeduse buildings, hotel and entertainment facilities, residential housing in forms ranging from townhomes to high-rise buildings, and community uses. Maximum floor space entitlement for the various land uses is outlined in the CPHPS2 Disposition & Development Agreement (as amended) and the CPHPS2 Final Environmental Impact Report (and associated Addendums).

#### **Urban Form**

The overall urban form – the pattern of streets, blocks and open spaces – is configured in such a way as to link the center of the site to the shoreline's open space and views. The physical linkage is achieved by providing new, wedge-shaped parks that connect the waterfront Candlestick Point State Recreation Area to the center of the site, while the visual linkage is achieved through the perpendicular orientation of the streets to the shoreline.

The street and block pattern is an extension of the existing Bayview grid. It will be augmented by mid-block breaks (pedestrian mews and/or vehicular alleyways) in order to create a finer, pedestrian scale of blocks and buildings while increasing mobility and connectivity.



- $\bigcirc$ Gateway
- ⊜ Focal Point
- \* Significant Feature
- Edge Streetwall and Park
- --> Sightline

Within blocks, building massing frames important streets and open spaces while protecting views and sunlight. Blocks with lower density building forms are located nearest the existing Bayview community as a transition between existing and new areas and near the waterfront areas. Higher density forms are located near important nodes at the center of the community.

Individual buildings are programmed and proportioned to enhance their legibility at the pedestrian level by way of clearly defined building bases that contain active uses. This includes an extensive setback zone for the provision of ground oriented patios, residential entrances, and landscaped transition areas between the private and public realm.

Residential housing will be in a variety of forms and densities, including tuck-under townhomes, liner (podium) townhomes, low-rise, mid-rise, and high-rise (tower) buildings.

Most residential parking will be located in structures embedded within buildings. Parking for regional retail is located in a large structure that is wrapped on the retail centre side by store fronts and on the Arelious Walker Drive side by a combination of sloping terrain and landscape buffers. Additional convenience parking for retail is located on many streets adjacent to shops and services. Off-street surface parking, other than very small and occasional lots, is not proposed.

Transit opportunities will be provided by a bus rapid transit (BRT) system and non-BRT Muni transit buses that connects to the Caltrain and the 3rd Street light rail systems. The transit stops for these systems serve as the major focal points for intensified retail, commercial and residential development. Further detail regarding the approved land uses at Candlestick Point are contained in the BVHP Redevelopment Plan, the CPHPS2 Disposition & Development Agreement (as amended), and the CPHPS2 Final Environmental Impact Report (and associated Addendums).



#### Figure 3.2 Candlestick Illustrative Site Plan

Legend – Building Types







Candlestick looking southwest – Lower and finer grained buildings near CPSRA.





Candlestick looking northeast – CPSRA in foreground, Candlestick South in front, Candlestick Center to left.

#### Neighborhoods

Candlestick will consist of four distinctive neighborhoods: Candlestick Center, Candlestick North, Candlestick South, and Alice Griffith (see the Illustrative Site Plan – Figure 3.2). A general description of the neighborhoods follows, while specific standards and guidelines are contained in Section 5. A fifth neighborhood, Jamestown, may also be developed independently of the Candlestick and Shipyard projects. For specific standards and guidelines, refer to Section 7.

#### **Candlestick Center**

The focal point of Candlestick will be Candlestick Center, a mixed-use neighborhood located in the vicinity of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue at the intersection of the two large wedge-shaped City Parks. Candlestick Center will have residential and/or commercial above retail uses, regional retail space, neighborhood retail space, a hotel, and entertainment uses. Buildings will be structured around retail streets with on-street parking and on pedestrian mews. The finest grain of buildings and individual stores will be located on Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue, whereas larger uses such as anchor stores will generally be located towards the interior of this neighborhood. Structured parking will be at the west side adjacent Arelious Walker Drive where the structure will be concealed by sloping terrain and landscaped screening. Rooftop treatment of the parking structure also presents an opportunity for implementing sustainable features such as renewable energy production (e.g., solar panels, wind turbines) and rainwater harvesting for landscaping irrigation.



Candlestick Center main street.

#### **Candlestick North**

Candlestick North will have mixed-use buildings on the north side of Ingerson Avenue. Residential buildings will be in forms ranging from low to mid to high rises. These will be structured in small blocks that will have pedestrian mews or vehicular laneways breaking the block at roughly its midpoint. Taller buildings will be located around the neighborhood's centrally located park and along the edge of the large, wedge-shaped park. Finer grained buildings will be located along the edges of the State Recreation Area providing a transition and protecting views of the Bay from inland locations.



Candlestick North at the edge of the centrally located community park.

#### **Candlestick South**

Candlestick South will have a mixed-use edge on the south side of Harney Way. The tallest buildings may be located immediately south of Harney Way, positioning the highest densities near services, including the BRT route that runs along Harney Way. Buildings will taper down in height going towards the water and the State Recreation Area. Blocks will be fine-grained and include mid-block breaks, which can be configured as either pedestrian mews or vehicular alleyways.



Candlestick South's waterfront streets and pedestrian promenades.

#### **Alice Griffith**

The Alice Griffith neighborhood, located north of Arelious Walker Drive, has a blend of market and affordable housing in townhomes and low-rise building forms that will total approximately 1,300 homes. The affordable housing will include replacement of the existing 256 units of public housing, low-income rental apartments and 'work-force' housing targeted to middle class families. The neighborhood is anchored by a City Park that extends through the center of the site along Egbert Avenue. This park is linked visually with the boulevard character of Egbert Avenue further south in order to create a sightline to the Bay.



Alice Griffith community park framed by townhomes and stack flats.

#### Jamestown

The Jamestown neighborhood is located to the west of Candlestick Center on Jamestown Avenue. Jamestown is not being developed by the Master Developer for the Candlestick and Shipyard projects. Therefore, development for Jamestown is discussed separately from the Sections 4 and 5 of this D4D in Section 7.

Should development be contemplated, this neighborhood will be predominantly residential and have a pedestrian connection to the Candlestick Center. It will have a blend of low-rise and mid-rise buildings that step with the sloping terrain while taking advantage of the opportunity for views of the Bay.

Specific standards, guidelines and plans for Jamestown are contained in Section 7 of this D4D, however the overarching principles and interpretations in Section 4 still apply.



Precedent - Residential patios and stoops.



Precedent - Blend of transportation modes.



Precedent - Pedestrian mews.



Precedent - Animated street edges.

## 3.2 Public Streets

This section of the D4D describes general intentions for the street hierarchy and design of Public Streets. More specific standards and guidelines are contained in the approved Transportation Plan (in relation to how public streets facilitate transportation), and approved Streetscape Plan (in relation to the design of public streets, including street furniture, trees and materials).

The Candlestick street network is designed for the efficient movement of people and goods throughout and beyond the community and is also an important component of the public realm and community character. Streets are a central element in creating safe and enjoyable neighborhoods. In keeping with the City and County of San Francisco's Transit First, Complete Streets, and Better Streets policies, the street system is designed to: prioritize walking, bicycling, and transit use; support the use of streets as public spaces for social interaction and community life; and be green spaces that enhance the City's ecological function.

An important feature of the streets network is the inclusion of mid-block breaks, which may be developed as either pedestrian mews or vehicular laneways. The breaks further reduce the scale of the blocks allowing for greater pedestrian movement through the community. A waterfront path within the park areas will create additional pedestrian and bicycle linkages around the development.

Streets are designed for:

**Pedestrians, Bicycles, and Transit** – Small block sizes centered on a dense, compact development pattern of mixed-use transit nodes creates short walking distances, while extensive bicycle routes create a desirable alternatives to the automobile;

**Public Life and Community Identity** – Streets are designed as outdoor rooms with attractive places to sit, stop, gather, and play. They provide opportunities for neighbors and visitors to meet one another, creating a vibrant community-oriented neighborhood experience. Unique plantings, furnishings, and public art create distinct and memorable neighborhood identities;

**Safety** – Major roadways and intersections are designed to be highly identifiable and include bike lanes and high visibility signage. Residential streets incorporate traffic calming measures such as curb extensions, raised crosswalks, tight corner radii, street trees, narrow lanes, short blocks, and other appropriate measures including bulb outs at street crossings.

**Urban Ecology** – Streets are part of the city's 'green infrastructure.' Street trees and plantings are used to help regulate climate, control storm water, cleanse air and water, and provide habitat;

**Efficiency** – A hierarchy of street types allows for the efficient movement of people and goods along designated priority corridors. Certain streets will allow for high degrees of movement and increased speeds where the majority emphasize calm and control.





Precedent - Sidewalks with street trees.



Precedent – Bicycle lanes incorporated into roadway.



Precedent - Bioswale storm water garden.

The creation of diverse street types, from quiet residential streets, to retail main streets, enhances the character of each region of the plan, facilitating wayfinding and promoting sense of place.

General public street categories include retail streets, boulevard park streets, local streets and mid-block breaks – public easements over private property which may be developed as either pedestrian mews or vehicular alleyways. The location and character of these streets is shown on the following pages. Within each of these broad street categories, there is further variety in their character and configuration. The character of streets is influenced by the building edges conditions and these are described in Section 4 of this document. The configuration of streets including specific lane and sidewalk widths, is described in the companion 'Transportation Plan'. Standards and guidelines for the streetscape are set forth in Section 4.6.



Location of Retail Streets.



Precedent - Patio areas on retail street sidewalks



Precedent - Generous sidewalks with street trees for pedestrian priority.

#### Legend

- Э Bulb-out with Special Paving
- 2 Sitting Area
- 3 (4) Street Trees
- Garden-style Planing/Bioswale Storm Water Garden
- 5 Street Parking
- Street
- Raised Crosswalk (speed table)
- 6 7 8 9 Pedestrian Lighting
- Opportunity for Outdoor Seating

#### **Retail Streets**

Retail streets are meant to have a 'main street' feel provided by generously sized and furnished sidewalks, on-street parking, transit shelters and continuous retail frontage on both sides. The plan, section and images below show the general intent including the range of street widths and building heights appropriate to the street hierarchy, character and importance.





Note: Section and plan are conceptual; specific Standards and Guidelines are described in Section 4.5.2 and Transportation Plan.



Location of Boulevard Streets.



Precedent - Dolores Street in San Francisco.

#### **Boulevard Park Streets**

#### Intent

Boulevard Park Streets are intended to provide additional open space and views out to the Bay from inland parcels. They should have generous sidewalks and tree–lined medians. The plan, section and images below show the general intent including the range of street widths and building heights appropriate to the street hierarchy, character and importance.



Note: Section and plan are conceptual; specific street types are described in 'Transportation Plan.'

#### Legend

- 1 Bulb-out with special paving
- 2 Bus stop with shelter and extended sidewalk zone
- 3 Sitting area
- (4) Street trees, double row
- Garden-style planting / bioswale storm water garden
- 6 Streetside parking (potential for permeable paving)
- 7 Bicycle/travel lane
- 8 Bicycle parking
- (9) Raised crosswalk (speed table)
- (10) Private terraces, porches, and gardens
- (1) Pedestrian lighting



Location of Local Streets.

Precedent - On-street parking and street trees.

#### Legend

- 1 Bulb-out with special paving
- (2) Sitting area
- (3) Street trees
- (4) Garden-style planting / bioswale storm water garden
- (5) Streetside parking (potential for permeable paving)
- (6) Narrow, shared lanes
- (7) Raised crosswalk (speed table)
- (8) Private terraces, porches, and gardens
- (9) Bicycle parking
- (10) Pedestrian lighting at corners

#### Local Streets

#### Intent

Local Streets should provide access for neighborhoods and function as 'outdoor rooms' in order to encourage socializing and recreating. They should include on-street parking, street trees and generous sidewalks. The plan, section and images below show the general intent including the range of street widths and building heights appropriate to the street hierarchy, character and importance.



Note: Section and plan are conceptual; specific street sections are described in 'Transportation Plan.'



Location of Mid-block breaks



Precedent - Mid-block break: Pedestrian Mews.



Precedent - Mid-block break: Laneway.

#### Mid-block Break

#### Intent

Mid-block breaks are intended to allow public access through the middle of private development blocks in order to create a more porous circulation system and decrease the scale of building massing. Mid-block breaks are configured as either pedestrian mews or laneways, allowing vehicular movement in order to meet the requirements of adjacent buildings. The mid-block break will be a public easement on the private land of the development block. A conceptual residential pedestrian mews is depicted below. For further details, refer to Section 4.6.2.



Note: Section and plan are conceptual; specific Standards and Guidelines are described in Section 4.6.2 and Transportation Plan.

#### Legend

- Pedestrian Path 20-26 ft width; at grade of public sidewalk
- 2 Elevated Private Patio
- (3) Landscape buffer including street trees.



Precedent - Community Parks.



Precedent - Destination Parks.



Precedent - Park with family amenities.



Precedent - Playground.



Precedent – Lawn Areas for active recreation.

## 3.3 Public Parks and Open Space

Note: The general intent for parks and open space design at Candlestick is described below. For detailed design information, standards and guidelines refer to the companion 'Parks, Open Space and Habitat Plan'.

The parks and open space program at Candlestick, as illustrated in Figure 3.4, will express the desires of existing neighborhood residents, the needs of future residents, overall citywide needs, and the unique opportunities presented by the site. Together these characteristics help to create a variety of park types as described below.

Incorporating this broad range of needs, input and opportunities, the parks system includes a rich diversity of programs, providing a mix of both active and quiet spaces.

Within the park system, there are two classifications of park: Community and Cultural/Heritage.

**Community Parks** – Community parks offer a mix of active and passive areas of open lawns, dog runs, play areas, tot lots, community gardens, court games, and environmental education opportunities. These parks will serve the adjacent local neighborhood and will draw regular users from within a 10 minute walking radius. The community parks adjacent to the waterfront will also attract visitors from other parts of San Francisco and beyond.

**Cultural/Heritage Parks** – The cultural and historical elements of these parks are designed to attract a broad range of visitors. In addition to regular neighborhood use, these parks draw visitors from throughout San Francisco, the Bay Area, and beyond.

The parks and open space system will generally be located and provided as described and shown on the following pages.



- (1) (2) Alice Griffith Community Park
- Candlestick Community Park (Final Location to be Determined in the Future)
- 3 Bayview Gardens / Wedge Destination Park
- (4) (5) Mini-wedge Community Park
  - Jamestown Hillside Community Park

- 6 7 8 9 State Recreation Area
  - Yosemite Slough (outside project)
  - Gilman Park (outside project)
  - Bayview Hill Park (outside project)
- 10 Grasslands Ecology Park (the Shipyard)
- Bay Trail



Location of Alice Griffith Community Park.



Aerial view looking north west.

## 3.3.1 City Park Descriptions

The development shall provide for five City Parks described generally as follows. Specific design shall be developed in consultation with the neighborhood.

#### 1. Alice Griffith Community Park

The Alice Griffith Community Park will serve as the commons for the Alice Griffith neighborhood. The park will be located on Egbert Avenue, which will be a one-way couplet around the park. A continuous four story or greater street wall will surround the park edge in order to frame and animate the space.

The park will offer a mix of active and passive areas that could include an open lawn, play areas, a tot lot, a dog run, community gardens, a shade pavilion with barbecue and picnic tables, a basketball court, and a bioswale stormwater garden.

#### Figure 3.5 Conceptual Plan – Alice Griffith Community Park





Location of Candlestick Community Park – Final location to be determined in the future.



Aerial view looking north east.

#### 2. Candlestick Community Park

Candlestick Community Park will be strategically located near the center of the built up area at Candlestick so that it serves as the 'living room' and meeting place for residents in the Candlestick North neighborhood. The final location of the park within the neighborhood will be determined in the future; however, if relocated, it will be in the central region of the Candlestick North Neighborhood, centrally located and well-served by the transportation network. Regardless of its location, the park will maintain the approximately 3 acre size shown below.

Compared to the waterfront and water view parks, Candlestick Community Park is meant to be a more urban experience. The park offers a mix of active and passive areas including, for example, an open lawn, a playground / tot lot, gardens, seating areas and volleyball and basketball courts.







Location of Bayview Gardens/Wedge Destination Park.

Aerial view looking south west.

#### 3. Bayview Gardens / Wedge Destination Park

The Bayview Gardens/Wedge Park will be the 'Central Park' for the urban development of Candlestick, providing views of the South Basin and the Shipyard, and linking the center of Candlestick with the State Recreation Area. This park includes virtually all of the passive programs found elsewhere in the open space system; however, here they are condensed in a smaller area and delivered to the heart of the community. Specific emphasis here is placed on signature forms and landscape expressions. Within these forms are ecological gardens, a plaza, reflecting ponds, shade pavilions, children's playground, passive lawn areas and a bioswale storm-water garden. The southerly portion is an urban plaza, including a BRT stop and on street parking.

#### Figure 3.7 Conceptual Plan – Bayview Gardens / Wedge Destination Park





Location of Mini-wedge Community Park.



Aerial view looking south east.

#### 4. Mini-wedge Community Park

The Mini-wedge Community Park provides dramatic views of the Bay and it serves as a primary connector between the urban core of Candlestick and the State Recreation Area beach area. Programmatic elements include a playground/tot lot, dog run, shade pavilion and open lawns with views to the bay. This park also serves an ecological function, intercepting and cleansing urban storm-water runoff before it enters the bay.

Figure 3.8 Conceptual Plan – Mini-wedge Community Park





Location of Jamestown Hillside Community Park.

#### 5. Jamestown Hillside Community Park

This park is located at the base of the Bayview Hill Park. The existing site is a steep, rocky slope that was graded and terraced for the construction of the former Candlestick Stadium. Following the recommendations of the Bayview Hill Natural Areas Plan, this park area will be enhanced with new native plantings to increase that habitat value of the site and to help to create a habitat link between Bayview Hill and the Bay. The park will have access to Candlestick Center via a new Ingerson Avenue extension as well as at Jamestown Avenue and Arelious Walker Drive.

Figure 3.9 Conceptual Plan – Jamestown Hillside Community Park





Existing Bayview Hill landscape.



Location of State Recreation Area and Bay Trail.



Precedent - Main Park.



Precedent - Bay Trail.

### 3.3.2 State Recreation Area Description

The Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA) is a unique opportunity in the State Recreation Area system and along the San Francisco Bay shoreline to create a model urban recreation area that links city residents and regional visitors to the diversity of estuary and upland habitats of the Bay and demonstrates integrated sustainable design principles for reclaiming fill areas for park uses.

Within the State Recreation Area, there are two main zones of activity.

**Main Park** – Although this park stands alone as a separate waterfront open space system, it is the primary connector that links the other various parks together and provides the regional link that makes this a greater system of open space. The zones of this park are the connective tissue of the open space system employing a simple, sensitive, and expressive palette of landscape materials to allow the park to grow over time. Native grasslands, woodland groves, and an ecological focus in these areas provide a system for choreographing the landscape experience. Examples of these CPSRA zones are the Last Rubble, the Point and the Last Port.

**Bay Trail** – Within the State Recreation Area, the Bay Trail links together all elements of the park and provides a system of clear connections to the regional green ways and waterways. This is the primary recreational route in the new open space system and will encourage users from adjacent neighborhoods, and other areas of the city to utilize the new open spaces of the development.

#### **Area Planning Process**

There will be a separate planning process for the CPSRA that will be undertaken by California State Parks. This process will include a General Plan addressing programming and policy, and a Master Plan addressing specific design. The State, City, community, and developer will work together to initiate the master planning process leading to the refurbishment of CPSRA.

The following principles are proposed for consideration in this design process. These are illustrated in the conceptual plan on the next page and in Figure 3.10.

- Design city parks and state recreation areas to feel from a user perspective as one park system despite potential programmatic and operational differences between jurisdictions.
- Develop a park that is programmed and designed for safe and active 18 – 24 hour daily use by the public.
- Design a pedestrian and bike accessible transition zone between all private development parcels and the park.
- Develop frequent routes into the park from the neighborhood aligning with the planned street network with major linkages with transit stops, bike routes and linear green way features.
- Create a mixture of passive and active spaces that activate the open space drawing neighbors and visitors to the waterfront.

- Provide duplicative trail systems including linkage to a Class One Bike Trail and multi-use recreation trail close to neighborhoods, a continuous Bay Trail close to the water, and multiple linkages between.
- Install multiple human powered boat access points including facilities for windsurfers south of Bayview Hill and kayak/canoe facilities in Yosemite Slough.
- Preserve and expand the existing pocket beach.
- Integrate stormwater treatment systems with the neighboring development to provide model/demonstration sustainability systems and habitat spaces.
- Utilize stainable design principles through park planning to expand the ecological functions of the recreation area and minimize resource consumption by park facilities, programs and users.
- Introduce limited commercial uses to provide food and recreational services for visitors.
- Balance dedicated parking facilities for the recreation area with available on and off street parking provided in the neighboring development and transit access to the area.
- Upgrade existing and install additional fishing and viewing piers into the bay.
- Provide multiple picnicking and barbecuing facilities to accommodate family and social gatherings in multiple areas of the park, and consider larger scaled gathering opportunities for events.
- Provide rest rooms and other support infrastructure.



Draft Concept Master Plan prepared by AECOM for California State Parks

### CONCEPT MASTER PLAN

Draft





Figure 3.10 Conceptual Plan – Candlestick Point State Recreation Area

2016 CANDLESTICK POINT DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT



# Land Use, Design Standards and Guidelines

#### 4.1 Land Use

- 4.2 Height, Bulk and Massing
- 4.3 Building Design
- 4.4 Signage
- 4.5 Parking and Loading
- 4.6 Streets

# 4 Land Use, Design Standards and Guidelines

This section, Land Use, Design Standards and Guidelines, covers elements applicable to all areas within Candlestick. (For elements specific to individual neighborhoods see Section 5 Neighborhood Standards and Guidelines).

*Standards* are mandatory actions, generally described in absolute terms such as by measurement or location. *Guidelines* are encouraged actions, which if adhered to in spirit will result in projects that best fit the vision for the site.

The section has six parts:

- 4.1 Land Use
- 4.2 Height, Bulk and Massing
- 4.3 Building Design
- 4.4 Signage
- 4.5 Parking and Loading
- 4.6 Streets
- 4.1 Land Use
- 4.1.1 Development Blocks

#### Intent

Development blocks should be similar in scale to the surrounding Bayview neighborhood whose blocks typically approximately 600 ft by 275 ft. Midblock breaks, in the form of pedestrian mews or vehicular laneways, have been added to several blocks. Open space has been located so that all development blocks have convenient access.

#### Standards

**Block Location** – Development blocks and mid-block breaks shall be located as close as possible to the location shown on Figure 4.1 on the following page.

**Street Location** – Streets shall be located as close as possible to the location shown on Figure 4.1. Final locations and dimensions shall be per the companion 'Transportation Plan'.

**Park Location** – Parks shall be located as close as possible to the location shown on Figure 4.1. Final locations and dimensions shall be per the companion 'Parks, Open Space and Habitat Concept Plan'.

**Turning Radii** – Certain corners within the development are rounded in order to accommodate buses and emergency vehicles. Those corners shall be rounded to accommodate a 41 ft curb turning radius (modeled as AASHTO WB-40).



- Block
- Neighborhood Boundary
- Street/Public Right of Way
- Open Space
- Mid-block Break/Public Easement
- Block Number

#### 4.1.2 Land Use Districts

The BVHP Plan establishes Land Use Districts for the Candlestick site, which is in Zone 1 of Project Area B of the BVHP Plan. As shown on Figure 4.2, three Land Use Districts are established for Zone 1 as follows:

- Candlestick Mixed-Use Residential District
- Candlestick Center Mixed-Use Commercial District
- Open Space District

The permitted land uses within each of these Land Use Districts are set forth in the BVHP Plan. Development of structures and uses of land within Candlestick are required to conform to the BVHP Plan and this D4D. To provide context for the remainder of this document, the general types of uses permitted by the BVHP Plan in these Districts are summarized below. This D4D provides the detailed design guidelines and development standards for all development within the Candlestick site.

The **Candlestick Mixed-use Residential District** provides the major housing development area, which will be comprised of lower scale residential development in the northern part of the site and higher density mid-rise to high-rise residential in the central part of the site. A mixture of building types and unit sizes will be provided in a range of densities to accommodate a variety of households. Neighborhood retail is an allowed use in this District, and indeed is encouraged where it is located on the ground floor in central areas within the neighborhood. Personal service, civic and institutional uses, and parks are also permitted.

The **Candlestick Center Mixed-use Commercial District** is located in the southwest quadrant of the site. It serves to facilitate the development of high-density, mid-rise and high-rise housing integrated with ground floor commercial frontage containing retail uses along the primary streets. The mixed-use neighborhood is designed to encourage retail, commercial, hotel and cultural arts activities. This will be achieved through compact, horizontal mixed-use whereby different activities and land uses locate in close proximity to each other; or through vertical mixed-use which will allow for more than one land use category within a single building – such as a residential apartment complex with retail uses on the ground floor. Educational, community activity, and park and recreation uses are also permitted.

The **Open Space District** will provide for quality open spaces and public parks, including active recreation facilities such as playing fields, gardens and walking/bicycling trails. A hierarchy of open spaces will be provided across Candlestick to include small urban parks and plazas, tree-lined parkways along streets and major park spaces along the waterfront. Public serving buildings to a maximum of 40 ft shall be allowed, including gymnasiums, amphitheater, rest rooms, food-service facilities, restaurants, and buildings for the provision of recreation related services (for example sports equipment rental).



Candlestick Mixed-Use Residential District

Candlestick Center Mixed-Use Commercial District

Open Space District

Note: For Jamestown lots, see Section 7



Cluster high-rise buildings near center of neighborhood.



Cluster high-rise buildings near transit.



Respect view corridors.



Avoid wind tunneling by staggering tower locations.

## 4.2 Height, Bulk and Massing

This section describes the intent, standards and guidelines related to height, bulk and massing of blocks and buildings. It contains five subsections:

4.2.1	Building	Types
1 0 0		

- 4.2.2 Height 4.2.3 Bulk & Massing
- 4.2.4 Street Wall
- 4.2.5 Sunlight/Shade
- 4.2.6 Wind

Height is regulated to provide a variety of walls that frame public space, and in some cases protect views. Within development blocks, the bulk of the building is regulated by building coverage at various height thresholds to ensure that the overall bulk of buildings is an appropriate scale and allows for light and view penetration to the street level. The massing of individual buildings is regulated by way of maximum lengths, diagonals, apparent face and upper floor stepback. At the finest grain, the building edge is regulated to ensure an appropriately scaled and detailed edge at the public interface. Finally, considerations of sunlight/shade and wind are regulated to ensure a comfortable environment in the public realm and in the buildings.

#### 4.2.1 Building Types

Building types are defined as described in Table 4.1 below.

#### Table 4.1 Building Types



\* Note: Mid-rise buildings above 85 ft to a maximum of 105 ft are only applicable in the Shipyard South R&D Option – see Section 8.

#### 4.2.2 Height

#### Intent

Heights are regulated in order to achieve several objectives:

- Integrate the new development with the scale of the surrounding Bayview neighborhood.
- Cluster density near services like transit, shopping and jobs.
- Reinforce focal points located at the center of the development.
- Protect views and sun in specific locations and mitigate wind tunneling effects.

#### **Standards**

**Parks and Open Space –** The maximum allowable building height in a park or other open space is 40 ft.

**Low-rise and Mid-rise** – The location and height of low-rise and mid-rise buildings is shown in Figure 4.3. Where a block has multiple height zones, the building(s) shall conform to the maximum percentage(s) of the block's developable area depicted in Figure 4.3. For the purposes of this provision, the developable area is the area of the block excluding land required for a mid-block break and the applicable ground floor setback areas.

**Landmark Building** – A landmark building within CP Center at the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue shall be a maximum of 120 ft.

**High-rise (Tower)** – The location of high-rise buildings (towers) is shown in Figure 4.3. The standards (S) and guidelines (G) that regulate the location and height of high-rise buildings are set forth in Table 4.3.


High-Rise separation.

- Tower Location Towers are either fixed (noted as fixed location) or allowed within an allowable zone, within which an encouraged location is shown.
- Tower Benching In order to encourage variation in tower height and preserve the project skyline profile, any tower not built to the maximum allowable height shall maintain the same maximum height differential to the next closest tower (not including towers at maximum height), while not exceeding the maximum allowable height. For example, if Tower 1 has a maximum height of 240 ft, and Tower 2 has a maximum height of 280 ft, these two towers shall maintain a minimum 40 ft height difference.
- Tower Separation Towers shall be separated by a minimum 115' to minimize view obstruction, increase privacy, limit wind tunneling impacts, and limit lighting impacts.
- Buildings taller than 100 feet are required to be safe for birds as outlined in MM-BI-20a.1 of the Final Environmental Impact Report for Candlestick and the Shipyard project. For these buildings, or where recommended by the Agency, a qualified biologist is required to identify lighting-related measures to minimize the effects of the building's lighting on birds. Any recommendations made by the qualified biologist shall be thereafter implemented.



Tower Benching Intent - Maintain sculpted skyline and promote height variation.

#### Guidelines

**Low-rise and Mid-rise** – For blocks with multiple height zones, the precise location of the height change for the building(s) on the block is flexible, provided the heights remain generally consistent with the locations depicted in Figure 4.3.



Building Stepping along public frontages with a grade greater than 5% and height measurement on sloping sites.



Height measurement for Flat Roof & Pitched Roof on flat sites.

**Building Stepping** – Buildings shall step with grade along all public street frontages that have a grade greater than 5.0%, as outlined in Table 4.2 below:

## Table 4.2Building Stepping Increments

MAXIMUM BUILDING STEP INCREMENT (ASSUMES 10 FT FLOOR-TO-FLOOR HEIGHT)							
	MAXIMUM STEP INCREMENT (LINEAL FEET)						
STREET GRADE	BUILDINGS WITH SHARED INTERNAL CIRCULATION*	BUILDINGS WITHOUT SHARED INTERNAL CIRCULATION					
Above 5% to 5.5%	200						
Above 5.5% to 6.0%	180						
Above 6.0% to 6.5%	165						
Above 6.5% to 7.0%	155	50					
Above 7.0% to 7.5%	145						
Above 7.5% to 8.0%	135						
Above 8.0%	125						

\* Buildings with shared internal circulation (e.g. apartments) shall step at the increment where a floor can be added at the designed floor-to-floor height for the proposed buildings.

#### Height Measurement - Heights are measured as follows:

- Heights shall be measured from curb level of the fronting street to the top of a flat roof or mid-point of a sloped roof.
- For stepped buildings, the height measurement shall be taken from curb level of the fronting street, midpoint along the step increment.

**Height Measurement Exceptions** – The following appurtenant structures are exempt from building height measurements provided their height, measured from the top of the roof, does not exceed 10 ft or other height as noted:

- Ornamental architectural features, such as turrets, parapets, corner towers, or other accentuating features provided they conform to Proposition K regulations where required.
- For Residential/Mixed-use/Commercial buildings mechanical and roof mounted elevator core equipment to a maximum of 18 ft, provided their combined coverage does not exceed 30% of the building roof area.
- Architectural and landscape screening designed to conceal mechanical and roof mounted equipment.
- Sustainability elements, such as photovoltaic cells, small-scale wind turbines suitable for residential development, storm water catchment/treatment equipment, solar water heating equipment.
- Enclosed amenity spaces to a height of 12 ft where roof is designed as an accessible outdoor common area if coverage of enclosed amenity space is no more than 20% of building roof area.

# **Building Heights**

<del>-</del>			
Iahla / 3	Mavimum High_rico L	Odium Haighte and	Ruilding Hoighte
			Duliulity Libights
		0	0 0

HIGH-F	RISE MAXIMU	M BUILDING HEI	IGHTS
HIGH- RISE <sup>1</sup>	MAXIMUM OVERALL BUILDING HEIGHT (Ft)	MAXIMUM PRODIUM HEIGHT (Ft)	REMARKS
			S – Shall be located on Egbert Avenue to frame the park and reinforce the park street.
A	S – 220	<b>S</b> – 65	G – May be located anywhere within allowable zone, however is encouraged to be located on center line axis of Candlestick North neighborhood park in order to reinforce the park's rectangular shape and frame its northern edge.
В	S- 240	<b>S</b> – 65	S – Shall be located at the corner of Harney Way and Egbert Avenue in order to anchor the northeastern corner of Bayview Park and offer views of the park while not crowding the CPSRA.
			S – Shall be located on Earl Street in order to frame the park and reinforce the park street.
С	S – 220	S – 65⁴	G – May be located anywhere within allowable zone, however is encouraged to be located at the corner of Earl and Fitzgerald in order to optimize separation of towers A, C and E.
D	S – 320	S – 65 Fronting Gilman S – 85 <sup>3</sup> Fronting Harney	G – May be located anywhere within allowable zone, however is encouraged to be located on Gilman Avenue to optimize tower separation of towers C, D and E.
			S – Shall be located on Earl Street in order to reinforce the street.
E <sup>2</sup>	S – 170	<b>S</b> – 65	G – May be located anywhere within allowable zone, however is encouraged to be located at the Gilman Avenue corner in order to frame the park.
F <sup>2</sup>	S – 320	<b>S</b> – 85 <sup>3</sup>	S – Shall be located at the corner of Ingerson and Harney Way in order to anchor the southern end of Bayview Park, reinforce the Avenue corner's central position in the neighborhood and offer views of the park.
			G – Encouraged to be at or near full allowable height in order to reinforce this central location.
G	S- 240	<b>S</b> – 65	S – Shall be located on Arelious Walker Drive in the southwest portion of Candlestick Center north of the intersection of Jamestown Avenue.
Н	S- 240	<b>S</b> - 65	S – Shall be located at the corner of Gilman Avenue and Harney Way's southern extension in order to anchor the southeastern end of Bayview Park and offer views of the park.
I	S – 320	<b>S</b> − 65⁴	<ul> <li>S – Shall be located at the corner of Ingerson and Harney Way's southern extension in order to anchor the intersection of the two wedge-shaped parks and offer views of the parks.</li> <li>G – Encouraged to be at or near full allowable height in order to reinforce this central location.</li> </ul>
J	S – 420	<b>S</b> – 65	S – Shall be located in the position indicated, roughly half way along 7 <sup>th</sup> Street between Harney Way and C Street in order to preserve a view shed from Bayview Hill Park to Candlestick Point.
			G – Encouraged to be at or near full allowable height in order to reinforce this central location.
			S – Shall be located on 9 <sup>th</sup> Street on east side of the mid-block break to optimize the separation from tower J.
K	S – 370	<b>S</b> – 65	<ul> <li>G – May be located anywhere within the allowable zone, which provides for preservation of a viewshed from Bayview Hill Park to Candlestick Point.</li> </ul>
			G – Encouraged to be at or near full allowable height in order to reinforce this central location.
L	S – 320	<b>S</b> – 65	G – May be located anywhere within allowable zone which provides for preservation of a viewshed from Bayview Hill Park to Candlestick Point, however is encouraged to be located on Ingerson at the southern corner of the Mini-Wedge Park in order to anchor the park.
			G – Encouraged to be at or near full allowable height in order to reinforce this central location.
	S – Standard		<sup>1</sup> See Figure 4.3 for location of high-rise buildings. <sup>2</sup> Pending the adoption of findings per planning code Section 295.

G – Guideline

<sup>a</sup>Podium height may be increased to 105 ft under Shipyard South R&D Option – see Section 8 <sup>a</sup>Podium height may be increased to 85 ft under Shipyard South R&D Option – see Section 8



Allowable high-rise location zone

\* See Table 4.1 for maximum heights.

Note: For Jamestown lots, see Section 7.



Project Boundary

Mid-Block Breaks

Maximum Percentage of Developable Area (see Section 4.2.2)

/////

XX%



Development block coverage.

## 4.2.3 Bulk & Massing

#### Intent

The following standards governing bulk and massing intend to facilitate building shapes that fit comfortably within their surroundings, are friendly and unimposing to pedestrians, achieve an attractive urban form, and are interesting. The mass of buildings should be shaped in such a way as to create fine-grained forms, reinforce the street and block pattern, and protect surrounding views and sunlight.

#### Standards

**Development Block Coverage** – Block coverage by all habitable and non-habitable buildings, including projections and structured parking, is limited as indicated in Table 4.4. A development block is defined as all land inside the legal property line. For the purpose of calculating coverage, the area of the block shall be exclusive of required setbacks and midblock breaks. Notwithstanding the parcel coverage standards, individual buildings within the parcel shall not exceed the sizes set forth in Table 4.5.

Table 4.4	Development Block Coverage

DEVELOPMENT BLOCK COVERAGE						
HEIGHT (FT)	COVERAGE					
0 - 40	100%					
40 – 65	75%					
65 +	50%					

**Bulk Controls** – Maximum floor plate sizes, plan lengths, and diagonals to limit the bulk of buildings are listed in Table 4.5. The maximum diagonal dimension shall be measured between the two points of a building's longest diagonal separation.

**Massing Controls** – Controls of apparent faces and stepback of upper floor(s) to limit the massing of buildings are also listed in Table 4.5.

**Apparent Face** – The unbroken plane of a building or 'apparent face' shall not exceed a maximum length without being broken by a change – either an offset in the horizontal plane, or a change in fenestration and/or material, or both in the case of high-rise buildings. There are different standards for the base section and upper section of the building to reflect the desire for a finer grain of building articulation at the street level. The base is defined low- and mid-rise buildings as the first 20 ft height minimum; for high-rise buildings as the first 35 ft height minimum. See Table 4.5.

**Upper Floor(s) Stepback** – The upper floor(s) of low and mid-rise buildings above a specified height shall step back a minimum of 20% of the floor plate size relative to the floor immediately below, as defined in Table 4.5 and Table 4.6.



Building plane articulation regulated by apparent face.

**Podiums** – High-rise buildings may have a podium, defined as a base whose plan dimensions are greater than those of the floors above. The podium height for high-rise buildings shall not exceed the podium height limit provided in Table 4.3. All podium floors with a maximum height (distance to ground) below 85 feet shall not be subject to the bulk controls (maximum floor plate, maximum plan length and maximum diagonal) for high-rise buildings shown in Table 4.5. All podium floors with a maximum height of 85'-105' shall be subject to the bulk controls for mid-rise buildings of 85-105 feet shown in Table 4.5. Notwithstanding these exceptions, the podium shall be subject to massing controls and all other applicable regulations. Further standards and guidelines for high-rise podiums are provided in Section 4.3, Building Design.

# Additional standards regulating specific building types such as high-rise buildings are contained in Section 4.3.

## Table 4.5 Massing – All Building Types

	BUILDING LENG	GTHS AND SIZES							
	BUILDING TYPE LOW-RISE		MID-	RISE	HIGH-RISE				LANDMARK BUILDING
	BUILDING HEIGHT	MAX 65 FT	ABOVE 65 FT TO MAX 85 FT	ABOVE 85 FT TO MAX 105 FT*	ABOVE 105 FT TO MAX 180 FT	ABOVE 180 FT TO MAX 240 FT	ABOVE 240 FT TO MAX 350 FT	ABOVE 350 FT	MAX 120 FT
DLS	Max Floor Plate	n	/a	15,000 sq ft	12,000 sq ft	10,500 sq ft	12,000 sq ft	12,500 sq ft	50,000 sq ft
MASSING CONTROLS A CONTROLS A Y Y A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	Max Plan Length	n	/a	210 ft	140 ft	140 ft	140 ft	145 ft	250 ft
S S	Max Diagonal	n	/a	n/a	170 ft	160 ft	170 ft	175 ft	350 ft
	Max Apparent Face - Base <sup>1</sup>				3	i0 ft			
	Min Change in Apparent Face – Base <sup>1</sup>	Offset in the horizontal plane of minimum 2 ft depth and 3 ft length OR a major change in fenestration and / o						material	
	Max Apparent Face – Above Base <sup>1</sup>	30 ft	100 ft	100 ft	105 ft	100 ft	105 ft	110 ft	250 ft
ASSING CONTROLS	Min Change in Apparent Face – Above Base <sup>1</sup>	Offset in the horizontal plane of the building face of minimum 1 ft depth and 1 ft length or a minor change in fenestration and/or material			Offset in the horizontal plane of minimum 10 ft depth and 10 ft leng or a major change in fenestration and/or material				
	Upper Floors Stepback	Floors above 55 ft: 20% of floor plate directly below Abutting Mid Block Break: Floors above 35 ft - 1:1.2 plane	Floors above 65 ft: 20% of floor plate directly below Abutting Mid Block Break: Floors above 35 ft - 1:1.2 plane	Floors above 85 ft: 20% of floor plate directly below Abutting Mid Block Break: Floors above 35 ft - 1:1.2 plane	n/a				
Σ	High-rise Shaping	n/a			Additional standards regulating segmentation of the high-rise elevation and floor plan. See Section 4.3.1 A.				n/a
	Massing Image <sup>2</sup>	A LANGE TO THE A	Caracter and						

\* Note: Mid-rise buildings above 85 ft to a maximum of 105 ft are only applicable in the Shipyard South R&D Option - see Section 8.

<sup>1</sup>The base is defined as a minimum of the first 20' in height for low- and mid-rise buildings;

and as a minimum of the first 35' in height for high-rise buildings. <sup>2</sup>Massing images for high-rise do not show podiums, which are permitted. Refer to Table 4.3 and Section 4.2.3.

## 4.2.4 Street Wall

The section has a definition of the key controls, sets forth the standards, and concludes with a series of cross sections that illustrate the standards by building use.

#### Intent

In order to control the quality and character of the block edges and street walls, and for controlling the expression of the mass of the buildings, standards for building uses are set forth for:

- A Setbacks
- B Build-to lines
- C Stepbacks
- **D** Projections

As a means of controlling the quality of the at-grade environments these streetwall controls also include considerations for grade separation, retail space heights and depths, and underground parking.









Stepbacks.

Build-to lines.



Projections.



Precedent – Residential setback provides private open space zone.



Precedent – State Recreation Area setback zone.



Retail has no setback in order to strengthen the relationship with sidewalk.

## A – Setback

#### Intent

A building setback is the minimum required distance between the building face and the property line, or in some cases where buildings face a midblock break, between the building face and the middle of the mid-block break. Setbacks apply to the ground floor use of a building. Setback zones, where specified, should be used for the purpose of landscaping or for active uses such as patios and entrance areas. This D4D calls for extensive setbacks throughout the community affording a comfortable and pleasant pedestrian experience that will be a departure from the development practices of most other San Francisco neighborhoods where buildings typically abut against or are close to the property line.

#### Standards

**Residential Setbacks** – A minimum setback of 10 ft to building face is required for residential buildings to allow for the provision of private landscaping and street facing patios and stoops. The setback shall not vary along the predominant wall of a building once established (aside from minor variation which are described in Build-To Percentages).

#### Exceptions:

- 1. Residential use that is located above retail use (i.e. mixed-use) may extend to property line.
- 2. Portions of a residential building that are adjacent to or across the street from a park/open space shall have a minimum setback of 6 ft.
- 3. The street side of CP South blocks 3 and 5, due to the shallow block depth, shall have a minimum setback of 5 ft.

**Mixed-Use/Commercial Setbacks** – There are no required setbacks for mixed-use/commercial buildings, except for parking structures, which shall have an 18 inch setback.

For additional guidelines on establishing appropriate setbacks, please refer to Section 4.3.1 Building Types and Section 4.3.2 F Private Open Space.







Precedent – Recessed balconies exempted from build-to calculations.



Precedent – Recessed building entrances exempted from build-to calculations.



Precedent - Stepback at top floor.

## B – Build-to Line

#### Intent

Build-to lines are intended to ensure that buildings are situated at or close to setback lines in order to create and maintain defined street walls. Street walls are important in the framing and animation of the public right of way. This framing intent is particularly important, for example, along the two wedge parks illustrated in Figure 3.4. A successful development of street wall will create defined 'outdoor rooms' which will invite greater activity of residents and visitors alike.

The build-to line is expressed as a percentage of the setback line for building faces that front a public street. For instance, with a 70% build-to line, 70% of all building faces fronting a public street must meet the setback, while no more than 30% of building faces may be behind the setback.

#### Standards

The build-to line standard for residential buildings is 70% and for mixeduse and commercial buildings is 85%.

**Exemptions** – Minor variations excluded from the calculation of the minimum build-to percentage are:

- For retail uses, recesses including entrances, walk-up window or street patio area shall not be allowed on more than 50% of the total frontage of the building and no recess shall be greater than 12 ft in depth.
- Recessed balconies.
- Recessed building entries to a maximum depth of 8 ft.
- Pass-through up to 2 floors in height.
- Recession in the building face for the purpose of building articulation.
- Stepback on the top floor or top two floors.
- Stepback for high-rise sculpting.

## C – Stepback

#### Intent

A stepback is that portion of a building that must be stepped back from the setback line. Typically, this is regulated for the upper floor(s) of mid-rise buildings as a means of sculpting their mass.

#### Standards

**Upper Floor(s) Stepback** – The upper floor(s) of low and mid-rise buildings above a specified height shall stepback a minimum of 20% of the floor plate of the floor immediately below the specified height. The stepback requirement shall apply to:

- Any floor(s) of a Low Rise Building with a maximum height above 55 ft;
- Any floor(s) of a Mid Rise Building with a maximum height between 65 ft to a maximum of 85 ft; and



Precedent – Bay window projections within setback zone.

Any floor(s) of a Mid Rise Building with a maximum height between 85 ft to a maximum of 105 ft (Shipyard South R&D Option only – see Section 8).

Where abutting a Mid-Block Break that is a Pedestrian Mews or Vehicular Laneway, any portion of a low or mid-rise building above 35 ft shall step back at a plane ratio of 1:1.2 (see Table 4.6 and Figure 4.12).

Allowable uses with the stepback roof area include usable open space, landscaping, and railings. Mechanical space is not allowed.

## **D** – Projection

#### Intent

A projection is that portion of a building that projects beyond the main building face. There are a number of types of projections as described below.

#### Standards

**Habitable Projections** – Habitable space within a projection means a portion of the building enclosed by walls and a roof. Typically this will be a bay window, corner element, or regularly occurring bay that extends through some or all floors of a building. A habitable space may project 3 ft beyond the building face, either into a setback zone or the public realm. No individual habitable projection may exceed 15 ft in length. All projections shall have a minimum clearance to the sidewalk of 9 ft.

**Non-habitable Projections** – non-habitable projections are spaces utilized by residents that are not enclosed by walls and a roof. Non-habitable spaces include all usable balconies, which may extend no more than 6 ft into a setback, or common open space or 3 ft into the public realm. No individual non-habitable projection may exceed 15 ft in length. All projections shall have a minimum clearance of 9 ft to the sidewalk.

**Cumulative Projections** – The cumulative total of all types of projections shall not exceed 67% of the building face.

**Other Projections** – Other allowable projections include:

- Decorative elements such as belt courses, cornices, sills and eaves to a maximum 2 ft 6 inches beyond the setback.
- Decks, patios and steps at the first floor of occupancy may project to the property line but not beyond.
- Fences, railings, chimneys, awnings and canopies may project to the property line but not beyond.
- Retail signs, canopies and awnings may project 5 ft beyond property line; a minimum 9 ft vertical clearance to the sidewalk shall be maintained.
- Sustainable elements such as solar shades and wind fins.

### Table 4.6Street Wall Standards

The table below summarizes the main street wall standards by use. All buildings must comply with all other design requirements outlined in this D4D.

STREET WALL CONDITIONS										
USE		MINIMUM SETBACK (ft)		MINIMUM BUILD-TO LINE (%)		MINIMUM	MAXIMUM PROJECTION (ft)		GRADE SEPARATION ABOVE SIDEWALK (ft)	
		Residential Building	Mixed Use or Commer- cial Building	Residential Building	Mixed Use or Commer- cial Building	STEPBACK (%)	Habitable	Non- Habitable	Residential Ground Floor Unit	Residential Entry or Retail Ground Floor
А	Mid-rise – Candlestick Center Frame	n/a	0	n/a	85	20	3	6	n/a	at grade
В	High-rise – Candlestick Center Frame	n/a	0	n/a	85	n/a	3	6	n/a	at grade
с	Commercial – Parking Structure	n/a	1.5	n/a	85	n/a	3	6	n/a	at grade
D	Low-rise – Mixed-Use Residential District	10 <sup>1</sup>	0	70²	85	20	3	6	2-4	n/a
E	Low-rise – CPSRA Edge	30	20	50	85	20	3	6	2-4	n/a
F	Mid-rise – Mixed-Use Residential District	10 <sup>1</sup>	0	70	85	20	3	6	2-4	n/a
G	High-rise – Mixed-Use Residential District	10 <sup>1</sup>	0	70	85	n/a	3	6	2-4	n/a
Н	Mid-block Break – Pedestrian Mews or Vehicular Laneway	20 <sup>4</sup>	204	50	85	ratio <sup>3</sup> 1:1.2	3	6	2-4	n/a
I	Mid-block Break – Commercial	n/a	20 <sup>4</sup>	n/a	85	n/a	3	6	n/a	at grade
J	Landmark Building	n/a	0	n/a	85	n/a	3	6	n/a	at grade

n/a = not applicable or no standard

<sup>1</sup> When residential building fronts or is located across the street from a park/open space, the minimum setback shall be 6 ft. CP South blocks 3 and 5 shall have a minimum setback of 5 ft.

<sup>2</sup> Minimum build-to percentage is reduced to 50% for buildings fronting waterfront.

<sup>3</sup> Building stepback shall be at a line of 1 horizontal to 1.2 vertical above 35 ft height to a maximum of 85 ft, thereafter being permitted to the full allowable height for the zone.

<sup>4</sup> Setback for mid-block breaks is to be taken from the center line of the mid-block break.

<sup>5</sup> Non-habitable projections may be a maximum of 6 ft, but may not project into the public realm by more than 3 ft.

#### Uses are defined as follows:

- A Mid-rise Candlestick Center Frame Mid-rise mixed-use buildings along both sides of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue at Candlestick Center. Mandatory retail or other commercial uses with a minimum height of 20 ft shall be provided at ground level, with a maximum of five stories of residential or other uses above. Maximum building height per Figure 4.3 or Figure 8.1\*.
- **B** High-rise Candlestick Center Frame High-rise mixed-use buildings with mandatory retail or other commercial uses with a minimum height of 20 ft at ground level, with residential or commercial uses above. Maximum building height per Figure 4.3 or Figure 8.1\*.
- C Commercial Parking Structure Structured parking with retail allowed in base, residential or other uses above (which, if developed, must conform to standards for building type A and/or B). Maximum building height per Figure 4.3 or Figure 8.1\*.
- D Low-rise Mixed-Use Residential District Low-rise residential buildings, or mixed-use buildings with limited ground floor retail. Maximum building height per Figure 4.3 or Figure 8.1\*.
- E Low-rise CPSRA Edge Low-rise residential buildings, or mixeduse buildings with limited ground floor retail abutting the eastern boundary of the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CSPRA). Maximum building height per Figure 4.3 or Figure 8.1\*.
- F Mid-rise Mixed-Use Residential District Mid-rise residential buildings, or mixed-use buildings with limited ground floor retail along the western side of Harney Way between Ingerson Avenue and Egbert Avenue. Maximum building height per Figure 4.3 or Figure 8.1\*.
- **G** High-rise Mixed-Use Residential District High-rise residential buildings, or high-rise mixed-use buildings with limited ground floor retail. Maximum building height per Figure 4.3 or Figure 8.1\*.
- H Mid-block Break Pedestrian Mews or Vehicular Laneway

   Low-rise or mid-rise residential or mixed use buildings facing a mid-block break that is a pedestrian mews or vehicular laneway. Maximum height at building face shall not exceed 35 ft, after which a stepback is required at a ratio of 1 horizontal to 1.2 vertical to a maximum of 85 ft and thereafter permitted to the full allowable height for the zone. Maximum building height per Figure 4.3 or Figure 8.1\*.
- I Mid-block Break Commercial Commercial or mixed use buildings facing a mid-block break. Maximum heights per Figure 4.3 or Figure 8.1\*.
- J Landmark Building A landmark building at Candlestick Center on the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue. Mandatory retail, commercial or other uses ancillary to the activities within the building with a minimum height of 20 ft shall be provided at ground floor level. Maximum building height is 120 ft.

\* Figure 8.1 relates to the Shipyard South R&D Option - see Section 8.



- B. High-rise Candlestick Center Frame\*
- C. Commercial Parking Structure
- D. Low-rise Mixed-Use Residential District
- E. Low-rise CPSRA Edge
  - F. Mid-rise Mixed-Use Residential District

- H. Mid-block Break Pedestrian Mews or Vehicular Laneway
- Mid-block Break Pedestrian Mews only
- I. Mid-block Break Commercial
  - J. Landmark Building

\* See Section 4.2.1 for allowable location zones for high-rise.

#### Note: For Jamestown lots, see Section 7.



#### Figure 4.5

#### Mid-rise – Candlestick Center Frame





SETBACK - There is no setback.

#### Figure 4.6

3'

#### High-rise – Candlestick Center Frame

STEPBACK – There is no required stepback. Other high-rise shaping standards are contained in Section 4.3.2. PROJECTION – Habitable Space: Maximum 3 ft. Non-Habitable: Maximum 6 ft (Maximum 3 ft into public realm).

BUILD TO LINE – Minimum 85% shall be built to the property line.

**RETAIL** – Minimum height of 20 ft and a minimum average depth of 35 ft. Provide at least 60% fenestration to full height.

SEPARATION – Retail grade must meet the grade of the adjacent sidewalk.

U/G PARKING – May be built to the property line provided a minimum of 36 inch soil depth maintained where landscape is provided.



Figure 4.7

Commercial – Parking Structure

to be visually unobtrusive.

SETBACK – Setback is 1.5 feet.

BUILD TO LINE – Minimum 85% shall be built to the setback line.

FLOOR TO FLOOR HEIGHT – Where applicable, a ground floor commercial use is to have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 15 ft. SCREENING – Where - there is not an active use, the face of structure shall be screened with mechanical or vegetative screens.

**ROOF** – Shall be landscaped with soft and hard landscaping



#### Figure 4.8

#### Low-rise – Mixed-Use Residential District

SETBACK – Residential Building – Building face must be set back 10 ft from the property line (see Table 4.6 for exceptions). Patio and underground parking may extend to the property line. Mixed Use / Commercial Building – There is no setback.

STEPBACK – Building floor plate shall stepback 20% in size above 55 ft height.

PROJECTION – Habitable Space: Maximum 3 ft. Non-Habitable: Maximum 6 ft (Maximum 3 ft into public realm).

BUILD TO LINE – Residential Building – Minimum 50% of building for the first 40 ft of height must be built to setback line. Mixed Use / Commercial Building – Minimum 85% of building for the first 40 ft of height must be built to setback line.

FLOOR TO FLOOR HEIGHT – Where applicable, a ground floor commercial use is to have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 15 ft.

BUILDING ENTRANCE – Maximum 8 ft recess.

**SEPARATION** – Ground floor units must be 2 ft to 4 ft above street; main building entry may be at street level.

U/G PARKING – May be built to the property line provided a minimum of 36 inch soil depth maintained where landscape provided.





**STEPBACK** – Building floor plate shall stepback 20% above 55 ft height.

SETBACK – Residential Building – Building shall be set back 30 ft from the property line. Patio and other private landscaping may extend 10 ft into setback. Mixed Use / Commercial Building – Building shall be set back 20 ft from the property line.

PROJECTION – Habitable Space:
Maximum 3 ft. Non-Habitable: Maximum 6 ft (Maximum 3 ft into public realm).
BUILD TO LINE – Residential Building – Minimum 50% of building for the first 40 ft of height must be built to setback line. At-Grade Retail – Minimum 85% of building for the first 40 ft of height must be built to setback line.

FLOOR TO FLOOR HEIGHT – Where applicable, a ground floor commercial use is to have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 15 ft.

BUILDING ENTRANCE – Maximum 8 ft recess. SEPARATION – Residential units must

be 2 ft to 4 ft above path; main building entry may be at street level.

U/G PARKING – May be built to the property line provided a minimum of 36 inch soil depth maintained where trees are provided.

#### **CPSRA CYCLE TRACK EDGE**

Edge treatment along CP North includes a separated cycle track and pedestrian sidewalk. All standards pertaining to buildings and private setbacks set forth above shall apply.

### Figure 4.9 Low-rise – CPSRA Edge







#### Figure 4.10 Mid-rise – Mixed-Use Residential District

SETBACK – Residential Building – Building face must be setback 10 ft from property line. Patio and underground parking may extend to property line. Mixed Use / Commercial Building – There is no setback.

STEPBACK – Building floor plate shall stepback 20%:

• Above 65 ft for buildings to 85 ft height.

PROJECTION – Habitable Space: Maximum 3 ft. Non-Habitable: Maximum 6 ft (Maximum 3 ft into public realm).

BUILD TO LINE – Residential Building – Minimum 70% of building to 65 ft height must be built to setback line. Mixed Use or Commercial Building – Minimum 85% of building for the first 65 ft of height must be built to setback line.

FLOOR TO FLOOR HEIGHT – Where applicable, a ground floor commercial use is to have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 15 ft.

**BUILDING ENTRY** – Max. 8 ft recess. **SEPARATION** – Ground floor units must be 2 ft to 4 ft above street; main building entry may be at street level.

U/G PARKING – May be built to the property line provided a minimum of 36 inch soil depth maintained where landscape is provided.





Figure 4.11

#### High-rise – Mixed-Use Residential District

SETBACK – Residential Building – Building face shall be set back 10 ft from the property line. Patio may extend to the property line. Mixed Use / Commercial Building – There is no setback.

**STEPBACK** – There is no required stepback. Other high-rise shaping standards are contained in Section 4.3.1.

PROJECTION – Habitable Space: Maximum 3 ft. Non-Habitable: Maximum 6 ft (Maximum 3 ft into public realm).

BUILD TO LINE – Residential Building – Minimum 70% of building face must be built to setback line. Mixed Use or Commercial Building – Minimum 85% of building face must be built to setback line. FLOOR TO FLOOR HEIGHT – Where applicable, a ground floor commercial use is to have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 15 ft.

BUILDING ENTRANCE – Maximum 8 ft recess.

**GROUND FLOOR HEIGHT** – Units must be 2 ft to 4 ft above street; main building entry may be at street level.

U/G PARKING – May be built to the property line provided a minimum of 36 inch soil depth maintained where landscape is provided.





must be setback 20 ft from center line of mid-block break.

**STEPBACK** – Building shall step back at a plane of 1:1.2 above 35 ft height to a maximum of 85 ft height after which the height may be the maximum permitted for the zone.

PROJECTION – Habitable Space:
 Maximum 3 ft. Non-Habitable: Maximum 6 ft (Maximum 3 ft into public realm).
 BUILD TO – 50% of building face must be built to setback line. Mixed Use or Commercial Building – Minimum 85% of building face must be built to setback line.

**SEPARATION** – Units must be 2 ft to 4 ft above the pathway if fronting a pedestrian mews.

U/G PARKING – May be built to the property line provided a minimum of 36 inch soil depth maintained where landscape is provided.

FLOOR TO FLOOR HEIGHT – Where applicable, a ground floor commercial use is to have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 15 ft.

**VEHICULAR LANEWAY STANDARDS** 

All standards for pedestrian mews set forth above shall apply to vehicular laneway, except there is no required separation.

# Figure 4.12 Mid-block Break – Pedestrian Mews or Vehicular Laneway





Vehicular Laneway



## Figure 4.13 Mid-block Break – Commercial

SETBACK – Building face must be setback 20 ft from center line of mid-block break.

PROJECTION – Habitable Space:
 Maximum 3 ft. Non-Habitable: Maximum 6 ft (Maximum 3 ft into public realm).
 BUILD TO LINE – Minimum 85% of building face must be built to setback line.
 RETAIL– Minimum height of 15 ft and a minimum average depth of 35 ft.
 Provide at least 60% fenestration to

full height.

U/G PARKING – May be built to the property line provided a minimum of 36 inch soil depth maintained where landscape is provided.







Sun path for Candlestick.

## 4.2.5 Sunlight/Shade

Intent

Parks and open space should have significant solar access. Buildings should be oriented and designed to mitigate solar heat gain.

#### Standards

**High-rise Buildings** – All proposed high-rise developments have been subject to a shadow analysis within the EIR in which certain towers cast shadows on Gilman Park and/or Bayview Hill Park. Should the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department not approve shadowing on one or both parks, a subsequent shadow analysis shall be required to determine maximum no-shadow height of non-conforming towers.

#### Guidelines

**Park Shadowing** – In order to minimize shadowing, the angle and direction of the sun should be a significant consideration in the placement and orientation of taller buildings. Taller buildings should be held back wherever possible from significant public parks, to avoid shadowing at times of day when parks are most used.

**Building Shadowing** – To reduce shadowing of adjacent buildings and associated open spaces, taller buildings should be located to the north of shorter buildings wherever possible.

#### **Heat Gain Mitigation**

- Shading strategies To reduce solar heat gain in buildings, sun shading strategies should be employed for west and south facing façades.
- Orientation Where possible, buildings should be aligned in a generally east/west direction. Given that the goals of wind mitigation and connection to the existing street grid have strongly influenced the 45 degree orientation of the street and block alignment (which in turn influences building alignment), it may not be possible to achieve optimum solar alignment in all cases.



Wind flows in street canyon.



Podium, canopy and street trees deflect winds.



Street and block oriented at 45° to prevailing winds.



Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Anemometer – Indicates the direction and intensity of prevailing winds at the site.

## 4.2.6 Wind

#### Intent

The effects of the prevailing westerly winds should be mitigated by careful orientation of streets and blocks, and by specific building strategies.

#### **Standards**

**Building Design Wind Analysis** – Prior to design approval of towers with a height of 100 ft or greater, or where recommended by the Agency, the Applicant shall retain a qualified wind consultant to provide a wind review to determine if the exposure, massing, and orientation of the building would result in wind impacts that could exceed the threshold of 26-mph-equivalent wind speed for a single hour during the year. The wind analysis shall be conducted to assess wind conditions for the proposed building(s) in conjunction with the anticipated pattern of development on surrounding blocks to determine if the Project building(s) would cause an exceedance of the wind hazard standard. The analysis shall be conducted as directed by the City's wind study guidelines, including, if required, wind tunnel modeling of potential adverse effects relating to hazardous wind conditions.

The Agency shall require the Applicant to identify design changes that would mitigate the adverse wind conditions to below the threshold of 26-mph-equivalent wind speed for a single hour of the year. These design changes could include, but are not limited to, wind-mitigating features, such as placing towers on podiums with a minimum 15 ft setback from street edges, placement of awnings on building frontages, street and frontage plantings, articulation of building façades, or the use of a variety of architectural materials.

#### Guidelines

**Street and Block Orientation** – Streets and blocks in the plan have been oriented close to 45 degrees from the prevailing wind direction in order to mitigate 'wind tunnel' funneling. This strategy has been employed as illustrated.

**Pedestrian Zones –** Pedestrian zones and other outdoor open spaces should be sheltered locations wherever possible.

**Street Level** – At the street level awnings and street trees should be encouraged in order to disrupt and reduce wind flows, particularly important in retail or café patio locations.

**Tower Block Location** – Staggered tower locations are preferable to aligned tower locations in order to reduce funneling.

**Tower Alignment** – Towers should not be aligned parallel to the prevailing wind direction.

**Building Shape** – Taller buildings should be designed to mitigate 'downwash' effects. Design features include rounded and/or complex geometry, a bustle/buttress (low or mid-rise extension at base of tower), and podiums.

# 4.3 Building Design

The standards and guidelines pertaining to building design and the mechanisms that will promote a positive built environment are contained in this section. It begins with the standards and guidelines that apply to the various building types by use, serving as a basis for differentiating buildings and creating variations in character within the neighborhoods. Following, there are standards and guidelines that apply to the general building elements for all building types within the development.

This section is organized as follows:

#### 4.3.1 Building Types

- A Residential
  - Low-Rise
  - Mid-Rise
  - High-Rise
- B Commercial
  - Retail and Mixed Use
  - Office
  - Landmark Building
  - Hotel
- C Other
  - Community Use
  - Park Buildings
- D Parking Structure

#### 4.3.2 General Building Elements

- A Base Activation
- **B** Façade Articulation
- C Materials and Colors
- D Corners
- E Roofs
- F Private Open Space
- G Sustainable Features
- H Building Lighting

## 4.3.1 Building Types

A variety of building types serving a range of functions are incorporated into the plan, as follows:

#### A – Residential

- Low-rise
- Mid-rise
- High-rise

#### **B** – Commercial

- Retail and Mixed Use
- Office
- Landmark Building
- Hotel

#### C – Other

- Community-use
- Park Buildings

#### **D** – Parking Structure



Precedent - Residential low-rise building.



Precedent - Residential high-rise building.







Precedent - Residential mid-rise building.



Precedent – Mixed-use building: retail with residential above.



Precedent – Performance Center



Precedent - Low-rise, tuck-under townhomes



Precedent - Low-rise, liner townhomes.



Precedent - Low-rise, stacked units.



Precedent - Mid-rise.



Precedent - High-rise.

## A – Residential: General

#### Intent

Several key characteristics of residential buildings will differentiate Candlestick from many San Francisco neighborhoods. In particular, the lower floors of residential buildings are intended to engage the street by having activated ground floor uses and lush landscaping in setbacks, helping to animate the streets and create a vibrant pedestrian oriented neighborhood.

A variety of residential building types are proposed to structure and define development that include:

- Low-rise tuck-under townhomes.
- Low-rise free-standing units with individual garages or shared underground parking.
- Low-rise liner townhomes that are located at the face of the building and have shared podium or underground podium parking.
- Low-rise buildings to a maximum of 65 ft height with shared corridors and vertical circulation.
- Mid-rise buildings to a maximum of 105 ft\* height with shared corridors and vertical circulation.
- High-rise buildings to a maximum of 420 ft height with shared corridors and vertical circulation.

\* Note: Mid-rise buildings above 85 ft to a maximum of 105 ft is only applicable in the Shipyard South R&D Option – see Section 8.

These types control the intensity and form of development while allowing some flexibility for how buildings are used and how they evolve over time. Within blocks, several building types may be combined, thus creating diverse characteristics throughout the neighborhoods. Ground floor uses for all building types other than townhomes include residential units, live/work units, retail, or office space depending on location and subject to entitlement limitations.



Residential setback allows for patio zone.

#### Standards

**Ground Floor Unit Entrances** – Ground floor units fronting public streets, parks, or along pedestrian mews shall have an access point along the fronting building face in addition to the main access from interior corridor, lobby, or parking structure. Entrances shall occur at intervals no greater than 30 ft, and may be ganged together.

**Grade Separation** – Ground floor units shall be elevated between 2 ft and 4 ft above the street for privacy.

**Ground Floor Height** – Where applicable, a ground floor commercial use shall have a minimum floor to floor height of 15 ft.

**Setbacks** – A minimum setback of 10 ft to building face is required for residential buildings to allow for the provision of private landscaping and street facing patios and stoops. The setback shall not vary along the predominant wall of a building once established (aside from minor variation which are described in Build-To Percentages).

Exceptions:

- 1. Residential use that is located above retail use (i.e. mixed-use) may extend to property line.
- 2. Portions of a residential building that are adjacent to or across the street from a park/open space shall have a minimum setback of 6 ft.
- 3. The street side of CD South blocks 3 and 5, due to the shallow block depth, shall have a minimum setback of 5 ft.

**Build-to Line** – The minimum build-to percentage is 70% excluding stepback requirement for all residential except 50% where the building fronts or is located across the street from waterfront open space.

**Stepback** – The upper floor(s) of low and mid-rise buildings above a specified height shall step back a minimum of 20% of the floor plate of the floor immediately below the specified height. The stepback requirement shall apply to:

- Any floor(s) of a Low Rise Building with a maximum height above 55 ft;
- Any floor(s) of a Mid Rise Building with a maximum height between 65 ft to a maximum of 85 ft; and
- Any floor(s) of a Mid Rise Building with a maximum height between 85 ft to a maximum of 105 ft (Shipyard South R&D Option only – see Section 8).

Where abutting a Mid-Block Break that is a Pedestrian Mews or Vehicular Laneway, any floor(s) of a low or mid-rise building above 35 ft shall step back at a plane ratio 1:1.2 (see Table 4.6 and Figure 4.12).

**Projections** – Projections into the setback to 3 ft for habitable space and 6 ft for balconies and other non-habitable space are permitted.



Precedent – Townhome garage entrance.



Precedent – Residential courtyards accessible from public streets.

## A - Residential: Low-Rise/Mid-Rise

#### Intent

Both low-rise and mid-rise building types should be designed to ensure visual interest from the street through changes in plane and a fine attention to architectural detail.

Low-rise buildings are the most common building type in the development, and thus have a profound effect on the streetscape. Care should be taken to ensure buildings engage the street, and are visually interesting on upper floors.

Mid-rise buildings are planned in strategic locations in order to emphasize and frame important spaces.

#### **Standards**

**Townhome Garages** – Street fronting townhome garages are prohibited on public streets, except for CP South blocks 3 and 5. Any townhomes that incorporate garages along a mid-block break, as well as those townhomes on CP South blocks 3 and 5, shall engage the mid-block break /street with design characteristics to limit the visual presence of garage doors, emphasizing the garage as secondary to the main entrance and front yard. The maximum number of garage doors per unit is one with a maximum width of 8 ft. Side-by-side garages are prohibited.

#### Guidelines

**Freestanding Townhome Form ('Tuck-under')** – Freestanding townhomes may be designed with individual character, or in a consistent style. Modular rhythm should be emphasized through the use of common elements such as bay windows, door recesses materials and fenestration. Variety in form at the pedestrian level is encouraged. Townhomes that form the base of a multi-story building should have elements and proportions that tie them to the building above.

**Residential Courtyards** – Residential courtyards that may be accessed or at least viewed from public streets and mews are encouraged.



Precedent – Elevation segmentation of primary and secondary planes.



Precedent – Primary plane of tower extends to full height.



Secondary plane no taller than 90% of primary plane for towers above 300 ft.

## A - Residential High-rise (Tower)

#### Intent

Towers are meant to punctuate the low and mid-rise skyline at important locations. As individual buildings, they should be seen as slender and vertical planes whose proportion and detailing creates an elegant and simple composition.

The tower standards and guidelines are intended to demonstrate design possibilities within a basic framework. This approach will encourage a rich variety of buildings, while ensuring that towers are graceful beacons that contribute to the built form of the community.

#### **Standards**

**Elevation segmentation** – Towers should be conceived as vertical planes that are extrusions of the floor plates. There shall be a primary and a secondary plane. Both shall be generally unbroken in order to accentuate the verticality of the tower. For towers over 300 ft height, the primary plane shall be unbroken for the entire height of the tower, and the secondary plane(s) shall be subordinate in height so that the tower has a clearly defined top and does not have an overbearing mass.

Towers over 300 ft height shall have a minimum of two vertical planes, primary and secondary. The size of the primary plane shall be no more than 2/3's and no less than 1/3 of the full floor plate size (ie for a floor plate of 12,500 sq ft, the primary plane shall be between 4,200 sq ft and 8,350 sq ft). The primary plane shall be the full height of the tower. The secondary plane(s) shall be no taller than 90% of the height of the primary plane.



Elevation segmentation - Various examples.



Precedent – Distinct breaks in floor plans reduce apparent façade.

**Floor plan segmentation** – The edges of tower floor plans shall be broken into segments in order to more finely articulate the basic vertical form and avoid monolithic buildings that are out of proportion with the community's finely scaled buildings. Within these divisions there can be subdivisions to respond to specific unit layouts; however, simpler forms are encouraged. Segmentation can be in either symmetrical or non-symmetrical fashion.

Both the long and the short side of floor plates shall have a minimum of two segments and no segment shall exceed the maximum permitted apparent face (100 - 110 ft, depending on tower height, see Table 4.5 for specific requirements).



Floor plate segmentation - minimum two segments.



Precedent – Floor plan segmentation with a curved façade.

Floor plate segmentation - various examples.



Precedent – Tower base in proportion to tower shaft.



Precedent – Distinctive forms and materials are encouraged.



Precedent – Boot character consistent with adjoining tower.

#### Guidelines

**Tower Base** – Tower base (podium) and tower shaft should be in proportion. Shorter towers will look more elegant if they reach the street and if the podium they are set upon is short; taller towers may look more stable if set on a taller podium, although consideration should also be given to letting them reach the street level, particularly where they are intended by the urban design to be landmarks.

**Innovation** – Innovative materials and forms that creates distinctive buildings is particularly encouraged for towers, since they are intended to be landmarks.

**Boot** – Boots (low-rise or mid-rise extensions of towers) should have a character that is consistent with the tower in order to unify the two forms. Tower should be positioned at the end of the boot, so that the tower meets the ground. The tower should not sit on top of the boot.



Boot - Tower should sit at end of boot, not on top.



Build-to line exemptions.



Canopies and building recesses create inviting spaces.

# B - Commercial: General

#### Intent

The following standards and guidelines apply to all commercial buildings. Standards and guidelines specific to the commercial building type are set forth on the following pages.

#### Standards

Setbacks - There are no required setbacks for commercial buildings.

**Build-to Line** – 85% of the building face shall be built to the property line. Patio spaces, entrances, publicly accessible plazas and walk-up windows are exempted provided they are stepped back no further than 12 ft from the property line and cumulatively for no more than 50% of the building face.

**Projections** – Projections are permitted for awnings, canopies, signage and lighting to a maximum of 5 ft into the public right-of-way provided they have a minimum of 9 ft clearance to the sidewalk.



Storefront bays articulated at regular increments.



Precedent - Storefront glazing.



Precedent – Retail entrances should be clearly distinguishable from residential entrances.



Precedent – Integrated canopy and distinct bays.

## B - Commercial: Retail and Mixed-use

Note: See residential standards for residential levels above retail.

#### Intent

Retail should engage and enliven the street. Emphasis should be placed on using glazing and creating an architectural rhythm at the ground plane.

#### Standards

**Sidewalk Relationship** – Retail buildings shall be oriented to and meet the sidewalk at grade.

**Storefronts** Shall promote pedestrian interest at the ground level and provide visual connection to the store interior with:

- Store frontage shall have at least 60% glazing; glazing shall be transparent. Large multi-story retailer's upper floor levels shall also meet this glazing requirement.
- Outdoor displays and patios are encouraged, but shall maintain a minimum 6 ft wide clear pedestrian zone within the public sidewalk.
- Interior displays shall provide visual permeability into store interior.

**Store Height and Depth** – All retail spaces along both sides of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue at CP Center shall be a minimum of 20 ft height and a minimum average of at least 35 ft in depth exclusive of service corridors. Minimum depth shall not apply to storefront liners of large format retail uses. All other retail uses shall have a minimum height of 15 ft.

**Façade Articulation** – Retail bays shall be no wider than 30 ft in order to create a fine-grained pattern of shops. Where a larger retailer is anticipated, bays can be combined; however the bay articulation shall be maintained. The impact of large retail stores can be mitigated by 'wrapping' exterior façades with smaller retail stores, thereby breaking up the façade and reducing large expanses of blank walls.

**Blank Walls** – Areas without entries or windows are prohibited on pedestrianoriented retail streets and paseos, except at building service areas and areas where floor elevation is not within 48" to sidewalk elevation due to grades (i.e. steep sections of Arelious Walker Drive). Blank walls shall be no longer than 8 ft along other retail street frontages. Display windows are not considered blank walls, provided they allow visual access into store interior.

#### Guidelines

**Entrances** – Retail entrances should be easily identifiable and distinguishable from residential entrances. They should be reinforced with such elements as recessed doorways, awnings, special lighting, fenestration, color and materials, and special paving. Multiple entrances to larger stores are encouraged.

**Materials** – Façades should be designed with high-quality materials that offer color, variety, and visual interest to the pedestrian (such as stone, tile masonry, brick or terra-cotta).

**Canopies / Awnings** – Canopies or awnings should be provided for the sun, wind and rain protection of pedestrians. Their design should be integrated with the building architecture. Permanent materials are encouraged over vinyl or fabric.



Precedent – Office entrance integrated into retail frontage.



Precedent - Office above retail.

# B – Commercial: Office

#### Intent

Subject to entitlement limitations, offices may be located above some retail uses, predominantly within Candlestick Center. Where permissible, office design should be compatible with ground level uses while providing clear architectural distinction.

Additional small office spaces may be located throughout the site, but will be designed in accordance with ground level retail space.

#### Standards

**Streetwall** – All streetwall edges shall conform to general commercial standards. See B – Commercial:General and Figure 4.5, Figure 4.6 and Figure 4.14.

#### Guidelines

**Entrance** – Entrances to office uses should be clearly defined by an architecture vernacular consistent with the building above, tying the office space use to the ground plane. Lobby size and character should relate to the size and character of the office space above. Lobbies should be inviting spaces; public art is strongly encouraged.

**Sustainable Features** – Solar shading, green walls, and other design elements are encouraged to be incorporated into the building façade of office buildings.


Precedent - Engaging lobby.



Precedent - Frames and activates public plaza.

## B - Commercial: Landmark Building

### Intent

A landmark building is planned at Candlestick Center on the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue. The building will frame a public plaza at the intersection and have high-quality architectural treatment that reinforces its central location and community importance. The Building should have active uses that encourage day and evening use, such as retail and entertainment.

### Standards

**Required Ground Floor Commercial** – Retail and ancillary uses that support the activities within the building shall be incorporated into the building façade to flank each side of the lobby.

**Required Entrance Plaza** – A public plaza shall be located in front of the building lobby. It shall incorporate public art and be adequately sized to serve as a gathering space and focal point.

**Streetwall** – All streetwall edges shall conform to general commercial standards with the exception of setbacks and build-to line, for which the building has no prescribed standards. If the building is set back from the property line, this zone shall be used for a plaza and landscaping in a manner that complements the buildings use and architectural character. See B – Commercial : General.

### Guidelines

**Lobby/Foyer** – The primary entrance to the building should read as an extension to the public realm. Pedestrians should feel welcome to enjoy the building's unique architecture.

**Iconic Architecture** – As an iconic landmark, the building's architecture should highlight its importance through bold design, including form, materials, and color.

**Plaza Climate Considerations** – The location and design of the entrance plaza should incorporate solar and wind impact considerations.

**Loading** – The location of off-street loading requirements should take into consideration the need to minimize interference with pedestrian activity.



Precedent - Active frontage.



Precedent - Clearly defined entrance.

## B – Commercial: Hotel

### Intent

One hotel is planned within the Candlestick Center neighborhood. The hotel should be well designed and incorporated into the overall urban fabric, encouraging guests to participate in the life of the neighborhood.

### Standards

**Streetwall** – All streetwall edges shall conform to general commercial standards. See B – Commercial: General, Figure 4.5 and Figure 4.6.

Active Frontage – Hotels shall have active and engaging uses at-grade, including check-in desk, concierge, valet, cafés, restaurants, or other retail uses, creating a strong connection between the public realm and building's interior.

**Pedestrian Entrance** – The hotel entrance shall be clearly defined with adequate signage and architecture treatments to ensure easy identification for guests and visitors alike. The entrance shall be located on a public street so that it plays an active role in strengthening the commercial fabric of the street.

**Parking and Loading Entries** – Shall be treated so their appearance is minimal and not a predominant feature of the hotel, and port-cocheres shall be designed to enhance the surrounding urban environment or treated so that their appearance is minimal. Where it doesn't undermine general site circulation and access, parking and loading entries shall be combined or coordinated with curb cuts and entry points to other garages within CP Center.

### Guidelines

**Blank Walls** – Where a substantial length of windowless wall is found to be unavoidable, some combination of eye-level displays, contrast in wall treatment, offset wall line, outdoor seating, and/or engaging landscaping should be employed.



Precedent – Community center on Market Street.



Precedent – Fire station in San Francisco as part of the street fabric.



Precedent - Recreational facilities.

## C – Other: Community Use

### Intent

There are several development parcels allocated for community uses. The specific uses of these parcels will be determined in the future through community consultation, but may include: fire facilities, police facilities, daycare, senior's housing, recreational and meeting space, performance spaces, sub-stations and other uses deemed to benefit the community.

The purpose of the following standards and guidelines is to facilitate the design of the buildings that will be consistent with the architectural character, in particular commercial buildings.

### **Standards**

Active Frontage – The building shall be sited at the street frontage in order actively engage the public and contribute to the fabric of the streetscape, unless it is within a park system where it shall be sited to be highly accessible to the majority of park users.

**Community Developed Program** – Program shall be determined through consultation with the community.

**Sub-station Screening** – Sub-stations shall be screened from view of public spaces (streets, parks) by a minimum of 8 ft high hedgerow or full screen fence.

**Streetwall** – All streetwall edges shall conform to general commercial standards. See B – Commercial: General and Figure 4.5 and Figure 4.6.

### Guidelines

**Transparency** – Should provide a minimum 50% transparency within the vertical plane on the street-facing side(s), unless specific programming requirements preclude this.

**Contextual Design** – Where building is an integral part of the street wall, it should complement the scale, massing and general proportions of surrounding buildings.

**Iconic Architecture** – Where building stands alone, it should be an expressive design that has a simple roof form and unique elements that distinguish it as a civic building.



Precedent - Cafe/restaurant building.



Precedent - Restroom building.



Precedent - Amphitheater structure.

## C - Other: Park Buildings

### Intent

New park buildings will be located throughout the development to enhance the park experience for users. Small auxiliary buildings may include rest rooms and covered picnicking areas, while other larger buildings may be included, such as a gymnasium, gazebo, covered performance space, restaurant, and park staff office space.

### Standards

### **Location and Design**

- The maximum height of park buildings shall be 40 ft.
- Park buildings shall not have blank walls greater than 16 ft.
- Buildings shall be sited in areas of high activity within the park system, including as extensions of development streetwalls along major streets.
- Layout, fenestration and entrances shall encourage public use.
- Adequate signage shall be placed within the park system and streetscape to facilitate wayfinding.

### Guidelines

### **Expressive Design and Character**

- The building should have an expressive design that includes a simple roof form and unique elements that distinguish it as a publicly accessible building.
- New buildings within the park system should have a high degree of transparency and an architectural style and composition consistent with the surrounding neighborhood.

**State Park** – Buildings within the State Park are not subject to the standards and guidelines listed above; however, consultation with the City and public for any construction on State Park lands is recommended.



Precedent – Parking structure screening where active uses not feasible.



Precedent – Screened structure with photovoltaics on the roof-deck.



Precedent - Screening with graphic panels.



Precedent – Screening with active uses at street level and green wall.

## D – Parking Structure

### Intent

Parking structures, whether stand alone or part of a multi-use block or building, should be screened so that they do not negatively impact the streetscape or other public spaces. Façades should be wrapped by active uses or visual screens and roofs should be screened with landscaping or active uses. The standards described herein are for both independent free standing parking structures, and parking structures integrated into residential or commercial buildings. Additional details related to parking structures are included in Section 4.2.4 and Section 4.5, and Figure 4.7.

### Standards

**Wrapping Uses in Multi-Use Buildings** – All multi-use buildings or blocks shall have active uses that wrap the street frontage so that parking is concealed internally.

**Wrapping Uses in Single-Use Parking Structures** – With the exception of the parking structure at Arelious Walker Drive, the street level building face of all single-use parking structures shall have active uses. For the street level of the structure at Arelious Walker Drive, and for levels above the street when there may not be active fronting uses, visual screening shall be utilized (see below).

Visual Screen – The face of parking structures, including the areas surrounding garage entrances, shall have at a minimum 'living' landscape wall screening or baffles where there is no active use. Active uses are encouraged wherever possible. Screening shall utilize a rhythm of entrances and bays in a scale compatible with the surrounding buildings. The height and design of any screen shall be sufficient to ensure that the headlights of vehicles will not be directly visible or cause nuisance to adjoining land uses.



Garage ingress/egress separation.



Combined ingress/egress maximum width.



Screened parking garage showing active use area.





Precedent – Residential parking entrance concealed by canopy and landscape.

**Entrance** – Unless otherwise provided for in this D4D, the combined parking ingress and egress entrance for structure off-street parking shall be a maximum width of 24 ft. This may be increased to a maximum of 27 ft where:

- access to off-street parking and loading is shared; or
- the extra width is needed to accommodate the fleet of emergency services or utility providers.

Separate parking ingress/egress shall be a maximum width of 11 ft and be spaced a minimum of 60 ft apart to re-establish the building façade. The sharing of parking entrances and loading is encouraged. The number of entrances is limited to a single ingress and egress unless a traffic impact analysis (TIA) substantiates the need for a second ingress/egress based on either volume or travel distance requirements. Shared parking entrances shall be a minimum of 40 ft from block corners and 20 ft from building entrances. The maximum width for a freestanding townhome entrance shall be 8 ft.

**Landscaping** – Underground parking structures that extend beyond the building face shall provide a minimum 36 in soil depth above where landscaping is provided.

**Roof Deck** – Parking stalls on any roof deck shall be 50% shaded through the use of landscaping (5 years from construction), photovoltaic trellises or any other appropriate high albedo shading techniques.

**Materials, Finishes & Colors** – All elements of the parking structure that will be visible from the public realm shall use textured and/or non-reflective materials, finishes and colors.

**Lighting** – Any lighting shall be concealed, focused on the intended area of illumination and directed away from surrounding land uses.

### Guidelines

**Entrance Concealment** – Parking entrances should be situated away from direct sightlines and in areas that are away from high pedestrian or vehicular traffic areas, and concealed by the use of canopies, landscaping and setbacks.

## 4.3.2 General Building Elements

For all building types, there are various common characteristics that create a strong sense of place within the plan. These are:

- A Base Activation
- **B** Façade Articulation
- C Materials and Colors
- D Corners
- E Roofs
- F Private Open Space
- G Sustainable Features
- H Building Lighting



Precedent - Base Activation.



Precedent - Distinctive corner.



Precedent - Distinctive roof.



Precedent - Lighting at entrance.



Precedent - Façade articulation.



Precedent - Coordinated color palette.



Precedent - Sustainable elements.



Precedent - Signage integrated into form.



Retail/entertainment/office added to edge of podium on mixed-use streets.



Residential townhomes and lobbies lining podium on residential streets.



Precedent - Townhomes lining podium.



Precedent - Retail lining podium.



Precedent - Entrance clearly defined.



Precedent - Individual entrances facing street.

## A – Base Activation

### Intent

The base of buildings should animate the street by containing active uses supported by generous windows, entrances and outdoor spaces at the street level. Active uses include street-level residential units with streetfacing entrances, retail and restaurants that meet and engage the sidewalk with ample glazing, displays and inviting entrances, entertainment, commercial offices (subject to entitlement limitations) and lobbies.

### **Standards**

**At-grade Activation** – In order to activate the ground plane along public streets and mid-block breaks, uses at-grade shall be active. These include residential, retail, office (subject to entitlement limitations), lobbies and corridors.

**Blank Wall** – A blank wall is defined as having no active uses including no glazing or doorways, excluding parking garage entrances. A building facing a street, mid-block break, or open space shall have no single blank walls more than 16 ft in length for residential buildings and 8 ft for commercial buildings. The total amount of blank wall shall be limited to 20% or a total of 40 ft of building face, whichever is greater.

**Main Building Entrance** – The main building entrance shall be prominent and expressed by such elements as taller volumes, recessed doorways, canopies, lighting, public art, water features, special materials and paving. Entrances shall be easily identifiable and well lit for convenience, visual interest and increased safety.

**Individual Entrances –** All ground floor units facing a public right of way or pedestrian mews shall have street-facing entrance area (patio/stoop) that serves as a transitional area between the building and public realm. Design shall emphasize safety, security, and render the entrance easily identifiable and visually appealing. Entrances shall define private space by creating a sense of 'territoriality' while remaining visually accessible from the street.



Precedent – Activation of street with residential.



Precedent – Garage entrance off private driveway.



Precedent – Artful elements incorporated into façade.



Eyes-on-the street design principles encourages safety.

**Garage Entrances** – Entrances to individual residential garages shall be limited to one per unit to a maximum 8 ft width. Entrances may be located on private lanes including in mid-block breaks. They are not permitted on public streets except for CP South blocks 3 and 5 (for standards on common parking structure entrances, see 4.5.1).

### Guidelines

**Neighborhood Retail** – Neighborhood serving retail is encouraged in the base of residential buildings at higher pedestrian traffic areas.

**Decorative Elements –** Decorative elements that evoke the community character are encouraged. These include use of color, banners and signage.

**Artful buildings –** Buildings themselves are encouraged to be artfully designed. This may include dynamic building elements or public art that is incorporated into building façades or entrances and lobbies.

**Safety** – Buildings and public space should be made safe by ensuring natural surveillance and clear legible boundaries and pathways. 'Eyes on the street' principles should be employed by locating doors, windows, and open spaces to face public streets and parks.



Vertical articulation of high-rise – Base, middle, top.



Base section – Retail and residential conditions.



Middle section.



Top section.

## **B** – Façade Articulation

### Intent

The façade of buildings should be purposefully articulated (i.e. defined, made clear) in order to make legible the various building functions (i.e. lobby, residential and retail) and segments (i.e. base, middle, top), and reduce its apparent mass.

The building façade should also help create a strong sense of identity for the building and be designed at one holistic scale where the massing, building details, and entries are proportionally related.

### Standards

•

**Vertical Articulation –** The three segments of the building, base, middle and top, shall be articulated by such elements as cornices, string courses, stepbacks, recesses and projections, changes in floor height, and changes in color and material.

- Base Section Retail/Residential
  - Shall relate directly with the street and add to the vitality of the public realm.
  - Shall 'ground' the building;
  - Retail shall have maximal glazing, and characterful signage and awnings (see Section 4.3.1 B).
  - Residential shall be defined through active elements such as doors, patios and stoops, and/or material and/or color differences.
- Mid Section
  - Shall define the principle building façade.
  - Shall differentiate from base- and top-sections through the use of materials and/or color.
- Top Section
  - Shall define roof line.
  - Penthouse units shall be stepped back from primary building face (see Section 4.2).



Precedent – Horizontal articulation by massing, materials and details.



Precedent – Horizontal articulation by rhythm of bays.



Precedent - Townhome base.



Balconies as integral part of façade articulation.

**Horizontal Articulation** – The first 20 ft height of the building faces shall have a rhythm of modules that serves to break down the scale of the building face. The maximum dimension of any module shall be 30 ft. A module shall be defined as a portion of the façade that is differentiated from the adjacent façade by a change in the line of the face of building, and/or a substantial change in material color or fenestration. Characteristics between modules should relate to one another to achieve a unified composition.



Horizontal articulation by differentiated modules.

### Guidelines

**Fenestration** – Windows should be proportioned relative to the scale of use. They should be elegant in form and complement the palate of other elements.

**Balconies** – Balconies should be designed as an integral component of the building form in order to not appear 'tacked on'. Full depth balconies are encouraged. Shallow depth 'Juliet' balconies are allowed, but balconies with a depth of under 6 ft may not be counted as open space.

**Sustainable Features –** Green (planted) walls, photovoltaics, and other sustainable features that reduce the overall energy consumption of a building are encouraged. Buildings façades should be designed to take advantage of passive solar design principles and maximize natural ventilation and interior day lighting.

**Innovation –** Innovation in building form, sustainability, and energy use is encouraged providing it meets the overall intent of the building design guidelines.

Lighting – Lights should be subtle and reinforce the overall façade design.



Precedent - Durable materials.



Precedent -Coordinated materials and colors.



Precedent – Consistent palette of materials creates clear building identity.



Precedent – Materials and their proportionate use reinforce the building form.

## C — Materials and Colors

### Intent

Building materials and colors should be carefully selected to achieve an overall built form that accentuates the uniqueness of individual buildings, and adds to the fabric of the street. Materials should be high quality and durable, and should suit the local environment. Materials on any one building should be carefully chosen to form a pleasing and controlled composition of the elevations and building mass.

### Standards

**Walls –** Permitted materials include: high quality finish cast in place or precast concrete, unitized ceramic panels, high quality non-reflective metal panels, brick, stone, wood, stucco, cement fibre lap, curtain wall glazing systems and photovoltaics forming an exterior wall system.

**Glass Types –** All glass inclusive of the glazing system, shall perform to the minimum or better of the State Energy Standards. Innovation related to sustainability is encouraged in the choice of glass and glazing products. Not permitted: reflective glass; greater than 10% tinted glass.

**Durable Materials –** Materials shall be durable and of high quality and respond to the site's maritime climate by utilizing appropriate envelope systems.

### Guidelines

**Smart Buildings –** The use of intelligent building skins, such as selfcleaning façades and glass, is encouraged.

**Local and Sustainable Materials** – To the extent possible, locally sourced materials should be used to help establish a palette that works with climate, light, history, and culture. Sustainable and recycled materials are highly encouraged.

**Building Form –** Materials and colors should highlight and reinforce unique forms within a building, such as base and corner elements, entrances, and other features.

**Colors –** Building should be composed of a well controlled and balanced palette of colors and textures. The color and material palette should contribute in a thoughtful manner to the overall fabric of the neighborhood.



Precedent – Reinforce buildings' corners at important intersections.



Precedent - Commercial at corner.



Precedent - High-rise bustle at corner.



Precedent - Unique element reinforcing corner.

## D – Corners

### Intent

Key intersections within the plan serve as gateways into the overall development or neighborhoods; these locations are identified in Section 5, Neighborhood Standards and Guidelines. Building corner design at these locations will help create a unique emphasis on such gateways and establish an overall character for the neighborhood. Buildings at all other street corners should also be carefully designed to reinforce the importance and visibility of these locations.

Corners are important elements of the public realm; therefore, mechanical, service, exposed parking and loading are prohibited at block corners.

### Guidelines

**Corner Expression** – Buildings at intersection locations should have special architectural treatments that reinforce the street corner's importance as a public realm element. This may be achieved through a change in massing, a contrasting façade finish and/or transparency.

**Materials** – Building materials should turn the corner. Where materials change from one façade to the next, such a change should be thoughtfully developed as an integral part of the design theme for the building.



Articulated roof.



Sheltering roof.



Precedent - Green roof.



Precedent - Solar panels.

## E – Roofs

### Intent

Building roofs will be visible in many cases from surrounding buildings or neighborhoods. Accordingly, roofs should be an integral aspect of the building and an expressive opportunity that should be attractive and usable for outdoor use, energy production, or stormwater storage.

### Standards

**Mechanical Equipment** – Rooftop mechanical equipment including elevator/stair cores more than above 6 ft above the roof line shall be screened from view of neighboring units. The mechanical screens shall form part of the building top composition and consist of materials consistent with the overall building color and material palette. The maximum permitted coverage by mechanical equipment is 30% of the roof top area for all buildings.

**Solar Energy** – Buildings shall provide 'solar ready' infrastructure such as solar panel curb standoffs, conduits, and roof water spigots that minimize the cost and effort of adding solar capacity at a later date. As an alternative, infrastructure shall be provided for solar hot water panels, minimizing future disruption to the building envelope and roof membranes.

**Stormwater** – Roofs shall be designed to accommodate water quality objectives. See Section 4.3.2 G and separate 'Infrastructure Plan' and 'Sustainability Plan' for more details.

### Guidelines

**Fifth Façade** – Where roofs are viewed from above they should be considered as a 'fifth façade' and designed to provide an attractive view from above.

**Articulation** – The roof line should be articulated to reinforce its role as the top of the building and should form an integral part of the overall building composition. Expressive and sculptural roof forms that will be seen from a distance are encouraged. Wherever possible, roof mechanical exhaust vent and equipment projections should be clustered and set back from the edge of buildings that are visible from the street or points above.

**Color** – The use of high albedo and landscaped roof is encouraged to prevent heat island effect.

**Usable Roof Terraces** – Usable terraces on building roofs and podiums are encouraged where possible. Trellises and open structures should be designed as part of the overall roof composition.

**Green Roof** – Green roofs are encouraged and should be insulated to minimize heat and noise transfer and use regionally appropriate plant species to minimize water consumption requirements. Drip or bubbler systems to establish green roof plants are permitted, but once the planting has been established the temporary irrigation systems should be disconnected and rendered unusable.



Townhome entrances and elevated patios with privacy screening.



Precedent - Patio extends livable space.

## F - Private Open Space

### Intent

Buildings have three distinct open spaces:

- Private at-grade patios and stoops within the building setback zone.
- Private above grade balconies and rooftop decks.
- Common (shared) open spaces.

**Private at-grade patios and stoops** create spaces for individual expression and opportunities for casual neighborly encounters. They should contribute to a safe and engaging public realm by having direct access from the street.

**Private above-grade outdoor open spaces** should be designed to a high standard and be carefully programmed and located to ensure usability. Private open spaces include terraces, patios, balconies, and possibly rooftop space, and are intended for the use of individual residents within a unit.

**Common open spaces** are intended for the use of all residents within a building or building cluster, and include rooftop spaces and internal courtyards.



Private open space zones.



Precedent - Private balcony.



Precedent - Common open space.



Elevated and screened patio.



Precedent – Landscaping for privacy of patios.



Precedent - Maximize solar access



Precedent – Common outdoor space with variety of program elements.

### Standards

**Total Open Space Area** – Every building shall have a minimum net usable open space equivalent to 60 sq ft per unit. Areas underneath a projection that has less than 9 ft clearance shall not be included. At the developers' option, open space shall be permitted as either Private Open Space or Private Common Open Space or any combination of both.

**Private Open Space** – Individual private open spaces shall be a minimum of 36 sq ft. Areas underneath a projection that has less than 9 ft clearance shall not be included. Open space with a dimension of less than 6 lineal ft in any direction shall not be counted towards total.

**Private Common Open Space** – Shall be a minimum of 100 sq ft open space. Areas underneath a projection that has less than 9 ft clearance and areas with a dimension of less than 10 lineal ft in any direction shall not be counted towards total.

**At-grade Open Space** – The setback zone of all residential buildings shall be used either to create high quality, usable open space for street-facing units, or in the case of building entrances to create a transition zone between private use and the public realm. Permitted uses within the setback zone include street-facing stairs, stoops, porches, patios, landscaping, driveways and entry plazas. The setback zone shall be landscaped with high quality materials from the building edge to the public sidewalk.

**Grade Separation** – Ground floor units shall be elevated above the street by between 2 ft and 4 ft.

**Fences and Gates** – Fences and gates shall be a maximum height of 4 ft as measured from their base.

**Lighting** – All lighting fixtures shall be low intensity or low-level of intensity and unobtrusive.

Stormwater Treatment - Standards are contained in Section 4.3.2 G.



Precedent - Patio in setback zone.



Precedent – Wall, fence and planting combine to enclose patio space.



Precedent - Common space with seating areas.



Precedent - Private gardens on podium.



Precedent – Flowing water to mitigate Pre surrounding noise.

### Guidelines

**At-grade design** – stoops and patios at grade should be designed in order to achieve usable space for residents, while also providing safety measures to ensure the space is defensible. Defensible design includes gates and railings, and appropriate landscaping to provide buffer from street while also allowing visual connections between the street and residence.

**Orientation –** Orientation of all open spaces should maximize solar access and views. Balconies on high-rise towers are encouraged to be located away from building corners that face the prevailing wind direction.

Safety - Common spaces should be inviting, interesting, and safe.

**Rooftop / Podium Deck Design –** Deck design should provide visual interest from surrounding overview homes.

**Common Space Programming –** A variety of programming uses should be provided to appeal to various constituents. This may include planters, paved areas, pools and play areas.

Plant Palette - Native and climate appropriate plants are encouraged.

**Irrigation** – Water demand should be minimized by carefully controlling irrigation timing and application.



Precedent – Common open space on podium.



Precedent - Privacy separation.



Precedent - Stormwater capture and treatment.



Precedent - Passive energy system.

### G – Sustainable Features

### Intent

Sustainable development practices are highly encouraged in implementing the sustainability vision summarized in Section 2.3. A variety of standards and guidelines are described below to ensure that baseline practices are followed.

Buildings and their associated landscapes should utilize industry-leading sustainability features. Innovative sustainable approaches at all levels are strongly encouraged.

### Standards

**Stormwater Treatment** – Storm runoff from development parcels shall be treated before draining to the stormwater system; this shall be accomplished using low impact development treatment measures as prescribed in the 'San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines'. For volume based treatment methods, the LEED sustainable sites Credit 6.2 shall be followed.

**Green Building Ordinance** – All new buildings shall be subject to the City and County of San Francisco Green Building Ordinance.

**Reclaimed Water** – Reclaimed water infrastructure (purple pipe) shall be installed as part of land development.

**Climate Appropriate Vegetation** – All buildings shall use climate appropriate vegetation that does not require permanent irrigation for landscaping open spaces, rooftops and green walls.

**Title 24 (2008) Energy Standards** – All new buildings shall be designed to exceed Title 24 (2008) energy standards by at least 14%.

**Landfill Diversion** – Construction of new buildings and demolition of existing buildings shall require that at least 75% of generated debris and waste be diverted from landfill with a goal of 90%.

**Recycling** – Dedicated recycling facilities are required for all buildings.

**Concrete** – Concrete used in building construction shall include at least 25% fly ash or slag.

**Solar Ready** – All new buildings shall be required to provide 'solar ready' infrastructure such as solar panel standoffs, conduit or roof water spigots that minimize the cost and effort of adding solar capacity at a later date.



Precedent - Wind turbine.



Precedent - Solar screens.



Precedent - Solar panels.

### Guidelines

- Sustainable elements should contribute to the cohesive whole of the building and site design.
- Encourage building form, orientation and thermal mass that optimize solar radiation, natural ventilation and day lighting.
- Reduce heat-islands by providing light colored / high albedo materials, pervious landscape, high emissivity roofing and green roofs.
- Eliminate light trespass from the building and site, improve night sky access and reduce development impact on nocturnal environments.
- Use regionally manufactured building materials.
- Use durable, thermally efficient roofs, walls and windows that reduce heating and cooling and enhance thermal comfort.
- Use landscaping that requires little or no irrigation or application of synthetic chemicals.
- Rainwater is encouraged to be harvested for on-site uses such as irrigation.
- Use efficient HVAC and electrical lighting systems.
- Use water efficient supply and waste fixtures.
- Reduce the use of finite raw materials and long-cycle renewable materials by replacing them with rapidly renewable materials.
- Use building products that incorporate recycled content materials.
- Where possible, wood-based materials and products should be certified by the Forest Stewardship Council.
- Use adaptable interior designs, providing visual access to the outdoors and access to daylight.
- Use interior finishes and installation methods that have lower toxic emissions.
- Incorporate 'smart metering' building management systems and feedback panels into homes.
- Incorporate bird-friendly building design elements (e.g. non-reflective tinted glass).



Precedent – Lighting and building style integrated.



Precedent - Entry stairway lighting.

## H – Building Lighting

Note: For information on street and park lighting, refer to the companion 'Parks, Open Space, and Habitat Concept Plan' and 'Streetscape Plan'.

### Intent

Lighting on buildings shall be integrated into the architectural design to creatively illuminate pedestrian areas and highlight building elements without impacting surrounding land uses and the streetscape.

### Standards

**Fixtures** – All lighting fixtures shall be low intensity or low level of intensity and unobtrusive. Lighting shall be focused directly on the intended area of illumination and away from surrounding land uses. Full cutoff or fully shielded fixtures shall be used in order to avoid light being directed upwards or outwards. Zero candela intensity shall occur at an angle of 90° or greater above nadir. Additionally, no more than 10% candela intensity shall occur at an angle greater than 80° above nadir.

### Guidelines

**Pedestrian Areas** – Pedestrian areas should have adequate illumination for safety.

**Retail** – Lighting should integrate with retail signage, storefront windows and other building elements to enhance visual interest.

### **Residential** –

- Lighting should be sensitive to nearby residential developments by:
  - Limiting Glare.
  - Minimizing spill light beyond the property boundary.
- Within a development, common outdoor lighting should be designed to mitigate light trespass into adjacent units.

**Energy Consumption** – Sensor or timer-based shut off controls should be used for residential, pedestrian and parking areas.



Precedent – Signage should allow views in and out of the premises.



Precedent – Window displays should be visually interesting and use product display in lieu of signs and banners.



Precedent – Signs that contain visual representations rather than text are encouraged.



Precedent – The illumination source should be concealed

## 4.4 Signage

The following signage controls are intended to provide basic direction for how signage is displayed. More detailed signage provisions will be contained in the 'Candlestick Point Signage Master Plan'. Information on street and park signage may also be contained in the 'Parks, Open Space, and Habitat Concept Plan'.

### General

### Intent

Signage should be artful, creative, add visual interest to the street, and complement overall building and site design. Signage utilized to identify a business or community use should be clearly identifiable, yet not be visually objectionable. Signage in the Mixed-use Residential and Open Space districts should be discreet, kept to a minimum and maintain a suitable level of amenity for residents and users of the public domain.

### Guidelines

**Variety** – A variety of signage types serving a range of functions should be provided in a way that is responsive to the built form, site design, district character and streetscape appearance.

**Location** – Signs should not obscure architectural elements such as pilasters, cornice lines, capping or openings.

Legibility - Sign typefaces should be clearly legible.

**Materials** – Signs should be designed with high quality materials consistent with the overall building architecture.

**Style –** Signs that are visually representational rather than textual are encouraged. Signs should be artful, creative, and highly graphic.

**Orientation** – Signs should be positioned and oriented to be easily visible to pedestrians.

### Lighted Signs

- The brightness of any illuminated sign should be limited to the minimum necessary for it to be operationally functional and compatible with the light level of the streetscape it is located in.
- Wherever possible, signs should be designed so that their brightness does not cause glare or detract from the amenity of nearby residential land uses.
- The light source, junction boxes, tubing, conduits and raceways should be concealed or incorporated into the design of the sign structure.

**Safety** – Sign design and operation must be safe for users of the public domain, including motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians.



Precedent – Use of new technology signs is appropriate provided there is no amenity or safety impact.



Precedent - Temporary contractor signs.



Precedent - Temporary for sale sign.

**New Technology Signs** – Signage using new forms of technology, such as dynamic content signs, digital displays or light projections, may be appropriate where designed, located, oriented and operated in a manner that avoids any negative amenity or safety impact on nearby residential land uses, motorists or bicyclists. This may include (but is not limited to):

- Limiting the hours of operation of the sign;
- Limiting the amount animation, or ensuring the content on dynamic content or digital signs has a minimum dwell time and transition time;
- Limiting sign brightness;
- Locating the sign inside a business premises and set back from window glazing; and
- Orienting the face of the sign away from the adjoining street network and land uses.

**Temporary Signage –** Temporary signage, such as contractor signs, real estate signs and special promotional signs, are appropriate where they are limited in size.

- Contractors One sign for persons or businesses connected to work on buildings under actual construction or alteration. Signs shall not exceed 12 sq ft in size. Signs must be removed within seven days following completion of the contract.
- For Sale / Lease One sign is allowed for each street frontage of the total parcel involved. The sign shall not be greater than 10 ft tall, and may not extend above the roof line if attached to the building. Sign area shall not exceed 6 sq ft for each lot or for each 3,000 sq ft in such total parcel, whichever permits the larger area; no sign shall exceed 18 sq ft. Signs must be removed within seven days following removal of the property from the market.
- Temporary signs should be displayed for a limited duration and removed immediately following the conclusion of the relevant activity. Where possible, temporary signage should be coordinated and integrated with other signage.
- Temporary signs should not be displayed or presented in a way that presents a public hazard, such as on the roof of a building or awning.

Prohibited Signage - The following sign types are prohibited:

- Permanent or temporary billboards (except as otherwise provided for in Section 4.3.10 of the BVHP Plan).
- Signage with reflective materials, colors and finishes.
- Signage with sound, vibration, odor or other emissions, unless the emission is necessary as part of a community message or to meet ADA standards.
- Signage that replicates, mimics or could be mistaken as a traffic control device.
- Signage that obstructs the passage or sightlines of motorists, bicyclists or pedestrians.
- Billposting, except where undertaken with the approval of the City or Agency.

## 4.5 Parking and Loading

## 4.5.1 Off-street Parking

### Intent

Off-street parking in shared structures should be provided for all land uses in convenient locations that are visually concealed from view of the street by active users. Additional standards and guidelines are contained in Section 3.2, Section 4.2.4, Section 4.3.1D, and Section 5.

### Standards

**Numbers/Ratio** – The maximum amount of off-street parking by use is described below. For residential parking, the maximum represents a cumulative total number of spaces equal to one space per unit. In the event some residential buildings provide for less than one space per unit, these unallocated spaces may be re-allocated to other residential buildings. But in no event shall the residential parking ratio exceed 1:1 at any given time. Re-allocation of any unused parking spaces shall be identified during the Design Review and Document Approval Procedure submission by sponsor. For additional detail, refer to the companion 'Transportation Plan'.

### Table 4.7 Maximum Off-Street Parking

USE	MAXIMUM
Residential	1 space/unit
Regional Retail	2.7 spaces/1000 sq ft
Office	1 space/1000 sq ft
Neighborhood Retail	1 space/1000 sq ft
Community Uses	1 space/2000 sq ft
Hotel	0.25 space/guest room
Performance Venue	1 space/15 seats
Cinema Parking	Where the number of cinema seats exceeds 50, one space for each eight seats up to 1,000 seats, plus one space for each 10 seats in excess of 1,000.
Grocery Store	2.7 spaces/1000 sq ft

**Bicycles** – Shall be located in a secured and convenient location that is near the garage entrance and does not conflict with autos. The standards for bicycle parking by use are listed in Table 4.8 and Table 4.9.

None required

	MINIMUM NUMBER OF BICYCLE PARKING SPACES REQUIRED
Dwelling units in all Districts	For projects up to 50 dwelling units: 1 Class 1 space for every 2 dwelling units.
	For projects over 50 dwelling units: 25 Class 1 spaces, plus 1 Class 1 space for every 4 additional dwelling units over 50.
Group Housing	1 Class 1 space for every 3 bedrooms

## Table 4.8 Bicycle Parking Spaces for Residential Uses

## Table 4.9Bicycle Parking Spaces for Commercial Uses

Dwelling units dedicated to senior citizens or physically

disabled persons

COMMERCIAL USE	MINIMUM NUMBER OF BICYCLE PARKING SPACES REQUIRED
New commercial buildings whose primary use consists of medical or other professional services, general business offices, financial services, business and trade schools, and development or manufacturing.	Where the gross square footage of the floor area exceeds 10,000 sq ft but is no greater than 20,000 ft, 3 bicycle spaces are required, of which at least 1 must be a Class 1 space.
	Where the gross square footage of the floor area exceeds 20,000 sq ft but is no greater than 50,000 feet, 6 bicycle spaces are required, of which at least 2 must be a Class 1 space.
	Where the gross square footage of the floor exceeds 50,000 sq ft, 12 bicycle spaces are required of at which at least 4 must be Class 1 spaces.
New commercial buildings whose primary use consists of retail, eating and drinking, or personal services.	Where the gross square footage of the floor area exceeds 25,000 sq ft but is no greater than 50,000 ft, 3 bicycle spaces are required, of which at least 1 must be a Class 1 space.
	Where the gross square footage of the floor area exceeds 50,000 sq ft but is no greater than 100,000 ft, 6 bicycle spaces are required, of which at least 2 must be a Class 1 space.
	Where the gross square footage of the floor exceeds 100,000 sq ft, 12 bicycle spaces are required of at which at least 4 must be Class 1 spaces.
New commercial buildings whose primary use consists of parking spaces for rent or other fee to the general public, and facilities which offer automobile parking space solely to building tenants, or a combination of both.	Every garage shall supply a minimum of 6 bicycle spaces regardless of the number of automobile spaces
	Where the number of automobile spaces is between 120 and 500, 1 bicycle space shall be provided for every 20 auto spaces
	Where the number of auto spaces is more than 500, 25 bicycle spaces shall be provided plus 1 additional space for every 40 auto spaces over 500 spaces, up to a maximum of 50 bicycle spaces



Precedent - Car-share parking spaces.



Precedent - Car-share vehicle.

**Car-sharing** – Local car-share organizations will have access to both on-street and off-street parking in order to provide car-share vehicles throughout the Project site. Car-share services are intended to reduce the overall parking demand by reducing the need for private vehicle ownership. Car-share vehicles are owned and maintained by the car-share service; members access vehicles when needed, paying based on how much they drive.

If it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Agency that no certified car-share organization can make use of the dedicated car-share parking spaces, the spaces may be occupied by non-car share vehicles; provided, however, that upon (90) days of advance written notice to the property owner from a certified car-sharing organization, the property owner shall terminate any non-car-sharing leases for leases for such spaces and shall make the spaces available to the car-share organization for its use of such space.

 Required Car-share Spaces – For new buildings, car-share spaces shall be provided as follows:

	Table 4.10	Required Car-share/Residential
--	------------	--------------------------------

RESIDENTIAL UNITS	REQUIRED CAR-SHARE PARKING SPACES	
0 - 49	0	
50 - 200	1	
201 or more	2, plus 1 for every 200 additional dwelling units over 200	

Table 4.11 Required Car-share/Non-residential

PROVIDED NON-RESIDENTIAL PARKING SPACES	REQUIRED CAR-SHARE PARKING SPACES
0 - 24	0
25 - 49	1
50 or more	1, plus 1 for every 50 additional parking spaces over 50

 Location – Required car-share vehicle spaces shall be located within 800 ft of the building site. Spaces may be located on-street or offstreet at the discretion of the Executive Director.

**Unbundled Residential Parking** – With the exception of stand-alone affordable housing developments, in all residential developments with more than 10 units excluding individually parked townhomes, residential parking shall be unbundled and sold or leased separately from units. Unbundling parking makes the cost of parking visible to households, and may encourage some residents to save money by opting for a single off-street space or no dedicated parking.



Precedent - Angled retail parking.



Precedent - Parallel parking.

## 4.5.2 On-street Parking

### Intent

On-street parking will be provided in select street locations for the short term convenience of residents and visitors.

### **Standards**

**Location** – Parking for the use of the general public shall be provided on the streets shown in Figure 4.15.

### Guidelines

**Parking Bays** – Curb bulb-outs that define on-street parking zones are encouraged where possible.

### Figure 4.15 On-street Parking Locations





Screen loading areas.



Precedent – Loading located on short side of block.



Enclosed mechanical equipment.

## 4.5.3 Loading, Mechanical Equipment and Meters

### Intent

The service component of buildings should be shielded from view of primary public areas such as significant streets and parks.

### Standards

**Off-street Loading Areas** – Off-street loading spaces are not required for residential and retail uses. If off-street loading spaces are supplied, they shall be a minimum length of 35 ft, minimum width of 12 ft, and minimum height of 14 ft and they shall not exceed 59 spaces for the entire Candlestick project. Where off-street loading spaces are not supplied on-street curb management practices must be utilized, meaning there shall be no disruption to transit operations or auto traffic at peak travel times or on critical routes.

**Location** – Loading areas and utility meters shall be located on mid-block breaks where possible. Where there is no mid-block break, locate loading and meters on the short dimension of the block.

**Curb Cuts** – The maximum width of a curb cut shall be 24 ft. This may be increased to a maximum of 27 ft where:

- access to off-street parking and loading is shared; or
- the extra width is needed to accommodate the fleet of emergency services or utility providers.

Curb cuts shall be a minimum of 30 ft from the end of a street corner radius.

**Screening** – Loading areas, trash storage and mechanical equipment and meters shall be enclosed within structures and hidden from view of the public realm.

### Guidelines

**Shared Entrances** – Shared loading and parking entrances are encouraged.



Precedent - Plaza bench.



Precedent - Sidewalk bench.



Precedent - Bike rack.

## 4.6 Streets

Street standards are set forth for streetscape (furnishings) aspects of public streets. Section 3.2 contains conceptual illustrations for the various primary street types, while additional standards controlling other aspects of the street such as the width of rights of way, lanes and sidewalks are contained in the Transportation Plan. Standards are also set forth herein for mid-block breaks, which are public easements on private land.

## 4.6.1 Streetscape

Note: Because construction of the project will occur over a period of many years Master Specifications are recommended to insure consistency of design, materials, and construction quality over the long range build-out of the project. Master specifications, based on the Streetscape Master Plan, have been developed with the design of the first phase of the project.

### **Standards**

**Sidewalks** – Standard sidewalk paving shall be concrete. Sidewalk paving shall also include special treatments such as concrete with integral color, special scoring patterns, and special finishes, or unit pavers.

**Curb/Gutter** – Standard curb/gutter shall be concrete per City Standard. In certain areas, curb and gutters may include special features such as wider curb widths, integral color and special finishes, or use of stone.

**BRT Lanes** – BRT lanes shall be distinguished by special paving that may be concrete with integral color and special texture or colored asphalt. In some areas BRT lanes may also include planted strips between tire tracks.

**Sustainable Landscaping** – Street landscaping shall consist of native and regionally appropriate planting. Street landscaping shall be strategically planted to help regulate climate, control stormwater, cleanse air and water, and provide habitat.

**Trash/Recycling/Compost Receptacles** – Shall be provided on retail streets, bus stops and in furnishing zones or on bulb-outs near the street corner.

**Benches and seating** – Shall be provided on retail and park boulevard streets and in bulb-out areas. Benches and seating should be oriented to create social spaces. Additionally, locate seating along steep streets and paths to provide a place to rest.



Precedent - Pedestrian scale lighting.



Precedent - Vehicle scale lighting.

### **Bicycle Racks**

- On public streets, provide bicycle racks on streets fronted by retail, commercial, multi-unit housing, and public service buildings. Additionally, provide bicycle racks adjacent to transit stops, and park entrances.
- Locate bicycle racks in the furnishing zone and on bulb-outs or curbextensions so that parked bicycles do not to block the pedestrian throughway.

### **Newspaper Racks**

 If newspaper racks are installed, they shall be installed in retail zones and near transit stops, located in the furnishings zone or on bulb-outs.

### **Tree Grates**

 Use tree grates where pedestrian traffic is high and where sidewalk space is limited.

### **Utility vaults**

• Locate utility vaults in the furnishings zone where possible. Group and arrange vault covers in an orderly fashion.

### **Street Lighting**

- Locate street lighting in the furnishing zone.
- Lamps should use high-efficiency technology such as LED to minimize energy consumption.
- Design lighting to maximize public safety while minimizing light pollution.

### Guidelines

**Permeable Parking Lanes** – Permeable parking lanes may be porous asphalt, porous concrete, permeable pavers, or concrete-grass-block grid.

**Special Crosswalks** – Special crosswalk paving may be colored, imprinted asphalt, concrete with integral color and special texture, or unit pavers. Raised crosswalks are encouraged where they will not impede transit or truck routes.

**Customized Style** – Elements and furnishings such as bicycle racks, tree grates, benches and lighting are encouraged to be customized.



Precedent - Residential pedestrian mews.



Precedent - Residential vehicular laneway.

## 4.6.2 Mid-block Breaks

Mid-block breaks are intended to allow public access through the middle of private development block in order to create a more porous circulation system and decrease the scale of building massing.

### Residential

### Intent

The mid-block break will be a public easement on the private land of the development block. The easement may be developed as either a pedestrian mews or a vehicular laneway at the discretion of the developer.

### Standards

**Mews vs. Laneway** – All mid-block breaks shall be either pedestrian mews or vehicular laneways or a combination of both. The Streetscape Master Plan has identified specific mid-block breaks defined pedestrian 'paths to water' that must at all times maintain a minimum 10 ft pedestrian way. These pedestrian ways may be separate from, or included within, the 20 ft emergency vehicle access.

Public Access – Mid-block breaks shall have unrestricted public access.

**Building Face-to-face Dimension** – The minimum building face-to-face dimension, exclusive of projections, shall be 40 ft.

**Path Dimension** – The minimum pedestrian path dimension for pedestrian mews shall be 10 ft.

**Drive Aisle Dimension** – The maximum drive aisle dimension for vehicular laneways shall be 16 ft.

### **Garage Entrances**

- Garage entrances to individual units shall be restricted to one per unit at a maximum width of 8 ft.
- Garage entrances to common parking structures shall be regulated per Section 4.3.1 D.
- Garage entrances for all types cumulatively shall be restricted to no more than 45% of the block face.
- Garage entrances shall not extend beyond the main building face; garage entrances that are recessed behind the building face are encouraged.

**Grade Elevation** – Paths and drive aisles shall be at the grade of the public sidewalk.

Surfaces – Hard surfaces shall be restricted to 70% of the ground plane.

**Street Trees** – A double row of street trees shall be planted at a spacing that is encouraged to match the town home modules, and in any case is not greater than 30 ft on center.



Precedent – Commercial mid-block break.

**Main Entrance** – The main entrance to the unit shall be located on the mid-block break side of the building.

**Activation** – The street level building face that is not garage shall be activated with ample glazing, entrances, stoops and porches.

**Lighting** – Adequate lighting shall be provided to ensure pedestrian and vehicular safety.

### Guidelines

**Entrance Elements** – Entrance elements that reinforce the main unit entrance such as porches, stoops and terraces are encouraged.

**Community Spaces** – Social spaces, seating and places for informal play are encouraged.

**Landscaping** – The mid-block break is intended to be an outdoor room. Rich landscaping is encouraged so that the drive aisle (in the case of a vehicular laneway) is subordinate. This includes street trees, shrub beds, patios and steps, benches and lighting.

**Permeable Ground** – Permeable paving and stormwater gardens are encouraged.

**Minimizing Vehicle Speeds** – Features to reduce vehicle speeds are encouraged, such as narrow drive aisle and offsets in the drive aisle alignment.

### Commercial

#### Intent

Commercial mid-block breaks are intended to allow public access through the middle of private development blocks and meet the requirements of the adjacent building. The mid-block break will be a public easement on the private land of the development block.

### **Standards**

**Pedestrian Access** – All mid-block breaks shall provide a minimum 10 ft pedestrian only access in the form of a grade separated sidewalk along the entire length of the break. The access can be configured as two 5 ft sidewalks on either side of the mid-block break, or as one 10 ft sidewalk.

Public Access - Mid-block breaks shall have unrestricted public access.

**Street Trees** – Street trees shall be planted at a spacing of no more than 30 ft on center within the pedestrian access zone, and shall serve as a buffer between the sidewalk and vehicular lane(s).

### Garage & Loading Entrances

- Garage & loading entrances shall be no more than 20% of the block face.
- Garage & loading entrances shall not extend beyond the main building face; and are encouraged to be recessed behind the building face.
- Garage & loading entrances shall not be closer than 20 ft to the corner of the building at the entry to the mid-block break.

**Grade Elevation** – Paths and drive aisles shall be at the grade of the public sidewalk.

**Building Face-to-face dimension** – The minimum building face-to-face dimension, exclusive of projections, shall be 40 ft.

**Drive Aisle Dimension** – The minimum drive aisle dimension for vehicular laneways shall be: 20 ft for two-way laneways; 16 ft for one-way laneways.

**Lighting** – Adequate lighting shall be provided to ensure pedestrian and vehicular safety.

### Guidelines

**Activation** – The corners of mid-block breaks should be active. Commercial activities are encouraged to wrap the corner to a minimum of 20 feet into the mid-block break.

**Permeable Ground** – Permeable paving and stormwater gardens are encouraged.

**Minimizing Vehicle Speeds** – Features to minimize vehicle speeds are encouraged.



## Mid-block Break Residential

Pedestrian Mews.





### Legend

- (1) Pedestrian Path min 10 ft width; at grade of public sidewalk
- (2) Elevated Private Patio
- (3) Landscape buffer including street trees at max spacing of 30 ft on center.



(1) Drive Aisle – max 16 ft width; at grade of public sidewalk

Landscape buffer including street trees at max spacing of 30 ft

(4) Pedestrian Entrance

on center.

Legend

(3)

2 Driveway



## Mid-block Break - Commercial



- 1 Pedestrian Path min 10 ft width
- 2 Drive Aisle
- (3) Landscape buffer including street trees at max spacing of 30 ft on center.



Example: Drive aisle in center with path one side, combination of loading & landscaping other side.



# **Neighborhood Standards and Guidelines**

- 5.1 Alice Griffith
- 5.2 Candlestick North
- 5.3 Candlestick Center
- 5.4 Candlestick South
# 5 Neighborhood Standards and Guidelines

# General

#### Section Summary

This section describes the standards and guidelines that are specific to the five "character" neighborhoods within Candlestick (for the Jamestown neighborhood, see Section 7). Each neighborhood is described in terms of its general character, design rationale, standards and guidelines, and any special studies which have been undertaken as a means of testing the neighborhoods standards and guidelines.

#### **Neighborhoods Summary**

There are five distinct character neighborhoods at Candlestick as shown in Figure 5.1. They are designed to have a range of building types, from predominantly low-rise in Alice Griffith to a blend of taller buildings including high-rises at the confluence of Candlestick North, South and Center. Across all five neighborhoods the ground floor will be activated with residential or commercial uses, thereby enhancing the pedestrian experience and creating a unique sense of place. Each neighborhood has defining open spaces, including parks and urban plazas. The neighborhoods are:

Alice Griffith – serves as a linkage between the development and the surrounding Bayview neighborhood. Heights have been kept low to mesh with the surrounding urban fabric. The Bayview street grid extends through the site in order to express the connectivity to adjacent blocks and eliminate the existing 'island' of public housing that is disconnected from the adjacent neighborhood.

**Candlestick North** – has a mixture of housing types and heights. A vibrant retail main street lies to the south of the neighborhood, while two major parks are included with a range of uses. Mid-rise and high-rise buildings frame important open spaces; up to six high-rise towers take advantage of spectacular views over the parks and Bay beyond.

**Candlestick Center** – is the mixed-use core of the Candlestick development. An economic and jobs backbone, Candlestick Center has a mix of neighborhood and regional retail, commercial, housing, a hotel site, and public plazas.

**Candlestick South** – has five high-rise towers concentrated towards its north side, but maintains an intimate scale in response to the State Recreation Area through smaller scaled buildings along its south and east park sides. A small wedge shaped park links the neighborhood with the State Recreation Area beach zone.

#### Jamestown – see Section 7.

Block plans indicating dimensions and parcel areas for each of the neighborhoods are included in Appendix B.



- Alice Griffith
- Candlestick North
- Candlestick Center
- 1 2 3 4 5 Candlestick South
- Jamestown See Section 7

# 5.1 Alice Griffith









Precedent - Park street.



Precedent – Four to five story residential buildings.



Precedent - Low-rise residential building.



Precedent - Internal courtyard.

# 5.1.1 Alice Griffith – General Description

Alice Griffith community, located north of Arelious Walker Drive, is currently the home of a public housing community. The site will be transformed into a mixed-income community with a diverse range of housing types and better connections to the surrounding neighborhood. The existing number of affordable homes will be fully replaced on site in a phased sequence that ensures residents can move directly into new homes without displacement.

Land Use / Built Form – Alice Griffith will be a predominantly residential neighborhood. Buildings will generally be four to five stories along streets, with two and three story townhomes along alleyways. Building façades will be articulated in order to maintain a fine-grained scale. The existing highly terraced topography will be re-contoured at more consistent grades in order to facilitate mobility and development.

**Open Space** – The focus of the community is the centrally located community park that stretches almost the length of the neighborhood, bisected by Griffith Street. It may contain community gardens, tot lots, sports courts, picnic areas and other amenities. Egbert Avenue will become a one-way couplet surrounding the park. The residential buildings fronting this street will be the highest in the neighborhood, providing a streetwall that frames and defines the edges of the park.

In addition, opportunities for outdoor seating associated with commercial and community uses, as well as public art, are encouraged within the large sidewalk areas at the northern and southern ends of Egbert Ave.

**Streets** – The existing grid of streets (Carroll, Donner, Egbert, Fitzgerald, and Gilman running north/south and Griffith running east/west) will be extended through the site, thereby connecting the community back into the larger Bayview fabric. Egbert Avenue is configured as a large parkway, with parallel parking and Class II bike lanes on each side. Arelious Walker Drive serves as the primary truck and auto route between Highway 101 to the south and Candlestick. Wide sidewalks along Arelious Walker Drive serve to connect the two southernmost blocks to the remainder of the neighborhood.

Most steep grades and hills that are barriers to pedestrian and vehicular movement will be removed; mid-block breaks (small local streets, laneways or pedestrian mews) are required on parcels with restrictive grading, creating pedestrian linkages from the central Alice Griffith Community Park to the State Recreation Area system and Gilman Park.



#### Figure 5.2 Alice Griffith Illustrative Site Plan

#### Legend

- Low-rise Residential
  - Alice Griffith Community Park
  - Candlestick Point State Recreation Area
- 1 2 3 4 Candlestick Community Park
  - Candlestick North Neighborhood
- 5 6 7

- Gilman Park BRT Stop
- Yosemite Slough Restoration Site



Conceptual design – Stacked flats along community park.



Precedent - Community gardens in park.



Precedent - Low-rise townhomes along local street.



View of Alice Griffith looking south.

# 5.1.2 Alice Griffith – Urban Design

Refer to Figure 5.3 for the location of the following standards and guidelines.

A block plan indicating dimensions and parcel areas is included in Appendix B.

## Standards

# S1. Street Wall Height

- Minimum height 40 ft A street wall to a minimum of 40 ft shall be built on all blocks that front Alice Griffith Community Park.
- Proposition K Blocks 6 and 7 shall have a maximum height of 40 ft to assure no shadows on Gilman Park except as permitted by Proposition K.

# S2. Mid-block Breaks

- Shall be provided on the blocks indicated on Figure 5.3 the precise location may vary from what is shown.
- S3. Griffith Street Public Access from Gilman Ave
  - Public entry to and from the site along Griffith Street between blocks 8 and 14 shall be a pedestrian-only path based on final grading.

# S4. Setbacks to Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue & G Street

- Development blocks 1, 2, 11, 12, 17, 18, 19 and 20 on Donner Avenue, development blocks 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15 and 16 on Fitzgerald Avenue, and development blocks 2, 4, 9 and 11 on G Street shall have a minimum building setback of 9ft.

# Guidelines

G1. Mid-block Breaks – Pedestrian mews are preferable to laneways.

# G2. Building Heights

- Building heights should be varied within the district, with shorter buildings along Hawes Street, the southwesterly side of Fitzgerald Avenue and the northern portion of Carroll Avenue to serve as a transition to the surrounding neighborhood. Taller buildings should be built along the community park, up to a maximum of six stories.

# G3. Encouraged Ground Floor Commercial/Community Use

- Additional ground floor commercial, community space or live/work units are encouraged around BRT transit stops, benefiting transit users and residents, and at the northern end of Egbert Avenue. Encouraged use is neighborhood-serving retail and/or community space.

## G4. Important Intersections

- The corner of Arelious Walker Drive and Carroll Avenue is a gateway into the site. Architectural elements should be utilized to accentuate and differentiate this entry point.

# G5. Gilman Properties Interface

- Building design on Blocks 5, 8, 14, and 15 should respect backyards of existing homes on Gilman by providing adequate stepbacks.



# Figure 5.3 Alice Griffith Urban Design

#### Legend

- S1 Residential Street Wall 40 ft Minimum
- S2/G1 Mid-block Break (pedestrian mews or vehicular laneways)
- S3 Griffith Street Public Right-of-Way (Pedestrian path)
- S4 Setbacks to Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue & G Street
- Parks

Ù

(#)

- G3 Encouraged Ground Floor Commercial or Community Facilities Space
- G4 Important Intersections
- Block Numbers

# 5.2 Candlestick North











Precedent - Park Street.



Precedent - Mid-block break.



Precedent - Residential patio zone.

# 5.2.1 Candlestick North – General Description

Candlestick North is a compact mixed-use community with the greatest number of homes in Candlestick, animated neighborhood streets, and engaging parks and a main street filled with shops and services.

Land Use / Built Form – The neighborhood contains a mix of low-rise, mid-rise and high-rise mixed-use and residential buildings that frame and focus civic life on the parks and streets. Mixed-use buildings along the main street (Ingerson Avenue) create an animated retail atmosphere. Eight to ten story residential buildings frame the Bayview Gardens Wedge Park, while shorter residential buildings line both park streets (Egbert Avenue and Earl Street) and the central Candlestick Community Park.

Up to six towers are strategically located to overlook the Candlestick Community and Wedge Parks, and to emphasize key intersections within the plan. Low-rise residential buildings make up the majority of remaining buildings, including two and three story townhomes along mid-block breaks that establish a more intimate pedestrian scale. Additional retail opportunities are located in the bases of buildings at the BRT stops on both ends of the community and along the Wedge Park.

**Open Space** – Parks and open spaces are plentiful; almost all blocks are adjacent to open space. The Bayview Gardens Wedge Park and State Recreation Area surround the bay sides of the neighborhood. A three-acre Candlestick Community Park will be located near its center; the final location of this park will be determined in the future. The parks meet the needs of residents and visitors, and offer a distinctly urban character compared to the more naturalized character of the State Recreation Area.

Two 'Park Streets', Egbert Avenue and Earl Street, run perpendicular through the neighborhood. The park streets provide breathing room within the plan, while serving as sustainable elements.

Streets – Streets vary considerably in character. The dynamic main street (Ingerson Avenue) has on-street parking and broad sidewalks with plaza zones. Ingerson is designed to accommodate high pedestrian and bicycle traffic, in addition to automobile uses. The Egbert Avenue and Earl Street parkways run through the center of the neighborhood, linking the adjacent communities of Alice Griffith and Candlestick Center and providing views to the Bay. Arelious Walker Drive is the main truck and auto route through the development. It has large sidewalks, medians, bike lanes, and parallel parking to buffer residential uses. A BRT street runs on Harney Way along the north edge of the Wedge Park then northward on Egbert Avenue to Arelious Walker Drive, linking Candlestick to the Shipyard and the Bayshore Caltrain Station. Local streets have bulb-outs, ample pedestrian crossings, and other traffic calming measures. Generous, tree-lined sidewalks and building setbacks provide a stoop or terrace transition between homes and the street. Pedestrian mews or vehicular laneways at mid-block create additional linkages to the Bay.



# Figure 5.4 Candlestick North Illustrative Site Plan

Legend

- Low-rise Residential
- Mid-rise Residential
- High-rise Tower
- Mixed-use
  Alice Griffit
  Alice Griffit
  Candlesticl
  (Final Lange
  - Alice Griffith Community Park
  - Alice Griffith Neighborhood

Candlestick Community Park (Final Location to be determined in the future. See Section 3.3 for location criteria)

- Candlestick Point State Recreation Area
- Bayview Gardens/Wedge Destination Park
- Candlestick Center Neighborhood
- Candlestick South Neighborhood
- BRT Stops



Precedent - Community park.



Precedent - Retail and sidewalk on Ingerson Avenue.



Precedent - Residential buildings fronting park street.



View of Candlestick North looking west.

# 5.2.2 Candlestick North - Urban Design

Refer to Figure 5.5 for the location of the following standards and guidelines.

A block plan indicating dimensions and parcel areas is included in Appendix B.

#### Standards

## S1. Mixed-use Zone / Required Ground Floor Commercial

- Ingerson Avenue shall be a mixed-use zone along its frontage within the neighborhood.
- Ground floor use on Ingerson Avenue shall be commercial; retail is encouraged; live/work is allowed.

# S2. Minimum Street Wall Heights

- Minimum height 35 ft A street wall to a minimum of 35 ft shall be built fronting the entirety of Ingerson Avenue.
- Minimum Height 40 ft A street wall to a minimum of 40 ft shall be built along the entirety of Earl Street, Egbert Avenue, and surrounding the community park
- Minimum height 60 ft A street wall to a minimum of 60 ft shall be built on Block 7b along the park edge, and on blocks 8a and 8b fronting Earl Street.
- Minimum height 80 ft A continuous street wall to a minimum of 80 ft shall be built fronting the Bayview Gardens Wedge Park on Blocks 9a, 9b, 11a, and 11b.

## S3. Towers

- Towers shall be located within the tower zones described in Section 4.2.2 Heights. If moved from the preferred location, towers shall be sited fronting major streets and/or frame parks and important public places, and shall require a shadow and wind analysis as per Section 4.2.5 and Section 4.2.6 respectively.
- No more than 6 towers shall be located within Candlestick North neighborhood. The towers on blocks 7b and 11a, if developed, shall not be relocated from the position shown. All other towers may be relocated within the allowable tower zone. Shown in Section 4.2.
- S4. Mid-block Breaks Shall be provided within the blocks indicated on Figure 5.5. The breaks on Block 5 and 6 shall be pedestrian mews; laneways are prohibited. The precise location of the midblock breaks shown on Figure 5.5 may vary slightly from what is shown, however they are mandatory for the block.

# S5. City Park

 A City Park of approximately 3 acres shall be provided within the central portion of the neighborhood. The final location of the park will be determined in the future, and will depend on which parcels within Candlestick North are acquired for development. See Section 3.3 for general criteria, currently shown on Block 12 for illustrative purposes.

## S6. State Park Edge

- A publicly accessible walkway/emergency access shall be provided as shown in Figure 4.9.

# Guidelines

## G1. Encouraged Ground Floor Commercial

- Additional ground floor commercial is encouraged around BRT transit stops, benefiting transit users and residents. Encouraged use is neighborhood-serving retail.

## G2. Important Intersections

- The corners of Arelious Walker Drive/Ingerson Avenue, Harney Way/Ingerson Avenue, Carroll Avenue/Arelious Walker Drive are important intersections, serving as either gateways into the site or zones of high pedestrian activity. Architectural elements should be utilized to accentuate and distinguish these entry points.
- G3. Grocery Store A grocery store, if developed, should be located in a prominent and easily accessible location along Ingerson Avenue. Where necessary to accommodate the grocery store's loading dock, the garage door and curb cut width may exceed the maximum standards in Section 4.3.1 D and 4.5.3 where:
  - Access to the loading dock and any on-site car parking is combined and located on the O Street frontage;
  - Any on-street loading or ADA parking that is impacted by the location of the curb cut on O Street is accommodated in an alternative location in immediate proximity of the site;
  - The loading dock is shielded from public view when not in use and designed in a manner that visually integrates with the building's architecture and street wall; and
  - The garage entry and the curb cut is designed in a manner that provides a continual, safe and comfortable crossing for pedestrians and bicyclists along the adjoining public street.
- **G4. Mid-block Breaks** Pedestrian Mews are preferable to laneways to enhance the overall pedestrian circulation network.
- **G5. Height Variation –** For buildings along Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way, building heights are encouraged to be varied to add architectural interest to the streetscape.



#### Legend

- S1 Mixed-use Zone/Required Ground Floor Commercial
  S2/G5 Mixed-use Street Wall 35' Minimum
  S2 Residential Street Wall 40' Minimum
  S2 Residential Street Wall 60' Minimum
  S2 Residential Street Wall 80' Minimum
  S3 Tower Locations (refer to Section 4.2.2 for the location of allowable tower zones)
  S4 Mid-block Break Pedestrian Mews
  SECTION 5 NEIGHBORHOOD STANDARDS & GUIDELINES
- S4/G4 Mid-block Breaks
  S5 Parks
  S6 State Park Edge
  G1 Encouraged Ground Floor Commercial
  G2 Important Intersections
  G3 Grocery Store
- (#) Block Numbers

2016 CANDLESTICK POINT DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT

# 5.3 Candlestick Center









Precedent - Vibrant retail street



Precedent - Mixed-use development.



Precedent - Internal pedestrian mews.



Precedent - Animated retail street.

# 5.3.1 Candlestick Center - General Description

Candlestick Center is the heart and focus of activity for Candlestick. It is a mixed-use neighborhood with regional shops and services, commercial uses, hotel, public uses and residential low-rises. The illustrative plan for the neighborhood is shown in Figure 5.6. The diagrams provided here show the current proposal for Candlestick Center. Circulation and streets could be adjusted if the general performance criteria are met.

Land Use / Built Form – Candlestick Center is comprised of 635,000 sq ft of mixed-use regional retail in a variety of forms ranging from small commercial retail units (CRU's) along the two main streets – Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way – with secondary uses above, to larger format stores accessed by internal streets and pedestrian mews. The scale of the large format stores will be reduced through wrapping with other uses and/or fenestration. Above retail, uses may include residential, office space, a hotel or additional commercial space, subject to entitlement limitations.

A landmark building on the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue will frame a public plaza at this important intersection. The iconic building will have high-quality architectural treatment and active day and evening uses (such as retail and entertainment) that anchor development at Candlestick Center and reinforce its central location and community importance.

A three to four story parking structure will serve the center. Its edges along internal streets will be lined with shops while edges fronting Arelious Walker Drive will be screened with landscaping and other concealing devices. The parking structure roof will have a variety of uses that may include additional parking, a hotel, residential buildings, commercial, utilities, a variety of 'green' uses including gardens and power generation possibly in the form of solar panels, and publicly accessible recreation uses. Should parking be provided on the roof deck, it will be screened from view of the Bayview Hill and taller buildings through landscaping, solar screening or other appropriate means.

**Open Space** – The public realm will have a very urban flavor. Comprised of pedestrian oriented sidewalks and mews, plazas and courts, these spaces will offer a range of scales and characters. Those along the main streets and at key intersections will be larger and livelier, while others at the interior of the site and along pedestrian mews will have a more intimate scale and character. A BRT plaza is included as an extension of the Bayview Gardens Wedge Park into the neighborhood. The plaza may have kiosks and small vendors, as well as ample seating, public art, and landscaping. All plazas will be fully accessible to the public, as are streets.

**Streets** – Two mixed-use main streets, Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way, wrap the edge of the site. On the eastern edge, Ingerson Avenue has 2 travel lanes and 2 lanes of parking. On the southern edge, Harney Way is a boulevard with 2 vehicle travel lanes and parking on the south side and 2 BRT travel lanes on the north side. Internal retail streets may provide service access points. Arelious Walker Drive, an arterial street, lines the western edge of the neighborhood and is anchored primarily by a multi-level parking structure, which will be screened and made visually interesting.



# Figure 5.6 Candlestick Center Illustrative Site Plan

Legend

	Mixed-use – Mid-rise Mixed Use Buildings: Retail ground floor with Residential and/or Office <sup>1</sup> above			
	High-rise Residential Over Parking			
	Mixed-use: Hotel Over Retail and/or Parking			
	Mixed-use: Anchor Land Uses			
	Commercial			
	Parking/Loading			

Pedestrian Zone

10345673

Landmark Building	and Plaza
-------------------	-----------

Candlestick North Neighborhood

- Bayview Gardens Wedge Destination Park
- Mini-wedge Community Park
- Candlestick South Neighborhood
- BRT Stop and Plaza

Pedestrian Zone with Service Vehicle Access

<sup>1</sup> Subject to entitlement limitations



Precedent - Public plaza.



Precedent - Mixed-use buildings.



Precedent - Public art, important in the placemaking of a neighborhood center.



Candlestick Center – Landmark Building and plaza at the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue.

# 5.3.2 Candlestick Center – Urban Design

Refer to Figure 5.7 for the location of the following standards and guidelines.

A block plan indicating dimensions and parcel areas is included in Appendix B.

#### **Standards**

## S1. Mixed-use Zone / Minimum Height

- Buildings fronting Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way shall be:
  - Mixed-use with either commercial or residential uses above at grade retail; or
  - Hotel with activating ground floor uses, such as lobby, bar, or restaurant.
- A continuous street wall shall be built to a minimum height of 35 ft for all buildings along Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way, as shown in Figure 5.7.

## S2. Required Ground Floor Commercial

- Ground floor commercial to a minimum floor-to-floor height of 20 ft shall be located along Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way and internal streets and pedestrian mews.
- Ground floor commercial shall not have a minimum average depth less than 35 ft, exclusive of service corridors.
- Commercial modules shall be no greater than 30 ft width, though a single retailer may combine and occupy modules. (See Section 4.3.1 B for details.)

## S3. Public Plazas

- A designated public plaza shall be located at the southwest corner of Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way and shall contain public art and be adequately sized to serve as a primary gathering space and focal point to the neighborhood.
- A designated public plaza shall be located in the wedge-shaped block between the Harney Way BRT lanes and the vehicle lanes, serving as an extension of the Bayview Gardens Wedge Park into the heart of the development. It shall serve primarily as a BRT/transit stop and contain public art, shade trees and comfortable seating areas.

## S4. Architectural Reinforcement

 Building(s) surround the public plaza at the corner of Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way shall be designed with distinguishing architectural features and/or scale to frame the plaza and help create a unique sense of place.

# S5. Service Vehicle Access for CP Center

- Service vehicle for CP Center should access from the intersection of Earl Street and Ingerson Avenue at the northeast, and exit to 8th Street and Harney Way at the southeast.
- Traffic within CP Center area is one way.

## S6. Pedestrian Mews

- The eastern portion of the site shall have two high quality publicly accessible pedestrian-only retail mews punctuating the block, running in both north-south and east-west directions approximately as shown in Figure 5.7.
- Mews width shall be a minimum dimension of 15 ft. Mews width shall take into consideration the surrounding scale of vertical development in order to maintain a comfortable pedestrian experience.

# S7. Parking Structure

- Parking structures serving the neighborhood and surrounding neighborhood retail requirements shall be located within the district.
- The majority of the parking requirement shall be provided in structure(s) located along Arelious Walker Drive.
- Notwithstanding the limits on garage entry widths in Section 4.3.1D:
  - The main entry for the CP Center garage along Arelious Walker Drive may have a maximum width of 50 ft. In this case, the parking entry must be designed in a manner that provides a continual, safe and comfortable crossing for pedestrians and bicyclists in front of the garage entry.
  - One garage entry larger than 27 ft wide may be permitted off Ingerson Avenue provided:
    - It aligns with either O Street or M Street.
    - It is designed in a manner that visually integrates with the Ingerson Avenue street wall.
    - The width of the entry and the number of lanes corresponds with the width and number of lanes of the aligned street.
    - The path of pedestrian travel along Ingerson Avenue remains continual and a safe and comfortable crossing in front of the garage entry is provided.
- Any portion of parking structure fronting Arelious Walker Drive shall be screened with landscaping or other appropriate elements (see also Section 4.3.1). All other above grade faces shall be screened with commercial uses or adequate material or planting screens.
- Should parking be provided on a roof deck, it shall be screened from view of the Bayview Hill and taller buildings through landscaping, solar screening or other appropriate means.

#### S8. Arelious Walker Entry Plaza

For any public or private grade level entry plaza (vehicular entry point or turn-off) abutting Arelious Walker near Jamestown Avenue, such entry plaza shall be publicly accessible at all times and designed / treated as an integrated element of the public domain. Buildings that face onto such entry plazas shall incorporate active ground floors facing towards the plaza. The treatment of buildings along Arelious Walker Drive that are adjacent to the plaza should include consistent active frontage to ensure the plaza does not feel isolated or private. The treatment of such plazas shall prioritize pedestrian needs over vehicular needs and enable entry into the core of Candlestick Center.

#### Guidelines

**G1. Residential and Office** – Encouraged uses above ground floor are residential and office (subject to entitlement limitations), particularly for buildings fronting Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue.

#### G2. Hotel

- A hotel location is allowed in the neighborhood and its location should be at a prominent, highly visible site.
- The hotel lobby should be easily identifiable and front a street.
- Private open space should be included in any hotel design, which may include the building rooftop.

#### G3. Parking Structure Rooftop

- Any portion of parking structure rooftop that is not parking, residential or commercial use should be designed with green features (such as solar shading), or active recreation uses (such as sports courts).
- Subject to parking needs, some portion of the rooftop should be considered for usable open space.

#### G4. Lobbies

- Above grade uses other than retail should have lobbies that are easily identifiable, secure, and well lit.

#### G5. Arelious Walker Entry Plaza

- The Arelious Walker Entry Plaza, if provided, should be aligned with Jamestown Avenue so as to feel like an extension of the Jamestown right-of-way.
- **G6.** Height Variation Building heights along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue are encouraged to be varied to add architectural interest to the streetscape.



# Figure 5.7 Candlestick Center Urban Design

# Legend

	S1/G6 – Mixed-use Street Wall 35 ft Minimum Height	 S6 – Pedestrian Mews (approximate location)
	S2 – Required Ground Floor Commercial (also required on internal streets; location to be determined)	Park
	S3 – Public Plaza	S8/G5 – Arelious Walker Entry Plaza
	S4 – Architectural Reinforcement	G1 – Encouraged Office <sup>1</sup> or Residential
$\rightarrow$	S5 – Service Vehicle Access (one way)	G2 – Encouraged Hotel Location
		<sup>1</sup> Subject to entitlement limitations

# 5.4 Candlestick South













Precedent - Articulated streetwall.



Precedent - Homes on the park.



Precedent - High-rise with bustle.



Precedent - Edge fronting CPSRA.

# 5.4.1 Candlestick South – General Description

Candlestick South derives its character from both the Harney Way retail street and the activity of the beach and surrounding Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA). A mix of low-rise and high-rise buildings are complemented by a fine grained streets and lanes system that links residents to the Mini-wedge Community Park, Bayview Gardens Wedge Destination Park, and the surrounding CPSRA.

Land Use / Built Form – Mixed-use buildings define the southern half of Harney Way creating a vibrant retail street. The bulk of the neighborhood is comprised of low-rise flats and townhomes. Both wedge parks are framed with strong street walls to help define the spaces, while townhomes or flats border the CPSRA. Up to five high-rise towers punctuate the neighborhood with extraordinary views to the Bay, while serving as visual landmarks. The high-rise towers have been strategically located to bring the bulk of residential density to the heart of Candlestick, in close proximity to shopping, services, and public transit. Towers are predominantly stepped back from the CPSRA emphasizing a less formal park experience. Further, the proposed towers located south of the Mini-wedge Community Park shall be situated in a manner that preserves a view corridor from the top of Bayview Hill to Candlestick Point.

**Open Space** – The Mini-wedge Community Park forms the heart of the community and complements the larger Bayview Gardens Wedge Park within Candlestick North. The Mini-wedge is oriented to focus views to the CPSRA beach and the point of land that gives Candlestick its name. The community's eastern and southern edges are wrapped by the CPSRA, creating views to the bay and easy access to recreation.

**Streets** – A defining element of this community is its mixed-use main street, Harney Way. This primary commercial street for this community will be a retail boulevard with dedicated bus rapid transit (BRT) lanes in each direction and a vehicle travel lane in each direction. Other streets in the community are local serving, and mid-block breaks offer greater connectivity to the parks and water's edge. A laneway is included parallel to Harney Way to serve commercial uses.



Figure 5.8 Candlestick South Illustrative Site Plan

Legend

- Low-rise Residential
  - High-rise Tower
    - Mixed-use

Mini-wedge Community Park

CPSRA Beach

1234567

- Bayview Gardens/Wedge Destination Park
- Candlestick Point State Recreation Area
- Candlestick Center Neighborhood
- Candlestick North Neighborhood
- BRT/Transit Stop and Plaza



Community gardens.



CPSRA – Great lawn.



CPSRA – Wind surfing beach.



View of Candlestick South looking west.
# 5.4.2 Candlestick South Urban Design

Refer to Figure 5.9 for the location of the following standards and guidelines.

A block plan indicating dimensions and parcel areas is included in Appendix B.

## Standards

# S1. Mixed-use Zone / Required Ground Floor Commercial

- Harney Way, between Arelious Walker Drive and Ingerson Avenue shall be a mixed-use zone along its frontage within the neighborhood
- Ground floor use shall be commercial along the aforementioned streets with a minimum floor-to-floor height of 12 ft.

# S2. Street Wall Heights

- Minimum height 35 ft A mixed-use street wall to a minimum of 35 ft shall be built along Harney Way between Arelious Walker Drive and Ingerson Avenue.
- Minimum height 40 ft A street wall to a minimum of 40 ft shall be built along Harney Way between Ingerson Avenue and Gilman Avenue, and on both sides of the Mini-wedge Community Park.

# S3. Towers

- Towers shall be located within the tower zones described in the Heights Section 4.2.2. If moved from the preferred location, towers shall be sited fronting major streets and/or frame parks and important public places, and shall require a shadow and wind analysis as per Section 4.2.5 and Section 4.2.6 respectively.
- No more than 5 towers shall be located within Candlestick South neighborhood. The towers on blocks 1 and 4a, if developed, shall not be relocated from the position shown. All other towers may be relocated within the tower zone. The view corridor indicated in 5.2.1 must be maintained.

# S4. Mid-block Breaks

- Shall be provided within the blocks indicated on Figure 5.9. Actual locations may vary slightly from that shown; however, all blocks indicated must contain a mid-block break.

# S5. CPSRA Edge

- A publicly accessible walkway/emergency access shall be provided as shown in Figure 5.9.

## Guidelines

## G1. Encouraged Ground Floor Commercial

- Additional ground floor commercial is encouraged along the Bayview Gardens Wedge Destination Park and Mini-wedge Community Park.
- Encouraged use is neighborhood-serving retail.
- Retail uses when provided are encouraged to be located at street corners, particularly the corner of Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way.

### G2. Important Intersections

- The corners of Arelious Walker Drive and Harney Way, and Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue are important intersections, serving as either gateways into the site or zones of high pedestrian activity. Architectural elements should be utilized to accentuate and differentiate these intersections.

## G3. Height Variation

- For buildings along Harvey Way, building heights are encouraged to be varied to add architectural interest to the streetscape.



#### Legend





(#)

S5 – State Park Edge

Park

- G1 Encouraged Ground Floor Commercial
- G2 Important Intersections
- Block Numbers

2016 CANDLESTICK POINT DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT



# Implementation

6.1 Design Review Process

# 6 Implementation

# 6.1 Design Review Process

#### Implementation

Implementation of this D4D shall be in accordance with the BVHP Plan as well as any disposition and development agreement or owner participation agreement entered into by the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco, as more fully described below.

### **Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan**

Candlestick lies within Zone 1 of the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area. This D4D provides the detailed design standards and guidelines for development within Zone 1 of this Redevelopment Project Area.

### **Review and Approval of Design Documents**

Any disposition and development agreement pertaining to Candlestick (Zone 1) shall abide by the Design Review and Document Approval Procedure (DRDAP). The DRDAP shall establish the processes by which applications for various Agency approvals required under a disposition and development agreement or owner participation agreement are to be submitted and reviewed by the Agency and other City agencies as well as the standards by which such approvals are to be granted by the Agency. The DRDAP shall further establish the processes and timelines for Agency review of architectural and design documents – such as schematic design documents, design development documents, and construction documents – for various improvements within the area subject to the disposition and development agreement or owner participation agreement.

In addition, it is anticipated that the Agency and City agencies having jurisdiction over the development contemplated by this Design for Development will enter into one or more Interagency Cooperation Agreements that will set forth the City agencies' obligations in connection with review and approval of applications pursuant to the DRDAP as well as review and approval of various permits, subdivision maps, and other authorizations required from the City.

As provided in the BVHP Plan, Agency review of any application relating to development within Candlestick shall be evaluated for consistency with the standards set forth in the Redevelopment Plan and the standards set forth in this D4D and shall follow the process set forth in the applicable DRDAP.

### Variances

The owner or developer of any property that is subject to this D4D may make a written request for a variance from the development standards, design guidelines, or any other provision within this D4D or the BVHP Plan pursuant to Section VII of the BVHP Plan. Such request for a variance shall state fully the grounds of the application and the facts pertaining thereto.

The Redevelopment Agency Commission may grant a variance from the development controls of this D4D or the BVHP Plan under the following circumstances:

- Due to unique physical constraints or other extraordinary circumstances applicable to the property, the enforcement of development regulations without a variance would otherwise result in practical difficulties for development and create undue hardship for the property owner or developer or constitute an unreasonable limitation beyond the intent of the BVHP Plan; and
- The granting of a variance would be in harmony with the goals of the BVHP Plan and would not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to neighboring property or improvements in the vicinity.

The Agency's determination to grant or deny a variance will be final and will not be appealable to the Planning Department.

### **Process for Amendment**

Amendments to this D4D shall be approved by both the San Francisco Planning Commission and the Agency Commission.



# Jamestown

7.1	General Description
7.2	Standards & Guidelines
73	Urban Design

# 7 Jamestown

#### Section Summary

This section describes the standards and guidelines that are specifically applicable to the Jamestown neighborhood. The Jamestown neighborhood is not contemplated for development by Master Developer of the Candlestick or Shipyard project. However, given the neighborhood forms part of the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan, development standards and guidelines are still required in the event that development is contemplated by current or future landowners. Incorporating development standards and guidelines for Jamestown into the D4D also ensures that any future development outcomes will be coordinated and consistent with the planning for Candlestick.

Consistent with Sections 4 and 5 of this D4D, standards are mandatory actions, generally described in absolute terms such as by measurement or location. Guidelines are encouraged actions, which if adhered to in spirit will result in projects that best fit the vision for the site.

Where a standard or guideline is not specifically provided for in this section for the Jamestown lots, the standards and guidelines contained in Section 4 shall apply.

# 7.1 General Description

The Jamestown neighborhood is located to the west of Candlestick Center on Jamestown Avenue. Lying above the rest of Candlestick along Jamestown Avenue, the neighborhood offers panoramic views to the Bay and new development below, and serves as a picturesque transition between Bayview Hill and Candlestick. The neighborhood has excellent connection to the Candlestick Center, providing residents with have access via Jamestown Avenue and Griffith Street.

The vision for Jamestown is a neighborhood that is predominantly residential with a blend of low-rise and mid-rise buildings that step with the sloping terrain while taking advantage of the opportunity for views of the Bay. The amenity of the neighborhood is expected to be reinforced through a pedestrian connection to the Candlestick Center.



Park
 Neighborhood Boundary

Development Block

Street – Public Right of Way

Public Easement – Mid-block Break

# 7.2 Standards & Guidelines

# 7.2.1 Block Plan

### Standards

Block dimensions are shown in Figure 7.1 for all development blocks within the Jamestown neighborhood. The table below indicates the area of each development block in the neighborhood. Final dimensions and areas will be defined in the sub-division mapping process where required.

# Table 7.1Jamestown Block Areas

JAMESTOWN BLOCK AREAS		
BLOCK NUMBER	AREA (acres)	
1	3.55	
2	1.75	
3	1.51	
Total *	6.81	

\* Total does not include open spaces and streets.

# 7.2.2 Land Use & Built Form

# Standards

- Land uses shall be in accordance with the Residential Mixed Use District in the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan.
- Lower buildings shall be sited on the northern portion of the parcel, with higher buildings to the south.
- Pedestrian linkages to the trail system on Bayview Hill shall be provided from the development parcel.
- Buildings shall be located to form a strong street wall along Jamestown Avenue, while maintaining breaks that relate to the surrounding street system.
- All other land use standards for Jamestown shall be consistent with those outlined Section 4.1.

# Guidelines

- Buildings should take advantage of the rising grade through terracing

   along the sloping roadway and corresponding to the grade change of Bayview Hill while creating opportunities for rooftop terraces.
   Building masses should be clustered to reduce the overall scale, while providing access points to the Bayview Hill open space.
- Where provided, parking structures should be terraced against Bayview Hill. The rooftop areas should be used for private common open spaces.
- All other land use guidelines for Jamestown shall be consistent with those outlined in Section 4.1.

# 7.2.3 Building Height

# Standards

• Building heights in the Jamestown neighborhood shall be in accordance with Figure 7.4.



# Legend



High-Rise Tower Location\*

Fixed high-rise location

# 7.2.4 Street Wall Conditions

# Standards

• Street wall conditions in the Jamestown neighborhood shall be in accordance with Figure 7.3.



# Legend

- Low-rise Residential Mixed-Use District
- Mid-rise Residential Mixed-Use District
- Mid-block Break Pedestrian Mews or Vehicular Laneway
- Mid-block Break Pedestrian Mews only
- Mid-block Break Commercial

\* See Section 4.2.2 for allowable location zones for high-rise.

# 7.3 Urban Design

Refer to Figure 7.4 for the location of the following standards and guidelines.

## Standards

# S1. Street Wall Height

 Minimum height 30 ft – A residential street wall to a minimum of 30 ft shall be built along Jamestown Avenue.

### S2. Development Pattern Extension

 Development shall respond to the surrounding street pattern of Griffith Street and Gilroy Street by providing consistent site access along these axes.

# S3. Street Network

- Jamestown Avenue services all lots in this neighborhood. Accordingly, there are no additional public roads required.

# S4. Parking

- On-street parallel car parking bays shall be provided having regard to Section 4.5.2.

# Guidelines

### G1. Building Scale

 Buildings should be designed with lower heights (maximum 65 ft) on Lots 2 and 3 in order to blend with the surrounding neighborhood.

### G2. Building Siting / Massing

- Buildings should respond to the grades of Jamestown Avenue and Bayview Hill. See standards Section 4.2.3.

#### G3. Private Open Space

- Buildings should provide generous rooftop and patio open spaces, taking advantage of the views to the bay.
- All exposed parking roof-decks should be landscaped in a manner that provides a transition to the natural landscape of and blend with the Bayview Hill.

#### G4. Views

- Buildings should be designed to maximize the views from the Jamestown parcel, which is roughly 80 ft higher that the rest of the development and has spectacular exposure.

# G5. Connection to CP Center

- An additional pedestrian connection is encouraged between Jamestown and CP Center.



# Legend

- S1 Residential Street Wall 30 ft Minimum
- S2 Development Pattern Extension
- S3 Street Design
- S4 Parking
- G5 Encouraged Pedestrian Connection
- Park
- # Block Number



# **Shipyard South R&D Option**

attes dates

8.1 General Description

# 8 Shipyard South R&D Option

# 8.1 General Description

The CPHPS2 Disposition and Development Agreement includes a mixture of housing and R&D in the southern portion of the Shipyard. The CPHPS2 Final Environmental Impact Report analyzed and approved a number of variants, including a scenario where the Shipyard South neighborhood is developed as exclusively R&D. This would result in 5.0 million sq ft of R&D at the Shipyard, with up to 1,625 residential units shifted from the Shipyard to Candlestick.

This section outlines how the additional density at Candlestick would be accommodated should the R&D Option be implemented by the Master Developer.

# 8.1.1 Building Heights

In the Shipyard South R&D Option, up to 1,625 units may be transferred from the Shipyard to Candlestick. To reflect the change:

- The maximum height of the mid-rise buildings along the west side of Harney Way between Ingerson Avene and Egbert Avenue (including the podiums for Tower F and Tower D if located on Harney Way) would be increased to 105 ft;
- The maximum height of buildings along the east side of Harney Way between Ingerson Avenue and Hollister Avenue (including the podium of Tower I) would be increased to 85 ft; and
- **3.** The height of buildings along the east side of Earl Street between Gilman Avenue and Egbert Avenue (including the podium of Tower C) would increase from 65 ft to 85 ft.

All other heights, including towers, would remain the same as the baseline option. The revised heights diagram is shown in Figure 8.1.



Encouraged high-rise location

Allowable high-rise location zone

\* See Table 4.1 for maximum heights.

Note: For Jamestown lots, see Section 7.

Project Boundary

Mid-Block Breaks

Maximum Percentage of Developable Area (see Section 4.2.2)

/////

XX%



214 SECTION 8 - HP SOUTH R&D OPTION



# Appendix

- 9.1 Appendix A Term Definitions
- 9.2 Appendix B Block Plans
- 9.3 Appendix C Case Studies

# 9 Appendix

# 9.1 Appendix A – Term Definitions

Agency	The office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, or Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency.
Block	An area of land bounded by public lands, including streets or parks.
Building	Any structure having a roof supported by columns or walls.
Building Entry	Any point of a building associated with the accessibility of the user, not including service or loading access.
Building Face	The major or primary plane of the exterior wall of the building. The term is often used in context with its relationship to an adjacent street or public area.
Building Height	The vertical distance between finished grade and the top of a building. The building top is defined as the top of the finished roof in the case of a flat roof, and the average height of the rise in the case of a pitched or stepped roof.
Building Projection	A portion of the building that extends beyond the primary building face, either into a setback or beyond the property line.
Build-to Line	The primary building face, of which a certain percentage of the building must be built to.
Bulk	The maximum physical dimensions of built volume. Standards include maximum plan dimension and maximum floor plate size.
Class I Bicycle	Spaces in secure, weather-protected facilities
Parking Space(s)	intended for use as long-term, overnight, and work-
	day bicycle storage by dwelling unit residents, non-
	residential occupants, and Employees.
	Disvelo reaks located in a publicly accessible
Darking Space(a)	bicycle racks located in a publicly-accessible,
Farking Space(s)	short-term use by visitors, guests, and patrons to the
	building or use.

Court	Any space on a lot other than a yard which, from a point not more than two ft above the floor line of the lowest story in the building on the lot in which there are windows from rooms abutting and served by the court, is open and unobstructed to the sky, except for obstructions permitted by the San Francisco Planning Code. An "outer court" is a court, one entire side or end of which is bounded by a front setback, a rear yard, a side yard, a front lot line, a street, or an alley. An "inner court" is any court which is not an outer court.
Dwelling Unit	A residential use that consists of a suite of one or more rooms and includes sleeping, bathing, cooking, and eating facilities.
Façade	Any vertical exterior face or wall of a building that is adjacent to or fronts on a street, public or semi-private right-of-way, park, or plaza.
Floor Area, Gross	The sum of the gross areas of the several floors of a building or buildings, measured from the exterior faces of exterior walls or from the centerlines of walls separating two buildings. Where columns are outside and separated from an exterior wall (curtain wall) which encloses the building space or are otherwise so arranged that the curtain wall is clearly separate from the structural members, the exterior face of the curtain wall shall be the line of measurement, and the area of the columns themselves at each floor shall also be counted.
Floor Area Ratio	The ratio of the gross floor area of all the buildings on a lot to the area of the lot. In cases in which portions of the gross floor area of a building project horizontally beyond the lot lines, all such projecting gross floor area shall also be included in determining the floor area ratio.
Floor, Ground	The lowest story of a building, other than a basement or cellar as defined in the Building Code.
Focal Point	An area within the public realm that is at a major intersection or within the park system, which will have a high degree of pedestrian use due to the immediately adjacent uses.

Gateway	A primary vehicular or pedestrian point of entry into the development project, typically at a key intersection between two or more public streets.
Ground Floor Retail Required	The percentage of building frontage facing the street that requires ground floor space suitable for retail use.
Guideline	Design recommendations for both private and public design and construction activities within the development project.
Live / Work Unit	A structure or portion of a structure combining a residential living space for a household or group of persons with an integrated work space principally used by one or more of the residents of that unit. Work spaces uses in a Live/Work Unit must comply with the other non-residential uses allowed within the respective land use District.
Modulation	Major variation in the massing, height, or setback of a building (as a means of reducing the structure's perceived bulk).
Neighborhood Retail	A commercial use that provides goods and/or services directly to the customer, whose primary clientele is customers who live or work nearby and who can access the establishment directly from the street in a walk-in basis. This use may provide goods and/or services to the business community, provided that it also serves the general public. This use would include those that sell, for example, groceries, personal toiletries, magazines, smaller scale comparison shopping; personal services such as laundromats, health clubs, formula retail outlets, hair or nail salons; and uses designed to attract customers from the surrounding neighborhood. Retail uses can also include outdoor activity areas, open air sales areas, and walk- up facilities (such as ATMs or window service) related to the retail sale or service use and need not be granted separate approvals for such features.
Property Line	The boundary line between two pieces of property.

Regional Ret	tail	A commercial use that provides goods and/or services directly to the customer, whose primary clientele is customers who live throughout the surrounding region and may include both small and large format tenants up to 120,000 square feet. This use would include those who sell apparel, electronics, furniture, durable goods, specialty items, formula retail outlets, and other more expensive, and less frequently purchased items; beyond the surrounding neighborhood. Regional Retail sales and services can include counter and other walk-up facilities as well as adjacent outdoor activity areas accessory to such uses.
Setback		A required distance that the Building Face shall be built in relation to the property line. Buildings with a setback of zero ft are built at the property line.
Setback, Lan	dscaping	The portion of the required setback area that shall be and remain unpaved and devoted to plant material, including the use of native/drought resistant plant material.
Setback, Red	quired	The minimum required distance between a building or a structure and the adjacent public right-of-way line; or any adjacent private vehicle access way easement, excluding private driveways; or any interior property line. A required distance that the Building Face shall be built in relation to the property line. Buildings with a setback of zero ft are built at the property line.
Mid-block Br	reak	A pedestrian pathway that provides a mid-block connection - either between parallel street frontages or between street frontages and rear parking areas. Mid-block breaks are landscaped and may also include front doors to residential or retail uses. They are intended for public pedestrian use and provided through public easements over private land.
Standard		The specific rules or measures establishing a level of quality or quantity, or a condition that must be complied with or satisfied

Stepback	The distance that upper levels of a building may be set back from the primary building face.
Street	A right-of-way, 30 ft or more in width, permanently dedicated to common and general use by the public, including any avenue, drive, boulevard, or similar way, but not including any freeway or highway without a general right of access for abutting properties.
Street Property Line	The boundary line between a street and an abutting property.
Streetwall	A continuous façade of buildings generally built along the property line facing a street or open space.
Tower Bustle	A portion of a tower that extends horizontally past the main vertical form of the building. Generally confined to the lower four to six floors of the tower.
Units Massing	The overall exterior shape of a building or structure; the proportion aspect of the elements of the form.
Use	The purpose for which land or a structure, or both, are designed, constructed, arranged or intended, or for which they are occupied or maintained, let or leased.
Wall	Any streetwall area that is not transparent, including solid doors and mechanical area wall(s).
Vehicular Laneway	A vehicular access way located on a private parcel, but having a public easement over it.

# 9.2 Appendix B – Block Plans

Block plans for the four neighborhoods are provided as reference. They indicate the block and street dimensions.

# 9.2.1 Alice Griffith – Block Plan

Block dimensions are shown in Figure 9.1 for all development blocks within the Alice Griffith neighborhood.

The chart below indicates the area of each development block in the neighborhood. Final dimension and areas will be defined by the sub-division mapping process.

# Table 9.1 Alice Griffith Block Areas

ALICE GRIFFITH BLOCK AREA	s
BLOCK NUMBER	AREA (acres)
1	1.45
2	1.23
4	1.23
5	0.81
6	0.80
7	0.82
8	0.72
9	1.02
11	1.03
12	1.14
13	1.13
14	0.79
15	0.75
16	1.11
17	1.12
18	1.31
19	1.35
20	1.22
TOTAL*	19.02

\* Total does not include open spaces and streets.



Neighborhood Boundary

Development Block

Street – Public Right of Way

(Pedestrian connection between along Griffith St. between Fitzgerald Ave. and Gilman Ave.)

Public Easement – Mid-block Breaks

# 9.2.2 Candlestick North – Block Plan

Block dimensions are shown in Figure 9.2 for all development blocks within the Candlestick North neighborhood. Certain corners are rounded to accommodate bus and fire truck turning radii (see Section 4.1.1).

The chart below indicates the area of each development block in the neighborhood. Final dimension and areas will be defined in the sub-division mapping process.

CANDLESTICK NORTH BLOCK	AREAS
BLOCK NUMBER	AREA (acres)
1a	1.45
1b	1.45
2a	1.31
2b	1.31
3a	1.40
3b	1.50
4a	1.14
4b	1.16
5a	1.00
5b	1.00
6a	1.00
6b	0.96
7a	1.16
7b	1.28
8a	1.27
8b	1.36
9a	1.42
9b	1.52
10a	1.31
10b	1.31
11a	1.46
11b	1.46
12	3.12
TOTAL*	31.35

Table 9.2Candlestick North Block Areas

\* Total does not include open spaces and streets


#### Legend

Neighborhood Boundary

# Development Block

Parks

- Street - Public Right of Way
- ///// Public Easement – Mid-block Break

# 9.2.3 Candlestick Center – Block Plan

Block dimensions are shown in Figure 9.3 for the Candlestick Center neighborhood development block. Certain corners are rounded to accommodate bus and fire truck turning radii.

The chart below indicates the area of the development block in the neighborhood. Final dimension and areas will be defined in the sub-division mapping process.

#### Table 9.3Candlestick Center Block Areas

CANDLESTICK CENTER BLOCK AREAS	
BLOCK NUMBER	AREA (acres)
1	22.29
Total *	22.29

\* Total does not include open spaces and streets



#### Legend

- Parks/Plaza
- Neighborhood Boundary
- Development Block
- Street Public Right of Way
- Public Easement Mid-block Break

# 9.2.4 Candlestick South – Block Plan

Parcel dimensions are included shown in Figure 9.4 for all development blocks within the Candlestick South Neighborhood. Certain corners are rounded to accommodate bus and fire truck turning radii (see Section 4.1.1).

The chart below indicates the area of each development block in the neighborhood. Final dimension and areas will be defined in the sub-division mapping process.

#### Table 9.4 Candlestick South Block Areas

CANDLESTICK SOUTH BLOCK	AREAS
BLOCK NUMBER	AREA (acres)
1	1.70
2a	0.77
2b	1.03
3	0.31
4a	1.05
4b	1.03
5	0.31
6a	1.15
6b	1.15
7a	1.08
7b	1.25
8a	1.21
8b	1.21
9a	1.25
9b	1.26
10a	1.30
10b	0.94
11a	1.53
11b	1.32
12a	1.62
12b	1.44
TOTAL*	23.90

\* Total does not include open spaces and streets



# Legend

Park Neighborhood Boundary

# Development Block

Street - Public Right of Way

///// Public Easement – Mid-block Break

# 9.3 Appendix C – Additional Studies

A number of additional studies have been developed for a variety of parcels. These may help to inform design decisions, regarding the Standards and Guidelines set forth in this document. These studies were undertaken prior to the formulation of the D4D and may not conform to current block configurations and/or al Standards and Guidelines.

# 9.3.1 Alice Griffith – Additional Studies

A representative block study for a block containing predominantly low-rise flats has been included for reference. In this study, a mixture of townhomes and flats wraps an internal garage. An internal courtyard is located on the parking rooftop. The parking garage is shown at grade, but could be built underground in order to create a stoop condition for at-grade units.



#### Legend

Park Street
 Local Street
 Townhomes
 Low-rise Flats
 Parking Rooftop Landscaping



# 9.3.2 Candlestick North – Additional Studies

A representative block study for a mixed-use block containing low-rise flats and townhomes, as well as mid-rise and high-rise flats has been included for reference. In this study, mainly low-rise flats are located over retail. Townhomes front the pedestrian mews in order to create a human scale. Above grade parking is screened by at-grade retail or residential uses. A high-rise tower anchors one corner of the retail street, with the main tower mass meeting the street. A mid-rise bustle extends from the tower, framing an important park.





1	Retail Street
2	Local Street
3	Pedestrian Mews
4	Townhomes along Mews
5	Flats over Retail
6	Low-rise Flats
7	Mid-rise bustle frames Wedge Park
(8)	High-rise tower anchors corner.





# 9.3.3 Candlestick South – Additional Studies

A representative block study for a mixed-use block containing low-rise and high-rise flats, and retail has been included for reference. In this study, low-rise flats are located above retail along the main street. A laneway separates the two portions of the block, serving as loading access for retail, as well as parking access. A high-rise tower and accompanying lowrise flats wrap a parking structure, with private open space located above the parking rooftop.



#### Legend

1	Retail Street
2	Local Street
3	Laneway
4	Flats over Retail
5	Low-rise Flats lining F Podium
6	High-rise Tower
7	Podium Landscaping

Parking



#### CANDLESTICK POINT D4D PROJECT REFINEMENTS SCHEDULE – 2010 APPROVED VS. 2016 PROPOSED

Project Item	Approved (2010 D4D)	
	3D Rendering (Page 1)	3D Rendering (Page 1)
	Figure 2.1: Illustrative Plan – Baseline Option (Page 22)	Figure 2.1: Illustrative Plan (I
	Figure 2.1a: Illustrative Plan – Non-Stadium Housing Option (Page 23)	3D Renderings (Page 35)
	Figure 2.1b: Illustrative Plan – Non-Stadium R&D Option (Page 24)	Figure 3.2: Candlestick Illustr
	3D Renderings (Page 39)	3D Renderings (Page 50 & 51
	Figure 3.2: Candlestick Illustrative Site Plan – Baseline Option (Page 53)	Table 4.3: Maximum High-ris
	3D Renderings (Page 54 & 55)	Figure 4.3: Building Heights (
	Figure 3.2a: Illustrative Site Plan – Shipyard Non-Stadium Housing Option (Page 57)	Table 4.6: Street Wall Standa
	Table 4.1: Maximum High-rise Building Heights – Baseline Option (Page 89)	Figure 4.4: Street Wall Condi
	Figure 4.3: Building Heights – Baseline Option (Page 90)	Figure 4.11: High-rise – Mixe
	Figure 4.3a: Building Heights – Shipyard Non-stadium Option (Page 91)	Figure 4.6: High-rise – Candle
Tower Delegations	Figure 4.4: Street Wall Conditions (Page 99)	3D Rendering (Pages 161 & 1
I ower Relocations	Figure 4.6: Mixed Use High Rise (Page 101)	Figure 5.6: Candlestick Cente
	Figure 4.11: Residential High Rise (Page 106)	Figure 5.7: Candlestick Cente
	3D Rendering (Pages 169, 179)	Figure 5.8: Candlestick South
	Figure 5.8: Candlestick Center Illustrative Site Plan (Page 189)	3D Rendering (Page 189)
	Figure 5.11: Candlestick South Illustrative Site Plan (Page 201)	Figure 5.9: Candlestick South
	3D Rendering (Page 203)	Figure 7.2: Building Heights (
	Figure 5.13: Candlestick South Urban Design (Page 208)	Figure 8.1: Building Heights -
	3D Rendering (Page 215)	3D Rendering (Page 236)
	3D Rendering (Page 238)	All items above upda
	All items above show Tower G in middle of CP Center	intersection of Arelia
	All items above show Tower J and K 100 ft closer to Harney Way	All items above upda
		Way
	3D Rendering (Page 1, 39, 54 & 55)	3D Rendering (Page 1, 35, 50
	Table 4.1: Maximum High-rise Building Heights – Baseline Option (Page 89)	Table 4.1: Building Types (Pa
	Figure 4.3: Building Heights – Baseline Option (Page 90)	Section 4.2.2: Height (Page 8
	Figure 4.3a: Building Heights – Shipyard Non-stadium Option (Page 91)	Table 4.3: Maximum High-ris
	Table 4.4: Street Wall Standards (Page 98)	Figure 4.3: Building Heights (
	Figure 4.4: Street Wall Conditions (Page 99)	Table 4.5: Massing – All Build
	Figure 4.5: Mixed-use Low-rise (Page 100)	Table 4.6: Street Wall Standa
	Figure 4.14: Commercial (Page 109)	Figure 4.4: Street Wall Condi
	Section 4.3.1 B: Commercial: Retail and Mixed-Use (Page 121)	Figure 4.5: Mid-Rise – Candle
	Section 4.3.1 B: Commercial: Performance Venue (Page 123)	Figure 4.14: Landmark Buildi
	3D Rendering (Pages 169 & 179)	Section 4.3.1 B: Commercial
	Figure 5.8: Candlestick Center Illustrative Site Plan (Page 189)	Section 4.3.1 B: Commercial
Height Increases	Section 5.3.3: Candlestick Center – Urban Design (Page 194)	3D Rendering (Pages 161 & 1
	Figure 5.11: Candlestick South Illustrative Site Plan (Page 201)	Figure 5.6: Candlestick Cente
	Figure 5.13: Candlestick South Urban Design (Page 203)	Section 5.3.2: Candlestick Ce
	3D Rendering (Page 203, 215 & 238)	Figure 5.7: Candlestick Cente
	• All items above show 65 ft buildings along both sides of Harney Way and	Figure 5.8: Candlestick South
	Ingerson Avenue at CP Center	3D Rendering (Page 189)
	• All items above show 85 ft building at south-east corner of CP Center at	Figure 5.9: Candlestick South
	intersection of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue.	Figure 8.1: Building Heights -
		3D Rendering (Page 236)
		All items above show
		Ingerson Avenue at (
		All items above show
		intersection of Harn

#### Proposed (2016 D4D)

Page 21)

rative Site Plan (Page 49)

1)

se Podium Heights and Building Heights (Page 84)

(Page 85)

ards (Pages 92 & 93)

itions (Page 94)

ed Use Residential District (Page 101)

estick Center Frame (Page 96)

169)

er Illustrative Site Plan (Page 177)

er Illustrative Site Plan (Page 183)

n Illustrative Site Plan (Page 187)

h Urban Design (Page 192) (Page 205) – Shipyard South R&D Option (Page 214)

ated to show Tower G in south-west area of CP Center at ous Walker Drive and Jamestown Avenue ated to show Tower J and J 100 ft further east of Harney

0 & 51) age 81) 31) se Podium Heights and Building Heights (Page 84) (Page 85) ding Types (Page 87) ards (Pages 92 & 93) itions (Page 94) estick Center Frame (Page 95) ing (Page 104) Retail and Mixed-Use (Page 116) : Landmark Building (Page 118) 169) er Illustrative Site Plan (Page 177) enter – Urban Design (Page 180) er Illustrative Site Plan (Page 183) n Illustrative Site Plan (Page 187) u Urban Design (Page 192) - Shipyard South R&D Option (Page 214) w 80 ft buildings along both sides of Harney Way and

W 80 ft buildings along both sides of Harney Way and CP Center (including building at south-west corner of w 120 ft building at south-east corner of CP Center at ey Way and Ingerson Avenue.

Project Item	Approved (2010 D4D)	Proposed (2016 D4D)
	Section 4.3.2 I: Building Signage (Pages 143-146)	Section 4.4: Signage (Pages 138-139)
	Preamble	Section retitled and relocated
	General	Revised preamble
	Intent, Guidelines (Location, Legibility, Materials, Style, Orientation, Lighted	Revised "Intent" description
	Signs)	Remove specific "Commercial Signage" standards
	Commercial Signage Standards	Remove specific "Residential Signage" standards
Revised signage language	Area Calculation, Electrical Services, Sign Types (Window Signs, Wall Signs,	<ul> <li>New guideline – "Variety"</li> </ul>
	Projecting Signs, Signs on Awnings, Nameplate)	<ul> <li>Revised guideline – "Style"</li> </ul>
	Residential Signage Standards	Revised guideline – "Orientation"
	• Common Entrance Signage – Area, Sign Types (Wall Signs, Projecting Signs, Signs	<ul> <li>Revised guideline – "Lighted Signs"</li> </ul>
	on Awnings)	<ul> <li>New guideline – "Safety"</li> </ul>
	Individual Entrance Signage – Area, Sign Types (Nameplate)	<ul> <li>New guideline – "New Technology Signs"</li> </ul>
	Temporary Signage	<ul> <li>Revised guideline – "Temporary Signage"</li> </ul>
	Contractors, For Sale / Lease, Public Events	<ul> <li>Revised guideline – "Prohibited Signage"</li> </ul>
	Prohibited Signage	Revised imagery
	Imagery	
		Table 4.3: Maximum High-rise Podium Heights and Building Heights (Page 84)
		Table retitled and new column added
		• The following podium heights corresponding to the heights in Figure 4.3
		• Tower A, B, C, E, G, H, I, J, K, L – 65 ft
	II/a	• Tower D – 65 ft fronting Gilman, 85 ft fronting Harney
		• Tower F – 85 ft
Tower pediums		• Notation identifying taller podium heights for Towers C, D, F, I under Shipyard
		R&D Option (Section 8) corresponding to Figure 8.1.
		Section 4.3.2: Bulk & Massing (Page 87)
	n/a	• New provision in Section 4.3.2 specifying high-rise buildings may have a podium
	ny a	up to the height specific in Table 3, and that the massing and bulk controls apply
		respectively to the relevant section of the building.
	n/a	Table 4.5: Massing – All Building Types
		New footnote added to Massing Image specifying that podiums are permitted.
	Figure 4.6: Mixed Use High Rise (Page 101)	Figures 4.7 through 4.12 (Pages 97 to 102)
	Minimum retail height of 12 ft	FLOOR TO FLOOR HEIGHT – Where applicable, a ground floor commercial use is
		to have a minimum noor-to-noor neight of 15 ft.
Minimum ground floor rotail baight in Candlastick Mixed Use		Section 4.3.1 A. Building Types, Residential General (Page 110)
Posidontial District	liya	Ground Floor Height – Where applicable, a ground hoor commercial use shall     have a minimum floor to floor height of 15 ft
	Section 4.3.1 B: Commercial: Retail and Mixed-Use (Page 121)	A 3.1 B: Commercial: Retail and Mixed Use (Page 116)
	<ul> <li>Store Height and Denth – All retail spaces shall be a minimum of 12 ft height</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Store Height and Denth – All retail spaces other than those on both sides of</li> </ul>
		Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue at CP Center and large format retail
		storeliners shall have a minimum height of 15 ft.
	Section 4.3.1 D: Parking Structure (Page 128)	Section 4.3.1 D: Parking Structure (Page 123)
	Maximum combined parking & loading entry width 24 ft	• Except where provided for elsewhere in D4D, the maximum garage entry width
		may be increased from 24 ft to 27 ft for combined parking and loading, or where
		extra width is needed to accommodate emergency services or utility providers.
Parking garage entry widths and curb cuts	Section 4.4.3: Loading, Mechanical Equipment and Meters (Page 152)	Section 4.4.3: Loading, Mechanical Equipment and Meters (Page 144)
	Maximum curb cut width 24 ft	• Except where provided for elsewhere in the D4D, the maximum curb cut width
		may be increased from 24 ft to 27 ft for combined parking and loading, or where
		extra width is needed to accommodate emergency services or utility providers.
	Figure 2.1: Illustrative Plan – Baseline Option (Page 22)	Figure 2.1: Illustrative Plan – Baseline Option (Page 21)
CP Center internal access	Figure 2.1a: Illustrative Plan – Non-Stadium Housing Option (Page 23)	Image: Density of residential and services is clustered around transit stops (Page 23)
	Image: Density of residential and services is clustered around transit stops (Page 27)	Image: Parks and Open Space Illustrative Plan (Page 24)

Project Item	Approved (2010 D4D)	
	Image: Parks and Open Space Illustrative Plan (Page 28)	Figure 2.2: Parks and Open S
	Figure 2.2: Parks and Open Space Network (Page 29)	Figure 2.3: Streets and Path
	Figure 2.3: Streets and Path Network (Page 31)	Figure 2.4: BRT Route and W
	Figure 2.4: BRT Route and Walking Radii (Page 33)	Figure 2.5: Pedestrian and B
	Figure 2.5: Pedestrian and Bicycle Network (Page 37)	Figure 2.6: Urban Placemaki
	Figure 2.6: Urban Placemaking (Page 41)	Figure 2.7: Character Neighb
	Figure 2.7: Character Neighborhoods (Page 43)	Figure 3.1: Urban Placemaki
	Figure 3.1: Urban Placemaking (Page 50)	Figure 3.2: Candlestick Illust
	Figure 3.2: Candlestick Illustrative Site Plan – Baseline Option (Page 53)	Figure 3.3: Public Streets Ne
	Figure 3.2a: Illustrative Site Plan – Shipyard Non-Stadium Housing Option (Page 57)	Figure 3.4: Parks and Open S
	Figure 3.10: Conceptual Plan – Candlestick Point State Recreation Area	Figure 3.10: Conceptual Plan
	Figure 4.1: Development Blocks (Page 83)	Figure 4.1: Development Blo
	Figure 4.2: Land Use Districts (Page 85)	Figure 4.2: Land Use Districts
	Figure 4.3: Building Heights – Baseline Option (Page 90)	Figure 4.3: Building Heights (
	Figure 4.3a: Building Heights – Shipyard Non-Stadium Housing Option (Page 91)	Figure 4.4: Street Wall Cond
	Figure 4.4: Street Wall Conditions (Page 99)	Figure 4.15: On-Street Parkin
	Figure 4.15: On-Street Parking Locations (Page 151)	Figure 5.1: Character Neighb
	Figure 5.1: Character Neighborhoods (Page 103)	Figure 5.6. Candlestick Center
	Figure 5.6. California (Page 103)	Figure 3.7. Candiestick Center
	Figure 5.0. Conductick Center Urban Design (Page 197)	Figure 7.2: Building Heights
	Figure 5.15: Jamestown Urban Design (Page 219)	Figure 7 3: Street Wall Condi
	Appendix : Candlestick Center – Additional Studies (Page 233)	Figure 7.4: Jamestown Urba
	Extension of Earl Street and O Street through the middle of Candlestick Center	Figure 8 1: Building Heights -
	with a new roadway (Bill Walsh Street) created.	Figure 9.3: Candlestick Center
		<ul> <li>All items above show no</li> </ul>
		nor creation of Bill Wals
		pedestrian-only corridor
		alignment of Arelious W
		center of the site. Servio
		aligns with Earl Street ar
		south).
	Location Plan (Page 39)	Location Plan (Page 35)
	Location Plan (Page 54)	Location Plan (Page 50)
	Location Plan (Page 55)	Location Plan (Page 51)
	Image: Location of Retail Streets (Page 65)	Image: Location of Retail Str
	Image: Location of Boulevard Streets (Page 66)	Image: Location of Boulevare
	Image: Location of Local Streets (Page 67)	Image: Location of Local Stre
	Image: Location of Mid-block Breaks (Page 68)	Image: Location of Mid-block
	Image: Location of Alice Griffith Community Park (Page 71)	Image: Location of Alice Grif
	Image: Location of Candlestick Community Park – Final location to be determined in	Image: Location of Candlesti
	the future (Page 72)	the future (Page 66)
	Image: Location of Bayview Gardens / Wedge Destination Park (Page 73)	Image: Location of Bayview (
	Image: Location of Mini-wedge Community Park (Page 74)	Image: Location of Mini-web
	Image: Location of State Recreation Area and Pay Trail (Page 75)	Image: Location of State Rec
	Location Plan (Page 100)	Location Plan (Page OE)
	Location Plan (Page 101)	Location Plan (Page 06)
	Location Plan (Page 102)	Location Plan (Page 30)
	Location Plan (Page 103)	Location Plan (Page 08)
	Location Plan (Page 104)	Location Plan (Page 00)
	Location Plan (Page 105)	Location Plan (Page 100)
	Location Plan (Page 106)	Location Plan (Page 100)

# Proposed (2016 D4D)

Space Network (Page 25) Network (Page 27) /alking Radii (Page 29) icycle Network (Page 33) ng (Page 37) oorhoods (Page 39) ng (Page 47) rative Site Plan (Page 49) etwork (Page 57) Space (Page 64) – Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (Page 72) ocks (Page 77) s (Page 79) (Page 85) itions (Page 94) ng Locations (Page 143) porhoods (Page 155) er Illustrative Site Plan (Page 177) er Urban Design (Page 183) 201) (Page 205) itions (Page 207) n Design (Page 209) – Shipyard South R&D Option (Page 214) er Block Plan (Page 228) extension of Earl Street or 8th Street into the CP Center sh Street. Access within the CP Center site via four rs. Three of these pedestrian corridors run parallel to the Valker Drive, and a fourth runs east-west through the ce vehicles permitted to use the pedestrian corridor that nd 8th Street for access in a one-way direction (north to

reets (Page 59) rd Streets (Page 60) reets (Page 61) ck Breaks (Page 62) iffith Community Park (Page 65) tick Community Park – Final location to be determined in

Gardens / Wedge Destination Park (Page 67) dge Community Park (Page 68) wn Hillside Community Park (Page 69) creation Area and Bay Trail (Page 70)

Project Item	Approved (2010 D4D)	
	Location Plan (Page 107)	Location Plan (Page 102)
	Location Plan (Page 108)	Location Plan (Page 103)
	Location Plan (Page 109)	Location Plan (Page 104)
	Image: Street block orientated at 45° to prevailing winds (Page 111)	Image: Street block orientat
	Location Plan (Page 158)	Location Plan (Page 150)
	Location Plan (Page 159)	Location Plan (Page 151)
	Location Plan (Page 164)	Location Plan (Page 156)
	Location Plan (Page 174)	Location Plan (Page 164)
	Location Plan (Page 186)	Location Plan (Page 174)
	Location Plan (Page 198)	Location Plan (Page 184)
	Location Plan (Page 210)	All items above show no
	• Extension of Earl Street and O Street through the middle of Candlestick Center,	nor creation of Bill Wals
	with a new roadway (Bill Walsh Street) created.	
	Section 5.3.3: Candlestick Center – Urban Design (Pages 194-195)	Section 5.3.3: Candlestick C
	• Ground floor commercial to a minimum floor-to-floor height of 12 ft shall be	All references to Earl St
	located along Earl Street, and 8 <sup>th</sup> Street.	Center removed.
	• Bill Walsh Street shall have an attractive and safe pedestrian environment.	
	• There shall be at least two pedestrian entrances to the parking along Bill Walsh	
	Street to encourage greater pedestrian activity.	
		Section 5.3.2 S8 and G5: Are
		Arelious Walker Entry P
		Jamestown Avenue. To
Arelious Walker Entry Plaza	n/a	element of public doma
		onto plaza. Pedestrian r
		Figure 5.7: Candlestick Cent
		Location of Arelious Wa
	Section 4.3.1 D: Parking Structure (Page 128)	Section 4.3.1 D: Parking Stru
	Maximum combined parking & loading entry width 24 ft	• Except where provided
		may be increased from
		extra width is needed to
	Section 4.4.3: Loading, Mechanical Equipment and Meters (Page 152)	Section 4.4.3: Loading, Mec
	Maximum curb cut width 24 ft	Except where provided
Parking Garage Entry Widths & Curb Cuts for the CP Center		may be increased from
Parking Garage		extra width is needed to
		Section E 2.2 S7: Darking St
		The main entry for the
		maximum width of 50 f
	n/a	One garage entry larger
		provided it meets certa
	Section 4.3.1 D: Parking Structure (Page 128)	Section 5.2.2 G3: Grocery St
	Maximum combined parking & loading entry width 24 ft	Garage entry width and
Grocery Store Garage Door/Curb Cut Width	Section 4.4.3: Loading, Mechanical Equipment and Meters (Page 152)	wider than 27 ft provide
	Maximum curb cut width 24 ft	
	Section 4.3.1: Retail and Mixed Use (Page 121)	Section 4.3.1: Retail and Mi
Blank Facades	Blank walls not permitted	Blank walls not permitte
		below grade elevation r
	Section 4.4.2: On-street Parking (Page 151)	Section 4.5.2: On-street Par
	<ul> <li>Parallel parking spaces shall be a minimum of 7 ft by 22 ft; angled parking spaces</li> </ul>	No minimum dimension
Remove dimension of parallel parking spaces	shall be a minimum of 9 ft bv 18 ft.	

#### Proposed (2016 D4D)

ted at 45° to prevailing winds (Page 106)

o extension of Earl Street or 8th Street into the CP Center sh Street. CP Center detail left blank.

enter – Urban Design (Pages 194-195) reet, 8<sup>th</sup> Street and Bill Walsh Street within Candlestick

elious Walker Entry Plaza (Page 182) Plaza provided for within CP Center at intersection of be publicly accessible and designed as an integrated ain, with buildings having ground floor active uses facing needs to be prioritized over vehicles.

ter Urban Design (Page 183)

alker Entry Plaza shown

ucture (Page 123)

for elsewhere in D4D, the maximum garage entry width 24 ft to 27 ft for combined parking and loading, or where o accommodate emergency services or utility providers.

hanical Equipment and Meters (Page 144)

for elsewhere in the D4D, the maximum curb cut width 24 ft to 27 ft for combined parking and loading, or where o accommodate emergency services or utility providers.

ructure

CP Center garage along Arelious Walker Drive may have a t provided it meets certain design requirements. r than 27 ft wide may be permitted off Ingerson Avenue

in design requirements.

tore (Page 171) I curb cut for grocery store at Candlestick North may be ed certain design requirements are met.

xed Use (Page 116) ed, except for essential building service areas or where makes it unfeasible. rking ns stated.

Project Item	Approved (2010 D4D)	
Naighborhood rotail parking ratio	Section 4.4: Off-Street Parking (Page 148)	Table 4.7: Maximum Off-Str
	Neighborhood Retail – N/A, shared with Regional Retail	Neighborhood Retail – 1
	Section 4.3.1 B: Commercial – Hotel (Page 124)	Section 4.3.1 B: Commercial
	• A maximum of two curb-cuts shall be allowed on Earl Street or 8th Street for the	• Parking, loading entries
	provision of passage drop off and loading.	entries to be combined
		garages within CP Cente
	Figure 5.8: Candlestick Center Illustrative Site Plan (Page 189)	Figure 5.6: Candlestick Cent
	Hotel shown in location in middle of CP Center	Hotel shown in location
CP Center Hotel location	Section 5.3.3 G3: Candlestick Center Urban Design (Page 195)	Section 5.3.3 G3: Candlestic
	• A hotel location designated at the center of the neighborhood. This location may	A hotel location is allow
	change within the neighborhood.	prominent, highly visible
	Figure 5.10: Candlestick Center Urban Design (Page 197)	Figure 5.10: Candlestick Cen
	Hotel shown in location in middle of CP Center	Hotel shown in location
	Appendix: Candlestick Center – Additional Studies (Page 233)	
	Hotel shown in location in middle of CP Center	
	Section 4.5.2: Mid-block Breaks (Page 155)	Section 4.6.2: Mid-block Bre
	Mews vs. Laneway – All mid-block breaks shall be either pedestrian mews or	Mews vs. Laneway – All
Width of Pedestrian 'path to water' Mews in Mid Block Breaks	vehicular laneways or a combination of both with the exception of blocks that	vehicular laneways or a
·	front onto waterfront park which shall be pedestrian mews only.	front onto waterfront p
		identified in the Streets
		maintain a minimum 10
		Section 5.1.1: Alice Griffith G
Alice Griffith Outdoor Seating	n/a	Opportunities for outdo
		uses, as well as public all
		Soction E 1 2 S4: Sotbacks to
Alice Griffith Reduced Setbacks to Donner Avenue, G Street and	n/a	Certain properties front
Ebgert Avenue	li/a	have a minimum buildin
		have a minimum bullul

# Proposed (2016 D4D)

reet Parking (Page 140)

space / 1000 sq ft – Hotel (Page 119)

and porte cocheres to be minimized. Parking and loading or coordinated with curb cuts and entry points to other er.

ter Illustrative Site Plan (Page 177)

at corner of Harney Way & Arelious Walker Drive

ck Center Urban Design (Page 195)

ed in the neighborhood and its location should be at a e site.

nter Urban Design (Page 197)

at corner of Harney Way & Arelious Walker Drive

n/a

eaks (Page 147)

I mid-block breaks shall be either pedestrian mews or combination of both with the exception of blocks that park which shall be pedestrian mews only, and the mews scape Master Plan as 'paths to the water', which shall D' pedestrian path (excluding emergency vehicles).

General Description (Page 158)

oor seating associated with commercial and community ort, are encouraged within the large sidewalk areas at the ends of Egbert Ave.

o Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue & G Street ting Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue and G Street shall ng setback of 9 ft.

#### CANDLESTICK POINT D4D EDITORIAL CHANGE LOG – 2010 APPROVED VS. 2016 PROPOSED

	2010 D4D	2016 D4D	
Page	Section / Item	Revision	New Page
		Page number inserted	
1	Front Cover Page	Update cover image	1
		Remove SFRA logo	
2	Blank page	Page number added	2
		Page number added	
3	Inner Cover Page	Document date added	3
		SFRA logo removed	
		Page number added	
4-5	Table of Contents	Titles and sections updated	4-5
		Page numbers updated	
6-7	Section 1 Introduction Title Page	Page numbers added	6-7
8	1.1 Summary of Document	Grammar correction	8
		Update reference to Redevelopment Authority to OCII	
9	1.1 Companion Documents	Correct title of Signage Master Plan	9
		Include new text identifying project documents specifying maximum floor space entitlements	
		Update number of sections	_
9-10	1 1 Organization	5. Neighborhood Standards and Guidelines – Identify Jamestown as part of Project Area but not being contemplated for	9-10
5 10		development by Master Developer	5 10
		Identify new sections for Jamestown, Shipyard South R&D Option & Appendices	
11	1.2 Background	Update references to Stadium	11
11		Grammar corrections	11
12	Candlestick photos	Update references to Stadium	12
14	1.3 Site Location & Context	Update references to Stadium	14
		Update references to Stadium	
16	1.4 Candlestick Access & Ownership	Update references to Jamestown	16
		Grammar corrections	
17	Figure 1.2 Candlestick Access & Ownership	Update references to Stadium	17
18-19	Section 2 Vision Title Page	Page numbers added	6-7
20.21	2.1. Querell Concent	Update project description to reflect current planning	20
20-21	2.1 Overall Concept	Remove discussion of Stadium scenarios	20
	Figure 2.1 Illustrative Site Dian - Deceling Option	Remove references to Baseline Option	21
22	Figure 2.1 mustrative site Plan – Baseline Option	Update Illustrative Plan to reflect current street network and proposed development program	21
	Table 2.1 Development Program – Baseline Option	Delete Table	-
22	Figure 2.1a Illustrative Plan – Non-Stadium Housing Option	Delete Figure	-
23	Table 2.1a Development Program – Non-Stadium Housing Option	Delete Table	-
24	Figure 2.1b Illustrative Plan – Non-Stadium R&D Option	Delete Figure	-
24	Table 2.1b Development Program – Non-Stadium R&D Option	Delete Table	-
		Delete Goal 1 (Location of 49ers Stadium)	
25		Number of goals updated to nine	22
25	2.2 Goals and Objectives	Remove reference to Stadium	22
		Update vision description	
26	1. Location of the 49ers Stadium	Delete all text and figures	-
		Update Goal number	1
27	2. Density Generates Vitality	Update density range	23
		Update image for 'Retail main street with regional retail'	

	2010 D4D	2016 D4D	
Page	Section / Item	Revision	New Page
		Update image 'Density of residential services is clustered around transit stops'	
28	3. Open Space and Natural Features	Update image 'Parks and Open Space Illustrative Plan'	24
29	Figure 2.2 Parks and Open Space Network	Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	25
30	4. Street and Block Connectivity	Grammar correction	26
31	Figure 2.3 Streets and Path Network	Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	27
22		Minor clarification on reference to Muni buses	20
32	5. Transportation Network	Grammar correction	28
		Title updated	
33	Figure 2.4 BRT Route and Walking Radii	Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	29
		5 Minute Walking Radii made own item in legend	
		Images removed	
34	Yosemite Slough Bridge	Remove references to Stadium Game Days	30
		Grammar corrected	
35	Harney Way	Cross-section image updated and moved to separate page	30-31
36	6 Pedestrian and Bicycle Friendly	Additional reference to linkages to Bay Trail	37
		Updated grammar	52
37	Figure 2.5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Network	Title updated to 'Bicycle Network' and detail only shown for bike network	33
		Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	
38	7. The Built Environment	Remove references to Stadium	34
39	3D Renderings	Updated location plan renderings to reflect current planning	35
40	8. Urban Placemaking	Grammar corrections	36
41	Figure 2.6 Urban Placemaking	Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	37
		Update reference to structure of document relating to specific neighborhoods, including Jamestown and Shipyard	
42	9. Character Neighborhoods	Remove image of Stadium	38
		Grammar corrections	
43	Figure 2.7 Character Neighborhoods	Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	39
		Update general project aspiration.	
44	10. Retail Services	Grammar corrections	40
		Update images of Candlestick Center	
48-49	Section 3 Proposed Plan for Candlestick Title Page	Page numbers added	44-45
		Remove Stadium references	
50	3.1 Plan Structure and Program	Update description of development program	46
		Grammar corrections	
51	Figure 3.1 Urban Placemaking	Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	47
52	Program	Crammer corrections	48
E.2	Figure 2.2 Candlectick Illustrative Site Dian	Grammal corrections	
55	2D Ponderings	Undated location plan renderings to reflect current planning	<u> </u>
54-55	Shinyard Non Stadium Housing Ontion		
50	Sinpyalu Non-Stadium Housing Option	Delete Section	
		Delete ligure	
59	Neighborhoods	Candlectick Center – some land use references generalized (e.g. performance venue referred to as 'entertainment')	52
58	Neighborhoods	Grammar corrections	52
50	Candlestick North	Remove reference to Shinvard Non-Stadium Housing Ontion	52
		Remove reference to Shinyard Non-Stadium Housing Option	
60	Candlestick South	Grammar correction	54
00	Alice Griffith	Moved to next page	55
61	lamestown	Description updated to reference not being part of Master Developer's program	55

	2010 D4D	2016 D4D	
Page	Section / Item	Revision	New Page
		Image removed	
62	3.2 Public Streets	Preamble updated	56
63	Figure 3.3 Public Streets Network	Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	57
64	3.2 Public Streets (cont'd)	Grammar corrections	58
		Updated location plan	
65	Retail Streets	Updated cross sections to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	59
		Grammar corrections	
		Updated location plan	
66	Boulevard Park Streets	Updated cross sections to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	60
		Grammar corrections	
		Updated location plan	
67	Local Streets	Updated cross sections to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	61
		Grammar corrections	
		Updated location plan	
68	Mid-block Break	Updated cross sections to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	62
		Grammar corrections	
69	3.3 Public Parks and Open Space	Update cross-referenced sections	63
70	Figure 3.4 Parks and Open Space	Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	64
		Include section number in title	
71	City Park Descriptions	Update location plan base	65
		Update Figure 3.5 per other project documents	
		Update location plan base	
72	2. Candlestick Community Park	Update Figure 3.6 per other project documents	66
		Grammar corrections	
		Update location plan base	
73	3. Bayview Gardens / Wedge Destination Park	Update Figure 3.7 per other project documents	67
		Update rendering	
		Update location plan base	
74	4. Mini-wedge Community Park	Update Figure 3.8 per other project documents	68
		Update rendering	
		Update location plan base	
75	5. Jamestown Hillside Community Park	Update Figure 3.9 per other project documents	69
		Update reference to Stadium	
		Include section number in title	
76 77	State Recreation Area Description	Update location plan base	70 71
70-77	State Recreation Area Description	Include Draft Concept Master Plan image	70-71
		Grammar corrections	
78	Figure 3.10 Conceptual Plan – Candlestick Point State Recreation Area	Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	72
80-81	Section 4 Land Use, Design Standards and Guidelines Title Page	Page numbers added	74-75
83	Figure 4.1 Development Blocks	Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	77
84	4.1.2 Land Use Districts	Update land use disctrict names to be consistent with BVHP Plan	78
<u>۶</u>	Figure 4.2 Land Use Districts	Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	70
65		Include Footnote for Jamestown Lots	75
86	1.2 Height Bulk & Massing	Update sub-sections and numbers	80
00	א.ב ווכוקות, שעות מ ועומסטווא	Move Height sub-section to subsequent page	00
_		Insert new Sub-Section 4.2.1 Building Types to define low-rise, mid-rise, high-rise and landmark building typologies	Q1
_		Insert new Table 4.1	01
86-87	4.2.1 Height	Move to new page	81-82

2010 D4D		2016 D4D		
Page	Section / Item	Revision	New Page	
		Remove building height definition text		
		Remove description of Low-rise and Mid-rise building height locations – refer instead to Figure 4.3		
		Define Landmark building location		
		Identify bird strike requirements for high-rise buildings		
	Height Measurement	Update description	83	
		Include new height measurement diagrams	85	
88		Update description		
	Stepping on Sloped Site	Include new building stepping image	83	
		Include new Table 4.2 Building Stepping Increments		
		Update Table number		
		Updated column headings		
89	Table 4.1 Maximum High-Rise Building Heights – Baseline Option	New column for Maximum Podium Height – heights consistent with Figure 4.3	84	
		Standards and Guidelines updated to reflect status of fixed and encouraged tower locations		
		Additional footnotes added to ensure consistency with Section 8 – Shipyard South R&D Option		
		Figure heading updated		
		Update base plan to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents		
90	Figure 4.3 Building Heights – Baseline Ontion	New tower locations for Tower G, J and K shown	85	
50		New building heights for Landmark Building and development on both sides of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue shown	00	
		New legend item for Landmark Building		
		New footnote for Jamestown lots		
91	Building Heights – Shipvard Non-Stadium Housing Option	Text deleted	_	
		Figure 4.3a deleted		
	4.2.2 Bulk & Massing	Updated sub-section number		
		Table 4.2 renumber to Table 4.4 – building type column removed		
92		Building size description deleted	86	
_		Building type definition image deleted		
		New description 'Bulk Controls'		
		New description 'Massing Controls'		
		Update Apparent Face description for clarification		
	4.2.2 Bulk & Massing (cont'd)	Update Upper Floor(s) Stepback for clarification	86-87	
		Delete diagonal and incorporate into Bulk Controls description		
		Include new Podiums description to clarify relationship between tower and podiums for high-rise buildings		
93	Table 4.3 Massing – All Building Types	Update Table number		
		Include new column for Landmark Building		
		Update floor plate, plan length and diagonal requirements for low and mid-rise for clarification and consistency	87	
		Reformatting of table for clarification		
		Update column headings for clarification		
06	C. Stanhack	Update Upper Floors Stepback for clarification	00.01	
90		Update Upper FIOU Steppacks for clarification of location (a.g. Mid Bica, Conductick Frame) and to reflect changes in preject planning	30-31	
		under other project documents		
98		Include Lise sategory for Landmark Building		
	Table 4 6 Street Wall Standards	Column title corrections for consistency with other costions	02.02	
	Table 4.0 Street Wall Standards	Locuring the corrections for consistency with other sections	92-93	
		Column coll corrections for consistency with other sections		
		Use descriptions undated for clarification and consistency with other sections		
		Use descriptions updated for clarification and consistency with other sections		
00	Figure 4.4 Street Wall Conditions	Updated to reflect them Street will Condition titles	04	
99	rigure 4.4 Street Wall Conditions	New feetnets for lamostown lots	94	
		new roothote for Jamestown rots		

2010 D4D		2016 D4D	
Page	Section / Item	Revision	New Page
100	Figure 4.5 Mixed-use Low-rise	Title changed to 'Mid-Rise – Candlestick Center Frame' Location plan updated Stepback height updated to 65 ft Minimum retail height changed to 20 ft Build To Line updated to for consistency with remainder of the document	95
101	Figure 4.6 Mixed-use High-rise	Title changed to 'High-Rise – Candlestick Center Frame' Location plan updated Minimum retail height changed to 20 ft Build To Line updated to for consistency with remainder of the document Grammar revisions	96
102	Figure 4.7 Commercial Parking Structure	Title changed to 'Commercial – Parking Structure' Location plan updated Setback updated for consistency with remainder of document Minimum retail Floor to floor height provision included	97
103	Figure 4.8 Residential Low-rise	Title changed to 'Low-rise – Mixed Use Residential District' Location plan updated Setback and build-to line updated for consistency with remainder of document Minimum retail Floor to floor height provision included	98
104	Figure 4.9 Residential Low-rise – CPSRA Edge	Title changed to 'Low-rise – CPSRA Edge' Location plan updated Setback and build-to line updated for consistency with remainder of document Minimum retail Floor to floor height provision included	99
105	Figure 4.10 Residential Mid-rise	Title changed to 'Mid-rise – Residential Mixed Use District' Location plan updated Setback and build-to line updated for consistency with remainder of document Minimum retail Floor to floor height provision included	100
106	Figure 4.11 Residential High-rise	Title changed to 'High-rise – Residential Mixed Use District' Location plan updated Setback and build-to line updated for consistency with remainder of document Minimum retail Floor to floor height provision included	
107	Figure 4.12 Residential Mid-Block Break	Title changed to 'Mid-block Break – Pedestrian Mews or Vehicular Laneway' Location plan updated Setback and build-to line updated for consistency with remainder of document Minimum retail Floor to floor height provision included	102
108	Figure 4.13 Commercial Mid-block Break	Title changed to 'Mid-block Break – Commercial' Location plan updated Build-to line updated for consistency with remainder of document Minimum retail Floor to floor height of 20 ft included	103
109	Figure 4.14 Commercial	Street wall condition removed and replaced with 'Landmark Building' Location plan updated New street wall standards included for Setback, Stepback, Projection, Build To Line, Retail, Separation and Underground Parking	104
110	4.2.4 Sunlight & Shade	Section number updated	105
111	4.2.5 Wind	Section number updated EIR requirement for 100 ft height added	106
112	4.3 Building Design	Updated table of contents Grammar revisions	107
113	4.3.1 Building Types	Updated table of contents	108
114	A – Residential: General	Footnote for Shipyard South R&D Option added	109

2010 D4D		2016 D4D		
Page	Section / Item	Revision	New Page	
		Reference to floorspace entitlement limitations added		
115	Standarda	Minimum 15 ft ground floor retail height added	110	
115	Standards	Stepback requirements updated for consistency with remainder of document	110	
120	B – Commercial: General	Build-to line – 25% building face updated to 50%		
121	R. Commercial: Retail and Mixed use	Store Height and Depth updated to 20 ft for buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue at CP Center	116	
121	B – Commercial: Retail and Mixeo-use	Blank Walls updated to allow some blank sections where topography makes having windows unfeasible		
122	R - Commercial: Office	Intent updated to make reference to entitlement limitations.	117	
122		Figure number cross-references updated.		
172	R – Commercial: Performance Venue	Section reworded to relate to Landmark Building (which may include a Performance Venue)	110	
125		Intent and Standards updated where required		
12/	B – Commercial: Hotel	Parking and Loading Entries updated to relate to new location.	119	
124		Figure cross-references updated.		
125	C – Other: Community Use	Figure cross-references updated.	120	
127	D – Parking Structure	Visual screen requirements clarified for consistency with EIR.	122	
127		Section cross-references updated.	122	
		Entrance requirements updated to allow flexibility for garage widths up to 27 ft in specific circumstances.		
128	D – Parking Structure (cont'd)	Garage entry width image updated	123	
		Materials, finishes & color and Lighting requirements added per EIR.		
129	4.3.2 General Building Elements	Table of contents updated	124	
130	A – Base Activation	References to entitlement limitations added	125	
134	C – Materials and Colors	Walls updated to refer to non-reflective metal panels consistent with EIR	129	
136	E – Roofs	Grammar revisions	131	
138	Standards	Lighting requirements added per EIR.	133	
141	Guidelines	Grammar revisions	136	
142	H – Building Lighting	Minor updates to provisions for consistency with EIR requirements	137	
		Section renumbered to '4.4' and titled changed to 'Signage'		
		Section retitled and relocated		
	I – Building Signage	Revised preamble		
		Revised "Intent" description		
		Remove specific "Commercial Signage" standards		
		Remove specific "Residential Signage" standards		
		New guideline – "Variety"		
143-146		Revised guideline – "Style"	138-139	
		Revised guideline – "Orientation"		
		Revised guideline – "Lighted Signs"		
		New guideline – "Safety"		
		New guideline – "New Technology Signs"		
		Revised guideline – "Temporary Signage"		
		Revised guideline – "Prohibited Signage"		
		Revised imagery		
	4.4 Parking and Loading	Updated section numbering	140	
148		Table number updated to Table 4.7		
1.0	Table 4.5 Maximum Off-Street Parking	Neighborhood Retail parking requirement updated per 2014 Transportation Plan	140	
		Grocery Store and Cinema parking ratios added		
149	Table 4.6 Bicycle Parking Spaces for Residential Uses	Table number updated to Table 4.8	141	
	Table 4.7 Bicycle Parking Spaces for Commercial Uses	Table number updated to Table 4.9	141	
150	Car-sharing	SF Planning Code requirement for interim private use of un-allocated car-sharing bays	142	
151	4.4.2 On-street Parking	Section number updated	143	

Page         Section / Item         Rear Data         Rear Data <threar data<="" th="">         Rear Data         <th< th=""><th colspan="2">2010 D4D</th><th colspan="2">2016 D4D</th></th<></threar>	2010 D4D		2016 D4D	
Instrume         Hear Costs reference aubited Update (gree 4.3 to reflex comme) annual green retwork per other project documents         114           132         4.4.3 Loading, Mechanical Equipment and Meters         Section number updated Cub and requirements injusted to allow flexibility for up to 27 fit in specific dirumstances.         144           133         4.5 Streets         Reference to Streetscape fuer Pin revised Updated freeters to Mechanical Equipment and Meters         145           154         Newspaper Aluka         Problem updated for directors of functioning roots.         146           155         State Reside Commercial         Fordiating roots.         147           156         Mexist, Laneave updated         100         153           151         Commercial         Fordiating roots.         153           152         Mid-Block Break Commercial         Control pain updated         153           153         Mid-Block Break Commercial         Control pain updated         153           154         State Commercial         Control pain updated         153           154         State Commercial         Control pain updated         153           154         State Commercial         Control pain updated         154           154         State Commercial         Control pain updated in relation transort         155	Page	Section / Item	Revision	New Page
122         4.43 Looking, Mechanical Equipment and Meters         Scientia muniter implants         144           123         4.43 Looking, Mechanical Equipment and Meters         Scientia muniter implants         144           124         4.43 Looking, Mechanical Equipment and Meters         Scientia muniter implants         144           125         4.43 Looking, Mechanical Equipment and Meters         Scientia muniter implants         145           126         A.53 Streets         Hermitian implants         146           126         A.53 Met Rock Break         Scientia muniter implants         146           126         Messager Racks         Browissin and Meters         147           126         Messager Racks         Browissin and Meters         147           126         Mediatock Break         Scientia muniter implants         148           126         Mediatock Break         Grammar upplants         128           120         Scientia muniter implants         Caramar upplants         122           120         Scientia muniter implants         123         123           120         Scientia Meters         Mediatok Break Scientia         126           120         Scientia Meters         Mediatok Break Scientia         126           120         Scient			Figure cross-reference updated	
112     4.4.3 Loading, Mechanical Equipment and Meters     Solution number updated     144       113     4.5 Strests     Each cold requirements updated     145       113     4.5 Strests     Belevenue to Strestage Mader Plan revised     146       113     4.5 Strests     Belevenue to Strestage Mader Plan revised     146       113     4.5 Strests     Belevenue to Strestage Mader Plan revised     146       113     4.5 Meta Bauk Break     Social number updated     147       113     Meta Bauk Break     Formating Understage     148       113     Meta Bauk Break     Grammar updated     130       113     MetaBauk Break     Grammar updated     130       114     Grammar updated     132       115     Grammar updated     132       115     Grammar updated     132       115     Social Strestage Mader Bauk Break Revision     132       115     Social Strestage Mader Bauk Bauk Break Revision     132       115     Social Strestage Mader Bauk Bauk Break Revision     132       116     Social Strestage Mader Bauk Bauk Break Revision     132       117     Formar Updated     132       118     Social Strestage Mader Bauk Bauk Bauk Bauk Bauk Bauk Bauk Bauk			Update Figure 4.15 to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	
133         4.5 Streets         Section numbers guidaded relativity for get 2.7 this specific discutstatives.         145           133         4.5 Streets         Section numbers guidaded relativity for get 2.7 this specific discutstatives.         146           134         Newspaper Russ         Provide information guidated or for evided updated relativity.         146           135         4.5 2 Mid Block Break         Section number updated Memory to 10 th width requirement for gedestrian path to water.         147           135.5         4.5 2 Mid Block Break Commercial         Interview         147           135.5         4.5 2 Mid Block Break Commercial         Interview         147           136.5         Commercial         Formating Changes         148-109           137         Mid Block Break Commercial         Interview         147           138         Mid Block Break Commercial         Interview         151           130         So Ceneral         General         Interview Terving to the provided interview of the provided	152	4.4.3 Loading, Mechanical Equipment and Meters	Section number updated	144
133     4.5 Streets     Reference to Streets can be here yield     145       154     Newspaper facts     Provision guidated for Carling rooms     346       155     A 5.2 Mice Block Preak.     Section number updated     147       156     A 5.2 Mice Block Preak.     Provision guidated for Carling rooms     144.439       158     Mice Block Reak.     Grammar updated     150       159     Mice Block Reak. Residential     Grammar updated     151       160:100     Section S Neghtomics and Guidelines Title Page     Page numbers added     152       161:100     Section S Neghtomics and Guidelines Title Page     Page numbers added     152       162:101     Section S Neghtomics and Guidelines Title Page     Page numbers added     154       163:102     Section S Neghtomics Standards and Guidelines Title Page     Page numbers added     155       164:105     S.1 Alice Griftith Tule Page     Page numbers added     155       166:105     S.1 Alice Griftith Tule Page     Page numbers added     156       167:111     Fague S.2 Alice Griftith Tule Page     Page numbers added     158       168:111     Updated I section Page Alice Griftith Tule Page     156       169:112     S.1 Alice Griftith Tule Page     Page Alice Alice Alice Griftith Undan Boolfh     158 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>Curb cut requirements updated to allow flexibility for up to 27 ft in specific circumstances.</td> <td></td>			Curb cut requirements updated to allow flexibility for up to 27 ft in specific circumstances.	
153     4.5 strets     Profession     145       154     Newspaper Racks     Profession     146       155     4.5 a Mid-block Dreak     Section subset updated     146       155     4.5 a Mid-block Dreak     Mexister updated to make reference to 10 ft width requirement for pedectrian path to water.     147       156     4.5 a Mid-block Dreak     Formatting databated to make reference to 10 ft width requirement for pedectrian path to water.     148-109       158     Mid Block Break Residential     Gommar updated     151       159     Mid Block Break Residential     Gommar updated     151       160-151     Section S Meightonhood Standards and Guidelines Title Page     Page numbers added     152-153       162     S.D General     Obtain plant reference to a thing in Appendix     154       163     Hack Greithin - General Description     General reference to a	452		Section numbering updated	145
154         Newspaper Racks         Produces interface to following other         146           155         4.5.2 MM Block Break         Provide the set of the	153	4.5 Streets	Reference to Streetscape Master Plan revised	145
134     149       135     4.5.2 Mid-Block Brack       135     4.5.2 Mid-Block Brack       136     4.5.2 Mid-Block Brack       137     6.5.2 Mid-Block Brack       138     Mid-Block Brack       139     5.2 Mid-Block Brack       139     Mid-Block Brack       139     Mid-Block Brack       139     Mid-Block Brack       130     Mid-Block Brack       131     Figure 3.1       132     5.3 General       132     S.0 General       133     Figure 5.1       134     S.0 General       135     S.1 Alice Oriffin Trile Page       134     S.0 General       135     S.1 Alice Oriffin Trile Page       134     Logation Jian updated       135     S.1 Alice Oriffin Trile Page       134     Logation Jian updated       135     S.1 Alice Oriffin Trile Page       134     Logation Jian updated       135     S.1 Alice Oriffin Trile Page       136     S.1 Alice Oriffin Trile Page       136     S.1 Alice Oriffin Trile Page       137     S.1 Alice Oriffin Trile Page       138     Lippet S.2 Alice Oriffin Logation path trile Page       139     Lippet S.2 Alice Oriffin Trile Page       130     S.1.2 Alice Orif	154	Nowspaper Packs	Dravician undated for clarity	116
155     4.5.2 Md-Block Wreak     New os a trans-parameter participant of the second of the se	134	Newspaper racks	Section number undated	140
150-137     Commercial     Formating changes     148-149       158     Mid-Block fareak Residential     Gurmmer updated     150       159     Mid-Block fareak Residential     Gurmmer updated     151       159     Mid-Block fareak Residential     Gurmmer updated     151       150-161     Section 5 Neighborhood Standards and Guidelines Title Page     Page numbers added     152       152     S.0 General     Chapter summary updated function to Jamestown     153       155     Standard Standards and Guidelines Title Page     Update fuger or Telect current planning and street network per other project documents     155       154     S.0 General     Update fuger or Telect current planning and street network per other project documents     155       154     S.1 Alke Gurffith - General Description     Ferrence to accuragement of outdoor seating in adewalk areas added     158       166     S.1 Alke Gurffith - General Description     Ferrence to accuragement of outdoor seating in adewalk areas added     158       170     S.1 Alke Gurffith - Book Plan     Update flager to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     161       171     Figure S.1 Alke Gurffith - Book Plan     Update flager to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     161       171     Figure S.1 Alke Gurffith - Book Plan     forattel added     162	155	4.5.2 Mid-Block Break	Mews vs. Laneway undated to make reference to 10 ft width requirement for pedestrian nath to water	147
138     Mik-Block Break Residential     137       138     Mik-Block Break Residential     102400 plan updated     150       139     Mik-Block Break Residential     102400 plan updated     151       130     Mik-Block Break Residential     102400 plan updated     152       139     Mik-Block Break Residential     102400 plan updated     152       130     5.0 General     Control updated     152       142     5.0 General     Dupdate Impacts     154       162     5.0 General     Dupdate Impacts     154       163     Tigger 5.1 Character Neighborhoods     Update Igure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     155       164-105     5.1 Alice Griffith Title Page     Update Igure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     159       166     5.1.1 Alice Griffith Title Page     Update Igure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     159       170     5.1.2 Alice Griffith Title Page     Update Igure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     159       167     Figure 5.2 Alice Griffith Dixing south     Update Igure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     152       170     5.1.2 Alice Griffith Dixing south     Update Igure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	156-157	Commercial	Formatting changes	148-149
158     Mid-Block Break Residential     Location plan updated     150       159     Mid-Block Break Residential     Gammar updated     151       160-161     Section 5 Neighborhood Slandards and Guidelines Tille Page     Page numbers added     152       162     5.0 General     Chapter summary updated control to jametory     154       163     Figure 5.1 Character Neighborhoods     Update liquers to reflect corrent planning and street network per other project documents     155       164     Figure 5.1 Character Neighborhoods     Updated location Plan     156-157       166     5.11 Alice Griffith - General Description     Foromar reasions     158       167     Figure 5.2 Alice Griffith billstratures Size Plan     Update liquers to reflect corrent planning and street network per other project documents     151       169     Inger - Wise Alice Griffith billstratures Size Plan     Update liquers to reflect corrent planning and street network per other project documents     151       170     5.12 Alice Griffith - Block Plan     Update liquers to reflect corrent planning and street network per other project documents     151       171     Figure 5.3 - Block Plan     Epider marker of took per other project documents     151       172     5.13 Alice Griffith - Urban Design     Fort and Table 5.1 movement added     9 foo sethods to Donner Anney Reside added     9 foo sethods to Donner Anney Reside added     9 foo sethods to Donner A	150 157		Grammar undated	140 143
159       Mid Block Break Commercial       1531         160-161       Section 5 Neighborhood Standards and Guidelines Title Page       Page numbers added       152-153         162       5.0 General       Choper summary updated in relation to Jamestown       154         163       Figure 5.1 Character Neighborhoods       Update Tagres to reflect Current planning and street network per other project documents       155         164-165       5.1 Altice Griffith Title Page       Update Tagres to reflect Current planning and street network per other project documents       156         164-165       5.1 Altice Griffith Unstrative Site Plan       Update Tagres to reflect Current planning and street network per other project documents       158         166       5.1.1 Altice Griffith Illustrative Site Plan       Update Tagres to reflect Current planning and street network per other project documents       151         167       5.1.2 Altice Griffith Illustrative Site Plan       Update Tagres to reflect Current planning and street network per other project documents       161         170       5.1.2 Altice Griffith Illustrative Site Plan       Update Tagres to reflect Current planning and street network per other project documents       161         170       5.1.2 Altice Griffith Illustrative Site Plan       Update Tagres to reflect Current planning and street network per other project documents       161         171       figure 5.3 Rick Plan       Figure Site A	158	Mid-Block Break Residential	Location plan updated	150
139     Mid-Bick Break Commercial     151       160-161     Section 5 Neighborhood Standards and Guidelines Title Page     Page numbers added     152-153       162     5.0 General     Chapter summary updated lo relation to anestown Bick plans referred to as being in Appendix Grammar revisions     154       163     Figure 5.1 Character Neighborhoods     Update figures to reflect to as being in Appendix Grammar revisions     155       164     5.1.Alice Griffith Title Page     Page numbers added     158       165     5.1.Alice Griffith - General Description     Reference to encouragement of outdoor seating in sidewalk areas added     158       166     5.1.Alice Griffith - General Description     Reference to encouragement of outdoor seating in sidewalk areas added     159       170     Figure 5.2. Alice Griffith outding south     Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     151       170     S.1. Alice Griffith - General Description     Reference to encouragement of outdoor seating in sidewalk areas added     128       171     Figure 5.3 – Blick Plan     Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per order documents     151       172     S.1.Alice Griffith outding south     Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per order documents     161       172     Figure 5.3 – Blick Plan     Figure S.1     Figure S.1     162       174     <			Grammar updated	
160-161       Section 5 Neighborhood Standards and Guidelines Title Page       Page numbers added       152-153         162       S.O. General       Chapter summary updated in relation to Jamestown       154         163       Figure 5.1 Character Neighborhoods       Updated Location Plan       154         163       Figure 5.1 Character Neighborhoods       Updated Location Plan       155         164       5.1 Alkce Griffth Title Page       Updated Location Plan       155         166       5.1.1 Alkce Griffth Title Page       Updated Location Plan       158         167       Figure 5.2 Alkce Griffth Title Page       Updated Location Plan       158         168       Image - View of Alke Griffth Title Page       Update Ingue to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents       158         169       Image - View of Alke Griffth Title Sign to the Page Plann       Update Ingue to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents       161         170       5.1.2 Alice Griffth Title Sign to the Plann       Text entwork per other project documents       161         171       Figure 5.2 Alice Griffth Tothok Plan       Text and Table S.1       1224         172       5.1.3 Alice Griffth Urban Design       Update Inservate Added       9 foot settacks to Doner Avenue, Fitzgregrad Avenue and G Street added per OCII working practrice	159	Mid-Block Break Commercial	Location plan updated	151
162     5.0 General     C (Lapter summary update) in relation to Jamestown     154       162     5.0 General     Block Plans referred to as being in Appendix     154       163     Figure 5.1 Character Neighborhoods     Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     155       164-165     5.1 Alice Griffith - General Description     Figure 5.2 Alice Griffith - General Description     156       166     5.1.1 Alice Griffith - General Description     Reference to encoursegment of outdoor seating in sidewalk areas added     158       160     Image - View of Alice Griffith fluxtative Site Plan     Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     159       170     S.1.2 Alice Griffith Doking south     Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     161       171     Figure 5.3 - Block Plan     Figure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.1 and Table 9.1     223       172     5.1.3 Alice Griffith - Urban Design     Reference to Block Plan     Figure moved to Appendix added       174     Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban Design     Update finage to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     163       174     Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban Design     New 54 linework added     164     164       175     S.2 Candlestick North Title Page     Update finage to reflect current planni	160-161	Section 5 Neighborhood Standards and Guidelines Title Page	Page numbers added	152-153
1625.0 GeneralBlock plans reference154163Figure 5.1 Character NeighborhoodsUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents155164-1655.1 Alice Griffith Title PageUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1561665.1.1 Alice Griffith - General DescriptionGrammar revisions158167Figure 5.2 Alice Griffith figures to the project documents1581685.1.2 Alice Griffith figures to the project documents151169Image - View of Alice Griffith obring southUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1611705.1.2 Alice Griffith obring southUpdate figure to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.1 and Table 9.1223171Figure 5.3 - Block PlanText and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.1 and Table 9.12241725.1.3 Alice Griffith obringProtein project documents162173Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith obringUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents163174S.2.1 Condicitik North - General DescriptionUpdate Image to Review Alded1641755.2 Candlestick North Title PageUpdate Image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents163175Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith urban DesignUpdate Image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1641765.2.1 Candlestick North Title PageUpdate			Chapter summary updated in relation to Jamestown	
Instrume         Grammar revisions         Instrume           163         Figure 5.1 Character Neighborhoods         Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents         155           164.165         5.1 Alice Griffith Title Page         Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents         156           166         5.1.1 Alice Griffith - General Description         Grammar revisions         158           167         Figure 5.2 Alice Griffith Illustrative Site Plan         Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents         159           169         Image - View of Alice Griffith Jooking south         Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents         161           170         5.1.2 Alice Griffith Jooking south         Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents         161           171         Figure 5.3 – Block Plan         Figure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.1         224           172         5.1.3 Alice Griffith Urban Design         Of statucks to Donner Avenue, Fitzgeraid Avenue and G Street added per OCII working practice         162           174         Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban Design         Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents         163           174.175         5.	162	5.0 General	Block plans referred to as being in Appendix	154
163       Figure 5.1 Character Neighborhoods       Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents       155         164-165       5.1 Alice Griffith Title Page       Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents       156         166       5.1.1 Alice Griffith - General Description       Grammar revisions Neterence to ancouragement of outdoor seating in sidewalk areas added       158         166       Figure 5.2 Alice Griffith burstruke Site Plan       Update figure or reflect current planning and street network per other project documents       159         167       Figure 5.3 - Block Plan       Update figure or reflect current planning and street network per other project documents       161         170       5.1.2 Alice Griffith - Block Plan       Fext and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.1 and Table 9.1       224         171       Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban Design       Fext and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix added       9 foot setbacks to Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue and G Street added per OCII working practice       162         173       Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban Design       Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents       163         174       Figure 5.2 Candlestick North Talle Page       Update figure 100       164         175       5.2 Candlestick North Talle Page       Update figure toreflect current planning a			Grammar revisions	
164-165     5.1 Alice Griffith Title Page     Update floure to encouragement of outdoor seating in sidewalk areas added     156-157       166     5.1.1 Alice Griffith - General Description     Grammar revisions Reference to encouragement of outdoor seating in sidewalk areas added     158       167     Figure 5.2 Alice Griffith Illustrative Site Plan     Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     159       169     Image - View of Alice Griffith Doking south     Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     161       170     S.1.2 Alice Griffith - Block Plan     Fet and Table S.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.1 and Table 9.1     223       171     Figure 5.3 - Block Plan     Figure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.1 and Table 9.1     224       172     S.1.3 Alice Griffith - Urban Design     Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added     162       173     Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban Design     Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     163       174-175     S.2 Candlestick North - General Description     Section number updated     164-165       176     5.2.1 Candlestick North - General Description     Section number updated     166       177     Figure 5.5 Candlestick North looking west     Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     167 <t< td=""><td>163</td><td>Figure 5.1 Character Neighborhoods</td><td>Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents</td><td>155</td></t<>	163	Figure 5.1 Character Neighborhoods	Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	155
101-103     5.1 Allce Griffith - General Description     Fage unbers added     156       166     5.1.1 Allce Griffith - General Description     Grammar revisions Perference to encouragement of outdoor seating in sidewalk areas added     158       167     Figure 5.2 Alice Griffith looking south     Update figure or felect current planning and street network per other project documents     161       170     5.1.2 Alice Griffith - Block Plan     Text and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.1 and Table 9.1     224       171     Figure 5.3 - Block Plan     Perference to Block Plan in Appendix addremumbered to Street added per OCII working practice Grammar revisions     162       172     S.1.3 Alice Griffith Urban Design     Vidate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     162       173     Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban Design     Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     163       174     Figure 5.2 Candlestick North Title Page     Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     164       174     Figure 5.2 Candlestick North - General Description     Section number updated     164       175     S.2.1 Candlestick North - Block Plan     Pigure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.2     164       175     Figure 5.5 Candlestick North - Block Plan     Pigure Braverk added     164       176     S.2.	104.105		Updated Location Plan	150 157
1665.1.1 Allce Griffith - General DescriptionGrammar revisions Reference to encouragement of outdoor seating in sidewalk areas added158167Figure 5.2 Allce Griffith looking southUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents159169Image - View of Alce Griffith looking southUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1611705.1.2 Allce Griffith - Block PlanText and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.1 and Table 5.1223171Figure 5.3 - Block PlanFigure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section Plan Purpedix and renumbered to Section number updated2241725.1.3 Alice Griffith - Urban DesignSection number updatedReference to Block Plan in Appendix added 9 foot setbacks to Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue and G Street added per OCII working practice Grammar revisions163173Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban DesignUpdate figure 0 crifted current planning and street network per other project documents New 54 Inework added164-1651765.2 Candlestick North - General DescriptionSection number updated166177Figure 5.5 Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1671805.2.1 Candlestick North Block PlanText and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix added166179Image - View of Candlestick North Block PlanFigure number updated1671805.2.2 Candlestick North Block PlanText and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered	164-165	5.1 Alice Griffith Title Page	Page numbers added	150-157
101Preference to encouragement of outdoor seating in sidewalk areas added1.13167Figure 5.2 Alice Griffith looking southUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1611005.1.2 Alice Griffith - Block PlanUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1611015.1.2 Alice Griffith - Block PlanText and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.1 and Table 9.1223117Figure 5.3 – Block PlanFigure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.1224128S.1.3 Alice Griffith - Urban DesignSection number updated Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added 9 foot setbacks to Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue and G Street added per OCII working practice Grammar revisions162173Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban DesignUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents New 54 linework added164-1651765.2.1 Candlestick North Title PageUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents New 54 linework added166177Figure 5.2 candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanEger number updated Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents167178Figure 5.2 candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents167179Image – View of Candlestick North Bolok PlanText and Table 5.1 moved to App	166	E 1 1 Alice Griffith - General Description	Grammar revisions	159
167Figure 5.2 Alice Griffith Illustrative Site PlanUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents159169Image - View of Alice Griffith - Block PlanText and Table 5.12231705.1.2 Alice Griffith - Block PlanFigure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.1 and Table 5.1223171Figure 5.3 - Block PlanExction number updated2241725.1.3 Alice Griffith - Urban DesignSection number updated162173Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban DesignUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents163174Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban DesignUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents163174Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban DesignUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents163174Figure 5.2 Candlestick North Title PageUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1641765.2.1 Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents166177Figure 5.5 Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1691805.2.2 Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1691805.2.2 Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanText and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and ren	100		Reference to encouragement of outdoor seating in sidewalk areas added	130
169     Image – View of Alice Griffith looking south     Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     161       170     5.1.2 Alice Griffith – Block Plan     Text and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.1     223       171     Figure 5.3 – Block Plan     Figure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.1     224       172     5.1.3 Alice Griffith – Urban Design     Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added     9 foot setbacks to Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue and G Street added per OCII working practice Grammar revisions     162       173     Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban Design     Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     163       174-175     5.2 Candlestick North Title Page     Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     166       176     5.2.1 Candlestick North General Description     Section number updated     166       177     Figure 5.2 Gandlestick North Illustrative Site Plan     Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     169       179     Image – View of Candlestick North Block Plan     Figure number updated     166       179     Image – View of Candlestick North Blocking west     Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     169       180     5.2.2 Candlestick North Blocking west     Update imgure to reflect current	167	Figure 5.2 Alice Griffith Illustrative Site Plan	Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	
170     5.1.2 Alice Griffith – Block Plan     Text and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.1 and Table 9.1     223       171     Figure 5.3 – Block Plan     Figure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.1 and Table 9.1     224       172     5.1.3 Alice Griffith – Urban Design     Section number updated Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added 9 forts setbacks to Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue and G Street added per OCI working practice Grammar revisions     162       173     Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban Design     Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents New 54 linework added     163       174-175     5.2 Candlestick North Title Page     Update linework added     164-165       176     5.2.1 Candlestick North - General Description     Section number updated     166       177     Figure 5.5 Candlestick North Illustrative Site Plan     Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     167       180     5.2.2 Candlestick North Illustrative Site Plan     Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     167       181     Figure 5.6 – Block Plan     Text and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.2     225       182-183     5.2.3a Candlestick North     Section number updated     169       182-1843     S.2.3a Candlestick North     Reference to Block Plan     226	169	Image – View of Alice Griffith looking south	Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	161
171Figure 5.3 – Block PlanFigure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.12241725.1.3 Alice Griffith – Urban DesignSection number updated Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added 9 foot setbacks to Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue and G Street added per OCII working practice Grammar revisions162173Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban DesignUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents New 54 linework added163174-1755.2 Candlestick North Title PageUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents New 54 linework added1661765.2.1 Candlestick North – General DescriptionSection number updated166177Figure 5.5 Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1691805.2.2 Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1691805.2.2 Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1691805.2.2 Candlestick North - Block PlanText and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.2225181Figure 5.6 - Block PlanFigure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents226182-1835.2.3a Candlestick NorthBlock numbers updated Figure cross-references updated Grocer ys rerecurrence updated170-171182-1835.2.3a Candlestick NorthBlock numbers	170	5.1.2 Alice Griffith – Block Plan	Text and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.1 and Table 9.1	223
172S.1.3 Alice Griffith - Urban DesignSection number updated Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added 9 foot setbacks to Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue and G Street added per OCII working practice Grammar revisions162173Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban DesignUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents New S4 linework added163174-1755.2 Candlestick North Title PageUpdate (Location Plan Page numbers added164-1651765.2.1 Candlestick North - General DescriptionSection number updated Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents166177Figure 5.5 Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1691805.2.2 Candlestick North - Block PlanUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents169181Figure 5.6 - Block PlanText and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.2225181Figure 5.6 - Block PlanSection number updated Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents226182-1835.2.3a Candlestick NorthSection numbers updated Block numbers updated Block Numbers updated Block Numbers updated Figure eross-references updated Figure eross-reference to Block Plan in Appendix added Block numbers updated Figure cross-references updated Figure cross-references updated Figure eross-references updated Figure eross-references updated Figure eross-references updated Figure eross-references updated Figure street netw	171	Figure 5.3 – Block Plan	Figure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.1	
1725.1.3 Alice Griffith – Urban DesignReference to Block Plan in Appendix added 9 foot setbacks to Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue and G Street added per OCII working practice Grammar revisions162173Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban DesignUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents New S4 linework added163174-1755.2 Candlestick North Title PageUpdate docation Plan Page numbers added164-1651765.2.1 Candlestick North – General DescriptionSection number updated166177Figure 5.S Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents167179Image – View of Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1691805.2.2 Candlestick North – Block PlanText and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.2. Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents225181Figure 5.6 – Block PlanFigure forsefieu to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents226182-1835.2.3a Candlestick NorthBlock numbers updated Block numbers updated Figure ross-references updated Figure ro			Section number updated	
112       9 foot setbacks to Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue and G Street added per OCII working practice       102         173       Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban Design       Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents       163         174-175       5.2 Candlestick North Title Page       Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents       164-165         176       5.2.1 Candlestick North – General Description       Section number updated       166         177       Figure 5.5 Candlestick North Illustrative Site Plan       Figure number updated       167         179       Image – View of Candlestick North looking west       Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents       169         180       5.2.2 Candlestick North Illustrative Site Plan       Figure number updated       125         181       Figure 5.6 – Block Plan       Text and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.2       225         181       Figure 5.6 – Block Plan       Evetion numbers updated Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added       120-171         182-183       5.2.3a Candlestick North       Block numbers updated Figure rorss-references updated       170-	172	5.1.2 Alice Griffith – Urban Design	Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added	162
InstructionGrammar revisionsInstruction173Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban DesignUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents163174-1755.2 Candlestick North Title PageUpdate Location Plan Page numbers added164-1651765.2.1 Candlestick North – General DescriptionSection number updated166177Figure 5.5 Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents167179Image – View of Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1691805.2.2 Candlestick North – Block PlanText and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.2.225181Figure 5.6 – Block PlanUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents226182-183S.2.3a Candlestick NorthBlock numbers updated Reference to Block Plan in Appendix adde Block numbers updated170-171	172		9 foot setbacks to Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue and G Street added per OCII working practice	102
173Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban DesignUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents163174-1755.2 Candlestick North Title PageUpdate linework added164-1651765.2.1 Candlestick North – General DescriptionSection number updated166177Figure 5.5 Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents167179Image – View of Candlestick North Illostrative Site PlanUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1691805.2.2 Candlestick North – Block PlanText and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.2225181Figure 5.6 – Block PlanFigure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.2. Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents226182-1835.2.3a Candlestick NorthBlock numbers updated Block numbers updated Figure cross-references updated 			Grammar revisions	
174-1755.2 Candlestick North Title PageNew S4 linework added164-1651765.2.1 Candlestick North – General DescriptionSection number updated166177Figure 5.5 Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanFigure number updated166179Image – View of Candlestick North - Block PlanUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1691805.2.2 Candlestick North - Block PlanText and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.2225181Figure 5.6 – Block PlanUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents226182-1835.2.3a Candlestick NorthSection numbers updated Block numbers updated Block numbers updated170-171182-1835.2.3a Candlestick NorthBlock numbers updated Figure cross-references updated Grocery store requirements moved from CP Center added170-171	173	Figure 5.4 Alice Griffith Urban Design	Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	163
174-1755.2 Candlestick North Title PageUpdated Location Plan Page numbers added164-1651765.2.1 Candlestick North – General DescriptionSection number updated166177Figure 5.5 Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanFigure number updated Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents167179Image – View of Candlestick North looking westUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1691805.2.2 Candlestick North – Block PlanText and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.2225181Figure 5.6 – Block PlanFigure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents226182-1835.2.3a Candlestick NorthSection numbers updated Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added Block numbers updated170-171182-1835.2.3a Candlestick NorthBlock numbers updated Figure cross-references updated Figure cross-references updated Figure cross-references updated Figure cross-references updated170-171			New S4 linework added	
Page numbers addedPage numbers addedPage numbers added1765.2.1 Candlestick North – General DescriptionSection number updated166177Figure 5.5 Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanFigure number updated167179Image – View of Candlestick North looking westUpdate figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1691805.2.2 Candlestick North – Block PlanText and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.2225181Figure 5.6 – Block PlanFigure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.2.226182-1835.2.3a Candlestick NorthSection numbers updated Block numbers updated Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added Block numbers updated Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added Block numbers updated Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added Block runmbers updated Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added Block numbers updated Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added Block runmbers updated Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added Block runmbers updated Figure cross-references updated Figure cross-references updated Figure cross-references updated Grocery store requirements moved from CP Center added170-171	174-175	5.2 Candlestick North Title Page	Updated Location Plan	164-165
176       5.2.1 Candlestick North – General Description       Section number updated       166         177       Figure 5.5 Candlestick North Illustrative Site Plan       Figure number updated       167         179       Image – View of Candlestick North looking west       Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents       169         180       5.2.2 Candlestick North – Block Plan       Text and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.2       225         181       Figure 5.6 – Block Plan       Figure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.2.       226         182-183       5.2.3a Candlestick North       Section numbers updated       Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added       170-171         182-183       5.2.3a Candlestick North       Block numbers updated       Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added       170-171	470	5.2.4 Conducticle North Concerned Decemination	Page numbers added	100
177Figure 5.5 Candlestick North Illustrative Site PlanFigure number dpdated Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents167179Image – View of Candlestick North looking westUpdate image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1691805.2.2 Candlestick North – Block PlanText and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.2225181Figure 5.6 – Block PlanFigure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.2. Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents226182-1835.2.3a Candlestick NorthSection numbers updated Block numbers updated Figure cross-references updated Grocery store requirements moved from CP Center added170-171	176	5.2.1 Candiestick North – General Description	Section humber updated	166
179Image – View of Candlestick North looking westUpdate ingure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents1691805.2.2 Candlestick North – Block PlanText and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.2225181Figure 5.6 – Block PlanFigure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.2. Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents226182-1835.2.3a Candlestick NorthSection numbers updated Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added Block numbers updated Figure cross-references updated Figure encost-references updated Figure moved from CP Center added170-171	177	Figure 5.5 Candlestick North Illustrative Site Plan	Figure number updated	167
175       Image - View of Candiestick North Hocking west       Opdate Image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents       109         180       5.2.2 Candlestick North – Block Plan       Text and Table 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.2       225         181       Figure 5.6 – Block Plan       Figure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.2.       226         182-183       5.2.3a Candlestick North       Section numbers updated Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added       Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added         182-183       5.2.3a Candlestick North       Block numbers updated Figure cross-references updated Grocery store requirements moved from CP Center added       170-171	170	Image - View of Candlestick North Leeking west	Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	160
180       5.2.2 candlestick North - block Hair       Text and ratie 5.1 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 5.2.2         181       Figure 5.6 - Block Plan       Figure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.2. Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents       226         182-183       5.2.3a Candlestick North       Section numbers updated Block numbers updated Figure cross-references updated Grocery store requirements moved from CP Center added       170-171	173	5.2.2 Candlestick North – Block Plan	Text and Table 5.1 moved to Annendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.2	225
181     Figure 5.6 – Block Plan     Figure 100 vert to Appendix and refinitioned to Figure 5.2.     226       181     Figure 5.6 – Block Plan     Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents     226       182-183     5.2.3a Candlestick North     Section numbers updated     Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added       182-183     5.2.3a Candlestick North     Block numbers updated     170-171       Figure cross-references updated     Figure cross-references updated     170-171	100		Figure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.2	225
182-183       5.2.3a Candlestick North       Section numbers updated         Block numbers updated       Block numbers updated         Figure cross-references updated       Grocery store requirements moved from CP Center added	181	Figure 5.6 – Block Plan	Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	226
182-183       5.2.3a Candlestick North       Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added       Block numbers updated       170-171         Figure cross-references updated       Grocery store requirements moved from CP Center added       170-171			Section numbers undated	
182-183       5.2.3a Candlestick North       Block numbers updated       170-171         Figure cross-references updated       Grocery store requirements moved from CP Center added       170-171			Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added	
Figure cross-references updated Grocery store requirements moved from CP Center added	182-183	5.2.3a Candlestick North	Block numbers updated	170-171
Grocery store requirements moved from CP Center added			Figure cross-references updated	
			Grocery store requirements moved from CP Center added	

2010 D4D		2016 D4D	
Page	Section / Item	Revision	New Page
184	Figure 5.7 Candlestick North – Urban Design	Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents Linework references updated per Section 5.2.2	172
186-187	5.3 Candlestick Center Title Page	Updated Location Plan Images updated Page numbers added	174-175
188	5.3.1 Candlestick Center – General Description	Make reference to potential alterations to CP Center street layout Make reference to entitlement limitations for Office Change reference to Performance Venue to Landmark Building	176
189	Figure 5.8 Candlestick Center Illustrative Site Plan	Figure number updated Updated figure to show new proposed street layout and land use distribution within CP Center Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	177
191	Image – Candlestick Center – Performance venue and plaza at the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue.	Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	179
192	5.3.2 Candlestick Center – Block Plan	Text and Table 5.3 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.3 and Table 9.3	227
193	Figure 5.9 – Block Plan	Figure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.3. Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	228
194-196	5.3.3 Candlestick Center – Urban Design	Section numbers updated Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added Mixed Use zone location and land uses updated to reflect current CP Center program Required Ground Floor Commercial height updated to a minimum of 20 ft and minimum depth updated to 35 ft consistent with other sections of the D4D Public Plaza requirements refined based on CP Center program Service Vehicle Access requirements incorporated based on CP Center Program Pedestrian mews requirements updated Parking Structure requirements updated, including additional width for garage doors and curb cuts for the CP Center garage in specific circumstances. Requirements for Arelious Walker Entry Plaza added Office also encouraged as use above ground floor commercial Encouraged Grocery Store relocated to Candlestick North Hotel guidelines updated Lobby guidelines updated	180-182
197	Figure 5.10 Candlestick Center Urban Design	Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents Linework references updated per Section 5.3.2	183
198-199	5.4 Candlestick South Title Page	Updated Location Plan Images updated Page numbers added	184-185
200	5.4.1 Candlestick South – General Description	Grammar revision	186
201	Figure 5.11 Candlestick South Illustrative Site Plan	Figure number updated Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	187
203	Image – View of Candlestick South looking west	Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	189
204	5.4.2 Candlestick South – Block Plan	Text and Table 5.4 moved to Appendix and renumbered to Section 9.2.4 and Table 9.4	229
205	Figure 5.12 – Block Plan	Figure moved to Appendix and renumbered to Figure 9.4. Update figure to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents	230
206-207	5.4.3 Candlestick South Urban Design	Section numbers updated Reference to Block Plan in Appendix added	190-191
208	Figure 5.13 Candlestick South Urban Design	Update image to reflect current planning and street network per other project documents Linework references updated per Section 5.4.2	183
210-219	5.5 Jamestown	Section moved to new Section 7	198-209

2010 D4D		2016 D4D		
Page	Section / Item	Revision		
		New section summary explaining context		
		General description updated		
		Minor updates to standards and guidelines to reflect current planning for elements that have relevance to Jamestown		
220 221	Section 6 Implementation Title Dage	Updated Location Plan	104 105	
220-221	Section o Implementation The Page	Page numbers added	194-195	
222	6.1 Design Review Process	Grammar revisions	196	
224 225	Castion 7 Appendix Title Daga	Section number updated to Section 9	216 217	
224-225	Section 7 Appendix Title Page	Table of Contents updated	210-217	
		Section number added		
226-229	Appendix A – Term Definitions	Definitions for 'Agency', 'Class I Bicycle Parking Space(s)' and 'Class II Bicycle Parking Space(s)', 'Mid-block Break' added	218-222	
		Definitions for Pedestrian Mews deleted		
230	Appendix B – Additional Studies	Section number added and title reference updated	231	
231	Alice Griffith – Additional Studies	Section number added	232	
232	Candlestick North – Additional Studies	Section number added	233	
233	Candlestick Center – Additional Studies	Deleted	-	
234	Candlestick South – Additional Studies	Section number added	234	
220	Pack sever page	SFRA logo removed	226	
238	Back cover page	Image updated	236	
		New Section - 8 Shipyard South R&D Option		
		New 8.1 – General Description explaining applicability		
NEW	-	New 8.1.1 – Building Heights with explanation of unit yield transfer from Shipyard to Candlestick	210-215	
		New Figure 8.1 – Building Heights – Shipyard South R&D Option showing maximum height adjustments should unit yield be		
		transferred from Shipyard to Candlestick		



0

450-0162016-002

# Addendum 4 to Environmental Impact Report

Addendum Date:	February 22, 2016
Case No.:	2007.0946E
Project Title:	Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II
EIR:	2007.0946E, certified June 3, 2010
Project Sponsor:	CP Development Co., LP
Lead Agency:	Office of Community Investment & Infrastructure
OCII Staff Contact:	Lila Hussain – (415) 749-2431
	lila.hussain@sfgov.org
City Staff Contact:	Joy Navarrete - (415) 575-9040
	joy.navarrete@sfgov.org

# REMARKS

The Addendum includes the following attached Exhibits, which provide technical analyses, graphics, and other information supporting the analysis in this Addendum:

		Exhibit A: Tier 1 Project Revisions
	Edwin M. Lee	Exhibit B: Tier 2 and 3 Project Revisions
	MAYOR	Exhibit C: Tower Location Analysis
	Tiffany Bohee	Exhibit D: Candlestick Center Mixed Use Height Visuals
	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	Exhibit E: Candlestick Center Hotel Height Visuals
		Exhibit F: Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Conversion Letter (12/14/15)
	Mara Rosales	Exhibit G: Fehr & Peers Candlestick Point Parking Letter (1/11/16)
	CHAIR	Exhibit H: OCII Commission Resolution No. 1-2014 (1/7/14)
	Miguel Bustos	Exhibit I: Fehr & Peers Harney Way Letter (12/9/15)
	Marily Mondejar	Exhibit J: Fehr & Peers Gilman Avenue Letter (8/13/15)
	Darshan Singh	Exhibit K: Candlestick Point Tower Analysis from CPSRA
	COMMISSIONERS	Exhibit L: Excerpts from CPSRA General Plan and California State Park and Recreation
0	One S. Van Ness Ave	Commission Approval Resolution 1-2013
1	5th Floor	Exhibit M: Fehr & Peers Arena Conversion Letter (12/21/15)
	San Francisco, CA 94103	Exhibit N: Candlestick Point Tower Visual Analysis
		Exhibit O: IBI Shadow Analysis and Memo
1	415 749 2400	Exhibit P: Ramboll Environ Air Quality and Climate Change Letter (1/22/16)
A	www.sfocii.org	Exhibit Q: CP Development Company Excavation Quantities at Candlestick Point Memo
		(1/26/16)
		Exhibit R: Fehr & Peers Loading Letter (2/18/16)

# Background

On June 3, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Agency Commission certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Candlestick Point –

Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project (Project), San Francisco Planning Department File Number 2007.0946E and San Francisco Redevelopment Agency File Number ER06.05.07. On July 14, 2010, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors affirmed the Planning Commission's certification of the FEIR (Motion No. M10-110).

Between June 3, 2010 and August 3, 2010, the Planning Commission, Redevelopment Agency, Board of Supervisors, and other City Boards and Commissions adopted findings of fact, evaluation of mitigation measures and alternatives, a statement of overriding considerations (File No. 100572) and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) in fulfillment of the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). These entities then adopted various resolutions, motions and ordinances related to Project approval and implementation, including but not limited to: (1) General Plan amendments; (2) Planning Code amendments; (3) Zoning Map amendments; (4) Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan amendments; (5) Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan amendments; (6) Interagency Cooperation Agreements; (7) Design for Development documents; (8) Health Code, Public Works Code, Building Code, and Subdivision Code amendments; (9) Disposition and Development Agreement, which included as attachments a Project Phasing Schedule, a Transportation Plan, and an Infrastructure Plan; (10) Real Property Transfer Agreement; (11) Public Trust Exchange Agreement; (12) Park Reconfiguration Agreement; and (13) Tax Increment Allocation Pledge Agreement.

# 1. Project Summary and Development Status

The Project covers approximately 702 acres along the southeastern waterfront of San Francisco: 281 acres at Candlestick Point (CP) and 421 acres at Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS Phase II). The FEIR evaluated several variants of the Project. At the time of Project approval, it was not known whether the 49ers football team would require a new stadium as part of the Project. As a result, the Project as approved authorized several different land use development scenarios:

- 1. the Project with a stadium as described in Chapter II of the FEIR with Candlestick Tower Variant 3D, Utility Variant 4, and Shared Stadium Variant 5;
- 2. the Project without the stadium, with R&D Variant 1, Candlestick Tower Variant 3D, and Utility Variant 4;
- 3. the Project without the stadium, with Housing/R&D Variant 2a, Candlestick Tower Variant 3D, and Utility Variant 4; and
- 4. Sub-alternative 4A, which provides for the preservation of four historic structures in Hunters Point Shipyard, and which could be implemented with either the stadium variants or non-stadium Variants (See Board of Supervisors CEQA Findings pp. 2-4).

Following Project approval, the 49ers relocated to the City of Santa Clara. As a result, the Project Sponsor decided to proceed with Option (3) above which provides for a mix of housing and research

and development at the stadium site (the "Housing/R&D Variant"). If either the R&D Variant or Housing/R&D Variant is implemented, it will be modified by implementation of Candlestick Tower Variant D and the Utilities Variant.

The Project is envisioned to be completed in phases, and calls for the developer to submit major phase applications covering large areas of development that address the conceptual land use proposal for that area, followed by sub-phase applications that provide more development details on specific portions of a major phase. Subsequent to the certification of the FEIR and the approvals listed above, the Project Sponsor sought approval of Major Phase 1 CP in the Candlestick Park area of the Project as well as a Master Streetscape Plan and Signage Plan. The Project Sponsor also sought changes in the previously approved Project Phasing Schedule, and the schedules for implementation of the Transportation Plan (including the Transit Operating Plan of the Infrastructure Plan), and of other public benefits. These changes were analyzed in Addendum No. 1 to the FEIR, published on December 11, 2013 (Addendum 1). The successor agency to the Redevelopment Agency, the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure ("OCII") Commission, approved these Project proposals on January 7, 2014. The approved Major Phase 1 CP encompasses 16 blocks of new development in the Candlestick Park area of the project, including approximately 1,500 new homes and 1.1 million square feet of mixed commercial uses and approximately 50,000 square feet of community facilities. Major Phase 1 CP includes the entirety of the Alice Griffith replacement project and the Candlestick Point retail center destination featuring retail, housing and entertainment uses.

The Project Sponsor has now submitted an application for approval of Sub-Phases 02-03-04 of Major Phase 1 CP ("Sub Phases CP-02-03-04 Application"). The application as proposed requires modifications of the approved Project Candlestick Point Design for Development ("D4D"), and proposed transportation system changes that require modification of the Major Phase 1 CP Approval, including the Schedule of Performance, the Candlestick Point Infrastructure Plan, the Candlestick Point Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Transportation Plan, and mitigation measures TR-MM.16, TR-MM.23.1, which are included in the approved Project MMRP.

This Addendum No. 4 to the FEIR, evaluates the proposed modifications to the Project, which are described in detail below in Section 3.<sup>1</sup>

# 2. Proposed Sub-Phase Application Description, Proposed Project Modifications, Approval Actions

#### 2.1 Sub-Phases 02-03-04

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> OCII has also prepared two other addenda to the FEIR. Addendum No. 2, published on May 2, 2014, evaluated the potential environmental impacts of the Automatic Waste Collection System described in the FEIR as part of Utility Variant 4. The Project Sponsor is no longer pursing this option. Addendum No. 3 to the FEIR published on September 19, 2014 evaluated the potential environmental impacts of a proposal to demolish Candlestick Park stadium with explosives rather than conventional/mechanical demolition (Addendum 3). This proposal was not pursued by the Project Sponsor and the stadium was demolished using conventional/mechanical means.

Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 would include approximately 1,565 residential units, approximately 635,000 square feet of regional retail at CP Center, approximately 50,000 square feet of community use, approximately 131,000 square feet of neighborhood retail, approximately 75,000 square feet of performance venue use distributed between two locations, approximately 220 hotel rooms, and approximately 134,5000 square feet of office use. A parking garage with approximately 2,700 spaces would be located below the CP Center and along Arelious Walker Drive. Necessary infrastructure, including utilities, transportation improvements, and open space improvements would be included with the development of these sub-phases. [See, Candlestick Point Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application on file at OCII, One South Van Ness, San Francisco, CA 94103, c/o Lila Hussain.]

Table 1 below summarizes the land uses approved for Candlestick Point in 2010 and the modifications proposed with the Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application.

Table 1: Candlestick Point Land Use – Approved vs. Proposed				
Candlestick Point Land Use	2010 Approved	2015 Proposed		
Housing Units	6,225 units	No change		
Neighborhood Retail	125,000 sf	131,000 sf (125,000 SF + 6,000 SF converted from 15,500 sf office)		
Community Facilities	50,000 sf	50,000 sf (Inclusive of floor space for a Fire Station, Safety Hub, International African Market Place, and CPSRA Welcome Center)		
Office	150,000 sf	134,500 sf (Reduction of 15,500 sf due to conversion to 6,000 SF retail )		
Performance Venue/Arena	10,000 seats 75,000 sf	1200 Seats 42,000 sf Film Arts Center 4400 Seats 33,000 sf Performance Venue		
Hotel	220 Rooms 150,000 sf	No Change		

# 2.2 Proposed Project Modifications Analyzed in Detail in Addendum

The proposed modifications addressed in this Addendum in detail are described below and in Exhibit A ("Tier 1 Project Revisions"). These modifications require revisions to certain Project documents including the CP D4D, the Major Phase 1 CP Application, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), the Transportation Plan, and the Infrastructure Plan. Other modifications that are not discussed in detail in this Addendum are also proposed that require revisions to some of these same documents.

In the case of any modifications not discussed in detail in the Addendum, OCII and the Planning Department have reviewed the changes and determined that no new or more severe environmental impacts would result from the changes because either the changes result in no physical changes to the environment or the nature of any physical changes are minor. Exhibit A summarizes proposed modifications that are discussed in the Addendum; for each modification discussed, Exhibit A identifies the specific elements of the Project documents requiring revisions. Exhibit B ("Tier 2 and 3 Project Revisions" and Change Logs) summarizes various modifications to Project documents including updates, refinements, clarifications, and editorial changes that are not discussed in detail in the Addendum. A brief summary of the refinements, clarifications, and editorial changes listed in Exhibit B (Tier 2 and 3 Project Revisions) is provided in the Addendum following the description of the modifications discussed in the Addendum in detail.

# 2.2.1: Tower Relocation: Towers G, J & K

The FEIR Tower Variant 3D included specific tower locations that corresponded with the tower zones identified in the D4D. Figure IV-16a (Vol IX, C&R-2426) in the FEIR shows the location of towers in Variant 3D. The proposed Project modifications would change the location of three towers. (See Exhibit C, Tower Location Analysis).

Tower G, located in CP Center (CP-02), would be moved west from the middle of the block to a location on Arelious Walker Drive near Jamestown Avenue. (See Exhibit C.) Tower G is proposed for relocation because of the practical difficulty of structural integration and construction timing concerns associated with co-locating the tower with the parking garage. The new location would be within CP-02 and outside the 2010 approved tower zone.

Towers J and K would be relocated in CP-04 immediately southeast of the approved locations. (See Exhibit C.) The towers are proposed for relocation because of the proposed increase in the depth of blocks in Sub-Phase CP-04. The approved block depths in CP-04 were established based on the expectation that these blocks would be developed for predominantly retail uses with a rear service alley. The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application now proposes to have residential townhomes lining the mid-block break, which means that approved blocks would not have sufficient depth to accommodate these townhomes. The proposed D4D modifications would increase the block depths in CP-04 to accommodate the townhomes. In response, the depth of the blocks immediately to the southeast of CP-04 would be reduced by the same amount and this change would be reflected in the future CP-10 and CP-11 Sub-Phase applications. The reduction in the block depths in CP-10 and

CP-11 would necessitate moving Towers J and K approximately 100 feet southeast of their approved locations. Tower K would remain within a 2010 approved tower zone. Tower J was approved with a fixed location and the proposed modification would establish a new fixed location.

#### 2.2.2: Height Increases

Height Increase within CP Center on Western Corner of Harney Way & Ingerson Avenue Intersection: The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application proposes an increase in the maximum height at CP Center on the corner of West Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue from 85 feet to 120 feet. The proposed height increase would allow for a performance venue (accommodating a Film Arts Center) above a two-story anchor retail space. (See Exhibit D, p. 1 Candlestick Center Mixed Use Height Visuals.)

*Height Increase for Development Within and Abutting CP Center.* The approved height limit for the buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue within and adjacent to the CP Center is 65 feet. This height allows for a 20 foot ground floor of retail with four to five floors of residential units above. The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application and D4D modifications would increase the maximum height of these buildings to 80 feet, mandate a minimum floor-to-floor height of 20 feet for the ground floor retail, and restrict residential and commercial uses above the ground floor retail to a maximum of five floors. (See Exhibit D, pp. 2-3.)

Height Increase for CP Center at the Corner of Arelious Walker Drive and Harney Way. The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application and proposed D4D modifications include an increase in the height of the building located at the corner of Arelious Walker Drive and Harney Way from 65 feet to 80 feet. (See, Exhibit E, Candlestick Center Hotel Height Visuals.)This building would include the 220-room hotel, performance venue space, and office space. The increase in height is intended to ensure consistency in the built form along Harney Way and allow greater flexibility to design the building as an iconic entry statement to CP Center given its important location at the intersection of Arelious Walker Drive and Harney Way. The additional height would also allow for a taller floor-to-floor height at ground level, which would provide flexibility for different uses and amenities.

#### 2.2.3: Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail Space

The 2010 approved Project, Variant 2A assumed that Candlestick Point would include 150,000 square feet of office use and 125,000 square feet of neighborhood retail use. The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application proposes to increase neighborhood retail use by 6,000 additional square feet, for a total of 131,000 square feet of neighborhood retail use. At the same time, the Project Sponsor proposes to forego development of 15,500 square feet of the 150,000 square feet of office use allowed under the approved Project. The remaining 134,500 square feet of office use would be included in the CP Center on the site with the hotel and performance venue space. (See Exhibit F, Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Conversion Letter, 12/14/15.)

#### 2.2.4: Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage

The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application proposes changes to the number of on-street and offstreet parking spaces, which are discussed in detail in Exhibit G, Fehr & Peers CP Parking Memo, 1/11/16.

Per Exhibit G and Table 2 below, there is an overall increase of 241 parking spaces within Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04, which is comprised of an overall increase of 510 off-street parking spaces and a reduction of 269 on-street parking spaces.

Table 2: Car Parking Summary - Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04				
Туре	Location	FEIR (2010)	Sub-Phase Application (2016)	Difference (+/-)
	CP Center Garage	2,596	2,677	+81
Off-Street	Other Location	1,141	1,570	+429
	Total	3,737	4,247	+510
	CP Center Street Network	170	0	-170
On-Street	Other Location	260	161	-99
	Total	430	161	-269
	Total Parking	4,167	4,408	+241

In 2010, the maximum supply of off-street parking at CP-02-03-04 was 3,737 spaces, which was based on the maximum floor space entitlements for land uses within the Sub-Phase. The maximum supply was comprised of 2,596 spaces at CP Center, and 1,141 spaces provided on other blocks by other developers. It was assumed that all off-street parking at CP Center would be located within a structured parking garage. Based on the land uses proposed in the CP-02-03-04 Sub-Phase Application, a total of 4,246 total off-street parking spaces would be provided within Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04. This is comprised of 2,677 spaces in the CP Center parking garage and 1,570 spaces provided separately by other developers. This represents a net increase of 510 parking spaces within Sub-Phase CP 02-03-04.

In relation to on-street parking within Sub Phase CP-02-03-04, the FEIR assumed that 430 on-street car parking spaces would be constructed within the Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04 street network. It was identified that 170 of these parking spaces would be located on streets within CP Center (Earl Street, 8th Street and Bill Walsh Street), and 260 spaces located elsewhere within the CP-02-03-04 street network. With the preparation of design development and construction drawings for the street network, the CP-02-03-04 Sub-Phase Application identifies that the maximum amount on-street parking that can be accommodated within the CP-02-03-04 street network is now 161 spaces. This represents a decrease of 269 on-street car parking spaces. The reduction in on-street parking spaces is the result of the need for the street design to provide adequate clearances for emergency vehicles and accommodate essential sidewalk amenities such as fire hydrants, transit stops, transit shelters, and ADA facilities.

The CP-02-03-04 Sub-Phase Application proposes to relocate the 269 displaced on-street parking spaces to the CP Center garage. The relocation of the displaced on-street car parking spaces, combined with the land uses proposed within CP Center, will result in an overall increase of 81 parking spaces in the CP Center garage from what was identified in the FEIR. The FEIR did not specify construction details for the CP Center garage – the size of the garage is controlled by the height, bulk, and other development regulations applicable to CP Center. The additional 81 spaces can be accommodated within these development limitations and through refinements being made to the design of the space internal to the garage. Thus, because no garage design was specified in 2010 and because the FEIR assumed full build out of the allowable development program at the CP Center, the additional spaces would not increase in the size of development in the CP Center from that anticipated in 2010.

# 2.2.5: Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements

Under FEIR Mitigation Measure TR-16 as modified pursuant to the Addendum 1 analysis (Addendum 1, p. 15), the Project Sponsor is required to construct certain off-site improvements to Harney Way. The changes identified in Addendum 1 and approved by the OCII Commission by Resolution dated January 7, 2014 are shown in Exhibit H. The Harney Way improvements include an initial configuration and a potential longer-term configuration involving a second phase of improvements. The initial configuration included improvements from Arelious Walker Drive to Thomas Mellon Drive prior to the occupancy permit for CP-02. This initial configuration would maintain the existing two travel lanes in each direction, add two BRT lanes on the north side, add a center median to accommodate left-turn lanes at intersections, add a median between the westbound travel lanes and BRT lands to accommodate a dedicated west bound right turn lane at Executive Park Boulevard East and an eastbound BRT stop just west of Executive Park Boulevard, provide a 12-foot sidewalk on the north side of Harney Way and provide a 13-foot two-way Class I bicycle facility on the south side separated from traffic by a five-foot median. (See, Exhibit I, 12/9/15 Fehr & Peers Harney Way Letter, Figure 1.)

Delays associated with two nearby major transportation projects – the extension of Geneva Avenue and the replacement of the US 101/Harney Way interchange - have delayed the final design of the BRT alignment. Given these delays, it is unlikely that the BRT alignment will be finalized by 2019. Consequently, the improvements anticipated in the initial configuration, which include several BRT related improvements, are affected by this delay. The timing of the second phase of improvements would not be affected by these delays.

The Project Sponsor proposes further modifying the MM TR-16 (which was previously modified in 2014 based on Addendum 1) as follows:

*MM* TR-16 Widen Harney Way as shown in Figure 5 in the Transportation Study. Prior to the issuance of the occupancy permit for Candlestick Point Sub-Phase CP-02, the The Project Applicant shall widen Harney Way as shown in figure 5 in the Transportation Study, with the modification to include a two-way cycle track, on the southern portion of the project right of way. <u>The portion</u>

between Arelious Walker Drive and Executive Park East (Phase 1-A) shall be widened to include a two-way cycle track and two-way BRT lanes, prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for Candlestick Sub-Phase CP-02. The remaining portion, between Thomas Mellon Drive and Executive Park East (Phase 1-B), shall be widened prior to implementation of the planned BRT route which coincides with construction of CP-07 and HP-04 in 2023, as outlined in the transit improvement implementation schedule identified in Addendum 1, based on the alignment recommendations from an ongoing feasibility study conducted by the San Francisco County Transportation Agency.

Prior to the issuance of grading permits for Candlestick Point Major Phases 2, 3, and 4, the Project Applicant shall fund a study to evaluate traffic conditions on Harney Way and determine whether additional traffic associated with the next phase of development would result in the need to modify Harney Way to its ultimate configuration, as shown in Figure 6 in the Transportation Study, unless this ultimate configuration has already been built. This study shall be conducted in collaboration with the SFMTA, which would be responsible for making final determinations regarding the ultimate configuration. The ultimate configuration would be linked to intersection performance, and it would be required when study results indicate intersection LOS at one or more of the three signalized intersections on Harney Way at mid-LOS D (i.e., at an average delay per vehicle of more than 45 seconds per vehicle). If the study and SFMTA conclude that reconfiguration would be necessary to accommodate traffic demands associated with the next phase of development, the Project Applicant shall be responsible to fund and complete construction of the improvements prior to occupancy of the next phase.

The proposed modification to MM TR-16, and corresponding modification of the Major Phase 1 CP Application, the Infrastructure Plan, and the Transportation Plan would allow the Project Sponsor to limit the construction of the first phase of improvements during Sub-Phase CP-02 to the area of Harney Way between Arelious Walker Drive and Executive Park Boulevard East, although the sidewalk on Harney Way would be completed all the way to the planned sidewalk and cycle track at Thomas Mellon Drive. When the BRT alignment has been finalized, the Project Sponsor would complete the BRT lanes between Executive Park Boulevard East and Thomas Mellon Drive. Thus, the first phase of improvements would be completed prior to operation of the BRT, and would not delay the start of BRT service. (See Exhibit I, Figure 2.) SFMTA has reviewed this proposed modification and verbally concurred.

# 2.2.6: Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The approved Major Phase 1 CP Application Schedule of Performance requires the Project Sponsor to construct streetscape improvements on Gilman Avenue concurrently with the development of Sub-Phase CP-02. Gilman Avenue is currently configured to facilitate egress from the former Candlestick Park stadium, with one eastbound lane and two westbound lanes. As required by MM TR-23.1, the streetscape improvements would include two lanes of travel in each direction and on-street parking on both sides of the street. Sidewalks would be narrowed from 15 feet to 12 feet (This configuration is shown in Figure 1(A) in Exhibit J, 8/13/15 Fehr & Peers Gilman Avenue Letter). Mitigation measure MM TR-23.1 also requires one travel lane in each direction to be converted to transit-only for project impacts to transit travel times. (This configuration is shown in Figure 1(B) in Exhibit J).

The proposed configuration would retain 15-foot sidewalks and on-street parking, provide one lane of travel in each direction with a center turn lane, and modify the intersections between Third Street and Arelious Walker from all-way-stop-control to signal control. In addition, far-side bus stops with bulb outs would be located on the corridor at Ingalls Street and Griffith Street.

Mitigation measure MM TR-23.1 would be revised as follows and would bring the transit travel times for the 29 Sunset to levels consistent with the mitigated EIR scenario:

*MM* TR-23.1 <u>Maintain the proposed headways of the 29-Sunset.</u> To address project impacts to the 29-Sunset, prior to issuance of a grading permit for Phase I, the Project Applicant in cooperation with SFMTA shall conduct a study to evaluate the effectiveness and feasibility of the following improvements which could reduce Project impacts on transit operations along the Gilman Avenue and Paul Avenue corridor, generally between Arelious Walker Drive and Bayshore Boulevard. The study shall create a monitoring program to determine the implementation extent and schedule (as identified below) to maintain the proposed headways of the 29-Sunset.</u>

- For the five-block segment of Gilman Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Third Street, prohibit on-street parking on westbound Gilman Avenue during the AM and PM peak periods to provide for three westbound travel lanes. During the peak periods convert one of the three westbound travel lanes to transit-only. During off-peak periods, parking would be allowed, and buses would travel in one of the two mixed-flow lanes. The peak period transit lanes would impact 90 parking spaces.
- For the same five-block segment of Gilman Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Third Street, restripe the eastbound direction to provide two travel lanes, one of which would accommodate onstreet parking and one of which would be a mixed-flow travel lane. During the AM and PM peak periods, prohibit on-street parking in the eastbound direction, and operate one of the two eastbound lanes as transit-only lanes. The peak period transit lanes would impact 80 parking spaces.
- As an alternative to the two bulleted measures above, narrow the existing sidewalks on Gilman Avenue from Third Street to Griffith Street (four blocks) from 5 feet to 12 feet in width. The resulting 12-foot-wide sidewalks would be consistent with the Better Streets Plan guidelines. The reduction in sidewalk width would allow for the provision of a 7-foot-wide on-street parking lane, an 11-foot-wide transit-only lane, and a 10-foot-wide mixed-flow lane in each direction on Gilman Avenue. This would preserve on-street parking along the corridor and provide four-block transit-only lanes on Gilman Avenue between Griffith Street and Third Street. Treatment for transit-only lanes can range from striping to physical elevation changes to protect right-of-way from mixed-flow traffic.
- Prohibit on-street parking on the north side of Paul Avenue, between Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard to create two westbound through lanes. Convert one westbound through lane to transitonly in the AM and PM peak periods. The peak period transit-only lane would impact 40 parking spaces. At the intersection of Paul Avenue and Bayshore Avenue, provide transit signal priority treatment (i.e., queue jump) to allow transit vehicles to maneuver into the mixed flow left-hand lane,

facilitating a left-turn movement immediately west of Bayshore Boulevard from westbound Paul Avenue to southbound San Bruno.

- <u>Implement traffic signal priority (TSP)</u>, which modifies the timing at signalized intersections to prioritize the movement of transit vehicles, at the intersections of Arelious Walker/Gilman Avenue, San Bruno Avenue/Paul Avenue, and Bayshore Boulevard/Paul Avenue.
- Implement a far-side stop in the eastbound and westbound directions at the intersection of Third Street/Gilman Avenue and a far-side stop in the westbound direction at the intersection of San Bruno/Paul Avenue.
- <u>Implement a peak period, transit-dedicated lane in the westbound direction along Paul Avenue</u> <u>between Third Street Bayshore Boulevard. The transit land would begin on Gilman Avenue and</u> <u>extend through the intersection to Paul Avenue.</u>

A study to evaluate the effectiveness and feasibility of the Project mitigation measures was completed (See Exhibit J, Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave. Addendum, 08/13/15). The monitoring program would evaluate the current conditions for the 29 Sunset to determine the implementation of the proposed measures above.

# 2.3. Proposed Minor Modifications of Project Documents Not Analyzed in Detail in Addendum

As noted above, certain Project documents, including the CP D4D, the Major Phase 1 CP Application, the CP Streetscape Master Plan, the Transportation Plan, and the Infrastructure Plan would be modified but are not discussed in detail in this Addendum because they do not raise environmental issues except for a few with respect to transportation. The few transportation-related issues raised by these modifications are discussed in the Transportation section as explained below. A complete list of these minor modifications is included in Exhibit B.

The modifications by and large clarify and clean up documents to reflect past approvals and elaborate on or make minor modifications to previously proposed design details. Briefly summarized, the modifications: (a) clarify design requirements and definitions; (b) update text and figures to reflect Project approvals received since 2010 and the Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application; (c) delete references to the stadium option; (d) reorganize text for clarity; (e) amplify design requirements for items such as signage and building massing; (f) add details on design requirements for items such as pedestrian amenities and ground floor heights; (g) revise certain garage entry and curb cut requirements, CP Center internal access, building facades, and timing of certain improvements; (h) update the Streetscape Master Plan for items such as street furniture, paving materials, and landscaping materials; (i) update the Major Phase 1 CP Application to reflect the Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application, including an update of the number of affordable housing units from 1025 to 1560; and provide for a portion of performance arts center space to be used for a movie theater.

Generally, these modifications are not further discussed in this Addendum, because OCII and the Planning Department have determined that these Project document modifications would not result in
physical changes sufficient to cause new or more severe significant environmental impacts. A few topics listed in Exhibit B are discussed at the end of the transportation section. These include the proposed garage entry and curb cut modifications, the reduction in performance venue seats as a result of the Film Arts Center proposal for the site at Harney Way and Ingerson, and change in internal circulation at the CP Center (See Section 4.3, Exhibit B Modifications Discussed in Transportation and Circulation Section, for additional discussion related to transportation.)

## 2.4 Project Approvals

The approvals required to implement the Project modifications addressed in this Addendum and the items listed in Exhibits A and B, include the following:

Table 3: Project Approvals		
	Project Approval	Agency
1.	D4D Amendments	OCII Commission
		Planning Commission
2.	Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04	OCII Executive Director
3.	Major Phase 1 CP Amendments	OCII Commission
4.	MMRP Amendments	OCII Commission
		Planning Commission
5.	CP Master Streetscape Plan	OCII Commission
6.	Transportation Plan	SFMTA
7.	Infrastructure Plan	SFDPW, SFMTA, SFPUC. SFFD

## 3. Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 provide that once a lead agency has certified an EIR, no subsequent or supplemental EIR is required to support subsequent discretionary approvals of the project unless major revisions are required in the previous EIR due to substantial changes in the project, the circumstances under which the project is undertaken, or as a result of new information, which becomes available and was not known and could not have been known at the time of the EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 provides for the use of an addendum to document the basis for a lead agency's decision not to require a subsequent EIR for a project that is already adequately covered in a previously certified EIR where some changes or additions are necessary in an EIR but none of the conditions calling for a subsequent or supplemental EIR have occurred. The lead agency's decision to use an addendum must be supported by substantial evidence that the conditions that would trigger the preparation of a Subsequent EIR, as provided in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, are not present.

This Addendum describes the potential environmental effects of the modified Project compared to the impacts identified in the FEIR, and explains why the proposed modifications would not result in any new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified environmental impacts and would not require the adoption of any new or considerably different

mitigation measures or alternatives. Modifications to two previously adopted mitigation measures are proposed and analyzed herein.

## 4.1 Land Use and Plans

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) no significant construction impacts; (2) LU-1, no significant impact on the physical division of an established community; (3) LU-2, less than significant impact as to conflict with plans, policies, or regulations; (4) LU-3, less than significant impacts on existing land use character; and (4) less than significant cumulative impacts.

## Relocation of Towers G, J, and K

The proposed Project modifications include the relocation of Towers G, J, and K. The FEIR land use analysis considered the inclusion of towers at Candlestick Point in determining that the Project would result in less than significant land use and plans impacts. The proposed relocation of three towers would not result in any changes to the Project land uses or introduce a new land use. Because the proposed modified tower locations are within the planned new development area at Candlestick Point (Tower G in CP Center and Towers J and K in CP South) and as shown in Exhibit C, the modified locations would not result in physically dividing an established community. The Project would continue to comply with the General Plan, the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan, the San Francisco Sustainability Plan and other applicable plans, policies, and regulations (e.g. noise regulations, regulations adopted to reduce air quality impact, regulations related to geology and hydrology, biological resource regulations, and other environmental regulatory requirements discussed throughout the FEIR) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. Thus, relocation of three towers would not affect the Project's consistency with a plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

The relocation of the three towers would not change the FEIR's finding that development of Candlestick Point, with the inclusion of towers, would not have a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity. The FEIR acknowledged that the Project would alter the land use character at Candlestick Point and result in a substantially different built environment. The FEIR noted that the scale of the proposed development, including the residential towers, which could be as high as 420 feet, would contrast with existing patterns. The FEIR also acknowledged that the Project's open space network would connect with the CP State Recreational Area (CPSRA) and that CPRSA lands would be reconfigured and improved as part of the Project. Towers J and K would be relocated a short distance within the interior of CP South and thus would not change the Project's impact on the existing character of the vicinity.

The relocation of tower G would move this tower closer to CPRSA. (Exhibit C.) Tower G would continue to be part of the CP Center, a dense concentrated area of development within the Project. As shown in Exhibit K, p. 1 (Candlestick Point Tower Analysis from CPSRA), the closest distance from the proposed tower G location to one corner of the CPSRA would be approximately 600 feet. This is an area of CPSRA located at the intersection of Harney Way and Arelious Walker and these

streets separate the proposed tower from the CPSRA. The majority of CPSRA, including the areas along the waterfront, would be a significantly greater distance from the relocated Tower G. (See Exhibit K, p. 1.) The proposed Tower G location previously accommodated the approximately 70,200 seat football stadium, which ranged in height from 70 to 114 feet and was surrounded by paved parking lots. (See Exhibit K, p. 1-4.) The change from the adjacent football stadium to the CP development, with towers, including the relocation of Tower G, would not represent a significant adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity.

Existing residential development in the Project vicinity includes multi-family housing south of the CP Center along Harney Way and other lower density housing located across Jamestown and farther up the hill from the Project site. Tower G would be moved away from the lower density housing located across Jamestown and somewhat closer to the multi-family, multi-story development along Harney Way. The FEIR Land Use section acknowledged that the Project would alter the character of Candlestick Point and result in a substantially different built environment compared with the existing site and vicinity. (EIR, p. III.B-39.) In particular, the EIR analysis specifically acknowledged that Candlestick Point would include residential towers ranging from 220 feet to 420 feet in height. (EIR, p. III.B-39.) The relocation of tower G within the CP Center would not alter the land use analysis or conclusions in the EIR.

Additionally, the CPSRA General Plan as amended in 2013 acknowledges that the park is located in an intensely urban area surrounded by industrial and residential uses, and, formerly, the stadium. (See Exhibit L, Excerpts from the CPSRA General Plan and Approval Resolution.) The State Park and Recreation Commission Resolution 1-2013 acknowledged that "the Park is located in an urban area surrounded by the proposed Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II project, which will dramatically alter the neighborhood surrounding the park, replacing the existing Candlestick Park stadium, vacant lands and other areas with a large mixed use development." (See Exhibit L.) The CPSRA General Plan describes the vision and role of the park as "an urban state park" where its "urban edge is as long as its shoreline, with CPSRA as the intermediary where these very different environments meet and blend." (See Exhibit L.) The Plan notes that the "proposed redevelopment surrounding the park will greatly change the character of the urban edge. The park will provide a 'green front lawn' for the planned community of townhomes, high rises, and shopping districts. There will be many more people visiting the park, looking to enjoy the incredible water's edge recreation, as well as contact with nature and a respite from city life. Thus, future development of the park must carefully navigate this intermediary nature between the city and shoreline edges. CPSRA's spirit of place will continue to evolve, as a gradient of these urban and natural experiences." (See Exhibit L.) Thus, the CPSRA includes a vision and plans that accommodate the intense urban development underway at Candlestick Point. Given these factors, the relocation of tower G would not result in a substantial adverse land use impact on the existing character of the vicinity, including the CPSRA.

Therefore, the relocation of towers G, J, and K would not change the land use findings or mitigation measures in the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

#### Height Increases

The proposed height increases would not change the Project's approved land uses. The height increases (15 feet-35 feet) for buildings located within the new development area are relatively modest. (See Exhibits D and E.) The increases in height would occur in the CP Center, which will accommodate dense urban development of varying heights. The most significant height increase would be at the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson for a building located in the interior of the new development area at a significant intersection. This is a prominent intersection where additional height would be an appropriate urban design feature. The height increases would not affect the existing lower density housing located across Jamestown and up the hill from the Project site because the distance, topography, and other project development would ensure that these height increases would not be noticeable from, or otherwise adversely affect the character of, these existing residential areas. Thus, these proposed height increases would not affect existing land uses, conflict with plans and policies designed to mitigate environmental impacts, or adversely affect the existing land use character of the area surrounding Candlestick Point. Consequently, the height increases would not result in new impacts or increases in the severity of previously identified impacts related to land use and plans and no new mitigation measures would be required.

#### Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail Space

The proposed conversion of 15,500 square feet of office use to 6,000 square feet of neighborhood retail use would maintain the overall mix of uses allowed in Candlestick Point, including residential, office, retail (neighborhood and regional), hotel, and open space/parks. The proposed use conversion would result in a robust neighborhood retail program that would meet the demand for shops and services in the new urban core of Candlestick Point and allow for neighborhood retail to be provided in various locations in the new neighborhoods. The remaining 134,500 square feet of office use would continue to allow appropriate office uses in Candlestick Point to serve residents and commercial uses. This minor change in the use allocation at Candlestick Point would not result in the physical division of an established community, conflict with plans, policies, or regulations designed to mitigate environmental impacts, or adversely affect the existing land use character since both office and neighborhood retail uses were already anticipated to be part of the development. Accordingly, there would be no new impacts or increases in the severity of previously identified impacts related to land use and plans and no new mitigation measures would be required.

# Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The proposed Project modifications to the parking and transportation system would not result in any change to the types of land uses in the Project, would not change the density or intensity of the Project uses, and would not change the Project location. Thus, these proposed Project modifications would not change the FEIR's findings with respect to land use and plans impacts. Consequently, there would be no new impacts or increases in the severity of previously identified impacts related to land use and plans and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Additionally, given that the proposed Project modifications would have no new or more severe land use impacts, the FEIR land use and plans cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

### 4.2 Population, Housing and Employment

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) PH-1, less than significant impacts as the Project would not induce substantial direct population growth during construction; (2) PH-2, less than significant impacts as the Project would not result in indirect population growth during operation; (3) PH-2a, less than significant impacts regarding indirect population growth during operation of Candlestick Point; (4) PH-2b, less than significant impacts regarding indirect population growth during operation of HPS Phase II; (5) PH-3, no impacts regarding the displacement of existing housing units or residents, necessitating the construction of new units elsewhere; (6) PH-3a, no impacts regarding displacement of existing housing units and residents at Candlestick Point, necessitating the construction of new units elsewhere; (7) PH-3b, no impacts regarding displacement of existing housing units and residents at HPS Phase II, necessitating the construction of new units elsewhere; (8) less than significant cumulative population, housing and employment impacts.

#### **Tower Relocations**

The relocation of three Project towers would not increase the overall intensity of development of the Project because these towers would accommodate the same amount and type of development contemplated by the FEIR for the towers. Thus, the tower relocation would not increase the FEIR's Project population and employment projections. Additionally, the tower relocations would not displace any existing housing units or residents, because the existing CP Center and CP South sites do not contain any existing housing units.

#### Height Increases

The proposed height increase would change the density range across the whole of Candlestick Point from 20-245 units per acre to 15-285 units per acre. While the density range would change, the total number of housing units at CP would not change and would remain at 6,225 units. Thus, no increase in the FEIR's population and employment projections would occur as a result of this density range change.

The height increases may slightly increase construction activities on the site, but the extent of this increase would be modest - 15 feet, approximately 1-story in most locations, and potentially 35 feet for the Film Arts Center location. In the context of the overall construction activity for the site, these relatively modest increases in potential building height would be unlikely to result in any additional population growth during construction, because any additional construction work would be done by workers already working on the Project. Thus, the height increase would not increase population or employment on the site because of construction activities.

Additionally, the height increase would not displace any existing housing units or residents, because the existing CP Center and CP South sites do not contain any existing housing units.

#### Conversion of Office Use to Neighborhood Retail Use

The proposed conversion of 15,500 square feet of office use to 6,000 square feet of neighborhood retail use would reduce the amount of square footage developed on the Project site. Thus, this proposed change would not increase population or employment on the site. Additionally, this proposed change would not displace any existing housing units or residents, because the existing CP Center and CP South sites do not contain any existing housing units.

#### <u>Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of</u> <u>Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue</u>

The relocation of on-street parking spaces to the garage would not substantially increase the number of spaces in the garage. The FEIR assumed the CP Center garage would accommodate 2,596 spaces (FEIR, Figure III.D-12) and the current plan includes 2,677 spaces. No plans for the garage were available in 2010, but the FEIR assumed full build out of the CP Center. This increase in spaces would be accommodated by the allocation of space within the planned garage and in compliance with the development regulations applicable to CP Center. Thus, this relatively modest increase in spaces would be unlikely to result in any additional population growth during construction, because any additional construction work that might be necessary would be done by workers already working on the Project. Thus, the relocation of parking spaces would not increase population or employment on the site because of construction activities.

The proposed change in the phasing of the Harney Way improvements and the Gilman Avenue configuration revisions would result in some adjustments to previously approved Project elements. Certain Harney Way improvements would be shifted to a later phase and the scope of the Gilman Avenue improvements would be reduced. Thus, these changes would not increase population or employment on the site. Additionally, these proposed transportation changes would not displace any existing housing units or residents, because the locations of these improvements do not contain any existing housing units.

Therefore, given that the Project modifications would not result in any significant changes that would implicate the significance criteria for population, employment and housing, the Project modifications would not change or alter any of the FEIR's findings with respect to population, housing and employment impacts. All impacts would remain less than significant or no impact and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR population, housing and employment cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant.

## 4.3 Transportation and Circulation

This discussion evaluates the following proposed Project modifications to determine if they would result in new or more severe significant transportation and circulation environmental impacts: (a) the conversion of office space to neighborhood retail use; (b) the relocation of on-street parking to the CP Center garage; (c) the change in the phasing of Harney Way off-site improvements; and (d) the revisions to the approved configuration of Gilman Avenue. Transportation and circulation are documented in detail in the following exhibits: Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail reference Exhibit F (Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Memo, 12/14/15); Relocation of On-Street Parking reference Exhibit G (Fehr & Peers CP Parking Memo, 1/11/16); Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing reference Exhibit I (Fehr & Peers Harney Way Phasing Letter, 12/09/15); and Gilman Avenue Revised Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements reference Exhibit J (Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15). In addition, a memorandum discussing transportation effects of the Performance Venue Revision, including the Film Arts Center, (discussed at the end of this Transportation and Circulation section) is included in Exhibit M (Fehr & Peers Arena Conversion Memo, 12/21/15. The FEIR project description refers to a "Performance Venue/Arena" at Candlestick Point. The Transportation and Circulation section of the EIR referred to this land use as an "Arena." In the Sub-Phases Application and in this Addendum, this land use is referred to as Performance Venue and the Film Arts Center is a performance venue use proposed for the building located at the western corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue. In this transportation analysis, the land use will be referred to as "Arena/Performance Venue" to reflect the terms used in the FEIR)

The proposed tower relocations and height increases would not result in new significant transportation impacts or an increase in the severity of previously identified transportation impacts, because these modifications would not increase or change the type of development previously approved. Additionally, the tower relocations would occur within areas approved for development and thus would not significantly change expected circulation patterns. Although the height increases may involve additional construction work, the increase is modest in the context of the construction necessary for the Project and would be completed by workers and equipment already anticipated to be on-site and thus no significant additional construction traffic would be expected. Thus, no additional transportation and circulation construction impacts are expected from the relatively modest proposed height increases. Thus, the tower relocations and height increases are not further discussed below.

## TR1-1: On-Site and Off-Site Construction Impacts

As described in the EIR, construction of the Project would result in significant and unavoidable transportation impacts in the Project vicinity due to construction vehicle traffic and roadway construction and would contribute to cumulative construction impacts in the Project vicinity. The EIR concluded implementation of mitigation measure MM TR-1, which would require the Applicant to develop and implement a construction traffic management plan to reduce the impact of construction activity on transportation facilities, would reduce the impacts caused by construction, but not to a less-than-significant level.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The conversion of office space to neighborhood retail would generate less occupied square-footage. Office space would decrease from 150 ksf to 134.5 ksf and local retail would increase from 125 ksf to 131 ksf; thus, the total office and local retail square footage would decrease from 275 ksf to 265.5 ksf, thereby decreasing the amount of construction. The Project revision does not result in any new significant construction impacts.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking does not result in any new significant construction impact because the additional parking spaces will not substantially increase the overall size of development at CP Center. The additional parking spaces would be accommodated by the allocation of space within the planned garage in compliance with the D4D development standards for CP Center.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The revised Harney Way construction plan would continue to construct the Harney Way cross-section; however, the construction would be completed in two phases (Phase 1-A and Phase 1-B.) Phase 1-B, Harney Way between Executive Park Boulevard East and Thomas Mellon Drive, shall be constructed prior to implementation of the planned BRT route and would likely coincide with other construction projects in the area. The Construction Traffic Management Program required by MM TR-1 would include specific provisions to manage the potential impacts on Harney Way. The overall amount of construction would remain approximately the same as presented in the EIR; therefore the Project revision does not result in any new significant construction impacts.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revise Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: The revised Gilman Avenue crosssection would decrease the amount of construction activity because the proposal would no longer widen Gilman Avenue. Therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant construction impacts.

The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to transportation and circulation during construction beyond those identified in the EIR, nor would it substantially increase in the severity of a significant impact identified in the EIR, and no new mitigation measures would be required (See Exhibit J, Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15.)

# Impacts TR-2 through TR-16: Traffic Impacts to Regional and Local Roadway System, Study Intersections, and Freeway Facilities

The EIR evaluated 60 intersections and several freeway facilities throughout the Project site and surrounding area. As described in the EIR, the Project would generate substantial amounts of new vehicular traffic resulting in a number of significant impacts and mitigation measures. Impacts TR-2 through TR-8 and TR-10 through TR-15, which identified several mitigation measures, were considered significant and unavoidable. Impact TR-9 was considered less than significant and TR-16 was considered less than significant with mitigation.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The conversion of office space to neighborhood retail would generate fewer AM peak hour trips and the same number of PM peak hour trips as

identified in the EIR and detailed in Exhibit F. (Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Memo, 12/14/15.) Therefore, the Project revision would not create any new significant traffic impacts because the total trips generated would remain the same or decrease.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking does not result in additional trips generated because under the FEIR analysis the total trips generated are based on land use factors, such as the amount of residential units, retail or office space, etc., not total parking or the location of parking (the analysis assumes that parking is located within the Project site); therefore the Project revision does not result in any new significant traffic impacts.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The revised Harney Way phasing plan would continue to provide two lanes of travel in both directions at all times, until monitoring requires construction of the ultimate configuration, as envisioned by MM TR-16. Thus, even with the phased implementation of the near-term configuration for Harney Way, the roadway would continue to have the same number of lanes and traffic capacity at all times. No additional significant traffic impacts [e.g. changes in LOS] were identified as a result of phasing the initial improvements to Harney Way because the vehicle configuration would remain the same as detailed in Exhibit I (Fehr & Peers Harney Way Phasing Letter, 12/09/15.)

<u>Gilman Avenue Revised Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: The Gilman Avenue revised crosssection would not influence the Project's travel demand; therefore, the Project revision would not result in additional impacts to locations away from Gilman Avenue. As indicated in the detailed analysis included in Exhibit J (Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15), the revised crosssection would result in similar or lower average intersection delay and travel times along Gilman Avenue compared to the original cross-section analyzed in the EIR, and no additional significant impacts would occur on Gilman Avenue, itself.

The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to traffic circulation beyond those identified in the EIR, nor would it substantially increase in the severity of a significant impact identified in the EIR, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

#### Impacts TR-17 through TR-30: Impacts to Local and Regional Transit Operations and Capacity

The EIR described the Project's impacts to transit in Impacts TR-17 through TR-30. The EIR identified that with mitigation measures, the Project would provide adequate transit capacity to meet Project demand; therefore, TR-17 through TR-20 were determined to be less than significant. TR-21 through TR-27, which describe impacts to transit travel time, were considered significant and unavoidable because mitigation measures identified would require substantial outreach and design, such that the feasibility of the mitigation measures is uncertain. The EIR also identified TR-28 through TR-30, regional transit routes using nearby freeways. The EIR concluded that TR-28 and TR-30 were significant and unavoidable and TR-29 was less than significant.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> As shown in Exhibit F (Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Memo, 12/14/15), the conversion of office space to neighborhood retail would generate fewer

AM peak hour trips and the same number of PM peak hour trips as the Project. Therefore, the Project revision would not influence the Project's travel demand, such that the revised Project would not cause additional significant transit impacts.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking does not result in additional transit trips generated, nor would it interfere with projected travel times. In fact, fewer on-street parking spaces may actually reduce the "friction" between transit and vehicles maneuvering into and out of parking spaces on-street. Therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant transit impacts.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The proposed phasing would not affect the Project's travel demand, such that the revised Project would not cause additional transit impacts related to transit ridership. The proposed phasing would require that the BRT facilities be constructed in a manner consistent with the alternative BRT alignment determined by the SFCTA and SFMTA prior to operation of the BRT system. MTA is in the process of evaluating the future BRT routes, including the 28 route which is planned to run along Harney Way. At this time, MTA has not completed environmental review or selected a preferred route. Consequently, the potential change in the routes for the BRT is uncertain and too speculative for further analysis. Therefore, transit service would not be affected by the proposed phasing of improvements to Harney Way.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revise Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements:</u> As described in Exhibit J (Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15), the revised cross-section would not affect the Project's travel demand, such that the revised Project would not cause additional transit impacts identified in TR-17 through TR-22 or TR-24 through TR-30, which relate to transit routes that do not travel on Gilman Avenue. However, the EIR identified proposed MM TR-23, which would widen the Gilman Avenue cross-section between Third Street and Griffith Street. If the revised proposal for Gilman Avenue is adopted, implementing Mitigation MM-TR-23 will be infeasible. Therefore, MM-TR-23 has been revised to include feasible mitigations measures that would result in better transit operations than the original MM-TR-23.

The revised mitigation measure is as follows, with detailed supporting analysis included in Exhibit J.

For the five-block segment of Gilman Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Third Street, prohibit on-street parking on westbound Gilman Avenue during the AM and PM peak periods to provide for three westbound travel lanes. During the peak periods convert one of the three westbound travel lanes to transit-only. During off-peak periods, parking would be allowed, and buses would travel in one of the two mixed-flow lanes. The peak period transit lanes would impact 90 parking spaces.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> To address the project impacts to the 29-Sunset, the DEIR included two mitigation measures, addressing the eastbound and westbound transit operations, and an alternative mitigation measure. Through discussions with City staff the mitigation measures identified were not desirable and removed from the final EIR, such that the alternative became the mitigation measure. The MMRP did not reflect this change; therefore, as part of Addendum 4, the two mitigation measures included in MM TR-23.1 are being removed in addition to the alternate described above.

- For the same five-block segment of Gilman Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Third Street, restripe the eastbound direction to provide two travel lanes, one of which would accommodate on-street parking and one of which would be a mixed-flow travel lane. During the AM and PM peak periods, prohibit on-street parking in the eastbound direction, and operate one of the two eastbound lanes as transit-only lanes. The peak period transit lanes would impact 80 parking spaces.<sup>1</sup>
- As an alternative to the two bulleted measures above, narrow the existing sidewalks on Gilman Avenue from Third Street to Griffith Street (four blocks) from 15 feet to 12 feet in width. The resulting 12-foot-wide sidewalks would be consistent with the Better Streets Plan guidelines. The reduction in sidewalk width would allow for the provision of a 7-foot-wide on-street parking lane, an 11-foot-wide transit-only lane, and a 10-foot-wide mixed-flow lane in each direction on Gilman Avenue. This would preserve on-street parking along the corridor and provide four-block transitonly lanes on Gilman Avenue between Griffith Street and Third Street. Treatment for transit-only lanes can range from striping to physical elevation changes to protect right-of-way from mixedflow traffic.
- Prohibit on-street parking on the north side of Paul Avenue, between Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard to create two westbound through lanes. Convert one westbound through lane to transit-only in the AM and PM peak periods. The peak period transit-only lane would impact 40 parking spaces. At the intersection of Paul Avenue and Bayshore Avenue, provide transit signal priority treatment (i.e., queue jump) to allow transit vehicles to maneuver into the mixed flow lefthand lane, facilitating a left-turn movement immediately west of Bayshore Boulevard from westbound Paul Avenue to southbound San Bruno.
- Implement TSP at the intersections of Arelious Walker/Gilman Avenue, San Bruno Avenue/Paul Avenue, and Bayshore Boulevard/Paul Avenue
- Implement a far-side stop in the eastbound and westbound directions at the intersection of Third Street/Gilman Avenue and a far-side stop in the westbound direction at the intersection of San Bruno/Paul Avenue
- Implement peak period-transit dedicated lane in the westbound direction along Paul Avenue between Third Street/Bayshore Boulevard. The transit lane would begin on Gilman Avenue and extend through the intersection to Paul Avenue.

As explained in Exhibit J of the Appendix, the revised MM TR-23 would offer a better level of improvement to transit travel times compared to the original MM TR-23, and therefore, no additional significant impacts to transit are anticipated as a result of the proposed change to the Gilman Avenue cross-section.

Consequently, the revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to transit beyond those identified in the EIR nor would it cause a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required with exception to MM TR-23, which would require a revised mitigation measure. The revised mitigation measure would result in better transit operations than the original mitigation measure identified in the EIR.

#### Impacts TR-31 and TR-32: Bicycle Circulation

The EIR described impacts to bicycle circulation in Impacts TR-31 and TR-32. The EIR concluded that TR-31 would result in a beneficial impact or no impact because the Project would construct bicycle facilities to serve the additional demand. TR-32 was identified as significant and unavoidable because the feasibility to implement MM TR-32 is uncertain.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The amount of office space converted to neighborhood retail was based on generating the same or fewer peak hour trips, as such, the conversion would generate fewer AM peak hour trips and the same number of PM peak hour trips as the Project analyzed in the EIR (See Exhibit F, Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Memo, 12/14/15.) Therefore, the Project revision would not increase the Project's travel demand and associated conflicts between auto traffic and bicycles such that the revised Project would not cause additional significant bicycle impacts.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking does not result in additional bicycle or vehicle trips generated because the total bicycle trips generated are based on land use factors, such as the amount of residential units, retail or office space, etc., not total parking or the location of parking. Further, the reduction in on-street parking supply may actually reduce the potential conflicts between bicycles and vehicles maneuvering into and out of on-street parking spaces, and from drivers opening their doors into bicycles on adjacent streets; therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant bicycle impacts.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The phased approach would include the full two-way cycletrack on the south side of Harney Way for the extent of the project's responsibility for improvements to Harney Way, between Arelious Walker Drive and Thomas Mellon Drive, as part of the very first phase. Therefore, the phasing will have no effect to bicycle conditions compared to what was described in the EIR and prior addenda.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revised Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: Neither the originally proposed configuration nor the revised configuration proposed dedicated bicycle facilities on Gilman Avenue. Both proposals continue to designate Gilman Avenue as a Class III facility. The provision of a single lane in each direction compared to two, as originally planned, may actually serve to calm traffic and reduce conflicts between cars and bicycles. Further, the revised cross-section actually widens the outside lane (that would accommodate the majority of bicyclists) from 11-feet to 12-feet, allowing more room for autos and bicycles. Therefore, since the revisions do not propose changes to the designation of bicycle routes nor to any physical infrastructure dedicated for bicycles, nor do they increase the potential for conflicts between bicycles and vehicles, the proposed changes will not result in any new significant bicycle impacts compared to those identified in the EIR. See Exhibit J (Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15) for additional details. The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to bicycle circulation beyond those identified in the EIR or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

#### Impacts TR-33 and TR-34: Pedestrian Circulation

The EIR described impacts to pedestrian circulation in Impacts TR-33 and TR-34. The EIR concluded that TR-33 would result in a beneficial impact or no impact because the Project would construct pedestrian facilities to serve the additional demand. TR-34 was identified as less than significant because the Project traffic would not substantially affect pedestrian circulation in the area.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The amount of office space converted to neighborhood retail was based on generating the same or fewer peak hour trips. As such, the conversion would generate fewer AM peak hour trips and the same number of PM peak hour trips as the Project. Therefore, the Project revision would not influence the Project's travel demand, such that the revised Project would not cause additional significant pedestrian impacts.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking does not result in additional pedestrian trips generated, but may change the pedestrian path of travel, as more pedestrians would travel between their destinations and the parking structure constructed as part of the candlestick retail center (Sub-Phase CP-02). However, the parking structure will be designed to meet existing design standards, which include provisions for pedestrian paths of travel. The final designs will be reviewed by the City as part of the issuance of construction permits to ensure that design standards are met; therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant pedestrian impacts.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The proposed phasing would widen the sidewalk from 8 to 12 feet between Arelious Walker and Executive Park Boulevard East. However, the sidewalk between Executive Park Boulevard and Thomas Mellon Drive would not be widened until the construction of the BRT lanes, prior to the operation of the BRT route. In the interim, the existing 8' sidewalk would remain along this section. Though the widening of a portion of the northern sidewalk would not occur for several years after opening of the Candlestick Point retail center, the retail center is not expected to generate a substantial number of new pedestrian trips along Harney Way and the existing facilities are expected to be adequate in the interim period. Therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant pedestrian impacts.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revised Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: The revised cross-section would keep the existing sidewalk width, instead of decreasing as originally proposed. The revised Project will result in improved pedestrian conditions compared to the originally proposed EIR cross-section which decreased the sidewalk widths by 3'. Therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant pedestrian impacts.

The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to pedestrian circulation beyond those identified in the EIR or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

#### Impacts TR-35 and TR-36: Parking

The EIR identified Impacts TR-35 and TR-36, which determined that the Project would result in a shortfall of parking spaces compared to its projected demand. Table III.D-21 of the FEIR shows that total parking demand in the Candlestick Hunters Point Shipyard Project site is approximately 21,200 parking spaces and the maximum parking supply is approximately 18,900 parking spaces, a shortfall of approximately 2,300 spaces. Although the Project would result in a shortfall of parking spaces and would remove some existing on-street parking spaces, the Project's impacts to parking conditions would be less than significant. Exhibit G (Fehr & Peers CP Parking Memo, 1/11/16) details the current total parking proposed in CP Center and Figure III.D-12 of the FEIR shows the total parking supply in the Project Site. Total demand is expected to remain approximately the same, as described in Table III.D-20 of the FEIR.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The conversion of some office space to neighborhood retail would decrease the office parking supply and increase the retail supply in CP Center, as shown in Exhibit G. (Fehr & Peers CP Parking Memo, 1/11/16.) The conversion would decrease the total office and local retail parking supply; however the revised Project's parking supply would remain within the range of parking spaces identified in the EIR (See Figure III.D-12 in the FEIR.)

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street to off-street parking does not affect the overall site total because parking would be relocated on-site; thus would not change the total supply Additionally, the EIR provided a range of parking provided within the Project site, and the total supply with the proposed relocation falls within the range. Therefore, the relocation of on-street parking does not result in additional significant parking impacts.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The proposed phasing would not impact parking because there is no on-street parking on Harney Way under existing conditions and none of the proposed configurations for Harney Way would provide parking. Therefore, the phased approach proposed would have no effect on parking.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revise Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: The proposed changes will not affect parking supply or demand within the proposed project nor along Gilman Avenue because the revised cross-section continues to provide on-street parking. See Figure 1, Exhibit J (Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15). Therefore, the changes do not result in any new significant impacts to parking conditions.

The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts associated with parking supply and demand beyond those identified in the EIR or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

#### Impact TR-37: Loading

The EIR identified Impact TR-37 and determined that the Project would provide adequate loading supply and therefore concluded that impacts related to loading would be less than significant, and that no mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the EIR states that if the loading demand

is not met on site and could not be accommodated within on-street loading zones, trucks would temporarily double-park and partially block local streets while loading and unloading goods, which would result in disruptions and impacts to traffic and transit operations, as well as bicycles and pedestrians. However, because any effects of unmet loading demand would be a temporary inconvenience, any excess demand would not result in a significant impact.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail / Relocation of On-Street Parking:</u> Both the conversion of office space to neighborhood retail and the relocation of on-street parking will have small effects on loading. However, an analysis of loading demand shows that these effects will be less than significant because the change in daily and peak hour truck loading demand would be minimal and will likely be met on-site. Table 2 in Exhibit R (Fehr & Peers Loading Letter, 2/18/16), shows that the daily truck trip generation would decrease by 32 truck trips and increase the peak hour loading space demand by 2 spaces compared to the Project Proposal. The slight increase will likely be accommodated by off-street loading spaces on-site; however, if the loading demand is not met on-site and could not be accommodate by on-street loading zones, the additional trucks would temporarily double-park and partially block local streets. As stated in the EIR, because the effects of unmet loading demand would be a temporary inconvenience, any excess demand would not be significant. Therefore, the revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts related to loading.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: There are currently no loading facilities on Harney Way, and none of the proposals would add loading. Therefore, the phased approach proposed would have no effect on loading in the area.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revise Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: The revised cross-section does not change the overall loading supply or demand. Thus, implementation of the revised design would not result in any new significant impacts related to loading.

The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to transportation associated with loading beyond those identified in the EIR or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

#### Impacts TR-38 through TR-50: Stadium Impacts

The revised Project does not include construction of a new stadium. Furthermore, the existing stadium at Candlestick Point has already been demolished and the 49ers games are played elsewhere. Game day impacts for the revised Project are not applicable.

#### Impact TR-51 through TR-55: Arena/Performance Venue Impacts

The EIR included summarized impacts related to the operation of an Arena/Performance Venue in TR-51 through TR-55. The EIR identified that with mitigation measures, TR-51 (related to traffic) and TR-52 (related to transit) would remain significant and unavoidable. TR-53 through TR-55, which

summarized bicycle, pedestrian, and parking impacts, respectively, related to the operation of the Arena/Performance Venue were considered less than significant.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail</u>: The conversion of office space to neighborhood retail would not affect the operation of the proposed Arena nor would the conversion generate additional trips to impact arena traffic operations (See Exhibit F, Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Memo, 12/14/15.) Therefore, the revised Project does not result in any new significant impacts related to the Arena.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking would not affect the operation of the Arena because the relocation of on-street parking would not change the total parking provided on-site. Therefore, the revised Project does not result in any new significant impacts related to the Arena/Performance Venue.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The revised Harney Way phasing plan would continue to provide two lanes of travel in both directions at all times, until monitoring requires construction of the ultimate configuration, as envisioned by MM TR-16. Thus, even with the phased implementation of the near-term configuration for Harney Way, the roadway would continue to have the same number of lanes and traffic capacity at all time, thereby will not result in additional impacts to Arena/Performance Venue operations.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revise Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: The Gilman Avenue revised crosssection would not influence the Project's travel demand; therefore, the Project revision would not result in additional significant impacts associated with the Arena/Performance Venue. As indicated in the detailed analysis, the revised cross-section would result in similar or better intersection delay and travel times.

The revised Project would reduce the capacity of the event space (Arena); therefore, the revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to transportation associated with the event space and will likely lessen the severity of significant impacts identified in the EIR. (See Exhibit B Modifications discussed below for additional details.)

#### Impact TR-56: Air Traffic Impacts

The EIR determined that the Project would have a less than significant impact on air traffic. The revised Project would contain the same overall land uses and general development form and would not change the EIR's conclusion regarding air traffic. The revised Project would not create any new significant impacts with respect to air traffic and no additional mitigation measures are required.

#### Impact TR-57: Hazards due to Design Features

The EIR determined that the Project's transportation infrastructure would be designed in accordance with City standards, and would be reviewed and approved by the City prior to construction. As a result the Project's impacts to hazards would be less than significant. The revised Project would be

designed in accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. Therefore, no new significant impacts to design features have been identified.

#### Impact TR-58: Emergency Access

The EIR determined that the Project's transportation infrastructure would adequately facilitate emergency access and be designed to City standards, which include provisions that address emergency vehicles.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The office to retail conversion would not affect the transportation infrastructure such that it would impact emergency vehicle access. Additionally, the revised Project would be designed in accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. Therefore, no new significant impacts to emergency access have been identified.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking would not affect the transportation infrastructure such that it would impact emergency vehicle access. In fact, fewer on-street parking spaces may actually reduce the "friction" between emergency vehicles and vehicles maneuvering into and out of parking spaces on-street. Therefore, no new significant impacts to emergency access have been identified.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The proposed phasing would maintain the same number of traffic lanes as proposed in the EIR. Therefore, there would be no additional significant impact to emergency vehicle access with the proposed phasing.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revised Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements:</u> The revised Project would be designed in accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. As indicated in the detailed analysis (Exhibit J, Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15), the revised cross-section would result in similar or better intersection delay and travel times. Therefore, no new significant impacts to emergency access have been identified.

The revised Project would not change the overall Project's transportation infrastructure. Additionally, the revised Project would be designed in accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. Therefore, no new significant impacts to emergency access have been identified.

#### Exhibit B Modifications Discussed in Transportation and Circulation Section

As noted in Section 3.3, Proposed Project Modifications Analyzed in Addendum, minor modifications that are not discussed in detail in this Addendum are also proposed and set out in Exhibit B. Planning and OCII have determined that these minor modifications either do not result in physical changes or result in such minor physical changes that they will not have different environmental effects from the effects analyzed in the FEIR. However, as explained in Section 3.3 Proposed Minor Modifications of Project Documents Not Analyzed in Detail in Addendum, a few of the minor

modifications could affect transportation or circulation impacts and those are discussed in this subsection. These include the proposed garage entry and curb cut modifications, the reduction in performance venue seats as a result of the Film Arts Center proposal for the site at Harney Way and Ingerson, and change in internal circulation at the CP Center.

<u>Parking Garage Entry and Curb Cut Widths:</u> The revised curb-cut widths would not influence the Project's travel demand; therefore, the Project revision would not result in additional impacts related to trip generation. The increased curb-width would extend the pedestrian crossing length; however, the garage entries will be designed to meet existing design standards and will comply with City regulations, which include adequate pedestrian treatments to facilitate pedestrian crossings with driveway ingress and egress. The final designs will be reviewed by the City as part of the issuance of construction permits to ensure that design standards are met; therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant impacts.

<u>Arena/ Performance Venue Conversion</u>: The Arena/ Performance Venue Conversion, including the Film Arts Center proposed at one performance venue location would not result in a substantial change in the Project's travel demand without an Arena Event as described in the EIR and would substantially decrease the number of PM peak hour trips with an Arena Event, as shown in Table 2 of Exhibit M (Fehr & Peers Arena Conversion Memo, 12/21/15.) With the Film Arts Center and a Performance Venue event (at the second location in CP Center for Performance Venue space), the revised Project would generate 678 fewer vehicle trips during the weekday PM peak hour. The Film Arts Center trip distribution and mode split is likely to behave similarly to retail uses and the second Performance Venue is likely to behave similarly to the originally assumed Arena; therefore, the mode splits and geographic distribution originally forecasted in the EIR are applicable.

The proposed land use revisions would likely result in localized changes to traffic volumes, because the change in traffic generation is relatively small compared to the project, and the relatively small increases would disperse relatively quickly farther away from the project. Thus, the revised Project will not create any new significant impacts compared to those identified in the EIR, nor would it substantially worsen the severity of those significant impacts that were identified in the EIR. Therefore, the results and conclusions from the EIR remain applicable to the Revised Project. A detailed study, included in Exhibit M, sets out these conclusions in detail. All impacts would remain less than significant, less than significant with mitigation, or significant and unavoidable, as previously identified, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

CP Center Internal Circulation Changes: Internal circulation related to vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian travel to CP Center, such as garage driveway locations and circulation with CP Center, was not evaluated in detail in the EIR; however, the proposed designs are not inconsistent with FEIR assumptions and will be designed in accordance with applicable design standards. Although some driveways and curb cuts will be wider under the proposed D4D amendments, these wider widths will allow adequate access to certain garages for large loading vehicles and accommodate the large volume of vehicles anticipated at the CP Center garage. The enhancement of adequate access to the garages would reduce back-ups on local streets and double-parking by service and delivery vehicles. These benefits will reduce pedestrian and bike conflicts and enhance vehicle circulation

functioning. Additionally, appropriate design features to ensure pedestrian and bike safety (such as pavement treatments, signage, car alert signals, staffing at garage entrances) will be required by the D4D during detailed design review. Internal circulation modifications such as removing certain street extensions into CP Center will enhance pedestrian and bike access by reducing the potential for conflicts with vehicle traffic. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not adversely affect circulation assumptions or impacts identified in the FEIR.

## 4.4 Aesthetics

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impact: (1) AE-1, less-thansignificant construction impacts on a scenic vista or scenic resource; (2) AE-2, less-than-significant construction impacts on visual character or quality with implementation of mitigation; (3) AE-3, construction impacts on light or glare that could obstruct day or night views; (4) AE-4, less-thansignificant Project impacts on scenic vistas; (5) AE-5, less-than-significant Project impacts on scenic resources; (6) AE-6, less-than-significant Project impacts on visual character; (7) AE-7, less-thansignificant Project impacts on light and glare with implementation of mitigation; or (8) less-thansignificant cumulative impacts.

### **Tower Relocations**

*Impact AE-4: Effects on Scenic Vistas.* The FEIR found that the Project, including Tower Variant D, would not have a significant effect on scenic vistas and acknowledged that long-range views of the site would include the Project towers. Visual simulations for the proposed tower relocations are attached as Exhibit N, Candlestick Point Tower Visual Analysis.

Tower G would move closer to open space areas south and east of Harney Way in the CPSRA, and would appear more prominent from this corner of the park. From some vantage points to the east, Tower G would be visible in front of Bayview Hill. Nonetheless, much of the Bayview Hill would still remain in view, particularly towards the northeast. The visibility of Tower G from the north would be reduced under the proposed location. From the south, the towers would appear in slightly different locations than in 2010 but would otherwise be similar in appearance. Thus, long-range views of the site would not be significantly affected by the relocation of Tower G.

Towers J & K would move marginally closer to the CPSRA, by approximately 100 feet and within the interior of a developed neighborhood. Given that the relocation would be modest, this modification would not be detectable in long-range views of the site and would not result in new or more severe impacts.

Under the proposed tower relocations, views of the site would continue to be of an urban development with towers and mid-rise buildings. Given that this visual context was established under the 2010 Project approval, the proposed tower relocations would continue to be consistent with the expectations of those viewing the development from the adjoining open space network and beyond. The new tower locations would not restrict views of the Bay and important landforms would still be visible from different vantage points without significant loss of prominence. Therefore, the tower

relocations would not result in new significant scenic view impacts or increases in the severity of significant scenic view impacts previously acknowledged in the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

*Impact AE-5: Effect on Scenic Resources:* Scenic resources at or near Candlestick Point include the CPSRA, Bayview Hill, Yosemite Slough, and the shoreline. In 2010, the FEIR found that the Project, including Tower Variant D, would not have a significant effect on scenic resources. The FEIR analysis focused on the change in the existing character of the site - from a stadium, parking lots, degraded urban areas – to a new, well-designed urban development, including towers, with integrated public parks, improvements to the CPSRA, and shoreline improvements.

As shown on the visual simulations in Exhibit N, the overall appearance of the tower relocations would be substantially similar to the Project and the other variants considered in the FEIR. The visual context of the site and associated scenic resources would continue to be of an urban development with towers and mid-rise buildings surrounded by an enhanced network of parks along the Bay shoreline. The new tower locations would not introduce new land uses or types of structures that were not previously considered and analyzed, and would not detract from long- or mid-range views compared to the 2010 approval. Other than a more prominent view of Tower G from one corner of the CPSRA located near the Harney Way and Arelious Walker intersection, the towers would appear similar to the 2010 locations. Thus, with the tower relocation, the impact would remain less than significant and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impact AE-6 Effect on Visual Character: The FEIR found that the Project, including Tower Variant D, would not have a significant effect on the visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. The FEIR acknowledged that the towers would be visible from various vantage points. As shown in Exhibit N, pp. 13-16, Tower G would no longer be visible in the view from Mariner Village towards Candlestick Point. It would appear more prominent from the corner of CPSRA at the intersection of Harney Way and Arelious Walker open space looking north away from the water and towards the development at CP Center. As shown in the FEIR, Tower G was clearly visible from the CPSRA. The new location of tower G is closer to the CPSRA and thus appears larger and more prominent from this vantage point in CPSRA than the approved location. Although Tower G would be more prominent from this location in CPSRA and would change the view from the 2010 plan, the overall character of the view north from this corner of CPSRA would continue to be of the dense CP Center. Additionally, the visual quality of this area of the Project site would be improved over the previous massive stadium surrounded by unpaved parking lots and little or no landscaping. The State Park and Recreation Commission has acknowledged in its 2013 CPSRA General Plan that the park is located in an urban area planned for a large mixed use development. As noted above in the "Land Use and Plans" the 2013 General Plan embraces this urban setting of the park, which will be a "green front lawn" for the new development. Thus, this new location would not result in a new significant impact on the visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings, or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact. No new mitigation measures would be required.

The proposed relocation of the towers would not change the analysis or conclusions in the FEIR with respect to Aesthetic impacts. The Project would continue to replace degraded urban areas, vacant

parcels, expanses of asphalt and dirt and outdated developments with a new, well-designed urban development including towers, parks, transportation facilities, and walkable mixed-use neighborhoods. The Project would continue to improve the visual quality of the site and provide new areas of open space, improvements to the CPSRA, and other amenities. Urban design guidelines would ensure high quality development and appropriate height transitions within the new development and between existing communities and new development. The towers would be required to comply with the D4D design guidelines, including bulk requirements. Proposed floor plates for the towers would not increase. Thus, with the proposed relocation of the towers, the impacts on visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings would remain less than significant and no new mitigation measures will be required.

*Impact AE-7 Effect of Light and Glare:* The FEIR found that the Project, including Tower Variant D, would not result in significant light and glare impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures MM AE-7a1 through MM AE-7a3. Because towers were included in the 2010 Project approvals and because the relocation would not increase the overall amount of development on the Project site, the proposed tower relocations would not introduce any new sources of light or glare in Candlestick Point, or increase the severity of approved sources of light or glare. Mitigation measures MM AE-7a1 through MM AE-7a3 would continue to apply to all development on the site, and would mitigate the potential for light and glare impacts to a less than significant level. Thus, under the proposed relocation of the towers, impacts on light and glare would remain less than significant. No new mitigation measures would be required.

#### Height Increases

As shown in Exhibits D and E, the increase in height for the Film Arts Center at the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson from 85 feet to 120 feet, the increase in the height of the building at Harney Way and Arelious Walker from 65 feet to 80 feet, and the increase in height for the buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson from 65 feet to 80 feet would be relatively minor in the context of a dense urban setting with multi-story buildings of varying heights, including several towers. These buildings would be largely internalized within the Candlestick Point project area and therefore would not result in new significant impacts to the scenic resources. These height modifications would not be noticeable in long-range views of the site, nor restrict any views of the Bay. Additionally, these buildings would be subject to mitigation measures MM AE-7a1-7a3, which would mitigate the potential for light and glare impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, these proposed height increases would not result in the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

#### Conversion of Office Use to Neighborhood Retail Use

The conversion would slightly reduce overall development because 15,500 square feet of office use would be replaced with 6,000 square feet of retail use. This conversion would not create new significant aesthetic impacts or significantly increase the impacts identified in the FEIR. The office to retail conversion would be accommodated in areas already planned for development and considered in the FEIR aesthetic analysis. Therefore, this land use conversion would not result in new

significant aesthetic impacts or an increase in the severity of significant impacts identified in the FEIR and no new mitigation measures would be required.

### <u>Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of</u> <u>Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue</u>

The proposed parking and transportation system modifications would not result in changes in the location of the Project or add new elements requiring the construction of additional Project structures. The relocation of parking spaces may result in a potential modest increase in the size of the CP Center garage, which would be unlikely to be noticeable in the dense urban context of the overall CP Center structure's height or bulk as identified in the FEIR, or create any new sources of light and glare other than those considered in the FEIR. Thus, these proposed modifications would not create new significant aesthetic impacts or significantly increase the impacts identified in the FEIR.

Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would result in no new significant aesthetic impacts and no more severe significant aesthetic impacts than identified in the FEIR and no new mitigation measures would be required. The FEIR aesthetic cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

### 4.5 Shadows

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts : (1) SH-1a, less than significant impacts as implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space; (2) SH-1b, less than significant impacts as implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space; (3) SH-1, less than significant impacts as implementation of the Project would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space; (3) SH-1, less than significant impacts as implementation of the Project would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space; (3) SH-1, less than significant impacts as implementation of the Project would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space; (3) SH-1, less than significant impacts as implementation of the Project would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space; (4) less than significant cumulative shadow impacts.<sup>3</sup>

#### Tower Relocation/Height Increases

Exhibit O (IBI Shadow Analysis and Memo) includes the shadow studies showing the December 21<sup>st</sup> (worst case) shadow impacts from Candlestick Point development with the proposed tower relocations and height increases. The analysis has been prepared to identify shadow impacts from the relocated towers on Bayview Hill Park and Gilman Park (located outside the Project boundary) and the CPSRA, Bayview Gardens/Wedge Destination Park (BGWDP), Mini-Wedge Community Park (MWCP) and the Jamestown Hillside Community Park (JHCP) The provisions of Planning Code

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The FEIR found that the Project under Tower Variants C and D, would have a significant and unavoidable shadow impact on Gilman Park (FEIR, Comments and Responses, p. 2445). Exhibit O shows that Towers G, J, and K would not contribute to this impact. Other shadow impacts of the towers were found to have a less than significant impact because they would not have an adverse effect on the use of open space (Impact SH-1a).

Section 295, commonly referred to Proposition K, apply only to Bayview Hill Park and Gilman Park and do not apply to CPSRA, BGWDP, MWCP, and JHCP. The shadow impacts were measured at three times during the day on winter solstice (10 a.m., 12 p.m., and 3 p.m.), which is consistent with the shadow analysis in the FEIR. These times were chosen to reflect the worst-case scenario, because shadows cast on the winter solstice are the longest of any time of the year due to the low angle of the sun, and therefore represent the greatest potential impact. The shadows in the FEIR layout and the layout for the analysis in Exhibit O were generated in Google Sketchup. The topography within the model is based on a survey of lands surrounding the site at 5 foot contour intervals, and the proposed topography within the Project site at 1 foot contour intervals. The shadow studies in Exhibit O show the 2010 shadow and 2016 shadows in different colors. Neither the tower relocations nor the increased building heights add new shadows to Bayview Hill Park or Gilman Park at any of the times studied.

At 10:00 a.m., the relocated Tower G would cast a minor increase in shadow (approximately 3%) on the JHCP open space area across Arelious Walker Drive and this small area of shadow would be gone by noon. The shadow would not have an adverse impact on the use of this area, because it is a relatively narrow strip of extremely steep land between two streets which does not contain any park amenities such as benches or play areas for children and is generally not usable due to the steep grade. Thus, the additional shade would not likely affect its use. At 10:00 a.m. the relocated Tower J would result in a minor increase in shadowing on the BGWDP. These increases in shadow would be minor and would not be a significant impact under the FEIR shadow significance criteria.

At 12:00 p.m., the relocated Tower G would not shadow any park or open space. At 12:00 p.m the relocated Tower J would add two slivers of shade to the BGWDP, similar to the shadow pattern already shown in the FEIR in Figure III-F-4 and approved under the 2010 Project approvals. Furthermore, the shadow from Tower J would shift away from the proposed Bus Rapid Transit station location (improving solar access to this high-activity zone) to a less activated portion of the park east of Ingerson. Tower J would also add a small amount of shadow to the MWCP. Tower K and the midrise building along Harney Way (Block 8a) would result in an increase of shadowing to the BGWDP of approximately 15-18 feet for one block length of approximately 200 feet. These slivers of shade would be unlikely to significantly affect use of the Project's wedge parks and would not be a significant impact under the FEIR shadow significance criteria.

At 3 p.m., the relocated Tower G would not add additional shadow on any park or open space. The relocated Tower J would add a small increase in shadow on CPSRA. The additional shadow would add approximately 10,000 square feet (.02 ac) of additional shadow to the shadow already cast at this location, which would represent approximately .02% of the total CPSRA area. The Project buildings approved in 2010 would already cast modest shadow impacts on CPSRA, generally in the late afternoon and evening. This small amount of additional shadow added to a shadow pattern that would occur under the approved development would be unlikely to adversely affect use of CPSRA. The small amount of additional shadow at this time of day would not be noticeable to most park users and significant areas of the park not in shadow at this time would be available to park users. Tower J would also add a minor increase in shadow to MWCP, which, when combined with the shadows expected in 2010, would shade the entirety of MWCP at this time. MWCP is part of the Project and

thus this increase in shading is not a Project impact on the existing environment. Additionally, this small wedge park, located between Project buildings, would be substantially in shadow at this time of the year and day from other Project buildings as acknowledged in the EIR (EIR, p. III.F-10.). The EIR found that that the orientation of the narrow wedge parks with respect to the path of the sun and the close proximity to Project buildings along the parks' southwestern boundaries combine to make these wedge parks most susceptible to new shade. (EIR, p. III.F-26.) The EIR acknowledged that the heights, layouts, and orientations of the Project buildings would result in variable levels of shading throughout the day on Project neighborhood parks, but public use of the proposed parks would not be adversely affected by these shade conditions. (EIR, p. III.F-26.) The new shadow would be consistent with the type of shadow impacts expected in the new highly urban development Project and would not result in a new significant shadow impact.

The shadow analyses prepared for the relocated towers and building height increase show that these proposed Project modifications would not result in a new significant impact or an increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact. No new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR shadow cumulative impact conclusions would remain the same.

#### Conversion of /Office Use to Retail Use

The office to retail conversion would not create any new or more severe significant shadow impacts because this modification adjusts square footage but does not involve a change in building location or a height increase. This modification would reduce the overall amount of development and thus would not result in new or more severe shadow impacts.

### Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The relocation of parking spaces would not result in new shadow impacts because these spaces will be relocated to the approved CP Center garage and would not involve a height increase for that structure. The transportation system modifications would not create new or more severe significant shadow impacts because these modifications propose horizontal construction and do not involve the construction of tall structures.

Therefore, the Project modifications would not change or alter any of the FEIR's findings with respect to shadow impacts. Additionally, the modifications would not affect the FEIR shadow cumulative impact conclusions and this impact would continue to be less than significant.

#### 4.6 Wind

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) W-1a, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measure W-1a, as implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point, with mitigation, would not include tall structures that would result in ground-level-equivalent wind speed exceeding 26 mph for a single hour of the year in pedestrian corridors and public spaces; (2) W-1b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation

measures, as implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not include tall structures that would result in ground-level-equivalent wind speed exceeding 26 mph for a single hour of the year in pedestrian corridors and public spaces; (3) W-1, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as implementation of the Project would not include tall structures that would result in ground-level-equivalent wind speed exceeding 26 mph for a single hour of the year in pedestrian corridors and public spaces; (a) W-1, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as implementation of the Project would not include tall structures that would result in ground-level-equivalent wind speed exceeding 26 mph for a single hour of the year in pedestrian corridors and public spaces; and (4) less than significant cumulative wind impacts.

### **Tower Relocations**

Under the proposed tower relocations development would continue to occur on areas of the Project site analyzed for development in the FEIR. The FEIR wind analysis assumed multiple towers at Candlestick Point. Implementation of mitigation measure W-1a, designed to address wind impacts and adopted as part of the 2010 Project approvals, would be unchanged by the tower relocations. Mitigation MM W-1a requires a wind analysis to be undertaken at schematic design stage for high-rise buildings with a maximum height over 100 feet. The wind analysis will assess the potential impacts of the building and make design recommendations to minimize those impacts. Therefore, the proposed tower relocations would not result in in a new significant wind impact or a substantial increase in a previously identified significant wind impact. The wind impacts associated with the towers would remain less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required.

## Height Increases

The proposed height increase for the buildings at the western corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue and along Harney Way and Ingerson within and adjacent to the CP Center would be limited to 80 feet. The proposed height increase for the performance venue/film arts center location at the corner of West Harney Way and Ingerson would be up to 120 feet. Buildings approximately 100 feet in height or higher have the potential to create wind impacts. The proposed Project modifications would allow the height of one building – the performance venue at CP Center – to exceed 100 feet in height. The other proposed height increases would be below 100 feet. The FEIR assumed that some Project buildings would exceed 100 feet in height and mitigation measure W-1a was adopted as part of the Project approvals to address wind impacts from these buildings. This mitigation measure would be implemented during the design review process for individual buildings and would ensure that potential adverse wind impacts would be mitigated. Accordingly, there would be no new impacts or increases in the severity of previously identified impacts related to wind and no new mitigation measures would be required.

## Conversion of Office Use to Neighborhood Retail Use

This proposed Project modification involves an adjustment to the allocation of square footage for certain Project land uses, would not require the construction of additional structures, and would not change the height of Project buildings. Thus, this proposed modification would not result in new or increased wind impacts.

# Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The proposed Harney Way and Gilman Avenue modifications primarily involve horizontal construction and would not include construction of tall structures that could result in wind impacts. Consequently, these transportation system modifications would not change the Project's effects related to wind. The proposed relocation of on-street spaces to the CP Center garage would not increase the height of the garage which is subject to a 65-foot height limit and thus would not create significant wind impacts.

All development in the Project must comply with the wind mitigation measures, which have been designed by the City to ensure no significant wind impacts will result from tall buildings. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not change or alter any of the FEIR's findings with respect to wind impacts. Additionally, the FEIR wind cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant.

## 4.7 Air Quality

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) AQ-1, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction emission of criteria pollutants; (2) AQ-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction emissions of diesel particulate matter; (3) AQ-3, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction emissions of toxic air contaminants; (4) AQ-4, significant and unavoidable impacts from mass emissions of criteria pollutants during project operations; (5) AQ-5, less than significant impact from carbon monoxide emissions due to motor vehicle trips during project operation; (6) AQ-6, less than significant impacts with implementation of mitigation measures from emissions of toxic air contaminants due to operation of research and development uses; (7) AQ-7, less than significant impact from vehicle emissions of PM<sub>2.5</sub> during project operation; (8) AQ-8, less than significant impacts from odors during project operations; (9) AQ-9 less than significant related to conformity with regional air quality plan objectives; and (10) less than significant cumulative impacts, except for the project's contribution to significant cumulative impacts from emissions of toxic air contaminants and PM<sub>2.5</sub>.

Ramboll Environ reviewed the prosed Project modifications for consistency with the FEIR air quality findings and the discussion below reflects their analysis and conclusions. (See, Exhibit P, 1/22/16 Ramboll Environ letter.)

#### **Tower Relocations**

Although the three towers would be relocated, the proposed relocations would not result in any change in the overall location of the Project or the amount of development evaluated in the FEIR. Because the tower relocation would not change the overall land use square footage of the Project, this modification would not alter the analysis of criteria air pollutant emissions (CAP) in the FEIR. This modification would have a negligible effect on the FEIR health risk assessment (HRA) performed for construction emissions because the towers would be relocated within the same sub-phases as analyzed in the FEIR. The HRA analysis in the FEIR assumed construction emission would be

distributed throughout the sub-phase, thus relocation of towers within the respective sub-phases would not change the analysis.

#### Height Increases

The proposed height increases would change the massing of the affected buildings, but would not change the floor area or the overall land use square footage of the Project. Although certain Project modifications such as the height increases may slightly increase construction activity, other modifications may slightly decrease construction activities. In any event, the overall amount of development and number of residential units at CP would be consistent with that analyzed in the FEIR such that no significant increase in construction activities would be expected from the Project modifications. Consequently, this modification would not alter the analysis of CAP in the FEIR, because the models used in the FEIR to estimate construction emissions are based on square footage. This modification would have a negligible effect on the FEIR health risk assessment (HRA) performed for construction emissions, because total construction emissions would be unchanged from the FEIR assumptions.

#### Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail Space

This analysis evaluates the proposed conversion of office floor space to local-serving retail floor space. The analysis is structured to determine the necessary reduction in the amount of office square footage that would be required to allow a 6,000-square-foot increase in neighborhood retail without increasing any of the Project criteria air pollutant (CAP) evaluated in the FEIR.

To evaluate the minimum size of office land use to be converted to 6,000 square feet of neighborhood retail without increasing the total Project operational criteria pollutant emissions, Ramboll Environ estimated 2030 criteria pollutant emissions associated with the proposed 6,000 square feet of local-serving retail using California Emission Estimator Model version 2013.2.2 (CalEEMod®).<sup>4</sup> The proposed neighborhood retail is modeled as "Strip Mall", which is consistent with the land use category used for the local-serving (neighborhood) retail in the FEIR. The mobile source emission factors generated using California Air Resources Board (ARB)'s EMFAC2014 model are used to replace the CalEEMod® default that was based on EMFAC2011. EMFAC2014 incorporates new vehicle emissions standards and rules and regulations (e.g., Advanced Clean Cars and Truck & Bus Rule).

The Project criteria pollutant emissions presented in the FEIR were modeled using URBEMIS 2007 version 9.2.4 for year 2030.<sup>5</sup> The minimum square footage of the approved office floor space entitlement that would be converted and its associated CAP emissions were scaled from the previous calculation presented in Appendix H1 of the FEIR by matching the worst case pollutant (i.e., NOx) of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> CalEEMod® is a statewide program designed to calculate both criteria and GHG emissions from development projects in California. It was developed in collaboration with California air districts led by South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and is currently supported by several lead agencies for use in quantifying the emissions associated with development projects undergoing environmental review.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> URBEMIS was the land use emissions inventory model recommended used for the EIR. It was widely used before the development of CalEEMod®.

the local-serving retail emissions discussed above. The emission comparison is summarized in Exhibit P, Table 1. As presented in Table 1, adding 6,000 square feet neighborhood retail development to the Project without increasing the emissions of any criteria pollutant previously estimated in the FEIR would require a removal of at least 10,300 square feet of office. The proposed Project modification would remove 15, 500 square feet of office space.

The proposed neighborhood retail development is designed to offer the community retail services (e.g., dry clean, barbershop, grocery and other businesses) within walking distance. The mobile source emissions in this analysis were evaluated using CalEEMod® default trip rates based on ITE Trip Generation, which does not reflect low trip generation rate due to the transit-oriented nature of the development plan. (See Exhibit P, Table 1.) Therefore, the estimated emissions for the proposed neighborhood retail uses are conservative. If a detailed site specific trip generation rate were available, it would be likely that less office space would need to be replaced due to lower emissions from mobile sources.

The construction emissions presented in the FEIR were calculated based on the Project construction schedule and equipment list. It is reasonable to assume the proposed neighborhood retail would be constructed over the same construction duration with the same equipment list. In addition, based on the operational criteria pollutant comparison discussed above, the equivalent neighborhood retail would be smaller in size than the office space to be removed. Therefore, converting office into local-serving retail would not generate increased criteria pollutant emissions, cancer risks, noncancer chronic hazard index (HI), or acute HI associated with the construction activities presented in the EIR.

#### Relocation of On-street Parking Spaces to CP Center Garage

The proposed relocation of certain on-street parking spaces to the CP Center garages is expected to have a negligible effect on construction activity, because the overall building envelope of the CP Center garage will not change from the garage size anticipated in the EIR. Consequently, there would be no change in the overall CAP emissions from that evaluated in the FEIR. This proposed modification would also have a negligible effect on the HRA as total construction emissions would not increase from the estimates in the FEIR.

#### Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements

The proposed modification results from the need to bifurcate construction on Harney Way into two phases in order to harmonize phasing with other transportation improvements planned for this area. This proposed modification would not change the overall work planned for the Harney Way improvements; it would spread the same amount of work over a longer time. Because this proposed modification only divides the Harney Way improvements into two phases and does not increase the amount of activity, there is no change in the overall CAP emissions. This proposed modification would also have a negligible effect on the HRA as total construction emissions would not increase from the estimates in the FEIR.

#### Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

This modification will result in less construction. The original cross-section proposed to widen Gilman Avenue to accommodate two lanes in each direction, whereas under the revised proposal there will be one lane in each direction plus a left turn lane in the middle. The curb to curb width will be 49 feet 9 inches instead of 56 feet. This revision reflects a reduction in construction activity (i.e., building a smaller roadway), thus the construction activity would be reduced from the FEIR assumptions. As such, there would be no increase in overall CAP and GHG emissions. This would also have a negligible effect on the HRA as total construction emissions are reduced from the FEIR assumptions.

Consequently, the Project modifications would not affect air quality-related impact analyses. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not change or alter any of the FEIR's findings with respect to air quality impacts. All Project impacts would remain less than significant or less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR air quality cumulative impact conclusions would be unchanged.

### 4.8 Noise and Vibration

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts:

(1) NO-1a, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as a result of construction at Candlestick Point on increased noise levels for both off-site and on-site sensitive receptors; however, the Project's construction noise impacts would occur primarily in noise-sensitive areas adjacent or near to active construction sites (which would vary in location and duration over the entire period the proposed Project would be under construction), they would not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction noise that exist in Sections 2907 and 2908 of the Municipal Code; (2) NO-1b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as a result of construction at HPS Phase II on increased noise levels for both off-site and on-site sensitive receptors; however, the Project's construction noise impacts would be temporary, they would also not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction noise that exist in Sections 2907 and 2908 of the Municipal Code; (3) NO-1, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as a result of construction activities associated with the Project on increased noise levels for both offsite and on-site sensitive receptors; however, the Project's construction noise impacts would occur primarily in noise-sensitive areas adjacent or near to active construction sites (which would vary in location and duration over the entire period the proposed Project would be under construction); they would also not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction noise that exist in Sections 2907 and 2908 of the Municipal Code; (4) NO-2a, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as a result of construction at Candlestick Point by creating excessive ground-borne 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 activity on adjacent parcels. Although the Project's construction vibration impacts would be temporary, would not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction activities that exist in Sections 2907 and 2908 of the Municipal Code, vibration levels would still be significant; (5) NO-2b, significant and

unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from rock removal activities in the Alice Griffith and Jamestown districts resulting in vibration levels that exceed the FTA threshold of 80 VdB or could cause damage to structures from vibration caused by the fracturing of bedrock for excavation; (6) NO-2c, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction at HPS Phase II that would create excessive ground-borne 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 activity on adjacent parcels is complete; (7) NO-2, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction activities associated with the Project that would create excessive ground-borne 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 activity on adjacent parcels is complete; (8) NO-3, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction activities associated with the Project that would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels; (9) NO-4, less than significant impacts with implementation of the Project, including the use of mechanical equipment or the delivery of goods, on exposure to noise-sensitive land uses on or off site to noise levels that exceed the standards established by the City; (10) NO-5, less than significant impacts from the Project regarding the generation or exposure of persons on or off site to excessive ground-borne vibration; (11) NO-6, significant and unavoidable impacts with operation of the Project as it would generate increased local traffic volumes that could cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in existing residential areas along the major Project site access routes; (12) NO-7, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on noise during football games and concerts at the proposed stadium resulting in temporary increases in ambient noise levels that could adversely affect surrounding residents for the duration of a game or concert; (13) NO-8, less than significant impacts from Project exposure of residents and visitors to excessive noise levels from flights from San Francisco International Airport such that the noise would be disruptive or cause annoyance; and (14) less than significant cumulative noise and vibration impacts.

#### Tower Relocations/Height Increases/Conversion of Office Use to Neighborhood Retail Use

These proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of operational activities, the overall nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units, or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Development would continue to occur on the same areas of the site analyzed for development in the FEIR. The proposed height increases might result in a slightly greater amount of construction activity, but these modest increases would not result in significant increases in noise impacts associated with the construction activities and would be within the scope of noise impacts expected for the overall Project. While the location of the three towers would change, the number of towers would remain the same and the towers would be located within the area analyzed for construction noise impacts in the FEIR. The office to retail land use conversion would reduce the overall amount of development because 6,000 square feet of retail space would be substituted for 15,500 square feet of office space. This reduction in development would offset any minor increase in construction activity related to the proposed height increase. Thus, no new noise construction impacts would be expected as a result of these proposed Project modifications.

# Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The change in phasing of Harney Way improvements would change the construction timing of the planned improvements, but would not increase construction noise impacts assumed in the FEIR analysis. Revisions to Gilman Avenue would modify the street configuration but would not increase the scope of construction and thus construction noise impacts would not increase. The relocation of the on-street parking spaces to the CP Center garage would increase the number of spaces assumed in the garage. The Project Sponsor has stated it is likely that these spaces would be accommodated through space allocation within the same garage footprint that could be assumed for the garage. Thus, the overall amount of construction noise would not be expected to significantly increase. Moreover, the reduction in the amount of office space at CP would offset the potential for other slight increases in construction impacts such as those associated with the increased heights. Consequently, no additional construction impacts would be expected.

The FEIR assumed that sensitive residential receptors in and outside the Project area would be exposed to construction-related noise and vibration impacts and operational traffic noise impacts. Under the FEIR, this was identified as significant and unavoidable, and the Project approvals included adoption of all identified feasible mitigation measures to reduce these noise- and vibration-related impacts. This impact will remain the same under the proposed Project modifications. The proposed Project modifications would result in similar sensitive residential receptor exposure to construction and operational noise and vibration impacts and would not alter these assumptions or conclusions.

Therefore, the Project modifications would not change or alter any of the FEIR's findings with respect to noise and vibration impacts. All impacts would remain less than significant, less than significant with mitigation, or significant and unavoidable with mitigation, and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR noise and vibration cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant.

#### 4.9 Cultural and Paleontological Resources

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) CP-1a, less than significant impacts on the significance of an historical resource during construction at Candlestick Point; (2) CP-1b, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, due to a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource at HPS Phase II; (3) CP-1, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, due to a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource at the combined Candlestick Point and HPS Phase II (Project); (4) CP-2a, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American, Chinese fishing camp, and maritime-related archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American resources, on the significance of archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American resources, Chinese fishing camps, and maritime related resources, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American resources, Chinese fishing camps, and maritime related resources, with construction at HPS Phase II; (6) CP-2, less than significant impacts, with

implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American resources, Chinese fishing camps, and maritime related resources with construction at Candlestick Point and HPS Phase II combined (7) CP-3a, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of a paleontological resources during construction at Candlestick Point; (8) CP-3b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of a paleontological resources during construction at HPS Phase II; (9) CP-3c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of a paleontological resource during construction of the Yosemite Slough bridge, shoreline improvements, and the marina improvements activities, including in-water activities; (10) CP-3d, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of a paleontological resource during pile driving associated with construction of the Yosemite Slough bridge, shoreline improvements, and the marina improvements (11) CP-3, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of a paleontological resource during construction activities associated with the Candlestick Point and HPS Phase II Project; and (4) less than significant cumulative archaeological and paleontological impacts and significant and unavoidable cumulative historical resource impacts.

#### **Proposed Modifications**

The proposed Project modifications would not result in any changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units, or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Although the increases in height may slightly increase construction activities, this potential construction increase would be offset by the proposed reduction in office space, which would reduce the overall construction. The FEIR assumed that excavation would occur across the entire development areas of the Project site and the off-site improvement areas. Generally, the FEIR acknowledged that Project construction activities would involve extensive construction to accommodate new development and site preparation could include deep excavations for large structures, installation of foundation piles, trenching for utilities, grading and compaction and other earth-disturbing activities. (EIR, pp. III.K-57, K-90.) Thus, these Project modifications would not result in additional excavation or other land alteration impacts that were not anticipated in the FEIR. Consequently, there would be no changes to the Project's effects related to cultural and paleontological resources. The mitigation measures have been designed to address to potential impacts at any depth of excavation, grading, or construction activities. Therefore, the Project modifications would not result in any changes in the FEIR's cultural and paleontological resources impact conclusions. All impacts would remain less than significant or significant and unavoidable with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR cultural and paleontological resources cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant for archeological and paleontological impacts and significant and unavoidable for historical resource impacts.

#### 4.10 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) HZ-1, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to known contaminants during construction activities; (2) HZ-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to previously unidentified contaminants during construction; (3) HZ-3, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from off-site transport and disposal of contaminated soil and groundwater during construction; (4) HZ-4, less than significant impacts from installation of underground utilities; (5) HZ-5, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from installation of foundation support piles; (6) HZ-6, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from soil handling, stockpiling, and transport within the project site boundaries during construction; (7) HZ-7, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from contaminated surface runoff from construction sites; (8) HZ-8, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to hazardous material releases that have not been fully remediated (9) HZ-9, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to hazardous materials in conjunction with limited remediation activities during construction of the Yosemite Slough Bridge; (10) HZ-10, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to hazardous materials during construction of shoreline improvements; (11) HZ-11, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to hazardous materials while constructing infrastructure on Navy-owned property; (12) HZ-12, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from remediation activities conducted in conjunction with development activities at HPS Phase II early transfer parcels; (13) HZ-13, less than significant impacts from exposures to hazardous materials contamination during construction of off-site roadway improvements; (14) HZ-14, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure of ecological receptors to hazardous materials from construction activities; (15) HZ-15, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to naturally occurring asbestos from construction activities; (16) HZ-16, less than significant impacts from exposure to hazardous materials in buildings and structures; (17) HZ-17, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure of workers to hazardous materials during construction; (18) HZ-18, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction activities with potential to generate hazardous air emissions within one-quarter mile of a school; (19) HZ-19, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from release of contaminants from historic uses or fill; (20) HZ-20, less than significant impacts from routine use, storage, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials during Project construction; (21) HZ-21, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from routine maintenance of properties; (22) HZ-22, less than significant impacts from routine use, storage, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials during Project operation; (23) HZ-23, less than significant impacts from exposure to hazardous materials caused by upset or accident conditions; (24) HZ-24, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from hazardous air emissions associated with R&D uses within one-guarter mile of a school; (25) HZ-25, no impacts from safety hazards from conflicts with airport land use plans; (26) HZ-26, no impact from safety hazards from proximity to private air strips; (27) HZ-27, less than significant impact from fire hazards or conflicts with emergency response and

evacuation plans; and (28) less than significant cumulative impacts from hazards and hazardous materials.

### Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units, or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Although the increases in height may slightly increase construction activities, this potential construction increases would be offset by the proposed reduction in office space, which would reduce the overall construction. The FEIR assumed that excavation and operational activities would occur across the entire development areas of the Project site and the off-site improvement areas. Generally, the FEIR acknowledged that Project construction activities would involve extensive construction to accommodate new development and site preparation could include deep excavations for large structures, installation of foundation piles, trenching for utilities, grading and compaction and other earth-disturbing activities. (EIR, pp. III.K-57, K-90) Thus, these Project modifications would not result in additional excavation or other land alteration impacts that were not anticipated in the FEIR. Additionally, none of these modifications would involve new or increased use of hazardous materials. Consequently, there would be no changes to the Project's effects related to hazards and hazardous materials. The mitigation measures have been designed to address to potential impacts at any depth of excavation, grading, or construction activities. Therefore, the Project modifications would not result in any changes in the FEIR's hazards and hazardous materials impact conclusions. All impacts would remain less than significant or less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR hazards or hazardous materials cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant.

## 4.11 Geology and Soils

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) GE-1, 1a, 1b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures from construction on soil erosion; (2) GE-2, 2a, 2b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on settlement from dewatering activities; (3) GE-3, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on destabilization of bedrock from rock removal activities; (4) GE-4, 4a, 4b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to seismically induced groundshaking; (5) GE-5, 5a, 5b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to seismically induced ground failure: (6) GE-6, 6a, 6b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to seismically induced landslides; (7) GE-7, 7a, 7b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to shoreline instability; (8) GE-8, 8a, 8b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to landslides; (9) GE-9, 9a, 9b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to

damage from settlement; (10) GE-10, 10a, 10b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to expansive soils; (11) GE-11, 11a, 11b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to corrosive soils; (12) GE-12, no impact from surface fault rupture; (13) GE-13, no impact from the use of soils incapable of supporting septic tanks or alternative wastewater systems; (14) GE-14, no impact from the destruction of unique geologic features; and (15) less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, to cumulative geology and soils impacts.

## Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units, or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Although the increases in height may slightly increase construction activities, this potential construction increases would be offset by the proposed reduction in office space which would reduce the overall construction. The FEIR assumed that excavation and grading would occur across the entire development areas of the Project site and the off-site improvement areas. Generally, the FEIR acknowledged that Project construction activities would involve extensive construction to accommodate new development and site preparation could include deep excavations for large structures, installation of foundation piles, trenching for utilities, grading and compaction and other earth-disturbing activities. (FEIR, pp. III.K-57, K-90) Thus, these Project modifications would not result in grading or other land alteration impacts that were not anticipated in the FEIR. (See, Exhibit Q, CP Development Co. Excavation Quantities Memo.) Consequently, there would be no changes to The mitigation measures and regulatory the Project's effects related to geology and soils. requirements summarized in the FEIR have been designed to address to potential impacts at any depth of excavation, grading, or construction activities. Therefore, the Project modifications would not result in any changes in the FEIR's geology and soils impact conclusions. All impacts would remain less than significant or less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR geology and soils cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures.

## 4.12 Hydrology and Water Quality

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) HY-1, 1a, 1b, 1c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction regarding compliance with water quality standards and waste discharge requirements; (2) HY-2, less than significant impacts from construction on groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge; (3) HY-3, less than significant impacts from construction on erosion and siltation; (4) HY-4, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on flooding; (5) HY-5, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on storm sever system capacity; (6) HY-6, 6a, 6b, 6c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on storm sever system capacity; (6) HY-6, 6a, 6b, 6c, less than significant impacts of the Yosemite Slough Bridge, from project operations regarding compliance with water quality standards

and waste discharge requirements; (7) HY-7, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on water quality; (8) HY-8, no impact from project operations on groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge; (9) HY-9, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, from project operations on erosion or siltation effects; (10) HY-10, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, from project operations on flooding from surface runoff; (11) HY-11, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, from project operations on storm sewer system capacity; (12) HY-12, 12a, 12b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, related to placing housing in a flood hazard area; (13) HY-13, 13a, 13b, 13c, less than significant impacts at Candlestick and the Yosemite Slough Bridge and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, at HPS Phase II related to placing structures within a flood hazard zone; (14) HY-14, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, regarding other flood risks; (15) HY-15, less than significant impacts related to seiche, tsunami, and mudflows; (16) less than significant cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts.

## Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project. the overall extent of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units, or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Although the increases in height may slightly increase construction activities, these potential construction increases would be offset by the proposed reduction in office space which would reduce the overall construction. Development would continue to occur on the same areas of the site analyzed for development in the FEIR. The Project modifications would not involve significant additional grading, construction, other land alteration impacts, or new operational activities that were not anticipated in the FEIR, because these modifications involve relocation of certain approved Project components, modest height increases for approved building sites, and changes in the timing and configuration of off-site roadway improvements. The FEIR assumed that excavation, construction, and operational activities would occur across the entire development area of the Project site and the off-site improvement areas. Additionally the FEIR mitigation measures and compliance with the regulatory requirements for water guality, runoff control, and stormwater management will continue to ensure that Project impacts are mitigated in accordance with the FEIR analysis and conclusions. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality impacts. All impacts would remain less than significant or less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR hydrology and water quality cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

#### 4.13 Biological Resources

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) BI-1, no construction impact on regional conservation plans; (2) BI-2, less than significant impacts from construction on common species and habitat; (3) BI-3a and 3b, no construction impact on sensitive plants; (4) BI-4a, 4b, 4c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures,
from construction on waters of the United States and navigable waters; (5) BI-5a, 5b, no construction impacts at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II from construction on eelgrass beds; (6) BI-6a, 6b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on sensitive bird species; (7) BI-7a, 7b. less than significant impacts at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II from construction on foraging habitat for raptors; (8) BI-8a, 8b, less than significant impacts from construction on the western red bat; (9) BI-9a, 9b, no impact at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II from construction on marine mammals and fish; (10) BI-10a, 10b, 10c, less than significant impacts from construction on mollusks; (11) BI-11a, 11b, 11c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on special-status fish species; (12) BI-12a, 12b, 12c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on essential fish habitat; (13) BI-13a, 13b, less than significant impacts at Candlestick and less than significant impact, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II from construction on wildlife movement; (14) BI-14a, 14b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on local plans and policies; (15) BI-15a, 15b, no impact at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II from construction on contaminated soils or sediments; (16) BI-16a, 16b, less than significant impacts from project operations on sensitive birds and animals; (17) BI-17a, 17b, no impact from project operations on nesting American peregrine falcons; (18) BI-18a, 18b, no impact at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II, from project operations on sensitive aquatic species, mollusks, and designated essential fish habitat; (19) BI-19a, 19b, no impact at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II, from project operations on contaminated sediments; (20) BI-20a, 20b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on the movement of bird species; (21) BI-21a, 21b, less than significant, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on local plans and policies; (22) BI-22, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on specialstatus and/or legally protected species; (23) BI-23, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on sensitive habitats; (24) BI-24, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on wetlands and jurisdictional waters; (25) BI-25, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on fish or wildlife movement; (26) BI-26, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on local plans and policies; and (27) less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, to cumulative biological resource impacts.

#### Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall location of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, or the overall number of housing units or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Even with the proposed Project modifications, development (construction and operational activities) would continue to occur on the same areas of the site analyzed for development in the FEIR. In

particular, the proposed tower relocations would shift the towers to sites previously identified for development. Thus, the new locations were fully considered in the analysis, conclusions and mitigation measures in the FEIR. The revised location for Tower G would be in a location previously occupied by the stadium. The stadium has been demolished and the site is devoid of vegetation. (See Exhibit K, p. 5.) Thus, there are no biological resources on this site. Consequently, the proposed tower relocations and other proposed Project modifications would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified biological resource impacts. Additionally the FEIR mitigation measures and compliance with the regulatory requirements designed to protect and mitigate for impacts to biological resources will continue to ensure that Project impacts are mitigated in accordance with the FEIR analysis and conclusions. All impacts would remain less than significant or less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR biological resource cumulative impact conclusions would not change.

#### 4.14 Public Services

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) PS-1, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on police protection; (2) PS-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on police protection; (3) PS-3, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on fire protection and emergency medical services; (4) PS-4, less than significant impacts from project operations on fire protection and emergency medical services; (5) PS-5, no impact from construction on schools; (6) PS-6, less than significant impacts from project operations on library services; (8) PS-8, less than significant impacts from project operations on library services; and (9) less than significant cumulative impacts, except for the project's contribution to significant cumulative impacts on police services.

#### Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units or an increase in the square footage of commercial space, or overall Project population and employment projections (as discussed above). Although certain Project modification such as the height increases may slightly increase construction activities, other modifications may slightly reduce construction activities. In any event, the overall amount of development and number of residential units at CP would be consistent with that analyzed in the FEIR such that no significant increase in construction activities would be done by workers already working on the site and thus would not generate additional workers. Consequently, there would be no increase in the demand for public services. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not change or alter the FEIR's findings with respect to public service impacts. Project impacts would be required. Additionally,

the FEIR public service cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant except for the Project's contribution of significant impacts on police services.

#### 4.15 Recreation

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) RE-1, less than significant impacts as construction of the parks, recreational uses, and open space proposed by the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical environmental impacts beyond those analyzed and disclosed in the EIR; (2) RE-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as implementation of the Project would not increase the use of existing parks and recreational facilities that would cause the substantial physical deterioration of the facilities to occur or to be accelerated, nor would it result in the need for, new or physically altered park or recreational facilities; (3) RE-3, less than significant impacts, as implementation of the Project would decrease the size of Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA) but would not, overall, adversely affect the recreational opportunities offered by that park, nor would it substantially adversely affect windsurfing opportunities at the Project site; and (4) less than significant cumulative recreation impacts.

#### **Tower Relocations**

The FEIR and 2010 Project approvals included the towers proposed for relocation, thus the towers are not a new Project element. The proposed tower relocations would occur in areas planned for development and would not affect the location, amount, use, or type of park and open space approved within the Project. Additionally, the proposed tower relocations would not affect plans for the reconfiguration and improvement of the CPSRA and would not affect use of the park. The CPSRA General Plan as amended in 2013 acknowledges that the park is located in an intensely urban area surrounded by industrial and residential uses, and, formerly, the stadium. (See Exhibit L.) The State Park and Recreation Commission Resolution 1-2013 acknowledged that "the Park is located in an urban area surrounded by the proposed Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II project, which will dramatically alter the neighborhood surrounding the park, replacing the existing Candlestick Park stadium, vacant lands and other areas with a large mixed use development." (See Exhibit L.) The CPSRA General Plan describes the vision and role of the park as "an urban state park" where its "urban edge is as long as its shoreline, with CPSRA as the intermediary where these very different environments meet and blend." (See Exhibit L.) The Plan notes that the "proposed redevelopment surrounding the park will greatly change the character of the urban edge. The park will provide a 'green front lawn' for the planned community of townhomes, high rises, and shopping districts. There will be many more people visiting the park, looking to enjoy the incredible water's edge recreation, as well as contact with nature and a respite from city life. Thus, future development of the park must carefully navigate this intermediary nature between the city and shoreline edges. CPSRA's spirit of place will continue to evolve, as a gradient of these urban and natural experiences." (See Exhibit L.) Thus, the State Park and Recreation Department, in establishing goals and objectives for the park, has recognized that the park must be designed to function with the development. As such, the new surrounding development would be compatible with

its recreational goals for the park. The tower relocations will change the location of three towers but not the overall planned development and the development and park would remain compatible.

Towers J and K would be relocated within Candlestick Point South. (Exhibit C.) These towers would move approximately 100 feet closer to the CPSRA, but this relatively modest change would not be noticeable in the context of the larger development. Intervening development with lower heights in Candlestick Point South would continue to separate the towers from the CPSRA. Thus, the modest relocation of these towers would not adversely affect use of the CPSRA.

As shown on Exhibit K, p.1, Tower G would be a minimum of 600 feet from the closest point to one corner of CPSRA in the area known as the "Last Port" which parallels Harney Way. The relocated Tower G would be approximately 1,860 feet from the area of the park known as "Wind Meadow" and 1,682 feet from the area known as the Last Rubble." (Exhibit K, p.1). Given these distances from the CPSRA, the dense urban context that would be created by the approved Project, the intervening streets (Harney Way and Arelious Walker), landscaping and other development (CP south) between this tower and the park, the relocation of Tower G would not interfere with use of CPSRA. Tower G would be part of the large, dense CP Center and would fit within the urban context approved for development adjacent to the CPSRA. Moreover, Tower G would be located on a site formerly occupied by the football stadium, which was a dominant feature near the CPSRA and visible from many areas in the CPSRA. (Exhibit K, pp.1-4.) Scenic views from the park to the water would not be affected by the relocated Tower G, which would be located behind the viewer. Thus, the proposed location of Tower G would not contribute to the deterioration or degradation of the CPSRA or reduce it recreational opportunities.

#### Height Increases

The proposed modifications to allow modest height increases at CP Center would not result in any changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, or the overall number of housing units or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Development would continue to occur on the same areas of the site analyzed for development in the FEIR. The proposed height increases are modest and would be limited to the CP Center so that no height increases are proposed near the CPSRA. No changes to the Project's park and open space system are proposed. These proposed changes would not affect the use of the CPSRA or any of its improvements.

#### <u>Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of</u> <u>Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue</u>

These proposed modifications would have not affect recreation areas and do not implicate the FEIR recreation significance criteria.

Consequently, the relocated towers would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts related to recreation. No new

mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, with the relocated towers, the FEIR recreation cumulative impact conclusions would not change.

#### 4.16 Utilities

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) UT-1, less than significant impacts regarding the need for new or expanded water entitlements and resources; (2) UT-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, regarding the need for construction of new or expanded water treatment or conveyance facilities; (3) UT-3, 3a, 3b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, regarding the need for expansion of off-site wastewater conveyance facilities; (4) UT-4, less than significant impacts regarding the potential to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board; (5) UT-5, 5a, 5b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, regarding construction-related solid waste generation; (6) UT-6, 6a, 6b, less than significant impacts regarding disposal of construction-related hazardous waste; (7) UT-7, 7a, 7b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, regarding operational solid waste generation; (8) UT-8, 8a, 8b, less than significant impacts regarding disposal of operational generated hazardous waste; (9) UT-9, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, regarding compliance with solid waste regulations; (10) UT-10, less than significant impacts regarding dry utility infrastructure and service capacity; (11) less than significant cumulative utility impacts.

#### Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units or an increase in the square footage of commercial space, or overall Project population and employment projections (as discussed above). Although the height increases may slightly increase construction activities, these potential construction increases would be offset by the net reduction in office space which would reduce overall construction. Additionally, the minor increases in construction activities would be done by workers already working on the site and thus would not generate additional workers. Consequently, there would be either minor or no increase in the demand for utility services from construction or operational activities. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not alter the FEIR's findings with respect to utility service impacts. Project impacts would remain less than significant or less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR utility cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

#### 4.17 Energy

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) ME-1, less than significant impact from energy use during construction; (2) ME-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from the use of large amount of electricity in a wasteful manner for the operation of buildings constructed under the Project; (3) ME-3, less than significant

impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from the use of large amount of natural gas in a wasteful manner for the operation of buildings constructed under the Project; (4) ME-4 less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from the use of large amount of energy in a wasteful manner for vehicle trips associated with the Project; and (5) less than significant cumulative impacts related to energy use during project construction and operation.

#### Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units or an increase in the square footage of commercial space, or overall Project population and employment projections (as discussed above). Although the height increases may slightly increase construction activities, these potential construction increases would be offset by the net reduction in office space which would reduce overall construction. Additionally, any potential minor increases in construction activities would be done by workers already working on the site and thus would not generate additional workers. Although some of these changes may slightly increase energy use and some may slightly decrease energy use, on balance Project energy use would be substantially as estimated in the FEIR because the proposed Project modifications are not the type or scale of modifications that would substantially affect energy use. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not change the FEIR's findings with respect to energy impacts. All Project energy impacts would be required. Additionally, the FEIR energy cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

#### 4.18 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) GC-1, less than significant impact, as the Project would not result in a substantial contribution to global climate change by increasing GHG emissions in a manner that conflicts with the state goal of reducing GHG emissions in California to 1990 levels by 2020 (e.g., a substantial contribution to global climate change) or conflict with the San Francisco's Climate Action Plan by impeding implementation of the local GHG reduction goals established by the San Francisco 2008 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Ordinance; (2) less than significant cumulative greenhouse gas emissions impacts.

Ramboll Environ reviewed the proposed Project modifications for consistency with the FEIR air quality findings and the discussion below reflects their analysis and conclusions. (See Exhibit P.)

#### **Tower Relocations**

Ramboll Environ reviewed the proposed tower relocations and determined that the relocation of three towers would not affect the analysis of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the FEIR because the overall square footage of the Project would not be increased.

#### Height Increases

Ramboll Environ reviewed the proposed increase in maximum building height for three locations in CP Center and determined that this modification would not affect the analysis of GHG emissions in the FEIR because, while the massing of the buildings would increase, the overall square footage of the Project would not be increased. Because the models used in the FEIR to estimate construction emissions are based on square footage; there would not be a material difference in the way the emissions are estimated. Therefore, this Project revision would not change the analysis in the FEIR.

#### Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail Space

Ramboll Environ evaluated whether this conversion of office use to neighborhood retail use would increase the GHG emissions findings in the FEIR. To evaluate the minimum size of office land use to be converted to 6,000 square feet of neighborhood retail without increasing the total Project operational GHG emissions, Ramboll Environ estimated the 2020 GHG emissions associated with proposed 6,000 square feet of neighborhood retail using CalEEMod®. The mobile source emission factors generated using California Air ARB's EMFAC2014 model are used to replace the CalEEMod® default as discussed in the Air Quality section above. In addition, the GHG emissions associated with energy incorporate the 2013 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24) and Pacific Gas and Electric's 2020 carbon intensity factor.

The Project GHG emissions presented in the FEIR were calculated for year 2020. In the analysis for this Addendum, Ramboll Environ determined the minimum square footage of the previously approved office land use that would require removal from the Project to ensure that the proposed increase in neighborhood retail would not increase Project GHG emissions. The land use GHG emissions for this analysis are calculated using the same methodology presented in F E I R Appendix S (Climate Change Technical Report). As presented in Exhibit P, Table 2, adding 6,000 square feet local-serving retail development to the Project without increasing the GHG emissions previously estimated in the FEIR would require a removal of at least 9,200 square feet of previously approved office land use. The CalEEMod® default trip rates does not reflect low trip generation rate due to the nature of the development plan. Therefore, the estimated GHG emissions for the proposed local-serving retail are conservative. Since the office use would be reduced by 15,500 square feet, no increase in GHG emissions above the emissions estimated in the FEIR would occur with this modification.

The construction emissions presented in the FEIR were calculated based on the Project specific construction schedule and equipment list. It is reasonable to assume the proposed neighborhood retail would be constructed over the same construction duration with the same equipment list. In addition, based on the GHG emission comparison discussed above, the equivalent local-serving retail would be smaller in size than the office space proposed for removal/conversion. Therefore, converting office space to neighborhood-retail space would not generate increased GHG emissions associated with the construction activities analysis presented in the EIR.

#### Relocation of On-Street Parking Spaces to CP Center Garage

The proposed relocation of certain on-street parking to the CP Center garage is expected to have negligible effect on construction activity, because the overall building envelope of the CP Center garage either would not change from the garage size anticipated in the EIR. Consequently, there would be no change in the overall GHG emissions from that evaluated in the EIR.

#### Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements

This proposed modification results from the need to bifurcate construction on Harney Way into two phases in order to harmonize phasing with other transportation improvements planned for this area. This proposed modification would not change the overall work planned for the Harney Way improvements; it would spread the same amount of work spread over a longer time. Because this proposed modification only divides the Harney Way improvements into two phases and does not increase the amount of activity, there would be no change to the GHG emissions.

#### Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The original cross-section proposed to widen the Gilman to accommodate two lanes in each direction, whereas under the revised proposal there will be one lane in each direction plus a left turn lane in the middle – the curb to curb width will be 49 feet 9 inches instead of 56 feet. This modification reflects a reduction in construction activity (i.e., building a smaller roadway) that was analyzed in the FEIR. Consequently, there would be no increase in the overall GHG emissions from this proposed modification.

Accordingly, there would be no new impacts or increases in the severity of previously identified impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions and no new mitigation measures would be required. The impacts would remain less than significant, and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR greenhouse gas emissions cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

#### 5. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, OCII concludes that the analysis and conclusions reached in the FEIR certified on June 3, 2010 remain valid, and that no supplemental environmental review is required for the proposed modifications to the Project. The modified Project would neither cause new significant impacts nor result in the substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce significant impacts. No changes have occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the Project that would cause significant environmental impacts to which the modified project would contribute considerably, and no new information has been put forward which shows that the modified Project would cause significant environmental impacts. Consequently, the Project changes do not require major revision of the FEIR, and the project sponsors may implement the proposed modifications without additional CEQA review,

consistent with California Public Resources Code Section 21166 and California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines) Section 15164. Therefore, no supplemental environmental review is required beyond this Addendum.

Date of Determination:

2

0

I do hereby certify that the above determination has been made pursuant to state and local requirements.

Tiffany Bohee Executive Director Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure

### Exhibit A: 02/05/16: Tier 1 Project Revisions

Date: February 5, 2016

#### CANDLESTICK POINT Proposed Project Revisions Associated with Development Plan Application for Sub-Phase 02-03-03 and Updates to Project Documents, Including: CP Major Phase 1 Application, CP Design for Development (D4D), CP Streetscape Master Plan, CP-HPS-Phase 2 MMRP, CP Transportation Plan

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)	
		Revision	
TIER 1: Substantive Project Revisions			
<u>1. Tower Relocation</u> : The sub-phase application proposes relocating Towers G, J and K. Tower G would be relocated within CP-02, but outside the approved tower zone. Tower J and K would be moved approximately 100 feet southeast. Tower K would remain in an approved tower zone and Tower K would be in a new fixed location.	D4D located Tower G in the approved tower location in the center of CP-02. D4D located Towers J and K in CP-South, approximately 100 feet north of the proposed location.	Major Phase 1 Application • Section 1.1 • Figure 6.1 • Figure 6.5 • Figure 6.6 • Figure 6.7 • Figure 6.8 D4D:	
		<ul><li>Table 4.3</li><li>Figure 4.3</li><li>Figure 8.1</li></ul>	
2. <u>Height Increase – CP Center at corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue</u> : The sub-phase application proposes to increase the height of the building at CP Center on the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue from 85 feet to 120 feet. The Film Arts Center will be developed at this location.	D4D limits height at this location to 85 feet.	Major Phase 1 Application • Section 1.1 • Figure 6.1 • Figure 6.3 • Figure 6.4 • Figure 6.5 • Figure 6.6 • Figure 6.7 • Figure 6.8 D4D:	
		<ul><li>Figure 4.3</li><li>Figure 8.1</li></ul>	

### Exhibit A: 02/05/16: Tier 1 Project Revisions

3 Height Increase – CP Center at corner of Arelious Walker Drive and Harney Way. The sub-phase	D4D limits height at this location to 65 feet	Major Phase 1 Application
application proposes to increase the height of the CP center at the corner of Arelious Walker Drive and	D+D mints height at this location to 05 leet.	• Section 1.1
Harney Way from 65 feet to 80 feet. A building containing a hotel office and performance venue floor		• Section 1.1
space will be developed at this location.		D4D <sup>.</sup>
		• Figure 4.3
		• Figure 8.1
4. Height Increase – CP Center on both Sides of Harney Way & Ingerson Avenue at CP Center: The sub-	D4D limits height at this location to 65 feet.	Major Phase 1 Application
phase application proposes to increase the height of buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue		• Section 1.1
from 65 feet to 80 feet. These buildings will be developed with retail land uses at ground floor, with a		• Figure 6.1
maximum of five stories of residential or commercial uses above. The D4D defines a maximum		• Figure 6.3
percentage of the block's developable area that can be built within the 80 ft height zone, and includes		• Figure 6.4
additional guidelines encouraging buildings to be designed with varied height to add architectural interest		• Figure 6.5
to the streetscape.		• Figure 6.6
		• Figure 6.7
		• Figure 6.8
		D4D:
		• Section 4.2.2
		• Figure 4.3
		• Section 5.2.2
		• Figure 5.5
		• Section 5.3.2
		• Figure 5.7
		• Section 5.4.2
		• Figure 5.9
		• Figure 8.1
<u>5. Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail Space:</u> The sub-phase application proposes to	Project approvals provide for 150,000 square feet	Major Phase 1 Application
convert 15,500 square feet of entitled office space in Candlestick Point to 6,000 square feet of	of office and 125,000 Square feet of neighborhood	• Section 1.1
neighborhood retail space. This will result in the neighborhood retail floor space increasing from 125,000 square fact to	retail use at Candiestick Point	• Figure 6.1
134,500 square feet.		• Table 6.1
		Transportation Plan:
		• Table 4
		• Table 14
6. <u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u> : The sub-phase application proposes to relocate 269 on-street spaces	430 on-street spaces	Major Phase 1 Application
of the planned 430 on-street spaces to the CP Center garage.		• Section 1.1
		• Section 8.6
		• Figure 8.7

### Exhibit A: 02/05/16: Tier 1 Project Revisions

7. <u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing:</u> The sub-phase application proposes to divide construction of the off-site Harney Way roadway improvements into two phases: 1) from Arelious Walker Drive to Executive Park Boulevard East, and 2) from Executive Park Boulevard East to Thomas Mellon Drive. The sidewalk and cycle track along Harney Way would be completed as originally the planned from Arelious Walker Drive to Thomas Mellon Drive.	First phase of Harney Way improvements extended to Thomas Mellon Drive.	Major Phase 1 Application • Section 1.1 • Section 2.5 • Section 8.1 MMRP: • MM-TR-16
8. <u>Gilman Avenue Revised Cross Section</u> : The sub-phase application proposes to revise the cross section configuration to retain 15-foot sidewalks	Two lanes of travel in each direction; on- street parking on both sides of street; 12-foot sidewalks.	Infrastructure Plan: • Section 2.1.3 A • Figure 2.1.3 Major Phase 1 Application • Section 1.1
and on-street parking on both sides of street. Only one travel lane in each direction and a center turn lane would be provided. The intersections between Third Street and Arelious Walker would be signal controlled.	All-way stop sign at the intersections between Third Street and Arelious Walker.	<ul> <li>Section 8.1</li> <li>MMRP:</li> <li>MM-TR-23.1</li> <li>Transportation Plan:</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>Figure 7M</li> <li>Infrastructure Plan:</li> <li>Section 2.1.3 E</li> <li>Figure 2.1.5</li> </ul>

Date: February 5, 2016

#### CANDLESTICK POINT

#### Tier 2 and Tier 3 Revisions Associated with Development Plan Application for Sub-Phase 02-03-03 and Updates to Project Documents, Including: CP Major Phase 1 Application, CP Design for Development (D4D), CP Streetscape Master Plan, CP-HPS-Phase 2 MMRP, CP Transportation Plan

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s) Revision
TIER 2: D4D. Streetscape Plan. and Major Phase 1 Applica	tion Refinements and Clarificati	ions
1. <u>Additional Signage Provisions</u> : Provisions amended to provide a greater level of guidance for signage, specifically in relation to intent, variety, style, orientation, lighted signs, safety, new technology signs, temporary signage and prohibited signage. Specific standards for commercial and residential signage are removed.	D4D: • Existing provisions in Section 4.3.2 I	D4D: • Section 4.4, p. 138-139
2. <u>Podium Heights</u> : Add provisions to the D4D to clarify massing and bulk controls for tower podiums and add maximum podium heights for each tower.	D4D: • No existing provisions	D4D: • Table 4.3 (p. 84), • Section 4.3.2 (p. 87) • Table 4.5 (p. 87)
3. <u>Ground Floor Retail Height In Mixed Use Residential District</u> : Add provisions to the D4D minimum floor-to-floor height of 15 feet for non-residential uses.	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Figure 4.6 – Minimum retail height of 12 feet for Mixed Use High Rise</li> <li>Section 4.3.1 B – All retail spaces shall be a minimum of 12 feet height</li> </ul>	D4D: • Figures 4.7 to 4.12 (p 97 to 102) • Section 4.3.1 (A) (p. 110) • Section 4.3.1 (B) (p. 116) Major Phase 1 Application: • Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5) • Section 6.1 (p. 52)
4. <u>Parking Garage Entry</u> and <u>Curb Cuts Widths</u> : Revise D4D to allow a maximum of 27 foot width for garage entrance and curb cuts if needed to accommodate large service vehicles and emergency services.	<ul> <li>D4D</li> <li>Section 4.3.1 D (p. 128) – Maximum combined parking &amp; loading entry width 24 ft</li> <li>Section 4.4.3 (p. 152) – Maximum curb cut width 24 ft</li> </ul>	D4D:         • Section 4.3.1 D (p. 123)         • Section 4.4.3 (p. 144)         Major Phase 1 Application:         • Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5)         • Section 8.7 (p. 79)
5. <u>CP Center Internal Access</u> : Eliminate extension of Earl Street and 8 <sup>th</sup> Street into CP Center and eliminate Bill Walsh Street. Add four pedestrian only corridors. Allow service vehicles to use one pedestrian corridor.	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Various figures, images and location plans show the extension of Earl Street and 8<sup>th</sup> Street into CP Center, with a new Bill Walsh Street.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Figure 2.1 (p. 21)</li> <li>Image: Density of residential and services is clustered around transit stops (p. 23)</li> </ul>

### Exhibit B Page 1 of 10

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)
		Revision
		<ul> <li>Revision</li> <li>Image: Parks and Open Space Illustrative Plan (p. 24)</li> <li>Figure 2.2: Parks and Open Space Network (p. 25)</li> <li>Figure 2.3 (p. 27)</li> <li>Figure 2.4 (p. 29)</li> <li>Figure 2.5 (p. 33)</li> <li>Figure 2.6 (p. 37)</li> <li>Figure 2.7 (p. 39)</li> <li>Figure 3.1 (p. 47)</li> <li>Figure 3.2 (p. 49)</li> <li>Figure 3.2 (p. 49)</li> <li>Figure 3.3: Public Streets Network (p. 57)</li> <li>Figure 3.4: Parks and Open Space (p. 64)</li> <li>Figure 3.10: Conceptual Plan – Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (p. 72)</li> <li>Figure 4.1: Development Blocks (p. 77)</li> <li>Figure 4.2: Land Use Districts (p. 79)</li> <li>Figure 4.3: Building Heights (p. 85)</li> <li>Figure 4.4: Street Wall Conditions (p. 94)</li> <li>Figure 5.1: Character Neighborhoods (p. 155)</li> <li>Figure 5.6: Candlestick Center Illustrative Site Plan (p. 177)</li> <li>Figure 5.7: Candlestick Center Urban Design (p. 183)</li> <li>Figure 7.1: Block Plan (p. 201)</li> <li>Figure 7.2: Building Heights (p. 205)</li> <li>Figure 7.4: Iamestown Urban Design</li> </ul>
		(p. 209)

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)
		Revision
Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	<ul> <li>Project Document(s) Revision</li> <li>Figure 8.1: Building Heights – Shipyard South R&amp;D Option (p. 214)</li> <li>Figure 9.3: Candlestick Center Block Plan (p. 228)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 35)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 50)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 51)</li> <li>Image: Location of Retail Streets (p. 59)</li> <li>Image: Location of Boulevard Streets (p. 60)</li> <li>Image: Location of Local Streets (p. 61)</li> <li>Image: Location of Alice Griffith Community Park (p. 65)</li> <li>Image: Location of Candlestick Community Park – Final location to be determined in the future (p. 66)</li> <li>Image: Location of Mini-wedge Community Park (p. 68)</li> <li>Image: Location of Jamestown Hillside Community Park (p. 69)</li> <li>Image: Location of State Recreation Area and Bay Trail (p. 70)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 95)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 97)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 99)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 101)</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>Location Plan (p. 101)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 102)</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>Location Plan (p. 102)</li> </ul>
		• Location Plan (p. 104)

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)
		Revision
		• Image: Street block orientated at 45° to
		prevailing winds (p. 106)
		• Location Plan (p. 150)
		<ul> <li>Location Plan (p. 151)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 156)</li> </ul>
		• Location Plan (p. 150)
		<ul> <li>Location Plan (p. 104)</li> <li>Location Plan (p. 174)</li> </ul>
		• Location Plan (p. 184)
		• Section 5.3.3: Candlestick Center –
		Urban Design (pp. 194-195)
		Major Phase 1 Application:
		• Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5)
		• Figure 2.1 (p. 10)
		• Figure 2.2 (p. 12)
		• Figure 2.3 (p. 14)
		• Figure 2.4 (p. 17)
		• Figure 2.5 (p. 18)
		• Figure 2.6 (p. 19)
		• Figure 2.7 (p. 20)
		• Figure 2.8 (p. 21)
		• Figure 2.9 (p. 22)
		• Figure 5.1 (p. 36)
		• Figure 5.2 (p. 37)
		• Figure 6.1 (p. 40)
		• Figure 6.2 (p. 42)
		• Figure 6.3 (p. 43)
		• Figure 6.4 (p. 44)
		• Figure 6.5 (p. 45)
		• Figure 6.6 (p. 46)
		• Figure 6.7 (p. 47)
		• Figure 6.8 (p. 48)
		• Figure 7.1 (p. 54)

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)
		Revision
		• Figure 8.1 (p. 67)
		• Figure 8.2 (p. 69)
		• Location Plan (p. 70)
		• Location Plan (p. 71)
		• Location Plan (p. 72)
		• Location Plan (p. 73)
		• Figure 8.3 (p. 74)
		• Figure 8.4 (p. 75)
		• Figure 8.5 (p. 76)
		• Figure 8.6 (p. 77)
		• Figure 9.1 (p. 83)
		• Figure 9.2 (p. 85)
		• Figure 9.3 (p. 86)
		• Figure 9.4 (p. 87)
		• Figure 9.5 (p. 88)
		• Figure 9.6 $(p, 89)$
		• Figure 9.7 (p. 90)
		<ul> <li>Figure 9.8 (p. 91)</li> </ul>
		• Figure 10.1 (p. 94)
		• Figure 10.5 (p. 100)
		- I Iguie 10.5 (p. 100)
6. Arelious Walker Entry Plaza: Add D4D provisions encouraging a vehicle/pedestrian entry plaza.	D4D:	D4D
	No existing provisions	• Section 5.3.2 S8 and G5 (p. 182)
		• Figure 5.7: Candlestick Center Urban
7. CP Enter Parking Garage Entry and Curb Cuts Widths: Add D4D provisions to allow garage entry and curb cuts widths up to	D4D:	Design (p. 105)
50 feet. All one parking garage entry and associated curb cut larger than 27 feet on Ingerson. Provide for a safe and comfortable	• Section 4.3.1 D, p. 128 – Maximum	• Section 4.3.1 D: Parking Structure (p.
pedestrian and bicyclist crossing.	combined parking & loading entry	123)
	width 24 ft	• Section 4.4.3: Loading, Mechanical
	• Section 4.4.3, p. 152 – Maximum curb	Equipment and Meters (p. 144)
	cut width 24 ft	• Section 5.5.2 57. Farking Structure

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s) Revision
8. <u>Grocery Store Garage Door and Curb Cut Widths</u> : Add D4D provisions allowing a garage door and curb cut width greater than 27 feet for the grocery store to accommodate a loading dock. Incorporates requirements for screening and design features to ensure a safe and comfortable pedestrian and bicyclist crossing.	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Section 4.3.1 D (p. 128) – Maximum combined parking &amp; loading entry width 24 ft</li> <li>Section 4.4.3 (p. 152) – Maximum curb cut width 24 ft</li> </ul>	D4D: • Section 5.2.2 G3: Grocery Store (p. 171)
9. <u>Blank Building Facades</u> : Revise D4D provisions to allow blank facades where floor area is below grade or for essential building service area and to avoid blank facades along paseos.	<ul><li>D4D:</li><li>Blank facades prohibited.</li></ul>	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Section 4.3.1: Retail and Mixed Use (p. 116)</li> <li>Major Phase 1 Application:</li> <li>Section 6.6 (p. 52)</li> </ul>
10. <u>Remove Parking Space Dimensions</u> : Remove D4D minimum parking space dimension requirements.	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Parallel parking spaces shall be a minimum of 7 ft by 22 ft; angled parking spaces shall be a minimum of 9 ft by 18 ft.</li> </ul>	<ul><li>D4D:</li><li>Section 4.5.2: On-street Parking</li></ul>
11. <u>Cinema and Grocery Store Parking Ratio</u> : Update D4D to include off-street car parking ratios for Cinema and Grocery Store.	<ul><li>D4D:</li><li>No existing provisions</li></ul>	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Table 4.7 (p. 140)</li> <li>Major Phase 1 Application:</li> <li>Table 8.3 (p. 87)</li> <li>Transportation Plan</li> <li>Table 9 (p. 60)</li> </ul>
12. <u>Hotel Location</u> : Update D4D to reflect new hotel location at the corner of Harney Way and Arelious Walker.	<ul> <li>D4D:Hotel in location in middle of CP Center, but indicates the location may move.</li> <li>Maximum of two curb-cuts allowed on Earl Street or 8th Street for the provision of passage drop off and loading.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Section 4.3.1 B: Commercial – Hotel (p. 119)</li> <li>Figure 5.6: Candlestick Center Illustrative Site Plan (p. 177)</li> <li>Section 5.3.3 G3: Candlestick Center Urban Design (p. 195)</li> <li>Figure 5.10: Candlestick Center Urban Design (p. 197)</li> </ul>

## Exhibit B Page 6 of 10

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)
		Revision
		Major Phase 1 Application: • Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5) • Figure 2.2 (p. 12) • Figure 6.1 (p. 40) • Table 6.1 (p. 41) • Figure 6.6 (p. 45) • Figure 6.7 (p. 46)
		• Figure 6.8 (p. 47)
13. Width of Pedestrian Path to Water Mews in Mid-Block Breaks: D4D provision added to require a minimum 10 foot width for	D4D:	D4D:
pedestrian path to water mews.	No existing provisions	• Section 4.6.2: Mid-block Breaks (p. 147)
14. <u>Alice Griffith Outdoor Seating</u> : Add D4D provision to encourage outdoor seating in large sidewalk areas at the northern and southern ends of Egbert Avenue.	D4D: • No existing provisions	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Section 5.1.1: Alice Griffith General Description (p. 158)</li> </ul>
15. <u>Alice Griffith Setbacks</u> : 9 foot setback to apply at Alice Griffith to properties fronting Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue and G Street	D4D: • 10 foot setback	<ul> <li>D4D:</li> <li>Section 5.1.2 S4: Setbacks to Donner Avenue Fitzgerald Avenue &amp; G Street</li> </ul>
16. <u>Wedge Park Phasing</u> : Accelerate development of Wedge Park 2a to Major Phase 1. Wedge Park 2b would remain in Major Phase 2.	Major Phase 1 Application: • Figure 2.9	Major Phase 1 Application: • Section 2.5 (p. 22-23) • Figure 2.9 (p. 22)
17. <u>Timing and Grading for Jamestown Avenue Improvements</u> : Reconstruction of Jamestown Avenue will end approximately 1,000 feet sooner than originally contemplated in order to avoid significant grade differences between the road and adjoining properties. Resurfacing of this section of roadway will be occur in Major Phase 2 along with the resurfacing of Jamestown to Third Street originally planned for Major Phase 2.	<ul> <li>Major Phase 1 Application:</li> <li>Figure 2.9</li> <li>Infrastructure Plan:</li> <li>Section 2.1.3.C (no changes required)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Major Phase 1 Application:</li> <li>Section 2.5 (p. 22-23)</li> <li>Figure 2.9 (p. 22)</li> </ul>

18. Bulb-outs: Several bulb-outs along Ingerson and Harney have been removed to accommodate SFFD and SFPUC concerns.	CP Streetscape Master Plan:	Major Phase 1 Application:
	• Figure 5.3	• Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5)
	• Figure 5.4	
		CP Streetscape Master Plan:
		• Figure 5.4
		• Figure 5.5
19. <u>Adjustment to CP-04 Boundary</u> : The block depth in CP-04 would be increased to accommodate townhomes and this would	Major Phase 1 Application:	Major Phase 1 Application:
adjust the boundary of CP-04 approximately 100 feet southeast.	Major Phase 1 Application:	• Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5)
	• Section 1.1	• Figure 2.1 (p. 10)
	• Figure 2.1	• Figure 2.2 (p. 12)
	• Figure 2.2	• Figure 2.3 (p. 14)
	• Figure 2.3	• Figure 2.4 (p. 17)
	• Figure 2.4	• Figure 2.5 (p. 18)
	• Figure 2.5	• Figure 2.6 (p. 19)
	• Figure 2.6	• Figure 2.7 (p. 20)
	• Figure 2.7	• Figure 2.8 (p. 21)
	• Figure 2.8	• Figure 2.9 (p. 22)
	• Figure 2.9	• Figure 5.1 (p. 36)
	• Figure 5.1	• Figure 5.2 $(p. 37)$
	• Figure 5.2	• Figure 6.1 $(p, 40)$
	• Figure 6.1	• Figure 6.2 (p. 42)
	• Figure 6.2	• Figure 6.3 (p. 43)
	• Figure 6.3	• Figure 6.4 (p. 44)
	• Figure 6.4	• Figure 6.5 $(p, 45)$
	• Figure 6.5	• Figure 7.1 (p. 54)
	• Figure 6.6	• Figure 8.1 (p. 67)
	• Figure 6.7	• Figure 8.2 (p. 69)
	• Figure 6.8	• Location Plan (p. 70)
	• Figure 7.1	• Location Plan (p. 71)
	• Figure 8.1	• Location Plan (p. 72)
	• Figure 8.2	• Location Plan (p. 73)
	• Figure 8.3	• Figure 8.3 ( $\mathbf{p}$ 74)
	• Figure 8.4	• Figure 8.4 (n. 75)
	• Figure 8 5	• Figure 8.5 $(n, 76)$
	• Figure 8.6	= Figure 8.6 (p. 77)
	• Figure 9.1	= Figure 0.1 (p. 77)
	Figure 0.2	• Figure 9.1 (p. 65)
	• Figure 9.2	

	<ul> <li>Figure 9.3</li> <li>Figure 9.4</li> <li>Figure 9.5</li> <li>Figure 9.6</li> <li>Figure 9.7</li> <li>Figure 9.8</li> <li>Figure 9.9</li> <li>Figure 9.10</li> <li>Figure 10.1</li> <li>Figure 10.5</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Figure 9.2 (p. 85)</li> <li>Figure 9.3 (p. 86)</li> <li>Figure 9.4 (p. 87)</li> <li>Figure 9.5 (p. 88)</li> <li>Figure 9.6 (p. 89)</li> <li>Figure 9.7 (p. 90)</li> <li>Figure 9.8 (p. 91)</li> <li>Figure 10.1 (p. 94)</li> <li>Figure 10.5 (p. 100)</li> </ul>
	• various Location Plans	
20. <u>Performance Venue Modification</u> : The CP Center performance venue square footage would be divided between two locations. Approximately 42,000 square feet would be located at Harney Way and Ingerson for a 1,200 seat Film Arts Center and approximately 33,000 square feet would be located on the lot with the hotel at the corner of Arelious Walker and Harney Way.	<ul> <li>Major Phase 1 Application:</li> <li>Section 2.2</li> <li>Table 2.1</li> <li>Figure 2.2</li> <li>Table 6.1</li> <li>Figure 6.1</li> <li>Figure 6.6</li> <li>Figure 6.7</li> <li>Figure 6.8</li> <li>Depicts the 75,000 sf arena / performance venue entitlement</li> <li>Transportation Plan:</li> <li>Table 2, p. 3</li> <li>Table 4, p. 20</li> <li>Table 14, p. 64</li> </ul>	Major Phase Application: • Section 2.2 (p. 11) • Figure 2.2 (p. 12) • Figure 6.1 (p. 40) • Table 6.1 (p. 41) • Figure 6.6 (p. 45) • Figure 6.7 (p. 46) • Figure 6.8 (p. 47) Transportation Plan: • Table 2, p. 3 • Table 4, p. 20 • Table 14, p. 64
21. <u>Street Width Changes:</u> The width of right-of-ways at Candlestick Point were widened to ensure a 26 foot unobstructed access for SF Fire Department vehicles.	<ul> <li>Transportation Plan:</li> <li>Arelious Walker Drive between Ingerson Avenue and Gilman Avenue – 113 foot right-of-way</li> <li>Arelious Walker Drive between Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way – 109 foot right-of-way</li> <li>B Street – 51 foot right-of-way</li> <li>Gilman Avenue, east of Harney Way – 51 foot right-of-way</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Major Phase 1 Application:</li> <li>Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5)</li> <li>Section 8.2 (pp. 70-73)</li> <li>Transportation Plan:</li> <li>Arelious Walker Drive between Ingerson Avenue and Gilman Avenue – 84 foot right-of-way</li> <li>Arelious Walker Drive between Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way</li> </ul>

## Exhibit B Page 9 of 10

22. <u>Building Height Percentages for Blocks with Multiple Height Zones:</u> Clarify building height massing for blocks with multiple	<ul> <li>Harney Way between Egbert Avenue and Donner Avenue – 58 foot right-of- way</li> <li>Ingerson Avenue between Harney Way and West Harney Way – 51 foot right- of-way</li> <li>D4D:</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>B Street – 56 foot right-of-way</li> <li>Gilman Avenue, east of Harney Way – 59 foot right-of-way</li> <li>Harney Way between Egbert Avenue and Donner Avenue – 78.5 foot right- of-way</li> <li>Ingerson Avenue between Harney Way and West Harney Way – 70 foot right- of-way</li> <li>D4D:</li> </ul>		
height zones by including a percentage of the developable block area that the higher height zone(s) cannot exceed.	No existing provision	• Section 4.2.2		
	er er er	• Figure 4.3		
Tier 3: Editorial Revisions to the D4D, Streetscape Plan, and Major Phase 1 Application				
1. <u>D4D Updates/Approvals Since 2010</u> : Remove reference to stadium, reflect implementation of Variant 2A, updates to reflect	Refer to detailed attachment	D4D:		
changes analyzed in Addendum 1, add certain mitigation measures from the FEIR, add neighborhood retail parking ratio		• Refer to attached change logs		
2 D4D Relocation of Text: Jamestown provisions consolidated in new section 7 Shinyard South R&D variant consolidated in	Refer to detailed attachment	D4D <sup>.</sup>		
new section 8. Block plans moved from section 5 to the Appendix.		Refer to attached change logs		
3. Clarifying Changes to Text, Tables, Figures, and Images in D4D: Clarify descriptions of project elements, interpretations of	Refer to detailed attachment	D4D:		
certain standards, add cross-reference, update text and graphics to reflect current plan, delete repetition, add definitions and other minor changes that do not affect the location, type, density, or intensity of the development. See attached change log sheet.		• Refer to attached change logs		
4. Updates and Edits to the Streetscape Master Plan: See attached change log sheet, including street furnishings and paving	Refer to detailed attachment	Streetscape Master Plan:		
selections and the substitution of a deciduous rather than coniferous trees.		• Refer to attached change logs		
5. Updates and Edits to the Major Phase 1 Application: See attached change log sheet, including update of Affordable Housing	Refer to detailed attachment	Major Phase 1 Application:		
from 1025 units to 1560 units.		Refer to attached change logs		

Notes:

- 1. The Transportation Plan and Infrastructure Plan were updated in July 2014 to reflect modifications to street cross sections and these modifications were approved by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (8/3/14 letter from Edward Reiskin, Director of Transportation)., San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (11/7/2014 letter from Michael Carlin, Deputy General Manager), and the San Francisco Fire Department (7/31/2014 letter from Joanne Hayes-White) in accordance with the approval process in the Interagency Cooperation Agreement.
- 2. As part of approval, obtain authority to update as necessary the FEIR tables and figures for the non-stadium variant 2a.

### Exhibit B Page 10 of 10

# Exhibit C: Tower Location Analysis Candlestick Point Design For Development \_ Figure 4.3 Building Heights



### Legend

- Fixed high-rise location IX Encouraged high-rise location Allowable high-rise location zone
  - Proposed high-rise location, 2015
- CP 02-03-04 SUB-PHASE BOUNDARY

Exhibit C Page 1 of 1

Exhibit D: Candlestick Center Mixed Use Height Visuals



## Exhibit D Page 1 of 3

## Exhibit D: Candlestick Center Mixed Use Height Visuals



## Exhibit D Page 2 of 3

Exhibit D: Candlestick Center Mixed Use Height Visuals



### Exhibit D Page 3 of 3



Exhibit E Page 1 of 5

### Exhibit E: Candlestick Center Hotel Height Visual







Exhibit E Page 3 of 5





Exhibit E Page 4 of 5



### Exhibit F: 12/14/15 Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Conversion Letter

June 25, 2015 (Updated December 14, 2015)

Ms. Joy Navarette San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Ms. Lila Hussain Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure One South Van Ness, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, CA 94103

#### Subject: Candlestick Point – Office to Local Serving Retail Conversion

Dear Joy and Lila,

The Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project Final EIR (herein referred to simply as "EIR") was certified by the San Francisco Planning Commission and the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission in June 2010. Since that time, the Housing/R&D Variant (Variant 2A) has been advanced as the project. Variant 2A assumed the Candlestick Point site would include:

- 150,000 square feet of office
- 6,225 residential dwelling units (includes replacement of 256 then-existing units at Alice Griffith)
- 635,000 square feet of regional retail
- 125,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving retail
- 220 room hotel
- 50,000 square feet of community-serving uses
- 10,000-seat arena<sup>1</sup>

Since the Project has been approved, the project sponsor has requested that we study the conversion of office to 6,000 square feet of local serving retail.

To maintain the same number of peak hour vehicle trips as was forecasted in the EIR's transportation analysis, the proposed size of office to be converted to neighborhood-serving retail has been based on the number of PM peak hour vehicle trips 6,000 square feet of local

<sup>1</sup> The Draft Sub-Phase CP 02 03 04 Application proposes to replace the arena with a proposed performance venue/nightclub with no more than 5,000 seats. However, since it is uncertain whether this represents a negligible change in the project, or whether that must undergo a separate review and approval process, this analysis evaluates the currently-approved land uses, which include an arena and not the performance venue.

serving retail space would generate. **Table 1** documents the number of PM peak hour vehicle trips. The PM peak hour was chosen for this analysis because it represents the period when the retail space would be most active. As shown, based on the rates used in the EIR, 6,000 square feet of local serving retail would generate 19 peak hour trips. The same number of trips would be generated by 15,500 square feet of office space. Therefore, the proposed change would result in a total of 131,000 square feet of local serving retail and 134,500 square feet of office at the Candlestick Point site.

TABLE 1. OFFICE TO NEIGHBORHOOD-SERVING RETAIL	CONVERSION
TABLE I. OFFICE TO INLIGHDORHOOD-SERVING RETAIL	CONVERSION

Land Use	Size (ksf)	PM Peak Hour Trip Rate <sup>1</sup>	PM Peak Hour Trips
Local Serving Retail	6	3.22	19
Office	15.5	1.25	19

Notes:

 Based on the effective vehicle trip generation rate used in the EIR, accounting for some internalization of trips that may occur within the development. This provides a conservative assumption by lowering the "credit" for external trip generation associated with the office and by using a "blended" rate for retail, which includes local serving and regional retail, resulting in a higher rate than simply using the effective rate for local serving retail only.
 Fehr & Peers, 2015

For questions or comments please contact Chris Mitchell or Sarah Nadiranto.

Sincerely,

FEHR & PEERS

K 1

Chris Mitchell, PE Principal

Sarah Nadiranto, PE Transportation Engineer

SF08-0407

### Exhibit G 1.11.16 Fehr & Peers CP Parking Memo

January 22, 2016

Ms. Joy Navarette San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, CA 94103

#### Subject: Candlestick Point / Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Revised Parking Ratio Assessment (SF08-0407)

Dear Joy:

As you know, the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Redevelopment Plan EIR was certified in July 2010. The Project's Transportation Plan and EIR outlined specific maximum offstreet parking supply ratios that could be constructed associated with various land uses. The Project's EIR also included a discussion of forecasted peak parking demand and a forecast of the on- and off-street parking supply that would be constructed if the maximum amount of on- and off-street parking were constructed.

Since that time, as project plans and details have been developed, the amount of on-street parking has been substantially reduced compared to what was described in the EIR to accommodate better clearance for emergency vehicles as well as the sidewalk amenities that will be provided (e.g., fire hydrants, transit stops and shelters, ADA facilities, etc.) where parking may be precluded. Further, the proposed off-street parking supply has been modified to reflect more specific land use development proposals. Because of this reduction in the overall amount of parking, the project sponsor has requested additional spaces be provided in the parking structure for the CP Retail Center equal to the number of off-street parking spaces that have been removed from the plan. The purpose of this letter is to describe the effect that this change would have on the analysis described in the Project's EIR.

#### **On-Street Parking Supply**

As part of the application for construction of CP-02-03-04, the project's street plans have been designed to a greater level of detail than available when the original EIR analysis was performed. The more detailed designs have resulted in a reduction from the original estimates of on-street parking. For those streets proposed to be constructed as part of CP 02-03-04, the original EIR estimates assumed that 430 on-street parking spaces could be constructed. Design considerations such as ADA design standards, fire hydrants, and utility equipment, would limit the number of on-street parking spaces and result in decreasing on-street parking supply from 430 to 161 parking spaces (a decrease of 269 parking spaces) just for those streets that comprise CP 02-03-04. This represents a reduction in overall parking supply at Candlestick Point compared to what was assumed in the EIR.

### Exhibit G Page 1 of 5

### Exhibit G 1.11.16 Fehr & Peers CP Parking Memo

#### **Off-Street Parking Supply**

The project sponsor is currently in the application process for Sub-phases CP-02-03-04. Table 1 presents the maximum amount of off-street parking supply permitted as part of CP-02-03-04 based on the original 2010 plan for Variant 2A as described in the EIR. The maximum off-street parking supply was calculated by multiplying the maximum parking ratios in the project's Transportation Plan and Design for Development document by the total amount of approved development by land use type.

The current application for CP-02-03-04 includes some refinements to the land uses within the CP Center, including:

- replacing 15.5 ksf of office space with 6 ksf of local serving retail
- the addition of a grocery store (which is considered part of the local-serving retail square footage already approved)
- the change from the originally contemplated arena to a smaller performance venue and movie theater, and
- the addition of 540 more housing units in this sub-phase (with a corresponding decrease in housing units to be supplied in future sub-phases, such that the total number of residential units in Candlestick Point remains the same).

For the cinema and grocery store, current Planning Code ratios from Planning Code Table 151.1 are applied. In the case of the grocery store, the current Planning Code ratio is the same as the ratio for regional retail. The Project Sponsor also requests that the loss of the 269 on-street parking spaces be supplied in the CP Center garage. Table 2 summarizes the proposed new parking calculation:

### Exhibit G Page 2 of 5

### Exhibit G 1.11.16 Fehr & Peers CP Parking Memo

Land Use	Proposed Amount	Maximum Supply Rate	Maximum Number of Spaces	
Non-Residential Parking – CP Center (20)				
Office	150 ksf	1 space / ksf	150 spaces	
Hotel	220 rooms	0.25 spaces / room	55 spaces	
Performance Arena	10,000 seats	1 space / 15 seats	667 spaces	
Regional Retail	635 ksf	2.7 spaces / ksf	1,715 spaces	
Local-Serving Retail	125 ksf	1 space / ksf <sup>1</sup>	125 spaces	
	Non	-Residential Subtotal	2,712 spaces	
Residential Parking – CP Center (2010 Plan)				
Housing Units – CP Center	280	1 space / unit	280 spaces	
Housing Units – Elsewhere in Subphase	745	1 space / unit	745 spaces	
		Residential Subtotal	1,025 spaces	
		Grand Total	3,737 spaces	

### TABLE 1 CALCULATION OF MAXIMUM PERMITTED SUPPLY AT CP-02-03-04(ORIGINAL 2010 PLAN)

1. The Design for Development document states that parking for local-serving retail would be "shared with" parking for regional retail; however, it does not include a specific rate. The project's Transportation Plan and EIR transportation analysis was based on a maximum rate of 1 space per 1,000 square feet for local-serving retail. Therefore, that ratio is used in this calculation.
# Exhibit G 1.11.16 Fehr & Peers CP Parking Memo

Land Use	Proposed Amount	Maximum Supply Rate <sup>1</sup>	Maximum Number of Spaces			
CP Center Parking (Retail/Entertainm						
Regional Retail	635 ksf	2.7 spaces / ksf	1,715 spaces			
Local Serving Retail	96 ksf <sup>2</sup>	1 space / ksf	96 spaces			
Office <sup>3</sup>	134.5 ksf	1 space / ksf	35 spaces			
International African Market Place and CPSRA Welcome Center	8 ksf	1 space / 2 ksf	4			
Performance Venue	4,400 seats/standing (33 ksf)	1/15 seats <sup>4</sup>	147 spaces			
Movie Theater	1,200 seats (42 ksf)	1/8/10 seats <sup>5</sup>	145 spaces			
Lost On-Street Parking Spaces			269 spaces			
	2,411 spaces					
CP Center Residential & Community Services Parking						
Harney/Ingerson Housing	265 units	1 space / unit	265 spaces			
SFPD	1 ksf	1 / 2 ksf	1			
Subtoto	al for CP Center Residential & Co	ommunity Services Uses	266 spaces			
Other CP 02-03-04 Uses Provided Separately by Site Developers						
Community Uses (e.g. Fire Station/School)	41 ksf	1 / 2 ksf	21			
Grocery	35 ksf	2.7 / 1 ksf	95			
Residential Tower at CP Center	220 units	1 space / unit	220 spaces			
Other Residential	1,080 units	1 space / unit	1,080 spaces			
Hotel	220 rooms	0.25 spaces / room	55 spaces			
Office Parking to be made available	100 spaces					
Subtotal Cl	1,570 spaces					
		<b>Grand Total</b> <sup>6</sup>	4,246 spaces			

# TABLE 2 CALCULATION OF MAXIMUM PERMITTED SUPPLY AT CP-02-03-04(REVISED 2015 PLAN)

# Exhibit G Page 4 of 5

## Exhibit G 1.11.16 Fehr & Peers CP Parking Memo

#### TABLE 2 CALCULATION OF MAXIMUM PERMITTED SUPPLY AT CP-02-03-04 (REVISED 2015 PLAN)

- 1. Some maximum rates have been revised from what was in the 2010 Transportation Plan, based on more specificity in proposed uses now compared to 2010. Detailed explanation for the revisions is included in the Subphase CP-02-03-04 Application.
- 2. Includes originally-approved 125 ksf of local-serving retail, less 35 ksf grocery store (which are considered a part of the local-serving retail) plus additional 6 ksf of local-serving retail proposed as a result of eliminating 15.5 ksf of approved office space (see letter to Planning Department and OCII, dated June 25, 2015).
- 3. Office parking shared with retail and entertainment. Number of parking spaces within the structure is reduced by approximately 75% (from 135 spaces to 35 spaces). The balance of entitled parking (100 spaces) will be made available for future development sites on Candlestick Point, provided by the site developer(s).
- 4. Assumes performance venue patrons will share parking with retail patrons. Reduce maximum number of spaces by half.
- 5. 1/8/10 seats = 1 parking space / 8 seats up to 1,000 seats + 1 parking space / 10 seats above 1,000 seats
- 6. Grand total excludes car-share parking spaces. A total of 50 car-share parking spaces will be in the CP Center parking structure and an additional 9 spaces will be provided separately by site developers, totaling 63 car-share spaces.

The revised proposed land uses and off-street parking supply for CP-02-03-04 would yield up to 509 more off-street parking spaces in this sub-phase than if the original land uses and parking ratios were used. However, the 2010 original plan did not account for the 25 Community Uses parking spaces and the grocery store, considered a local serving use, is now using a higher parking rate (2.7 parking space / 1 ksf compared to 1 parking space / 1 ksf). When adjusted for the fact that this sub-phase includes 540 additional housing units and their associated spaces (which are simply being relocated into this sub-phase from another future sub-phase, and do not affect the overall site total), the proposed parking supply would be nearly identical to the amount of off-street spaces previously proposed at the same time that the on-street parking supply has also been reduced by 269 spaces. In fact, the revised 2015 parking supply is less than the 2010 total with the added 540 housing units by approximately 30 parking spaces.

Given that further reductions to the on-street parking supply are likely as additional more detailed plans are developed for future sub-phases, we expect the overall on- and off-street parking supply to be lower than what was contemplated in the 2010 EIR. The reduction to overall parking supply would not result in new significant impacts nor would it substantially worsen any significant impacts identified in the EIR. If anything, fewer people would drive to the site and transit capacity is adequate to accommodate minor increases associated with less driving, if that were to materialize. The relocation of on-street parking does not affect the total trips generated or trip patterns assumed in the EIR because the primary paths of travel would remain the same. For questions or comments please contact Chris Mitchell or Sarah Nadiranto at (415) 348-0300.

Sincerely, FEHR & PEERS

Chris Mitchell, PE Principal

Sarah Nadiranto, PE Transportation Engineer

## Exhibit G Page 5 of 5

Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure

### RESOLUTION NO. 1-2014 Adopted January 7, 2014

ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND APPROVING THE STREETSCAPE PLAN AND THE SIGNAGE PLAN FOR CANDLESTICK POINT AND THE MAJOR PHASE APPLICATION FOR MAJOR PHASE 1 AND CONFORMING CHANGES TO THE PROJECT DOCUMENTS PURSUANT TO THE DISPOSITION AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH CP DEVELOPMENT CO., LP, SUBJECT TO APPROVAL FROM THE AFFECTED CITY DEPARTMENTS AND MAYOR UNDER AND TO THE EXTENT REQUIRED BY THE ICA AND THE PLANNING COOPERATION AGREEMENT; BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT AND HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD PROJECT AREAS

- WHEREAS, Under Chapter 5, Statutes of 2011, Assembly Bill No. 1X26 (Chapter 5, Statutes of 2011-12, First Extraordinary Session), and Assembly Bill No. 1484 (Chapter 26, Statutes of 2011-12, Regular Session) (collectively, as amended from time to time, the "Dissolution Law"), the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco ("SFRA" or the "Redevelopment Agency") was dissolved and the non-affordable housing assets and obligations of SFRA were transferred to the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco ("Successor Agency"), commonly known as the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure ("OCII"), by operation of law; and,
- WHEREAS. Subsequent to the adoption of AB 1484, on October 2, 2012 the Board of Supervisors of the City, acting as the legislative body of the Successor Agency, adopted Ordinance No. 215-12 (the "Implementing Ordinance"), which Implementing Ordinance was signed by the Mayor on October 4, 2012, and which, among other matters: (a) acknowledged and confirmed that, as of the effective date of AB 1484, the Successor Agency is a separate legal entity from the City, and (b) established the Successor Agency Commission (the "Commission") and delegated to it the authority to (i) act in place of the Redevelopment Commission to, among other matters, implement, modify, enforce and complete the Redevelopment Agency's enforceable obligations, (ii) approve all contracts and actions related to the assets transferred to or retained by the Successor Agency, including, without limitation, the authority to exercise land use, development, and design approvals, consistent with applicable enforceable obligations, and (iii) take any action that the Dissolution Law requires or authorizes on behalf of the Successor Agency and any other action that this Successor Agency Commission deems appropriate, consistent with the Dissolution Law, to comply with such obligations; and,
- WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors' delegation to the Commission includes the authority to grant approvals under specified land use controls for the Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard Project (the "Project"); and,
- WHEREAS, In connection with the Project, the Board of Supervisors on August 3, 2010, approved amendments to the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan and the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan by ordinances 210-10 and 211-10, respectively (the "Redevelopment Plans"), the SFRA approved the Candlestick Point Design for Development and the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Design for Development (as more particularly defined in the Phase 2 DDA, the "Design for Development") by Resolution 62-2010 and the SFRA and CP Development Co., LP (as more particularly

defined in the Phase 2 DDA, "Developer") entered into a Disposition and Development Agreement (Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard), dated for reference purposes as of June 3, 2010 (as amended and as the same may be further amended from time to time, the "Phase 2 DDA") by Resolution 69-2010. The Phase 2 DDA was amended on December 18, 2012 by a First Amendment to the Phase 2 DDA, pursuant to OCII Resolution No. 3-2012. Capitalized terms used but not otherwise defined in this Resolution have the meanings ascribed to or provided for them in the Phase 2 DDA; and,

- WHEREAS, The Phase 2 DDA establishes Developer's rights to develop within the parameters of the Redevelopment Plans and Design for Development and incorporates through exhibits and attachments various Project Documents including the Design Review and Document Approval Procedure ("DRDAP"), the Below -Market Rate Housing Plan, the Transportation Plan, the Infrastructure Plan, the Community Benefits Plan, the Design for Development, the Parks and Open Space Plan and the Incorporated Sustainability Requirements and Sustainability Goals and other documents (all as more particularly described in the Phase 2 DDA, together, the "Project Documents"); and,
- WHEREAS, The Phase 2 DDA is an enforceable obligation under the Dissolution Law and shown on line HPSY 30 of the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule for January to June 2014, which was approved by the Oversight Board and the California Department of Finance ("DOF"). On December 14, 2012, DOF issued a final and conclusive determination under California Health and Safety Code § 34177.5 (i) that the Phase 2 DDA and the HPS Phase 1 DDA are enforceable obligations that survived the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency; and,
- WHEREAS, The Interagency Cooperation Agreement (Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard) (as more particularly defined in the Phase 2 DDA, the "ICA") between OCII and the City establishes procedures for interdepartmental coordination related to the implementation of the Project. The ICA was executed by the Redevelopment Agency and the City, including by and through the San Francisco Port Commission, the San Francisco Public Utility Commission, the Department of Public Works, the San Francisco Fire Chief and Fire Marshall, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, the City Administrator, the Controller, the Mayor and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, and was consented to by Developer as a third party beneficiary thereof; and,
- WHEREAS, The Planning Cooperation Agreement (Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard) (as more particularly defined in the Phase 2 DDA, the "Planning Cooperation Agreement") between OCII and the Planning Department of the City and County of San Francisco establishes procedures for coordination between OCII and the Planning Department related to the implementation of the Project, including with respect to the review and approval of Major Phase Applications; and,
- WHEREAS, In accordance with the Phase 2 DDA (including the DRDAP), Developer must submit a Streetscape Plan, a Signage Plan, a Major Phase Application and a Sub-Phase Application before commencing construction on any phase of the Project; and,
- WHEREAS, Developer has submitted a Streetscape Plan and a Signage Plan for Candlestick Point and a Major Phase Application for Major Phase 1 (collectively, the "CP Plans"). As part of the submittal of the CP Plans and as contemplated by the Phase 2 DDA, Developer has proposed refinements to the Project Documents that were adopted in 2010, including to the Phasing Plan, the Infrastructure Plan and the Transportation Plan (collectively, the "Project Refinements"). The Project Refinements are

# Exhibit H Page 2 of 6

described in Attachment 6A-6N in the OCII memorandum prepared in connection with the approval of this Resolution; and,

- WHEREAS, The Signage Plan includes historic content to illustrate how the history of Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard may be conveyed through signage. Historic narratives reported in interpretive displays signs shall rely on resources such as the Bayview Library's Oral Histories Project and allow for additional community input through a process defined in collaboration with OCII and the Hunters Point Shipyard CAC; and,
- WHEREAS, Final approval of the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Refinements, under this Resolution is subject to approval from the affected City departments and Mayor under and to the extent required by the ICA and the Planning Cooperation Agreement; and,
- WHEREAS, OCII staff has determined that the CP Plans are complete under, and are consistent with, the Phase 2 DDA, the Project Documents, and the Redevelopment Plans, with the only modifications to the Project Documents being the Project Refinements; and,
- WHEREAS, The affected City departments have completed a thorough review of the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Refinements, under and in accordance with the ICA and the Planning Cooperation Agreement; OCII staff expects that the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Refinements, will be approved by the affected City departments under and to the extent required by the ICA and the Planning Cooperation Agreement; and,
- WHEREAS, OCII staff seeks approval of the Project Refinements as part of the approval of the CP Plans. Subsequent to the adoption of this Resolution and approval of the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Refinements, by the affected City departments under and to the extent required by the ICA and the Planning Cooperation Agreement, OCII staff and Developer will make conforming changes to the applicable Project Documents; and,
- WHEREAS, Once the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Refinements, have been approved by the affected City departments under and to the extent required by the ICA and the Planning Cooperation Agreement, the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Refinements, will be deemed finally approved by the Commission without further action from the Commission; and,
- WHEREAS, On June 3, 2010, the SFRA Commission by Resolution No. 58-2010 and the San Francisco Planning Commission by Motion No. 18096, certified the Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") for the Project as adequate, accurate, and objective and in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA") and the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq.); the Board of Supervisors affirmed the Planning Commission's certification of the FEIR by Motion No. 10-110 on July 14, 2010; and,
- WHEREAS, As part of its approval of the Project on June 3, 2010, in addition to certifying the FEIR, the SFRA Commission, by Resolution No. 59-2010 adopted findings pursuant to CEQA, regarding the alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant environmental effects analyzed in the FEIR, including a Mitigation Monitoring and

## Exhibit H Page 3 of 6

Reporting Program and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Project, which findings are incorporated into this Resolution by this reference; and,

- WHEREAS, Subsequent to the certification of the FEIR, the Planning Department, at the request of OCII and in response to the proposed Project Refinements as part of the first Major Phase and Sub-Phase Applications, issued an addendum to the FEIR ("Addendum No. 1"); and,
- WHEREAS, Addendum No. 1 addresses changes to the phasing schedule for the Project and corresponding changes to the schedules for implementation of related transportation system improvements in the Transportation Plan, including the Transit Operating Plan, the Infrastructure Plan and other public benefits; and minor proposed revisions in two adopted mitigations measures, TR-16 Widen Harney Way, and UT-2 Auxiliary Water Supply System; and,
- WHEREAS, Mitigation Measure TR-16 Widen Harney Way is proposed to be amended to provide for implementation prior to issuance of the occupancy permit for the Candlestick Point Sub-Phase CP-02, instead of the first grading permit for Major Phase 1 of the Project, and to provide for a two-way cycle track on Harney Way rather than the previously proposed bicycle lane; and,
- WHEREAS, Mitigation Measure UT-2 Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) is proposed to be amended to no longer specify a loop system for the AWSS; and,
- WHEREAS, Based on the analysis in Addendum No. 1, the Planning Department concludes that the analyses conducted and the conclusions reached in the FEIR on June 3, 2010, remain valid and the proposed Project Refinements and the amendments to the two adopted mitigation measures will not cause new significant impacts not identified in the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures will be necessary to reduce significant impacts; further, other than as described in the Addendum No. 1, no Project changes have occurred, and no changes have occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the proposed Project that will cause significant environmental impacts to which the Project will contribute considerably, and no new information has become available that shows that the Project will cause significant environmental impacts and, therefore, no supplemental environmental review is required under CEQA beyond the Addendum No. 1 to approve the first Major Phase and Sub-Phase Applications; and,
- WHEREAS, OCII staff has reviewed and considered the FEIR, Addendum No. 1, and supporting documentation in preparing necessary findings for the Commission's consideration, and has made the FEIR, Addendum No. 1, and supporting documentation available for review by the Commission and the public and these files are part of the record before the Commission; and,
- WHEREAS, Copies of the FEIR and Addendum No. 1 and supporting documentation are on file with the Commission Secretary and are incorporated in this Resolution by this reference; and,
- WHEREAS, The FEIR and the CEQA Findings adopted by the SFRA Commission by Resolution No. 59-2010 on June 3, 2010 reflected the independent judgment and analysis of the SFRA Commission, were and, except for the proposed minor amendments to Mitigation Measures TR-16 and UT-2, remain adequate, accurate and objective, and were prepared and adopted following the procedures required by CEQA; and,
- WHEREAS, OCII staff has reviewed the CP Plans and finds that they are acceptable and recommends approval of the CP Plans; and,

- WHEREAS, As noted above, the Phase 2 DDA is an enforceable obligation under the Dissolution Law. Review and approval of the CP Plans is an implementing action under the Phase 2 DDA; and,
- WHEREAS, Under the Phase 2 DDA, Developer is expected to propose Insurance Requirements as part of each Major Phase Application. Developer and OCII staff have substantially completed the Insurance Requirements for Major Phase 1 CP and are in final discussions regarding same, including with their respective insurance consultants. The OCII Director and Developer will agree upon the final Insurance Requirements for Major Phase 1 CP prior to commencement of construction. The Insurance Requirements include the form, amount, type, terms and conditions; and,
- WHEREAS, The Hunters Point Shipyard Citizen's Advisory Committee ("CAC"), the Alice Griffith Tenants, and the Bayview Hunters Point community generally have participated in the review of the CP Plans through a series of workshops held at Alice Griffith, the Hunters Point Shipyard and the Southeast Community Facility; and,
- WHEREAS, The CAC, at its meeting of December 9, 2013 reviewed and endorsed the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Refinements; now, therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, That the Commission has reviewed and considered the FEIR, together with Addendum No. 1 and any additional environmental documentation in the OCII's files, and adopts the CEQA Findings set forth in 59-2010 and amends them to incorporate the minor modifications to the Mitigation Measures TR-16 and UT-2, as set forth in Addendum 1 and in these findings as follows:

MM TR-16 Widen Harney Way as shown in Figure 5 in the Transportation **Study.** Prior to issuance of the *grading occupancy* permit for *Development Phase 1 of* the Project, Candlestick Point Sub-Phase CP-02, the Project Applicant shall widen Harney Way as shown in Figure 5 in the Transportation Study, with the modification to include a two-way cycle track, on the southern portion of the project right of way. Prior to the issuance of grading permits for *Candlestick Point Major* Phases 2, 3 and 4, the Project Applicant shall fund a study to evaluate traffic conditions on Harney Way and determine whether additional traffic associated with the next phase of development would result in the need to modify Harney Way to its ultimate configuration, as shown in Figure 6 in the Transportation Study, unless this ultimate configuration has already been built. This study shall be conducted in collaboration with the SFMTA, which would be responsible for making final determinations regarding the ultimate configuration. The ultimate configuration would be linked to intersection performance, and it would be required when study results indicate intersection LOS at one or more of the three signalized intersection on Harney Way at mid-LOS D (i.e., at an average delay per vehicle of more than 45 seconds per vehicle). If the study and SFMTA conclude that reconfiguration would be necessary to accommodate traffic demands associated with the next phase of development, the Project Applicant shall be responsible to fund and complete construction of the improvements prior to occupancy of the next phase.

**MM UT-2** <u>Auxiliary Water Supply System</u>. Prior to issuance of occupancy permits, as part of the Infrastructure Plan to be approved, the Project Applicant shall construct an Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) *loop* within Candlestick Point to connect to the City's planned extension of the offsite system off-site on Gilman Street from Ingalls Street to Candlestick Point. The Project Applicant shall construct an additional AWSS *loop* on HPS Phase II to connect to the existing system at Earl Street and Innes

## Exhibit H Page 5 of 6

Avenue and at Palou and Griffith Avenues, with *looped* service along Spear Avenue/Crisp Road.

The Commission finds that these amendments are supported by the analysis in Addendum 1 and incorporates such analysis in these findings by this reference; and be it further

- RESOLVED, That the Streetscape Plan and the Signage Plan for Candlestick Point and the Major Phase Application for Major Phase 1, each dated January 7, 2014, are hereby approved, including approval of the Project Refinements; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That the Streetscape Plan and the Signage Plan for Candlestick Point and the Major Phase Application for Major Phase 1 will not be deemed finally approved by the Commission until the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Refinements, have been approved by the affected City departments under and to the extent required by the ICA and the Planning Cooperation Agreement. No further action is required by the Commission with respect to the Streetscape Plan or the Signage Plan for Candlestick Point or the Major Phase Application for Major Phase 1 or conforming changes to the Project Documents as approved by this Resolution, and this Resolution shall constitute Approval of the Streetscape Plan and the Signage Plan for Candlestick Point and Major Phase Approval for Major Phase 1 under the Phase 2 DDA, unless the conforming changes to Project Documents are not made consistent with this Resolution, in which case Developer will propose an alternative solution to ensure the conformity of the CP Plans to the Project Documents in accordance with the Phase 2 DDA; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That the Commission hereby authorizes and directs the OCII Director and such OCII staff as the OCII Director may designate, upon approval by the affected City departments of the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Modifications, under and to the extent required by the ICA and the Planning Cooperation Agreement, to together with Developer make changes to the Project Documents so that they conform to the CP Plans, including the Project Refinements, and to take such additional actions as the OCII Director deems necessary or appropriate in connection therewith, including approving the Insurance Requirements under the Phase 2 DDA, provided, however, that the OCII Director determines that such additional actions are not inconsistent with this Resolution and do not materially increase the burdens and responsibilities of OCII or materially decrease the benefits to OCII with respect of the Project; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That the Commission hereby authorizes and directs the OCII Director to take all actions as needed, to the extent permitted under applicable law and subject to the Project Documents (as modified pursuant hereto), to effectuate OCII's performance under the Project Documents (as modified pursuant hereto).

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting of January 7, 2014.

Natasha Jones

Commission Secretary

## Exhibit H Page 6 of 6

December 9, 2015

Ms. Joy Navarette San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

# Subject: Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II: Implementaiton Phasing for Mitigation Measure MM TR-16 (Widening of Harney Way)

Dear Joy:

The *Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project Final EIR* (herein referred to as "EIR") was certified by the San Francisco Planning Commission and the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission in June 2010. Subsequently, the San Francisco Planning Commission and the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure certified an addendum to the EIR, dated December 11, 2013. Both the EIR and the Addendum include Mitigation Measure MM TR-16, which calls for the widening and reconfiguration of Harney Way west of the development area, between Arelious Walker Drive and Thomas Mellon Drive.

Currently, this section of Harney Way provides two auto travel lanes in each direction and an eight-foot sidewalk on the north side of the street. No sidewalk is provided along the south side of the street, although a parallel Class I shared use path is provided as part of the San Francisco Bay Trail within State Parks lands, just south of Harney Way.

Mitigation Measure MM TR-16 calls for an initial widening of Harney Way that would maintain two travel lanes in each direction, add two BRT lanes on the north side, add a center median to accommodate left-turn lanes at intersections, and add a median between the westbound travel lanes and the BRT lanes to accommodate a dedicated westbound right turn lane at Executive Park Boulevard East and an eastbound BRT stop just west of Executive Park Boulevard. The 2013 Addendum maintained this general configuration and called for provision of a 12-foot sidewalk on the north side of Harney Way and a 13-foot two-way Class I bicycle facility on the south side, separated from traffic by a five-foot median.

## Exhibit I Page 1 of 7

A long-term configuration for Harney Way was also included as part of Mitigation Measure MM TR-16 that would replace the cycletrack with an on-street Class II bicycle lane in the westbound direction and an additional westbound travel lane. Eastbound bicyclists (and westbound cyclists who wish not to ride in the roadway) would be directed to the existing Class I shared use path through State Parks. The long-term configuration for Harney Way is illustrated in the Project's Transportation Plan and the Transportation Impact Study.<sup>1</sup>

The Addendum also clarified the timing of implementation of this measure. The Addendum calls for the initial configuration to be constructed prior to occupancy of the Candlestick Point retail center (Candlestick Point Sub-Phase CP-02), with ongoing monitoring of traffic congestion levels that may ultimately trigger implementation of the longer-term configuration. The Addendum also specifies that the BRT service is not scheduled to begin for several years after completion of the initial configuration, until Major Phase 2, Subphase CP-07 and HP-04, which are currently anticipated by 2023.

It is our understanding that there is currently some uncertainty regarding the timing of the Geneva Avenue extension and replacement of the US 101 / Harney Way interchange. It is likely that the interchange will not be constructed prior to operation of the BRT system, which would preclude the originally conceived BRT alignment from operating in the early stages of development of the project.

As a result, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) is currently conducting a study to define an alternate interim BRT alignment that uses some combination of existing tunnels underneath US 101 at Blanken Avenue and Alana Way. Because that alignment may affect the way in which the BRT lanes are constructed along Harney Way, the SFCTA and the City propose to construct the initial Harney Way Configuration in two phases. Phase 1, shown on **Figure 1**, would construct the initial Harney Way improvements between Arelious Walker and Executive Park Boulevard East, although the sidewalk and Class I cycletrack would be completed all the way to Thomas Mellon Drive. **Figure 2** details the intersection configuration and striping at the Harney Way and Executive Park Boulevard East intersection that would be constructed as part

## Exhibit I Page 2 of 7

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The City is currently performing an evaluation of the Geneva Avenue extension and replacement of the US 101 / Harney Way interchange in collaboration with the City of Brisbane as part of several ongoing studies. The long-term configuration of Harney Way may need to be revised in the future based on the recommended configuration of the US 101 / Harney Way interchange. However, because those other studies are ongoing, no changes to the long-term configuration of Harney Way are currently proposed. Refer to the EIR for illustrations of the long-term configuration of Harney Way.

of Phase 1 of the initial configuration. It also illustrates the way in which the new Phase 1 striping will conform to the existing striping just west of Executive Park Boulevard East. Phase 2 of the initial improvements would construct the remaining portion of Harney Way, between Executive Park Boulevard and Thomas Mellon Drive, at a later time, prior to operation of the BRT, and in a way that matches the BRT alignment recommended in the SFCTA's study (and accommodates future permanent alignment).

Exhibit I Page 3 of 7



Figure 1

Harney Way Interim Configuration – Phase 1

Exhibit I Page 4 of 7



Source: BKF Engineers

Figure 2

Harney Way Interim Configuration – Phase 1 Detail

Exhibit I Page 5 of 7

Under this proposed phasing for the initial configuration of Harney Way, there would be no additional transportation impacts, as described below:

- Traffic. There would continue to be two lanes of travel in both directions at all times until monitoring required construction of the ultimate configuration, as envisioned by Mitigation Measure TR-16. The initial phase would also include construction of the westbound left-turn lane at Executive Park Boulevard East. Thus, even with the phased implementation of the near-term configuration for Harney Way, the roadway would continue to have the same number of lanes and traffic capacity at all times.
- Transit. The proposed phasing would require that the BRT facilities be constructed in a manner consistent with the alternative BRT alignment determined by the SFCTA and SFMTA prior to operation of the BRT system. Therefore, transit service would not be affected by the proposed phasing of improvements to Harney Way.
- 3. Bicycles. The phased approach proposed would include the full two-way cycletrack on the south side of Harney Way for the extent of the project's responsibility for improvements to Harney Way, between Arelious Walker Drive and Thomas Mellon Drive, as part of the very first phase. Therefore, the phasing will have no effect to bicycle conditions compared to what was described in the EIR Addendum.
- 4. Pedestrians. There would be a continuous sidewalk on the north side of the street. Between Arelious Walker Drive and Executive Park Boulevard East, the sidewalk would be widened to 12-feet including 6' of landscaping. However, the existing eight-foot sidewalk on the north side of Harney Way between Executive Park Boulevard East and Thomas Mellon Drive would remain, and would instead be widened to 12-feet simultaneously with the construction of the BRT lanes, prior to operation of the BRT route. Despite the fact that widening of a portion of the northern sidewalk would not occur for several years after opening of the Candlestick Point retail center, the retail center is not expected to generate a substantial number of new pedestrian trips along Harney Way and the existing facilities are expected to be adequate.
- 5. Parking. Although parking conditions are not considered an impact by the City of San Francisco, information is provided for informational purposes only. There is no on-street parking on Harney Way under existing conditions and none of the proposals for reconfiguration and widening of Harney Way would provide parking. Therefore, the phased approach proposed would have no effect on parking in the area.

### Exhibit I Page 6 of 7

- 6. **Loading.** Similar to parking, there are currently no loading facilities on Harney Way, and none of the proposals would add loading. Therefore, the phased approach proposed would have no effect on parking in the area.
- 7. **Emergency Vehicle Access.** Because the phased implementation approach would maintain the same number of traffic lanes as the approach envisioned in the Addendum, there would be no effect to emergency vehicle access by using the proposed phased implementation.

We hope you have found this useful. Please do not hesitate to call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

FEHR & PEERS

Cis Matter

Chris Mitchell, PE Principal

SF08-0407

Exhibit I Page 7 of 7

# Exhibit J: 8/13/15 Fehr & Peers Gilman Letter FEHR PEERS

August 13, 2015

Ms. Joy Navarette San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Ms. Lila Hussain Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure One South Van Ness, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, CA 94103

### Subject: Draft Analysis of Transportation Effects of Proposed Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue in Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan

Dear Joy and Lila,

As you know, the *Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project Final EIR* (herein referred to simply as "EIR") was certified by the San Francisco Planning Commission and the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission in June 2010. Since that time, the Housing/R&D Variant (Variant 2A) has been advanced as the project. Some refinements to the project were proposed in late 2013, resulting in an EIR Addendum certified in December 2013.

One of the most substantial changes contemplated in the December 2013 Addendum was a change to the project phasing, such that the CP Retail Center would be advanced much sooner than originally contemplated. As part of this, certain off-site roadway infrastructure and transit service was proposed to occur sooner than originally contemplated to ensure that the near term transportation system would be adequate to serve the CP Retail Center. One key aspect of the infrastructure required to be constructed commensurate with the Candlestick Point (CP) Retail Center is improvements to Gilman Avenue.

Gilman Avenue has historically served not just as a neighborhood street, but also as one of three primary access routes to and from large events at Candlestick Park. As a result, it is currently configured to facilitate egress from the Park, with one lane eastbound and two lanes westbound (when Candlestick Park was in operation, parking was prohibited on the north side of the street on game days such that a third westbound lane was provided for stadium egress). The originallyproposed and approved concept for Gilman Avenue as part of the project EIR would make the

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 2 of 20



street cross section more symmetric, providing on-street parking on both sides and two travel lanes in each direction. Sidewalks would be narrowed from 15 feet to 12 feet. The originallyproposed configuration is shown in in **Figure 1(A)**. At some point in the longer-term future, one of the travel lanes in each direction may be converted to transit-only as part of a mitigation measure for project impacts to transit travel times, as shown in **Figure 1(B)**.

Although a cross-section for Gilman Avenue had been developed in collaboration with the community during the project's planning process prior to the EIR, the City and project team felt it would be appropriate to re-engage the community prior to preparation of more detailed design to confirm the concept. Based on an initial round of outreach, the neighborhood, SMFTA, and the Planning Department all expressed concerns regarding the proposed reduction in sidewalk widths. Further, the originally-proposed changes would require relocation of existing utilities, and no funding is available for this work.

As a result, the project team has begun to test a new concept that would retain the existing sidewalk widths, and instead provide on-street parking and one travel lane in each direction, with a center turn lane. Far-side bus stops with bulb-outs would be located at Ingalls Street and Griffith Street. To compensate for the reduction in capacity associated with the reduction in auto lanes, the existing all-way stop controlled intersections would be converted to signalized intersections, which generally have a much higher throughput.

This letter documents Fehr & Peers' analysis findings associated with a revised concept for Gilman Avenue and incorporates some minor adjustment to traffic forecasts at the intersection of Arelious Walker Drive/Gilman Avenue associated with newly defined details for the CP Retail Center.

### SUMMARY

The assessment indicates that the proposed design changes result in similar or better conditions than those presented in the EIR for all modes; therefore, no additional impacts are anticipated and no additional mitigation is required.

### TRAVEL DEMAND

Although the land uses proposed as part of the project have not changed, the designs for the CP retail center have been developed to a more detailed level than when prior analyses were

## Exhibit J Page 2 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 3 of 20



conducted. As a result, we now have better information regarding the size of the proposed parking structure and the relative size and location of the access points on the surrounding network. This more detailed information suggests that revisions to the overall traffic assignment associated with the CP Retail Center may be warranted.

### **Original EIR Assumptions**

The parking structure associated with the CP retail center was intended to serve the following uses:

- 150,000 square feet of office
- 472 residential dwelling units
- 635,000 square feet of regional retail
- 125,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving retail
- 220 room hotel
- 10,000-seat arena<sup>1</sup>

The EIR forecasted that these uses would generate 3,257 PM peak hour vehicle trips, including 1,490 inbound and 1,767 outbound trips. However, since further design of the CP retail center, an additional 192 residential units have been proposed for the CP center site (relocated from elsewhere in the CP site). Parking for 210 of the residential units and the hotel will be accessed from a separate entrance, adjacent to the retail center. Furthermore, the office is no longer proposed to be constructed at the CP center and instead will be proposed at some other location within CP.

Overall, the total number of vehicle trips generated from the Project will remain the same; however, the number of Project trips destined for the CP retail center garage (i.e., excluding trips associated with the office, the hotel, and 210 of the 472 residential units) would decrease to 2,969 PM peak hour trips, including 1,381 inbound and 1,588 outbound trips.

The proposed parking structure will accommodate approximately 2,900 spaces, which suggests that if all project trips for uses the structure is intended to serve were to use the garage, each

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Draft Sub-Phase CP 02 03 04 Application proposes to replace the arena with a proposed 45,000 square foot performance venue/nightclub. However, since it is uncertain whether this represents a negligible change in the project, or whether that must undergo a separate review and approval process, this analysis evaluates the currently-approved land uses, which include an arena and not the performance venue.

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 4 of 20



space would have to turn over more than once per hour. This is not a realistic scenario; instead, the limited parking supply will likely cause travelers to switch modes to transit, bicycles, and walking. However, for purposes of this analysis, we have assumed that the originally-forecasted vehicle trips use the proposed parking structure.

### **Revised Design Assumptions**

**Figure 2** shows the Cumulative Plus Project volume assumptions used in the EIR. Note that of the intersections presented, only Third Street / Gilman Avenue and Arelious Walker / Gilman Avenue were analyzed in the EIR; intersection analyses at the other, smaller internal intersections were not evaluated in detail in the EIR. The analysis in the EIR assumed that the majority of project trips using the parking garage would access the site from Arelious Walker Drive. However, since completing the EIR, the CP Retail Center parking garage design has been designed to greater level of detail to include and define access points, including:

- Arelious Walker Drive (Primary, signalized, full access)
- Arelious Walker Drive (Secondary, right-in/right-out only)
- Harney Way (Signalized, egress only)
- Ingerson Avenue (Stop-controlled, right-in/right-out only)

Figure 3 shows the latest parking garage design and four access points.

Based on the current understanding of parking stall locations and access points, Fehr & Peers has refined the anticipated trip assignment through local intersections to better align with the current proposed layout. In addition, it has been determined that due to BRT operations along Harney Way, vehicles traveling southbound will not be able to turn right onto Arelious Walker Drive. This will not result in an adverse impact to intersection operations.

**Figure 4** shows the trip assignment for trips associated with the parking structure based on the trip generation and distribution forecasts from the EIR and the most recent proposed layout of the parking structure.

### Gilman Avenue Corridor

As described above, the EIR assumed conversion of Gilman Avenue to a four-lane roadway with a parking lane in each direction. To accomplish this, existing sidewalks would be reduced to 12 feet – still consistent with Better Streets Plan standards, but less than the existing 15 feet. Upon

# Exhibit J Page 4 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 5 of 20



completing the EIR, the study team conducted several meetings with the neighborhood and City staff to review and discuss the Gilman Avenue corridor. Based on these discussions, it was more desirable to keep existing sidewalk widths and modify the travel way to accommodate the future traffic and transit. The Project team worked with SFMTA and others to define a potential revision to the cross-section that would keep the current 15-foot sidewalks and retain on-street parking. As noted earlier, the revised cross section would provide one lane of travel in each direction with a center turn lane and intersections between Third Street and Arelious Walker would be modified from all-way-stop-control (AWSC) to signal control. In addition, far-side bus stops with bulb-outs would be located on the corridor at Ingalls Street and Griffith Street. Figure 1(C) shows the revised cross section and Figure 4 shows the revised PM peak hour intersection volumes. As a result of the revised Gilman Avenue cross section and detailed access points to the CP Retail Center garage, the lane configuration and volume at Gilman Avenue / Arelious Walker has changed, though the total number of vehicles along the Gilman Avenue corridor has remained the same. The eastbound and westbound approach on Gilman Avenue would result in a one left turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane. The northbound approach on Arelious Walker would provide one left turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through-right lane. The southbound approach would remain the same.

### ANALYSIS

### **Transit Operations**

This section describes the transit travel time analysis methodology and results, comparing the revised Gilman Avenue cross-section proposal with the originally-proposed section from the EIR. Consistent with the methodology presented in the EIR, transit travel time is the sum of three components: travel delay, transit re-entry delay, and passenger boarding delay.

There are several measures that can be used to reduce traffic congestion delay or transit re-entry delay, as described below.

**Transit signal priority (TSP)** modifies the timing at signalized intersections to prioritize the movement of transit vehicles through an intersection. If TSP is implemented at an intersection, consistent with the EIR methodology, the traffic congestion delay for transit is assumed to be eliminated.

## Exhibit J Page 5 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 6 of 20



**Queue jump lanes** are bus priority lanes that are installed at signalized intersections (either as a separate pocket lane or in an existing right turn pocket lane) that, in conjunction with a special signal phase, allow a bus to enter the intersection before other traffic is allowed to proceed. If queue jump lanes are implemented at an intersection and co-located with a right turn, the traffic congestion delay for transit is assumed to be equal to the vehicle delay for the right turn movement.

**Bus bulb-outs** are extensions of the sidewalk curb at the corner of intersections that allow buses to stop without needing to exit the travel lane. Bus bulb-outs eliminate transit re-entry delay for each stop at which they are implemented.

**Transit-dedicated lanes** are travel lanes on a roadway that permit only transit vehicles to operate. The exception to this is at some intersections, where other vehicles wishing to make a right turn can use the transit lane as a pocket lane. Therefore, when co-located with right turn movements at an intersection, the traffic congestion delay for transit is assumed to be equal to the vehicle delay for the right turn movement.

**Far-side stops** are transit stops that are placed downstream of an intersection such that a transit vehicle is able to pass through an intersection before stopping to allow passengers to board and alight. It is generally accepted that a far-side bus stop would result in time-savings benefit compared to a near-side stop. Based on a VISSIM simulation assessment completed for AC Transit, it was found that moving a near-side to far-side bus stop resulted in travel time savings of 15 to 40 seconds<sup>2</sup>. Although this strategy was not considered in the EIR, for the purpose of this assessment, it was assumed that moving a near-side stop to a far-side stop at a signalized intersection resulted in a travel time savings of 15 seconds, the most conservative of the identified range.

### Significance Criteria

As noted in the EIR, the Project would cause a significant impact if it would increase travel times such that additional transit vehicles would be required to maintain the proposed headways. This was assumed to be the case if the Project would increase the transit travel time along a given route by more than  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the proposed headway for the route. Route 29 Sunset, which will continue to travel along Gilman Avenue under Project conditions, has a proposed headway of 5

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Fehr & Peers, Line 51 Corridor Delay Reduction & Sustainability Project, 2013

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 7 of 20



minutes. Therefore, if the increase in transit travel time associated with the Project is more than 2.5 minutes, the Project would cause a significant impact that requires mitigation.

#### Analysis Results

The EIR compared the increase in transit travel time from 2030 No Project conditions to the Proposed Project (and Project Variants) in order to identify significant impacts. The EIR identified that there would be a significant impact to transit travel time under Project Variant 2A, and that even with mitigation the impact would be significant and unavoidable. As mentioned earlier, since the completion of the EIR, some of the mitigations proposed for Gilman Avenue have been deemed infeasible. Therefore, the purpose of this analysis is to define the changes to the transit travel time analysis associated with the revised Gilman Avenue cross-section and identify feasible mitigation measures that can reduce the transit travel time to at least the same level as what was presented under mitigated conditions in the EIR. Table 1 presents the transit travel time associated with Project Variant 2A from the EIR and the revised, unmitigated Gilman Avenue cross-section.

Time	EIR (Project Variant 2A)		EIR (PPV2A)	– Mitigated	Revised Gilman (No Mitigation)	
(min:sec)	Eastbound	Westbound	Eastbound	Westbound	Eastbound	Westbound
Travel Delay	14:45	18:36	10:45	14:36	13:25	17:44
Transit Re- Entry	3:52	1:43	2:13	1:20	2:13	1:34
Passenger Boarding	9:55	9:19	9:55	9:19	9:55	9:19
Total Time	28:32	29:38	22:54	25:17	25:33	28:37
Notes: For Muni Route	29 Sunset only					

TARIF 1	PROJECT	TRANSIT	TRAVFI	TIMF -	WFFKDAY	ΡΜ ΡΕΔ	
IADLL I	INOJECI	110411311					

For Muni Route 29 Sunset only.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2015

**Table 1** shows that the revised Gilman Avenue cross-section has a better (i.e., lower) transit travel time than the unmitigated Project Variant 2A from the EIR, but is still approximately three minutes higher than the mitigated EIR scenario. Therefore, mitigation measures that could be

# Exhibit J Page 7 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 8 of 20



implemented at some point in the future need to be implemented to bring the transit travel time to a level consistent with the mitigated Project Variant 2A scenario from the EIR.

The following is a revision to Mitigation Measure MM-TR-23.1 to bring the transit travel times for the 29 Sunset to levels consistent with the mitigated EIR scenario:

- Implement TSP at the intersections of Arelious Walker / Gilman Avenue, San Bruno Avenue / Paul Avenue, and Bayshore Boulevard / Paul Avenue.
- Implement a far-side stop in the eastbound and westbound directions at the intersection of Third Street / Gilman Avenue and a far-side stop in the westbound direction at the intersection of San Bruno Avenue / Paul Avenue.
- Implement a peak period, transit-dedicated lane in the westbound direction along Paul Avenue between Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard. The transit lane would begin on Gilman Avenue about 200 feet prior to Third Street and extend through the intersection to Paul Avenue. (Note that this component of the mitigation measures was included in the original mitigation measure for the 29 Sunset. Changes to the proposed cross-section on Gilman Avenue do not affect this component and it remains feasible).

Figures 5 and 6 depict the revised mitigation measure along Route 29.

Using the transit travel time saving methodologies discussed above for the mitigation measures, **Table 2** compares the transit travel time for the revised Gilman Avenue cross-section with the mitigated Project Variant 2A from the EIR.

Exhibit J Page 8 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 9 of 20



Time (minuses)	EIR – M	itigated	Revised Gilman - Mitigated		
nine (min.sec)	Eastbound Westbound		Eastbound	Westbound	
Travel Delay	10:45	14:36	10:45	6:55	
Transit Re-Entry	2:13	1:20	1:58	1:20	
Passenger Boarding	9:55	9:19	9:55	9:19	
Total Time	22:54	25:17	22:38	17:34	
Notes: For Muni Route 29 Sunse	t only.				

#### TABLE 2 PROJECT TRANSIT TRAVEL TIME – WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR (MITIGATED)

For Muni Route 29 Sunset only. Source: Fehr & Peers, 2015

Since passenger ridership is assumed to remain the same (and therefore the time associated with passenger boarding), the proposed mitigation measures focus on reducing traffic congestion delay and transit re-entry delay where feasible. Most travel time savings are from reductions in traffic congestion delay through the implementation of TSP, far-side stops, and transit-dedicated lanes. As **Table 2** shows, the proposed mitigation measures for the revised Gilman cross-section would reduce the total travel time due to the proposed project to slightly below the mitigated conditions under the original EIR in the eastbound direction and about eight minutes lower in the westbound direction.

### **Traffic Operations**

This section describes the methodology and traffic analysis results comparing the revised Gilman Avenue cross-section proposal with the originally-proposed section, and also accounting for shifts in traffic associated with the more detailed CP Center garage proposal.

### Methodology

To remain consistent with transportation studies completed as part of the EIR in 2009, the study intersections were evaluated using the HCM 2000 methodology. For signalized intersections, this methodology determines the capacity for each lane group approaching the intersection. The LOS is then based on average delay per vehicle (in seconds per vehicle) for the various movements within the intersection. A combined weighted average delay and LOS is presented for the intersection. In San Francisco, LOS E and F are considered unacceptable operating conditions for

# Exhibit J Page 9 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 10 of 20



signalized intersections. For unsignalized intersections, average delay and LOS operating conditions are calculated by approach (e.g., northbound) and movement (e.g., northbound leftturn), for those movements that are subject to delay. For the purpose of this analysis, the operating conditions (LOS and delay) for unsignalized intersections are presented for the worst approach (i.e., the approach with the highest average delay per vehicle) for side-street STOP-sign controlled intersections, and average intersection delay is presented for all-way STOP controlled intersections. LOS calculation sheets are included in **Attachment A**.

### Significance Criteria

The significance criteria used to evaluate the proposed revisions are the same as those stated in the EIR, Section 4.4 and summarized below.

The Project would result in a significant impact if:

- An intersection would result in a change in intersection operations from LOS D or better under the 2030 No Project condition to LOS E or LOS F, or from LOS E to LOS F, with the proposed Project
- If at an intersection that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 No Project conditions, and would continue to operate at LOS E or LOS F under Project conditions, the Project trips were reviewed to determine whether the increase would contribute considerably to critical movements operating at LOS E or LOS F.
- If it would increase travel times such that additional transit vehicles would be required to maintain the proposed headways. This was assumed to be the case if the Project would increase the transit travel time along a given route by more than ½ of the proposed headway for the route.

### Analysis Results

The EIR analyzed two of the five intersections along this corridor; this analysis evaluates all five intersections along Gilman Avenue to assess the overall throughput of the corridor under the original proposal and the revised proposal. **Table 3** shows the intersection LOS and delay results and **Table 4** describes the arterial LOS results from the assessment.

As shown in **Table 3**, under the original concept, the smaller AWSC intersections between Third Street and Arelious Walker Drive are projected to operate at LOS E or F with an average delay exceeding 55 seconds per vehicle. With the revised alternative, reducing Gilman Avenue to a

# Exhibit J Page 10 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 11 of 20



single through lane in each direction with a shared turn lane and installing signals throughout, intersection operations improve substantially, compared to the originally proposed configuration.

The intersection of Gilman Avenue / Third Street is still projected to operate at LOS F, the revised proposal does not propose to change any lane configurations or affect travel demand at this intersection, so the revised proposal for Gilman Avenue has no effect on the EIR impact analysis. The remaining intersections operate at LOS D or better, which represents a substantial improvement from what was projected in the EIR.

Exhibit J Page 11 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 12 of 20



### TABLE 3 LOS AND DELAY RESULTS ALONG GILMAN AVENUE CORRIDOR (CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT)

Interrection	Original Design (AWSC)			Revised Design (Signals)		
Intersection	Control	Avg Delay (s)	LOS	Control	Avg Delay (s)	LOS
Third Street / Gilman Avenue	Signal	>80	F	Signal	>80	F
Jennings Street / Gilman Avenue	AWSC	>80	F	Signal	31	С
Ingalls Street / Gilman Avenue	AWSC	>80	F	Signal	16	В
Hawes Street / Gilman Avenue	AWSC	36	E	Signal	<10	А
Arelious Walker / Gilman Avenue	Signal	36	D	Signal	40	D

**Bold** indicates intersection operates at LOS E or LOS F.

Sources: Fehr & Peers, 2015

Exhibit J Page 12 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 13 of 20



#### Impact Analysis

#### Impact TR-1: On-Site and Off-Site Construction Impacts

As described in the EIR, construction of the Project would result in transportation impacts in the Project vicinity due to construction vehicle traffic and roadway construction and would contribute to cumulative construction impacts in the Project vicinity. The EIR concluded implementation of mitigation measure MM TR-1, which would require the Applicant to develop and implement a construction traffic management plan to reduce the impact of construction activity on transportation facilities, would reduce the impacts caused by construction, but not to a less-than-significant level.

The overall amount of construction anticipated to occur as part of the modified Project will be the same as originally conceived and described in the EIR or less because the proposed design does not relocate the existing curb or utilities. Instead the Project will resurface existing pavement, stripe new lane configurations, and construct new signals.

It is anticipated that the Project phasing would follow the assumed phasing documented in the December 2013 addendum (Analysis of Transportation Effects of Project Refinements to the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project since Certification of the Project's Final EIR). Overall, although the timing and location of construction activities may vary within the site compared to what was originally anticipated, the construction activities are expected to create similar significant and unavoidable localized construction-related traffic impacts as were originally described in Impact TR-1 the EIR. Mitigation measure MM-TR-1, development of a Construction Traffic Management Program, would still apply, although impacts would continue to remain significant and unavoidable.

Therefore, construction of the modified project would not result in any new significant effects to transportation beyond those identified in the EIR or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

### Impacts TR-2 through TR-16: Traffic Impacts to Regional and Local Roadway System, Study Intersections, and Freeway Facilities

As described in the EIR, the Project would generate substantial amounts of new vehicular traffic resulting in a number of significant impacts and mitigation measures. More specifically, the EIR

# Exhibit J Page 13 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 14 of 20



identified Impact TR-2, a significant impact related to the Project's overall increase in traffic generation in relation to the current roadway system capacity. The EIR identified Mitigation Measure MM TR-2, the development and implementation of the Project's Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan as a means to lessen the severity of Project-generated traffic impact; however, Impact TR-2 would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation. The EIR identified Impacts TR-3 through TR-8, which described locations where the Project would create new project-related impacts or contribute to significant cumulative impacts at study intersections. Mitigation Measures MM TR-4 (restriping at the intersection of Tunnel/Blanken), MM TR-6 (participating in the bi-county study and paying a fair share contribution toward improvements near the Geneva Avenue/US 101 interchange), MM TR-7 (restriping at the Amador/Cargo Way intersection), and MM TR-8 (participating in the bi-county study and paying a fair share contribution toward improvements near the Bayshore/Geneva intersection) were recommended to reduce the severity of Project-related impacts. However, due to uncertainty regarding implementation of mitigation measures, Impacts TR-3 through TR-8 were determined to remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation. The FIER also identified Impact TR-9, which described the project's less than significant impact to a number of other study intersections.

At a slightly larger scale, the EIR identified Impact TR-10, which describes the effect of Projectrelated traffic spilling over into nearby residential neighborhood streets. The EIR determined this impact to be significant, and referenced other mitigation measures described elsewhere in the EIR (including Mitigation Measure MM TR-2, the development and implementation of a TDM Plan) as appropriate strategies to reduce the severity of Impact TR-10. However, the EIR determined that the impact would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

The EIR also identified a number of significant Project-related impacts to freeway facilities, including Impacts TR-11 through TR-15. No feasible mitigation measures were identified for Impacts TR-11 through TR-13 and these impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Mitigation Measures MM TR-14 and MM TR-15, which called for participation in the bi-county study and payment of a fair share contribution toward improvements near the Geneva Avenue / US 101 interchange area, were identified to reduce the severity of Impacts TR-14 and TR-15; however, since the implementation of these measures was uncertain, Impacts TR-14 and TR-15 would also remain significant and unavoidable.

Finally, the EIR identified Impact TR-16, a significant impact associated with the Project's contribution to traffic on Harney Way, which will be a primary access route for all modes between

## Exhibit J Page 14 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 15 of 20



the Project site and regional transportation facilities (US 101, Bayshore Caltrain, Balboa Park BART, the Bay Trail, etc.). Mitigation Measure MM TR-16 called for the project to construct the initial phase of Harney Way at the outset of construction of the first major phase, which would reduce the Project's impact to less than significant.

The primary factors that influence the Project's travel demand have not changed; therefore, the modified Project's travel demand forecasts for buildout conditions will be identical to those described in the EIR. Based on the traffic analysis above, the revisions to the Project would not result in any additional impacts as the results indicate similar or better intersection delay and travel times.

### Impacts TR-17 through TR-30: Impacts to Local and Regional Transit Operations and Capacity

Transit ridership demand and frequency is expected to be the same under the revised proposal as under the Proposed Project. Therefore, the proposed changes do not affect the EIR analysis and conclusions related to Impacts TR-17 through TR-22, or Impacts TR-24 through TR-30. However, the EIR identified Impact TR-23, which concluded that traffic congestion on Gilman Avenue would result in a significant impact for transit. The EIR states that the City and Project Applicant shall develop a monitoring program to determine the implementation extent and schedule to maintain transit proposed headways. When transit travel times degrade to a certain point, Mitigation Measure MM-TR-23 should be implemented. The adopted mitigation measure is as follows:

Convert one of the two travel lanes in each direction and narrow the existing sidewalks on Gilman Avenue from Third Street to Griffith Street (four blocks) from 15 feet to 12 feet in width. The resulting 12-foot-wide sidewalks would be consistent with the Better Streets Plan guidelines. The reduction in sidewalk width would allow for the provision of a 7-foot-wide on-street parking lane, an 11-foot-wide transit-only lane, and a 10-foot-wide mixed-flow lane in each direction on Gilman Avenue. This would preserve on-street parking along the corridor and provide four-block transit-only lanes on Gilman Avenue between Griffith Street and Third Street. Treatment for transit-only lanes can range from striping to physical elevation changes to protect right-of-way from mixed-flow traffic.<sup>3</sup>

The EIR noted that additional outreach and analysis may be required to assess the feasibility of Mitigation Measure MM-TR-23, and therefore, the EIR found the impact to be significant and unavoidable. However, if the revised proposal for Gilman Avenue is adopted, implementing

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The Draft EIR included several optional mitigation measures. However, based on further analysis, SFMTA determined that the other options were not feasible or desirable due to right of way constraints.

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 16 of 20



Mitigation MM-TR-23 will be infeasible. Therefore, MM-TR-23 has been revised to include feasible mitigations measures that would result in better transit operations than the original MM-TR-23. Mitigation Measure MM-TR-23 should be revised, as follow:

- Implement TSP at the intersections of Arelious Walker / Gilman Avenue, San Bruno Avenue / Paul Avenue, and Bayshore Boulevard / Paul Avenue.
- Implement a far-side stop in the eastbound and westbound directions at the intersection of Third Street / Gilman Avenue and a far-side stop in the westbound direction at the intersection of San Bruno Avenue / Paul Avenue.
- Implement a peak period, transit-dedicated lane in the westbound direction along Paul Avenue between Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard. The transit lane would begin on Gilman Avenue about 200 feet prior to Third Street and extend through the intersection to Paul Avenue.
- Convert one of the two travel lanes in each direction and narrow the existing sidewalks on Gilman Avenue from Third Street to Griffith Street (four blocks) from 15 feet to 12 feet in width. The resulting 12-foot-wide sidewalks would be consistent with the Better Streets Plan guidelines. The reduction in sidewalk width would allow for the provision of a 7-footwide on-street parking lane, an 11-foot-wide transit-only lane, and a 10-foot-wide mixedflow lane in each direction on Gilman Avenue. This would preserve on street parking along the corridor and provide four-block transit-only lanes on Gilman Avenue between Griffith Street and Third Street. Treatment for transit-only lanes can range from striping to physical elevation changes to protect right-of-way from mixed-flow traffic

Implementing revised Mitigation Measure MM-TR-23 would result in a significant and unavoidable impact; however, the revised MM-TR-23 would result in better operations than what was reported in the approved EIR. Therefore, since the revisions do not propose more severe impacts to transit, the proposed changes and the revised Mitigation Measure MM-TR-23 do not result in any new significant impacts to transit operations and capacity.

### Impacts TR-31 and TR-32: Bicycle Circulation

Neither the originally proposed configuration nor the revised configuration proposed dedicated bicycle facilities on Gilman Avenue. Both proposals continue to designate Gilman Avenue as a Class III facility. Therefore, since the revisions do not propose changes to the designation of

# Exhibit J Page 16 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 17 of 20



bicycle routes nor to any physical infrastructure dedicated for bicycles, the proposed changes will have less than a significant impact to bicycle circulation.

### Impacts TR-33 and TR-34: Pedestrian Circulation

Sidewalks will remain at 15' thereby keeping existing pedestrian facilities instead of decreasing the width. This will result in improved conditions compared to the scenario that was originally proposed, and therefore the changes do not result in any new significant impact to pedestrian circulation.

### Impacts TR-35 and TR-36: Parking

The proposed changes will not affect parking supply in the proposed project nor along Gilman Avenue. Therefore, the changes do not result in any new significant impacts to parking conditions.

### Impact TR-37: Loading

The EIR identified Impact TR-37 and determined that the Project would provide adequate loading supply and therefore concluded that impacts related to loading would be less than significant, and that no mitigation measures would be required. As the revised design does not change the overall loading requirements, implementation of the revised design would not result in any new significant impacts related to loading and no new mitigation measures would be required.

### Impacts TR-38 through TR-50: Stadium Impacts

The EIR included a number of impacts related to operation of the proposed new NFL stadium in the Hunters Point Shipyard site. The revised design does not change the operation or travel demand of the proposed Stadium, therefore the implementation of the revised design would not result in any new significant impacts related to the Stadium and no new mitigation measures would be required.

### Impact TR-51 through TR-55: Arena Impacts

The EIR included a number of impacts related to operation of the proposed Arena in the Hunters Point Shipyard site. The revised design does not change the operation or travel demand of the

# Exhibit J Page 17 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 18 of 20



proposed Arena, therefore the implementation of the revised design would not result in any new significant impacts related to the Arena and no new mitigation measures would be required.

### Impact TR-56: Air Traffic Impacts

The EIR determined that the Project would have a less than significant impact on air traffic. The revised design would contain the same overall land uses and general development form and would not change the EIR's conclusion regarding air traffic. The revised design would not create any new significant impacts with respect to air traffic and no additional mitigation measures are required.

### Impact TR-57: Hazards due to Design Features

The EIR determined that the Project's transportation infrastructure would be designed in accordance with City standards, and would be reviewed and approved by the City prior to construction. As a result the Project's impacts to hazards would be less than significant. The revised design would also be designed accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. Therefore, no new significant impacts to design features have been identified and no mitigation measures are required.

### Impact TR-58: Emergency Access

The EIR determined that the Project's transportation infrastructure would adequately facilitate emergency access and be designed to City standards, which include provisions that address emergency vehicles. The revised design would also be designed accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. Therefore, no new significant impacts to emergency access have been identified and no mitigation measures are required.

### Cumulative Impacts

As noted in the EIR, the discussion of cumulative impacts was included with the discussion of project-related impacts in Impacts TR-1 through TR-58 and no additional cumulative impact discussion is necessary. Similar to what is described above and in the EIR, since the revised design would generate the same levels of travel demand at buildout and would have a similar transportation infrastructure, the modified Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be the same as what is described in the EIR.

# Exhibit J Page 18 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 19 of 20



### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the revised design, including proposed revisions to MM-TR-23, would not change or alter any of the EIR's findings with respect to transportation impacts. All impacts would remain less than significant, less than significant with mitigation, or significant and unavoidable, as previously identified, and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the EIR's transportation cumulative impact conclusions would not be altered.

For questions or comments, please contact Chris Mitchell or Sarah Nadiranto.

Sincerely,

FEHR & PEERS

ns Mtt

Chris Mitchell, PE Principal

Sarah Nadiranto, PE Transportation Engineer

SF08-0407

Exhibit J Page 19 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 20 of 20



### <u>Figures</u>

- Figure 1 Proposed Cross-Sections: Gilman Avenue
- Figure 2 EIR Assumed Volumes and Study Intersection Locations
- Figure 3 CP Retail Center Parking Garage Site Plan
- Figure 4 Revised Design Assumed Volumes and Study Intersection Locations
- Figure 5 Gilman Avenue Transit Mitigation
- Figure 6 Paul Avenue/San Bruno Avenue Transit Mitigation

### **Attachments**

Attachment A – LOS Calculations

Exhibit J Page 20 of 37

### **GILMAN AVENUE**

			Gilman Avent	le lker
3rd S	nings St galls St	iwes St	_	relious W <mark>a</mark>

### A) EIR Proposed Conditions:



### B) EIR Mitigated Conditions:



### C) New Proposed Conditions:





Figure 1 Proposed Cross-Sections: Gilman Avenue

Exhibit J Page 21 of 37


1. Third St/Gilman Ave	2. Jennings St/Gilman Ave	3. Ingalls St/Gilman Ave	4. Hawes St/Gilman Ave
Paul Ave 160 940 ↔ 130 Paul Ave Paul Ave 160 940 ↔ 130 Paul Ave Paul Ave 160 940 ↔ 160 940 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 1	INTERSECTION NOT STUDIED IN EIR	INTERSECTION NOT STUDIED IN EIR	INTERSECTION NOT STUDIED IN EIR
5. Arelious Walker/Gilman Ave	6. Ingerson Ave/Parking Garage	7. Harney Way/Parking Garage	8. Arelious Walker/Parking Garage
Gilman Ave	INTERSECTION NOT STUDIED IN EIR	INTERSECTION NOT STUDIED IN EIR	INTERSECTION NOT STUDIED IN EIR
EIR Study Intersection	- <b>1</b> Turn Lane	🔹 Traffic	Signal



EIR Study Intersection Intersection Not Studied in EIR

XXX Peak Hour Traffic Volume

Turn Lane

Traffic Signal Stop Sign



Figure 2 EIR Assumed Volumes and Study Intersection Locations

STOP

Exhibit J Page 22 of 37



7

Figure 3 CP Retail Center Parking Garage Site Plan

Exhibit J Page 23 of 37



1. Third St/Gilman Ave	2. Jennings St/Gilman Ave	3. Ingalls St/Gilman Ave	4. Hawes St/Gilman Ave
Paul Ave 160 940 ↔ 130 Paul Ave Paul Ave 160 940 ↔ 130 Paul Ave Paul Ave 160 940 ↔ 160 940 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 1	St S	600 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	88 0 1 € 64 942 3 4 19 776 51 4 19 776 51 4 19 776 51 4 19 776 51 4 19 776 51
5. Arelious Walker/Gilman Ave	6. Ingerson Ave/Parking Garage	7. Harney Way/Parking Garage	8. Arelious Walker/Parking Garage
Gilman Ave	173 → 135 173 → 100 173 → 100 175 → 100	Parking Garage 156 545 156 545 156 156 156 156 156 156 156 15	S85 100 make S85 111 4th Level Entry 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 20
X Study Intersection	XXX Peak Hour Traffic Volume	🗊 Traffic Signal	

Turn Lane

🐵 🛛 Stop Sign

Þ

Study Intersection Volumes and Lane Configuration

Exhibit J Page 24 of 37

Figure 4



Figure 5 Gilman Avenue

## Exhibit J Page 25 of 37





P



Figure 6 Paul Avenue / San Bruno Avenue Transit Mitigations

## Exhibit J Page 26 of 37

### ATTACHMENT A – LOS CALCULATIONS



Exhibit J Page 27 of 37

Level Of Service Computation Report

Page 3-1

#### Original EIR LOS Analysis

		2000 H	ICM Operations (Futu PP Variant 2	re Volume Alternat A PM	tive)		
Intersection #1009	: 3rd St / Paul Av	e / Gilman Ave					
	Initial Vol: Lanes:	Signal=Protect/Rig 220 1770*** 0 1 1	hts=Include 260 0 1				
Sig Initial Vol: Lanes: Ric	nal=Permit hts=Overlap	Vol Cnt	Date: n/a	Signal=Permit Rights=Overlap	Lanes: Initial	/ol:	
160 0	•	Cycle Time	(sec): 100		1 220		
0	<b>€</b>	Loss Time	(sec): 12	- À	- 220		
940*** 1!	→	Critica	I V/C: 3.412	-	1 660	I	
0	*	Avg Crit Del (sec	/veh): 1386.8	*	- 1		
130 0	¥	Avg Delay (sec.	/veh): 786.0		- 0 60		
			LOS: F	1			
	•	∖ ◀↑ ↑	♠ ♦				
	Lanes: Initial Vol: 9	1 0 1 0*** 1310 Signal=Protect/Rig	1 0 60 hts=Include				
Street Name:		3rd St		Pa	ul Ave /	Gilman Ave	
Approach:	North Bo	und So	uth Bound	East	Bound	West Bo	und - P
		- K L	- 1 - K				- K 
Min. Green:	12 49	49 12	49 49	24	24 24	24 24	24
Y+R:	5.0 5.0	5.0 5.0	5.0 5.0	5.0 5	.0 5.0	5.0 5.0	5.0
Volume Modul	 e:						
Base Vol:	90 1310	60 260	1770 220	160 9	40 130	60 660	220
Growth Adj:	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.	00 1.00	1.00 1.00	1.00
Initial Bse:	90 1310	60 260	1770 220	160 9	40 130	60 660	220
PasserByVol:	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	0 0	0 0	0
Initial Fut:	90 1310	60 260	1770 220	160 9	40 130	60 660	220
User Adj:	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.	00 1.00	1.00 1.00	1.00
PHF Adj:	0.98 0.98	0.98 0.98	0.98 0.98	0.98 0.	98 0.98	0.98 0.98	0.98
PHF Volume:	92 1337	61 265	1806 224	163 9	0 133	61 6/3	224
Reduced Vol:	92 1337	61 265	1806 224	163 9	59 133	61 673	224
PCE Adj:	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.	00 1.00	1.00 1.00	1.00
MLF Adj:	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.	00 1.00	1.00 1.00	1.00
FinalVolume:	92 1337	61 265	1806 224	163 9	59 133	61 673	224
Saturation F	low Module:						
Sat/Lane:	1900 1900	1900 1900	1900 1900	1900 19	00 1900	1900 1900	1900
Adjustment:	0.90 0.88	0.88 0.90	0.89 0.89	0.28 0.	28 0.28	0.61 0.61	0.80
Lanes:	1.00 1.91	0.09 1.00	1.78 0.22	0.13 0.	76 0.11	0.17 1.83	1.00
Final Sat.:	1/18 3198	146 1/18	3005 373	/0 4	.09 57	194 2137	1519
Capacity Ana	' lysis Modul	e:		11	1	I	I
Vol/Sat:	0.05 0.42	0.42 0.15	0.60 0.60	2.35 2.	35 2.35	0.32 0.32	0.15
Crit Moves:	****		****	**	**		0.00
Green/Cycle:	0.12 0.49	0.49 0.12	0.49 0.49	0.27 0.	2/ 0.39	$0.27 \ 0.27$ 1 17 1 17	0.39
Uniform Del:	40.9 22.3	22.3 44.0	25.5 25.5	36.5 36	5.5 30.5	36.5 36.5	21.8
IncremntDel:	6.8 5.9	5.9 160.5	108 107.6	3477 34	77 2269	91.6 91.6	1.8
InitQueuDel:	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0	.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0
Delay Adj:	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.00	1.00 1.	UU 1.00	1.00 1.00	1.00
User DelAdi.	4/./ 28.2 1.00 1 00	20.2 204.5	1.00 1 00	3513 35 1.00 1	00 1 00	1.00 1 00	23./ 1.00
AdjDel/Veh:	47.7 28.2	28.2 204.5	133 133.1	3513 35	13 2300	128.1 128	23.7
LOS by Move:	D C	C F	F F	F	F F	F F	С
HCM2kAvgQ:	3 22	22 18	59 59	174 1	74 166	22 22	5
Note: Queue	reported is	cne number	or cars pe	r Lane.	sibit I	Dogo (	20  of  2

Page 3-2

#### Original EIR LOS Analysis



Copyright (c) 2008 Dowling Associates the hibit J Page to 29 Ports, 3,7A

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 2: Jennings Street & Gilman Avenue

3/26/2015

	≯	-	$\mathbf{r}$	1	-	•	1	1	1	1	Ŧ	-
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		đÞ			đ þ			4			\$	
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Volume (vph)	85	1045	130	67	752	61	43	83	56	68	195	145
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Hourly flow rate (vph)	89	1100	137	71	792	64	45	87	59	72	205	153
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	WB 2	NB 1	SB 1						
Volume Total (vph)	639	687	466	460	192	429						
Volume Left (vph)	89	0	71	0	45	72						
Volume Right (vph)	0	137	0	64	59	153						
Hadj (s)	0.10	-0.11	0.11	-0.06	-0.10	-0.15						
Departure Headway (s)	8.8	8.6	8.8	8.6	9.4	8.1						
Degree Utilization, x	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.50	0.97						
Capacity (veh/h)	412	423	412	428	369	432						
Control Delay (s)	287.5	319.5	117.2	103.6	21.4	64.2						
Approach Delay (s)	304.1		110.4		21.4	64.2						
Approach LOS	F		F		С	F						
Intersection Summary												
Delay			187.0									
Level of Service			F									
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	ition		97.9%	IC	CU Level o	of Service			F			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 3: Ingalls Street & Gilman Avenue

3/26/2015

	≯	-	$\rightarrow$	1	-	*	1	1	1	1	Ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		đ þ			đ þ			\$			÷	
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Volume (vph)	130	962	77	30	730	58	31	83	12	35	216	119
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Hourly flow rate (vph)	137	1013	81	32	768	61	33	87	13	37	227	125
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	WB 2	NB 1	SB 1						
Volume Total (vph)	643	587	416	445	133	389						
Volume Left (vph)	137	0	32	0	33	37						
Volume Right (vph)	0	81	0	61	13	125						
Hadj (s)	0.14	-0.06	0.07	-0.06	0.03	-0.14						
Departure Headway (s)	8.4	8.2	8.2	8.1	9.1	7.7						
Degree Utilization, x	1.0	1.0	0.95	1.0	0.34	0.83						
Capacity (veh/h)	438	447	432	445	365	389						
Control Delay (s)	262.2	192.1	59.2	70.5	16.6	38.2						
Approach Delay (s)	228.7		65.1		16.6	38.2						
Approach LOS	F		F		С	E						
Intersection Summary												
Delay			135.7									
Level of Service			F									
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	ition		88.3%	IC	CU Level o	of Service			E			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 4: Hawes Street & Gilman Avenue

	≯	-	$\mathbf{r}$	4	-	•	•	1	1	1	Ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4î þ			đ þ			\$			\$	
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Volume (vph)	64	942	3	51	776	19	4	5	0	37	10	38
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Hourly flow rate (vph)	67	992	3	54	817	20	4	5	0	39	11	40
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	WB 2	NB 1	SB 1						
Volume Total (vph)	563	499	462	428	9	89						
Volume Left (vph)	67	0	54	0	4	39						
Volume Right (vph)	0	3	0	20	0	40						
Hadj (s)	0.09	0.03	0.09	0.00	0.12	-0.15						
Departure Headway (s)	6.2	6.1	6.4	6.3	7.5	6.8						
Degree Utilization, x	0.97	0.85	0.82	0.75	0.02	0.17						
Capacity (veh/h)	576	580	551	556	463	512						
Control Delay (s)	53.2	33.0	31.4	24.8	10.6	11.2						
Approach Delay (s)	43.7		28.2		10.6	11.2						
Approach LOS	E		D		В	В						
Intersection Summary												
Delay			35.4									
Level of Service			E									
Intersection Capacity Utilizati	on		67.7%	IC	CU Level o	of Service			С			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 1: 3rd Street & Gilman Avenue

3/26/2015

	۶	-	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	1	+	•	1	1	۲	1	Ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4			ta ta	1	ሻ	A		ሻ	<b>≜</b> †Ъ	
Volume (vph)	160	940	130	60	660	220	90	1310	60	260	1770	220
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		5.0			5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	
Lane Util. Factor		1.00			0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95		1.00	0.95	
Frt		0.99			1.00	0.85	1.00	0.99		1.00	0.98	
Flt Protected		0.99			1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		1824			3525	1583	1770	3516		1770	3480	
Flt Permitted		0.36			0.64	1.00	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		667			2257	1583	1770	3516		1770	3480	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Adj. Flow (vph)	168	989	137	63	695	232	95	1379	63	274	1863	232
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	4	0	0	0	43	0	4	0	0	9	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	1290	0	0	758	189	95	1438	0	274	2086	0
Turn Type	Perm	NA		Perm	NA	pm+ov	Prot	NA		Prot	NA	
Protected Phases		2			6	3	7	4		3	8	
Permitted Phases	2			6		6						
Actuated Green, G (s)		28.5			28.5	44.0	8.1	41.0		15.5	48.4	
Effective Green, g (s)		28.5			28.5	44.0	8.1	41.0		15.5	48.4	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.28			0.28	0.44	0.08	0.41		0.16	0.48	
Clearance Time (s)		5.0			5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)		3.0			3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		190			643	775	143	1441		274	1684	
v/s Ratio Prot						0.04	0.05	c0.41		0.15	c0.60	
v/s Ratio Perm		c1.93			0.34	0.08						
v/c Ratio		6.79			1.18	0.24	0.66	1.00		1.00	1.24	
Uniform Delay, d1		35.8			35.8	17.6	44.6	29.5		42.2	25.8	
Progression Factor		1.00			1.04	1.18	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		2615.6			91.1	0.1	11.1	23.3		54.4	112.6	
Delay (s)		2651.4			128.3	20.8	55.7	52.8		96.6	138.4	
Level of Service		F			F	С	E	D		F	F	
Approach Delay (s)		2651.4			103.1			52.9			133.6	
Approach LOS		F			F			D			F	
Intersection Summary												
HCM 2000 Control Delay			635.0	H	ICM 2000	) Level of	Service		F			
HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity	ratio		3.10									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			100.0	S	um of los	st time (s)			15.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization	۱		163.8%	10	CU Level	of Service	è		Н			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

Synchro 8 Report Page 1

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 2: Jennings Street & Gilman Avenue

3/26/2015

	٦	-	$\rightarrow$	•	-	•	1	1	1	1	Ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	۲	ĥ		5	ţ,			\$			\$	
Volume (vph)	85	1045	130	67	752	61	43	83	56	68	195	145
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0			4.0			4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00			1.00			1.00	
Frt	1.00	0.98		1.00	0.99			0.96			0.95	
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00			0.99			0.99	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	1832		1770	1842			1764			1759	
Flt Permitted	0.21	1.00		0.06	1.00			0.69			0.88	
Satd. Flow (perm)	394	1832		111	1842			1238			1569	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Adj. Flow (vph)	89	1100	137	71	792	64	45	87	59	72	205	153
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	5	0	0	3	0	0	16	0	0	20	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	89	1232	0	71	853	0	0	175	0	0	410	0
Turn Type	Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA	
Protected Phases		2			6			4			8	
Permitted Phases	2			6			4			8		
Actuated Green, G (s)	67.0	67.0		67.0	67.0			25.0			25.0	
Effective Green, g (s)	67.0	67.0		67.0	67.0			25.0			25.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.67	0.67		0.67	0.67			0.25			0.25	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0			4.0			4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0			3.0			3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	263	1227		74	1234			309			392	
v/s Ratio Prot		c0.67			0.46							
v/s Ratio Perm	0.23			0.64				0.14			c0.26	
v/c Ratio	0.34	1.00		0.96	0.69			0.57			1.05	
Uniform Delay, d1	7.0	16.5		15.2	10.1			32.8			37.5	
Progression Factor	0.13	0.83		0.70	0.69			1.00			1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	0.3	8.8		78.6	2.3			2.4			57.8	
Delay (s)	1.2	22.5		89.2	9.4			35.2			95.3	
Level of Service	А	С		F	А			D			F	
Approach Delay (s)		21.1			15.5			35.2			95.3	
Approach LOS		С			В			D			F	
Intersection Summary												
HCM 2000 Control Delay			31.3	Н	CM 2000	Level of	Service		С			
HCM 2000 Volume to Capa	city ratio		1.02									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			100.0	S	um of lost	time (s)			8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	ition		104.3%	IC	CU Level of	of Service	<u>;</u>		G			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 3: Ingalls Street & Gilman Avenue

	٦	-	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	4	+	×	1	t	۲	1	Ļ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	¢Î,		۲.	4Î			4			4	
Volume (vph)	130	962	77	30	730	58	31	83	12	35	216	119
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0			4.0			4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00			1.00			1.00	
Frt	1.00	0.99		1.00	0.99			0.99			0.96	
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00			0.99			1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	1842		1770	1842			1816			1774	
Flt Permitted	0.23	1.00		0.09	1.00			0.71			0.96	
Satd. Flow (perm)	433	1842		169	1842			1309			1712	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Adj. Flow (vph)	137	1013	81	32	768	61	33	87	13	37	227	125
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	4	0	0	17	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	137	1091	0	32	826	0	0	129	0	0	372	0
Turn Type	Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA	
Protected Phases		2			6			4			8	
Permitted Phases	2			6			4			8		
Actuated Green, G (s)	68.0	68.0		68.0	68.0			24.0			24.0	
Effective Green, g (s)	68.0	68.0		68.0	68.0			24.0			24.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.68	0.68		0.68	0.68			0.24			0.24	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0			4.0			4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0			3.0			3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	294	1252		114	1252			314			410	
v/s Ratio Prot		c0.59			0.45							
v/s Ratio Perm	0.32			0.19				0.10			c0.22	
v/c Ratio	0.47	0.87		0.28	0.66			0.41			0.91	
Uniform Delay, d1	7.5	12.6		6.3	9.3			32.0			36.9	
Progression Factor	0.27	0.29		0.62	0.78			1.00			1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	1.3	2.3		5.3	2.4			0.9			23.0	
Delay (s)	3.3	5.9		9.2	9.6			32.9			59.9	
Level of Service	А	А		А	А			С			E	
Approach Delay (s)		5.7			9.6			32.9			59.9	
Approach LOS		А			А			С			E	
Intersection Summary												
HCM 2000 Control Delay			16.4	Н	CM 2000	Level of	Service		В			
HCM 2000 Volume to Capa	city ratio		0.88									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			100.0	S	um of lost	time (s)			8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	tion		91.2%	IC	CU Level o	of Service	;		F			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 4: Hawes Street & Gilman Avenue

	٭	-	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	4	-	*	٩.	Ť	۲	1	Ļ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	۲	¢Î		۲	et 🗧			\$			\$	
Volume (vph)	64	942	3	51	776	19	4	5	0	37	10	38
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0			4.0			4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00			1.00			1.00	
Frt	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00			1.00			0.94	
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00			0.98			0.98	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	1862		1770	1856			1822			1714	
Flt Permitted	0.31	1.00		0.24	1.00			0.91			0.86	
Satd. Flow (perm)	575	1862		456	1856			1693			1499	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Adj. Flow (vph)	67	992	3	54	817	20	4	5	0	39	11	40
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	67	995	0	54	836	0	0	9	0	0	59	0
Turn Type	Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA	
Protected Phases		2			6			4			8	
Permitted Phases	2			6			4			8		
Actuated Green, G (s)	83.8	83.8		83.8	83.8			8.2			8.2	
Effective Green, g (s)	83.8	83.8		83.8	83.8			8.2			8.2	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.84	0.84		0.84	0.84			0.08			0.08	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0			4.0			4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0			3.0			3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	481	1560		382	1555			138			122	
v/s Ratio Prot		c0.53			0.45							
v/s Ratio Perm	0.12			0.12				0.01			c0.04	
v/c Ratio	0.14	0.64		0.14	0.54			0.07			0.48	
Uniform Delay, d1	1.5	2.8		1.5	2.4			42.4			43.9	
Progression Factor	1.35	0.98		1.00	1.00			1.00			1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	0.3	1.0		0.8	1.3			0.2			3.0	
Delay (s)	2.3	3.7		2.3	3.7			42.6			46.9	
Level of Service	А	А		А	А			D			D	
Approach Delay (s)		3.6			3.6			42.6			46.9	
Approach LOS		А			А			D			D	
Intersection Summary												
HCM 2000 Control Delay			5.7	Н	CM 2000	Level of	Service		А			
HCM 2000 Volume to Capac	city ratio		0.62									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			100.0	S	um of lost	time (s)			8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilizat	tion		66.1%	IC	U Level o	of Service	<u>;</u>		С			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 5: Gilman Avenue & Arelious Walker Drive

5: Gilman Avenue & Arelious Walker Drive 3/2												26/2015
	۶	-	$\mathbf{r}$	4	+	•	•	Ť	1	1	Ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	5	•	1	5	•	1	5	<b>4</b> 12		5	<b>≜1</b> ≽	
Volume (vph)	102	173	704	38	422	206	381	432	9	81	671	43
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95		1.00	0.95	
Frt	1.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	1.00		1.00	0.99	
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583	1770	3529		1770	3507	
Flt Permitted	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)	1770	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583	1770	3529		1770	3507	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Adj. Flow (vph)	107	182	741	40	444	217	401	455	9	85	706	45
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	39	0	0	93	0	1	0	0	5	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	107	182	702	40	444	124	401	463	0	85	746	0
Turn Type	Prot	NA	pm+ov	Prot	NA	Perm	Prot	NA		Prot	NA	
Protected Phases	1	6	7	5	2		7	4		3	8	
Permitted Phases			6			2						
Actuated Green, G (s)	8.1	34.9	63.9	3.6	30.4	30.4	29.0	47.2		8.3	26.5	
Effective Green, g (s)	8.1	34.9	63.9	3.6	30.4	30.4	29.0	47.2		8.3	26.5	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.07	0.32	0.58	0.03	0.28	0.28	0.26	0.43		0.08	0.24	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	130	591	977	57	514	437	466	1514		133	844	
v/s Ratio Prot	c0.06	0.10	c0.19	0.02	c0.24		c0.23	0.13		0.05	c0.21	
v/s Ratio Perm			0.25			0.08						
v/c Ratio	0.82	0.31	0.72	0.70	0.86	0.28	0.86	0.31		0.64	0.88	
Uniform Delay, d1	50.2	28.4	16.6	52.7	37.8	31.2	38.6	20.6		49.4	40.3	
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	32.6	0.3	2.5	32.3	14.0	0.4	18.4	0.1		9.7	10.9	
Delay (s)	82.8	28.7	19.1	85.0	51.9	31.6	57.0	20.7		59.1	51.2	
Level of Service	F	С	В	F	D	С	E	С		E	D	
Approach Delay (s)		27.4			47.5			37.6			52.0	
Approach LOS		С			D			D			D	
Intersection Summary												
HCM 2000 Control Delay			40.1	Н	CM 2000	Level of	Service		D			
HCM 2000 Volume to Capa	acity ratio		0.87									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			110.0	S	um of los	t time (s)			16.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization	ation		82.2%	IC	CU Level	of Service	;		E			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												



# Exhibit K Page 1 of 5



Exhibit K Page 2 of 5



Exhibit K Page 3 of 5



Exhibit K Page 4 of 5



Exhibit K Page 5 of 5



DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Major General Anthony L. Jackson, USMC (Ret), Director

Resolution 1-2013 Adopted by the CALIFORNIA STATE PARK AND RECREATION COMMISSION at its regular meeting in Brisbane, California January 18, 2013

#### General Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report for Candlestick Point State Recreation Area

WHEREAS, the Director of California State Parks has presented to this Commission for approval the proposed General Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report ("Plan") for Candlestick Point State Recreation Area ("Park"); and

WHEREAS, the Park is the first and one of the few intensely urban units in the State Park System, surrounded by industrial and residential uses and Candlestick Park stadium; and

WHEREAS, the Park is located in an urban area surrounded by the proposed Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II project, which will dramatically alter the neighborhood surrounding the park, replacing the existing Candlestick Park stadium, vacant lands, and other areas with a large, mixed-use development; and

WHEREAS, California State Parks entered into a land exchange agreement with the City and County of San Francisco that will reconfigure the park boundary, adding land in some of the narrowest areas and removing it from others and in exchange, California State Parks will receive funding to improve and enhance Candlestick Point State Recreation Area, and

WHEREAS, this general plan will guide the development and management of the Park for public use and resource protection for the next 20 or more years, by establishing goals and guidelines to assist in the daily and long-term management of the park to ensure that its resources are protected, while encouraging a variety of recreation activities; and

WHEREAS, the Plan is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and includes the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as a part of a General Plan, pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5002.2 and the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15166 (CEQA Guidelines), providing discussion of the probable impacts of future development, establishing goals, policies and objectives, and addressing all the requirements of an EIR; and

WHEREAS, the Plan and EIR function as a "tiered EIR" pursuant to PRC 21093, covering general goals and objectives of the Plan, and that the appropriate level of CEQA review will be conducted for each project relying on the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Plan establishes a foundation to designate the remaining portions of lands at Candlestick Point State Recreation Area for park priority use in the Bay Plan managed and maintained by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC);

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

#### CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That this Commission has reviewed and considered the information and analysis in the Plan prior to approving the Plan, and this Commission finds and certifies that the Plan reflects the independent judgment and analysis of this Commission and has been completed in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and be it

RESOLVED: In connection with its review of the Plan prior to approving the General Plan, this Commission independently finds that the environmental conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis Section of the Plan are supported by facts therein and that each fact in support of the findings is true and is based on substantial evidence in the record and that mitigation measures or other changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Plan which will avoid or substantially lessen the potential impacts identified in the Plan; and be it

RESOLVED: The location and custodian of the Plan and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings on which the Commission's decision is based is: State Park and Recreation Commission, P.O. Box 942896, Sacramento, California 94296-0001, Phone 916/653-0524, Facsimile 916/653-4458; and be it

RESOLVED: The California State Park and Recreation Commission hereby approves the Department of Parks and Recreation's General Plan and certifies the Environmental Impact Report prepared for Candlestick Point State Recreation Area, dated January 2012; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That a Notice of Determination will be filed with the Office of Planning and Research within five days of this approval.

Attest: This Resolution was duly adopted by the California State Park and Recreation Commission on January 18, 2013 at the Commission's duly-noticed public meeting at Brisbane, California.

By: ORIGINAL SIGNED BY Date: 1-18-13

Louis Nastro Assistant to the Commission For Major General Anthony L. Jackson, USMC (Ret), Director Secretary to the Commission Exhibit L: Excerpts from the CPSRA General Plan and Approval Resolution



### S.1 Park Description

Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA, or the park) is located in the City and County of San Francisco along the southeastern waterfront, adjacent to San Francisco Bay. It occupies 151 acres within San Francisco's Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood, and is surrounded by industrial uses, residential uses, and Candlestick Park stadium. As California's first urban state park, CPSRA provides access to open space, the Bay, and recreational opportunities in a highly urbanized and industrial area of San Francisco.

The shoreline of CPSRA is perhaps its most defining feature. The park skirts the western shore of San Francisco Bay for approximately 3.4 miles, offering access to the Bay and long-range scenic views. Visitors from the local and regional community engage in a wide range of day-use recreation activities, including trail use, picnicking, windsurfing, wildlife viewing, and beach use, among others.

Although CPSRA is built entirely on reclaimed land, the park conserves important natural and cultural resources. A rare open space resource in San Francisco's southeastern corner, CPSRA provides habitat for birds, small mammals, and other wildlife. The park's position along the Pacific flyway makes it a valuable stopover for migrating birds. CPSRA's history of use, from the Ohlone people, to Chinese fishing camps, to the filling of the Bay, enriches its story as the state's first urban state park.

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)
- U.S. Department of the Navy (USNA)
- California State Lands Commission (SLC)
- California Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW)
- Ohlone Indian Tribe
- California State Parks Foundation
- San Francisco Bay Trail
- Literacy for Environmental Justice
- Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter
- Golden Gate Audubon Society
- California Native Plant Society
- Nature in the City
- Bay Access

Public outreach included a variety of methods: four public workshops; a webpage on State Parks' website; and mailing materials, including emails, postcards, flyers, and newsletters. Notices of the public meetings were placed at CPSRA and in local business storefronts.

## S.4 Park Vision

The park vision describes the future desired outcome of CPSRA, expressing what the park represents and its role as a state park. The vision for CPSRA is as follows:

The vision of Candlestick Point SRA, California's first urban state park, is to bring state park values and mission into an urban setting. Visitors from the local community, state of California and farther afield will enjoy a range of opportunities to participate in recreational activities and experience nature along the San Francisco Bay. Sweeping views of the Bay, native coastal landscapes, tidal marshes, beaches, and areas for community gathering and activity will all contribute to the character of CPSRA. The park will encourage active, healthy lifestyles while at the same time serving as a respite from the urban surroundings of San Francisco and the larger Bay Area. Recreation programs and facilities will maximize access to the Bay and be developed in concert with CPSRA's natural surroundings, treading lightly on the land. CPSRA will enhance the public's understanding of the Bay – its natural history, stories of settlement and development, and future challenges related to sea level rise. The park will foster community and encourage stewardship, and in doing so, become a destination along the Bay for visitors both near and far.

Exhibit L: Excerpts from the CPSRA General Plan and Approval Resolution

### 1.4 Sense of Place

What characteristics make CPSRA distinctive, and draw users to this unit? What inherent qualities should be protected, highlighted, and enhanced? The first response must be the relationship of the site with San Francisco Bay, with over three miles of coastline, and ever-changing, sweeping Bay views that include distant mountains and ridges to the east. The presence of the Bay can be sensed throughout the entire unit, either through direct recreational activities with the water, or as a backdrop sensed through the taste of salty cool air, the sounds of water birds, gusting winds, and lapping waves, or the open and bright expanse beyond a tree-protected meadow. The changing shoreline offers a variety in Bay experience, from wind-driven choppy waves, to quieter protected coves and beaches, to the inlet of Yosemite Slough, where the water is a narrow channel marked by the presence of the bird-covered "Double Rock" feature.

Also idiosyncratic are the often-present strong winds, traveling from the Pacific Ocean through the Alemany Gap and swirling around the adjacent Bayview Hill. While the wind poses challenges for human comfort, it is undeniably a distinct characteristic of the site, and is what makes CPSRA a world famous windsurfing area. Despite being an urban site, with the influence of the Bay, the wind, and the backdrop of the undeveloped Bayview Hill, the park offers a sense of being in contact with natural forces. It is seen as a source of respite and renewal, although at times a bracing one.

Nonetheless, CPSRA is an urban state park. Its urban edge is as long as its shoreline, with CPSRA as the intermediary where these very different environments meet and blend. The existing urban context of acres of parking lot and a rarely used stadium means the park is rather isolated, and often with few visitors. This factor in itself contributes to the sense of being an "urban getaway" for a quiet walk alone.

The land, which is almost entirely fill, is a created landscape, characterized by features that were either placed there or that naturalized over time. Large areas of the park are undeveloped, and apart from the natural factors previously mentioned, offer a sense of place that resembles an open canvas. The shape of the shoreline follows the tidal lots where the Bay was sold off in rectangular blocks to be filled for new land. The very shape of the park offers an authentic story that is part of the spirit of the area.

The proposed redevelopment surrounding the park will greatly change the character of the urban edge. The park will provide a "green front lawn" for the planned community of townhomes, high rises, and shopping districts. There will be many more people visiting the park, looking to enjoy the incredible water's edge recreation, as well as contact with nature and a respite from city life. Thus, future development of the park must carefully navigate this intermediary nature between the city and shoreline edges. CPSRA's spirit of place will continue to evolve, as a gradient of these urban and natural experiences. December 21, 2015

Ms. Joy Navarette San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Ms. Lila Hussain Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure One South Van Ness, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, CA 94103

#### Subject: Candlestick Point – Revised Project Description

Dear Joy and Lila,

The *Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project Final EIR* (herein referred to simply as "EIR") was certified by the San Francisco Planning Commission and the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission in June 2010. Following the approval, the Housing/R&D Variant (Variant 2A) has been advanced as the project.

Since the Project has been approved, the project sponsor has proposed minor revisions to the approved land uses. Specifically, the sponsor is proposing to construct a portion of the previously-approved arena/performance venue space as a new movie theater, while retaining the balance of the previously-approved square footage for future performance venue. This letter summarizes the transportation analysis results conducted to determine whether this modification would result in changes to the conclusions from the EIR.

### PROJECT LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS

As described in the EIR, Variant 2A (the Project) assumed the Candlestick Point site would include:

- 150,000 square feet of office
- 6,225 residential dwelling units (includes replacement of 256 then-existing units at Alice Griffith)
- 635,000 square feet of regional retail

- 125,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving retail
- 220 room hotel
- 50,000 square feet of community-serving uses
- 10,000-seat arena

Since the Project was approved, the project sponsor proposed to replace 15,500 square feet of office space with 6,000 square feet of local serving retail. This change resulted in either a net decrease or no net change to peak hour trip generation for the peak hours evaluated in the EIR (see memo to SF Planning Department and Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, dated June 25, 2015).

Currently, the project sponsor is proposing to replace a portion of the approved arena with a movie theater; the remaining portion would be left as a performing arts theater/arena. **Table 1** summarizes the land use assumptions.

TABLE 1: LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS						
	Units	Total <sup>1</sup>				
Land Use		EIR / Variant 2A	Revised Land Uses with No Office <sup>5</sup>	Revised Project to Include Movie Theater		
Regional Retail	ksf	635,000	635,000	635,000		
Local Serving Retail	ksf	125,000	131,000	183,000		
Office	ksf	150,000	134,500	0		
Performance Venue / Arena <sup>2</sup>	seats	10,000	10,000	4,400		
Recreational Community Center	ksf	50,000	50,000	50,000		
County Park	acres	97	97	97		
Hotel	rooms	220	220	220		
Residential Units <sup>3</sup>	dwelling units	6,225	6,225	6,225		
Movie Theater <sup>4</sup>	seats	0	0	1,200		

Notes:

1. Bold indicates a change in land use assumption.

2. EIR and revised Project assume 75,000 sf arena and 33,000 sf arena, respectively. Number of Arena seats interpolated based on square-feet to seat ratio used in the EIR.

3. Residential units includes replacement of 256 then-existing units at Alice Griffith that would be replaced.

4. The revised Project movie theater is 42,000 sf.

5. See memo to SF Planning Department and Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, dated June 25 2015 (Updated December 14, 2015).

This letter assesses the impacts of converting a portion of the originally-approved arena into a movie theater and includes the conversion of office to local serving retail.

### PROJECT TRAVEL DEMAND

The EIR forecasted weekday AM (8:00 to 9:00 AM) and PM (5:00 to 6:00 PM) peak hour<sup>1</sup> trip generation by calculating person trips generated by each land use. Peak hour person trips were distributed to geographical origins/destinations throughout the Bay Area and by mode split. For this analysis, the trip rates, trip distribution, including internalization, and mode splits methodology are consistent with those used in the EIR.

The movie theater is a specific land use that was not included in the original traffic generation forecasts (although the trip generation rates for "shopping center" in the EIR analysis do include movie theaters). In this case, the analysis is based on the specific "movie theater" rates since the specific use is known. Trip generation rates provided by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), *Trip Generation Manual*, 9<sup>th</sup> Edition, were used to forecast movie theater trips. AM peak hour trip generate traffic during the AM peak hour and because the ITE data did not provide AM peak hour data. Movie Theater trips are likely to behave similarly to retail uses; therefore, the mode splits and geographic distribution originally forecasted for retail were applied to the theater trips as well.

#### Performance Venue (Arena) Travel Demand

The EIR analyzed traffic generation associated with the arena under conditions with and without an event. The "with event" analysis evaluates pre-event conditions for the weekday PM peak hour to address transportation impacts associated with sold-out events. As described in the EIR, the arena travel demand assumes that weekday evening events would begin at 7:00 PM. and about half of arena attendees (2,200 attendees) would arrive during the PM peak hour. The EIR forecasted that 20 percent of attendees would arrive by transit and the remaining 80 percent would arrive by car.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In addition to the weekday AM and PM peak hours, the EIR evaluated the weekday daily and Sunday PM peak hour trip generation. For this study, only the weekday AM and PM peak hours were evaluated because they are the critical peak periods.

This results in approximately 440 transit users and 587 vehicles (assumes 3 spectators per auto) during the weekday PM peak hour associated with a sold-out event.

TABLE 2: WEEKDAY AM AND PM PEAK HOUR PERSON AND VEHICLE TRIPS							
Scenario	Perso	on Trips	Vehicle Trips				
	AM Peak Hour	Peak Hour PM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour			
EIR No Event <sup>1</sup>	6,578	12,632	2,235	4,981			
EIR With Event <sup>1, 2</sup>	6,578	22,632	2,235	6,315			
Revised Project No Event	6,530	12,798	2,219	5,050			
Revised Project With Event <sup>2</sup>	6,530	17,198	2,219	5,637			

Table 2 describes the total AM and PM peak hour person and vehicle trip generation.

Notes:

1. These numbers include the conversion of approved office space to retail, as described earlier. This land use change results in a slight change in AM and PM peak hour person trips to what was reported in the EIR.

2. Assumes no trips during the AM peak hour associated with a major event; however, does account for arena employees.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2015

As shown in the table above, with the movie theater and without an event, the revised Project would generate 16 fewer vehicle trips during the weekday AM peak hour and 69 more vehicle trips during the weekday PM peak hour. With the movie theater and an event, the revised Project would generate 678 fewer vehicle trips during the weekday PM peak hour.

### IMPACT ANALYSIS

The remainder of this report discusses the extent to which the proposed project revision would change any impact conclusions from the EIR.

#### TR1-1: ON-SITE AND OFF-SITE CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

As described in the EIR, construction of the Project would result in transportation impacts in the Project vicinity due to construction vehicle traffic and roadway construction and would contribute to cumulative construction impacts in the Project vicinity. The EIR concluded implementation of mitigation measure MM TR-1, which would require the Applicant to develop and implement a

construction traffic management plan to reduce the impact of construction activity on transportation facilities, would reduce the impacts caused by construction, but not to a less-than-significant level.

The overall amount of construction anticipated to occur as part of the revised Project will be approximately the same as originally conceived and described in the EIR. The revised Project anticipates constructing the proposed movie theater with construction of sub-phases 02-03-04, while the event space venue may be constructed at a later time, within the CP-02 boundary. Overall, although the timing and location of construction activities may vary within the site compared to what was originally anticipated, the construction activities are expected to create similar significant and unavoidable localized construction-related traffic impacts as were originally described in Impact TR-1 the EIR. Mitigation measure MM-TR-1, development of a Construction Traffic Management Program, would still apply, although impacts would continue to remain significant and unavoidable.

Therefore, construction of the revised Project would not result in any new significant effects to transportation beyond those identified in the EIR or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

### IMPACTS TR-2 THROUGH TR-16: TRAFFIC IMPACTS TO REGIONAL AND LOCAL ROADWAY SYSTEM, STUDY INTERSECTIONS, AND FREEWAY FACILITIES

The EIR evaluated 60 intersections throughout the Project site and surrounding area. As described in the EIR, the Project would generate substantial amounts of new vehicular traffic resulting in a number of significant impacts and mitigation measures. More specifically, the EIR identified Impact TR-2, a significant impact related to the Project's overall increase in traffic generation in relation to the current roadway system capacity. The EIR identified Mitigation Measure MM TR-2, the development and implementation of the Project's Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan as a means to lessen the severity of Project-generated traffic impact; however, Impact TR-2 would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation. The EIR identified Impacts TR-3 through TR-8, which described locations where the Project would create new project-related impacts or contribute to significant cumulative impacts at study intersections. Mitigation Measures MM TR-4 (restriping at the intersection of Tunnel/Blanken), MM TR-6 (participating in the bi-county study and paying a fair share contribution toward improvements near the Geneva Avenue/US 101

interchange), MM TR-7 (restriping at the Amador/Cargo Way intersection), and MM TR-8 (participating in the bi-county study and paying a fair share contribution toward improvements near the Bayshore/Geneva intersection) were recommended to reduce the severity of Project-related impacts. However, due to uncertainty regarding implementation of mitigation measures, Impacts TR-3 through TR-8 were determined to remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation. The FIER also identified Impact TR-9, which described the project's less than significant impact to a number of other study intersections.

At a slightly larger scale, the EIR identified Impact TR-10, which describes the effect of Projectrelated traffic spilling over into nearby residential neighborhood streets. The EIR determined this impact to be significant, and referenced other mitigation measures described elsewhere in the EIR (including Mitigation Measure MM TR-2, the development and implementation of a TDM Plan) as appropriate strategies to reduce the severity of Impact TR-10. However, the EIR determined that the impact would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

The EIR also identified a number of significant Project-related impacts to freeway facilities, including Impacts TR-11 through TR-15. No feasible mitigation measures were identified for Impacts TR-11 through TR-13 and these impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Mitigation Measures MM TR-14 and MM TR-15, which called for participation in the bi-county study and payment of a fair share contribution toward improvements near the Geneva Avenue / US 101 interchange area, were identified to reduce the severity of Impacts TR-14 and TR-15; however, since the implementation of these measures was uncertain, Impacts TR-14 and TR-15 would also remain significant and unavoidable.

Finally, the EIR identified Impact TR-16, a significant impact associated with the Project's contribution to traffic on Harney Way, which will be a primary access route for all modes between the Project site and regional transportation facilities (US 101, Bayshore Caltrain, Balboa Park BART, the Bay Trail, etc.). Mitigation Measure MM TR-16 called for the project to construct the initial phase of Harney Way at the outset of construction of the first major phase, which would reduce the Project's impact to less than significant.

The proposed land use revisions would likely result in localized changes to traffic volumes, because the change in traffic generation is relatively small compared to the project, and the relatively small increases would disperse relatively quickly farther away from the project. As a result, for the purpose of this analysis, a subset of 25 of the 60 EIR intersections was evaluated representing those

### Exhibit M Page 6 of 21

intersections most likely to experience a measurable change to traffic volumes as a result of the proposed changes. Specifically, this analysis examined the following intersections (intersection numbers are consistent with the numbering from the EIR):

- 1. Third Street / 25th Street
- 2. Third Street / Cesar Chavez
- 3. Third Street / Cargo Way
- 4. Third Street / Evans Avenue
- 5. Third Street / Oakdale Avenue
- 6. Third Street / Palou Avenue
- 7. Third Street / Reverse Avenue
- 8. Third Street / Carroll Avenue
- 9. Third Street / Paul Avenue
- 10. Third Street / Ingerson Avenue
- 11. Third Street / Jamestown Avenue
- 12. Third Street / Le Conte / US 101 Northbound Off-Ramp
- 19. Bayshore Boulevard / Paul Avenue
- 26. Tunnel Avenue / Blanken Avenue
- 27. Geneva Avenue / US 101 Southbound Ramps (Alana Way / Beatty Road)
- 28. Harney Way / US 101 Northbound Ramps (Alana Way / Harney Way / Thomas Mellon)
- 29. Harney Way / Jamestown Avenue
- 30. Crisp Road / Palou Avenue / Griffith Street
- 34. Arelious Walker / Gilman Avenue
- 35. Amador Street / Cargo Way / Illinois Street
- 49. Bayshore Boulevard / Geneva Avenue
- 56. Third Street / Williams Avenue / Van Dyke Avenue
- 57. Third Street / Jerrold Avenue
- 59. Harney Way / Executive Park East
- 60. Harney Way / Thomas Mellon Drive

Weekday AM and PM peak hour intersection level of service (LOS) and delay are summarized in **Tables 3 and 4**, respectively. The tables compare the results for the 2030 No Project, 2030 Plus Project Variant 2A, and 2030 Plus revised Project. **Appendix A** summarizes intersection operations including delay, LOS, and volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratios for the AM and PM peak hours. Additionally, Appendix A includes the critical movement's Project's contribution at intersections operating at LOS E or F.

WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR – 2030 CONDITIONS (NO ARENA EVENT)							
Intersection <sup>1</sup>	No Project		Project – Variant 2A		Revised	Revised Project	
	Delay <sup>2</sup>	LOS <sup>3</sup>	Delay <sup>2</sup>	LOS <sup>3</sup>	Delay <sup>2</sup>	LOS <sup>3</sup>	
1.	Third Street / 25 <sup>th</sup> Street	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
2.	Third Street / Cesar Chavez	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
3.	Third Street / Cargo Way	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
4.	Third Street / Evans Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
5.	Third Street / Oakdale Avenue	21	С	24	С	23	C
6.	Third Street / Palou Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
7.	Third Street / Reverse Avenue	35	С	48	D	43	D
8.	Third Street / Carroll Avenue	12	В	18	В	18	В
9.	Third Street / Paul Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
10.	Third Street / Ingerson Avenue	5	А	6	А	6	A
11.	Third Street / Jamestown Avenue	29	С	53	D	51	D
12.	Third Street / Le Conte / US 101 Northbound Off-Ramp	50	D	50	D	48	D
19.	Bayshore Boulevard / Paul Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
26.	Tunnel Avenue / Blanken Avenue	43	D	>80	F	>80	F
27.	Geneva Avenue / US 101 Southbound Ramps (Alana Way / Beatty Road)	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
28.	Harney Way / US 101 Northbound Ramps (Alana Way / Harney Way / Thomas Mellon)	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F

#### TABLE 3: INTERSECTION LOS WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR – 2030 CONDITIONS (NO ARENA EVEN)

TABLE 3: INTERSECTION LOS WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR – 2030 CONDITIONS (NO ARENA EVENT)							
Intersection <sup>1</sup>	No Project		Project – Variant 2A		Revised Project		
	Delay <sup>2</sup>	LOS <sup>3</sup>	Delay <sup>2</sup>	LOS <sup>3</sup>	Delay <sup>2</sup>	LOS <sup>3</sup>	
29. Harney Way / Jamestown Avenue <sup>5</sup>	12	В	23	С	22	С	
30. Crisp Road / Palou Avenue / Griffith Street	57	E	46	D	45	D	
34. Arelious Walker / Gilman Avenue <sup>5</sup>	>50 (EB)	F	30	С	30	С	
35. Amador Street / Cargo Way / Illinois Street	65	E	61	E	57	E	
49. Bayshore Boulevard / Geneva Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F	
56. Third Street / Williams Avenue / Van Dyke Avenue	18	В	29	С	28	С	
57. Third Street / Jerrold Avenue	49	D	>80	F	>80	F	
59. Harney Way / Executive Park East	25	С	25	С	25	С	
60. Harney Way / Thomas Mellon Drive	30	С	34	С	33	С	

Notes:

1. Based on intersection numbers identified in the EIR.

2. Delay in seconds per vehicle.

3. Intersections operating at LOS E or LOS F conditions highlighted in bold.

4. Year 2030 analysis includes signalization as part of Executive Park Development or new Harney Interchange.

5. Year 2030 analysis includes signalization as part of Project.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2015
WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR – 2030 CONDITIONS (NO ARENA EVENT)						
· · · · · ·	No Project		Project – Variant 2A		Revised Project	
Intersection	Delay <sup>2</sup>	LOS <sup>3</sup>	Delay <sup>2</sup>	LOS <sup>3</sup>	Delay <sup>2</sup>	LOS <sup>3</sup>
1. Third Street / 25 <sup>th</sup> Street	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
2. Third Street / Cesar Chavez	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
3. Third Street / Cargo Way	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
4. Third Street / Evans Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
5. Third Street / Oakdale Avenue	30	С	62	E	56	E
6. Third Street / Palou Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
7. Third Street / Reverse Avenue	37	D	>80	F	>80	F
8. Third Street / Carroll Avenue	14	В	63	E	62	E
9. Third Street / Paul Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
10. Third Street / Ingerson Avenue	7	А	54	D	55	D
11. Third Street / Jamestown Avenue	30	С	>80	F	>80	F
12. Third Street / Le Conte / US 101 Northbound Off-Ramp	24	С	23	С	22	С
19. Bayshore Boulevard / Paul Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
26. Tunnel Avenue / Blanken Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
27. Geneva Avenue / US 101 Southbound Ramps (Alana Way / Beatty Road)	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
28. Harney Way / US 101 Northbound Ramps (Alana Way / Harney Way / Thomas Mellon)	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
29. Harney Way / Jamestown Avenue <sup>5</sup>	40	E	44	D	42	D

A DI E A. INITEDCECTION

TABLE 4: INTERSECTION LOS WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR – 2030 CONDITIONS (NO ARENA EVENT)						
Textore estimul	No Project		Project – Variant 2A		Revised Project	
Intersection	Delay <sup>2</sup>	LOS <sup>3</sup>	Delay <sup>2</sup>	LOS <sup>3</sup>	Delay <sup>2</sup>	LOS <sup>3</sup>
30. Crisp Road / Palou Avenue / Griffith Street	58	E	67	E	63	E
34. Arelious Walker / Gilman Avenue <sup>5</sup>	>50 (WB)	F	36	D	36	D
35. Amador Street / Cargo Way / Illinois Street	60	E	66	E	62	E
49. Bayshore Boulevard / Geneva Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
56. Third Street / Williams Avenue / Van Dyke Avenue	17	В	>80	F	>80	F
57. Third Street / Jerrold Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
59. Harney Way / Executive Park East	25	С	26	С	26	С
60. Harney Way / Thomas Mellon Drive	19	В	26	С	25	С

Notes:

1. Based on intersection numbers identified in the EIR.

2. Delay in seconds per vehicle.

3. Intersections operating at LOS E or LOS F conditions highlighted in bold.

4. Year 2030 analysis includes signalization as part of Executive Park Development or new Harney Interchange.

5. Year 2030 analysis includes signalization as part of Project.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2015

As shown in Tables 3 and 4, with the addition of the movie theater, the study intersections will continue to operate at the same LOS compared to Project Variant 2A during the AM and PM peak hour. 19 of the 25 study intersections would continue to operate at LOS E or F during the weekday AM or PM peak hour and 18 of those intersections would continue to experience a significant project impact. One of the intersections operating at LOS E or F, Bayshore Boulevard / Hester Avenue, was not projected to experience a significant project impact in the original EIR because the Project would not significantly contribute<sup>2</sup> to the intersection; however, the revised Project's contribution would not significantly contribute to the intersection; however, the revised Project's revised Project would not cause any additional intersections operating acceptably under the no project condition to operate unacceptably beyond those identified in the EIR.

Further, the revised Project will not make a considerable contribution to critical movements operating unacceptably beyond those identified in the EIR. The revised Project's contribution would not substantially worsen the intersections operations, as shown in Appendix A, by the negligible change in volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratios and percent contribution to the critical movements.<sup>3</sup>

The revised Project will not create any new significant impacts compared to those identified in the EIR, nor would it substantially worsen the severity of those significant impacts that were identified in the EIR. Therefore, the results and conclusions from the EIR remain applicable to the Revised Project.

#### **Traffic Analysis Results with Event**

The revised Project includes a 4,400 seat arena in the Candlestick Hunters Point area, compared to the 10,000 seat arena approved in the EIR. The transportation analysis in the EIR assumed the worst-case scenario, in which a 10,000 person event is held on a weekday evening.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> An intersection was considered a significant contribution if with the Project, the intersection was operating at LOS E or F and the Project was to contribute greater than 5-percent of Project traffic to a critical movement operating at LOS E or F.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> As shown in Appendix A, the revised Project would increase the Project's contribution by 1-percent or less at study intersections operating at LOS E or F during the AM and PM peak hour, except at 2 intersections. At Third Street / Carroll Avenue and Third Street / Paul Avenue, the revised Project would contribute an additional 15 and 30 trips, respectively, during the weekday PM peak hour. However, the intersection's v/c ratio would remain approximately the same as reported in the EIR. Therefore, the revised Project's contribution would not substantially worsen the intersection's operations.

Since the revised Project would result in congested traffic prior to an arena event, traffic impacts associated with the arena during arena events would be *significant*. However, as shown in Tables 2 and 3, the revised Project will generate less trips than the approved Project Variant 2A with a sold-out arena event. Therefore the impacts associated with an Arena Event in the revised Project scenario will be less than the impacts reported in the EIR. Furthermore, the results and conclusions stated in the EIR are applicable to the revised Project.

As described in the section above, the revised Project will decrease the Project travel demand during the AM peak hour and increase the Project travel demand during the PM peak hour under conditions with no arena event. However, based on the traffic analysis described above, the revisions to the Project would not result in any additional impacts as the results indicate similar intersection delay and levels of service to what was described in the EIR.

#### IMPACTS TR-17 THROUGH TR-30: IMPACTS TO LOCAL AND REGIONAL TRANSIT OPERATIONS AND CAPACITY

The EIR described the Project's impacts to transit in Impacts TR-17 through TR-30. Impacts TR-17 through TR-20 identified that, with implementation of the Project's Transit Operating Plan (identified as Mitigation Measure MM TR-17), the Project would provide adequate transit capacity locally, at the standard Downtown screenlines, and regionally to meet its projected demand. With implementation of MM TR-17, Impacts TR-17 through TR-20 were determined to be less than significant.

The EIR also identified Impacts TR-21 through TR-27, which describe impacts to transit travel time associated with Project-generated traffic congestion on specific corridors affecting specific transit lines. Mitigation Measures MM TR-21 through MM TR-27 were identified and consist of three parts:

- Transit travel times should be monitored throughout the course of project buildout to determine whether Project-generated traffic is decreasing transit travel speeds.
- If speeds are decreasing, travel time reduction measures should be implemented on the affected corridors. These measures typically involve dedication of transit-only lanes.
- If reduction measures are either infeasible or not effective at improving travel speeds, new vehicles should be purchased to allow SFMTA to maintain planned service frequencies.

However, because implementation of these measures requires substantial additional outreach and design, the feasibility of these measures is uncertain, and Impacts TR-21 through TR-27 were determined to be significant and unavoidable.<sup>4</sup>

The EIR also identifies Impact TR-28, a significant and unavoidable impact to SFMTA transit express routes using US 101 that may be slowed down by Project-generated freeway traffic for which no mitigation measures were identified. Impact TR-29 was identified as a less than significant impact to SFMTA transit express routes using I-280 because project-generated traffic on this route would not be as substantial. Impact TR-30 would be a significant and unavoidable impact to other regional transit routes (such as SamTrans express routes) using regional facilities to which the Project would contribute substantial amounts of traffic congestion.

Transit ridership is expected to slightly increase under the revised proposal compared to Project Variant 2A. However, the increase in transit ridership is less than one percent, and is not likely to result in a measurable change to ridership, as described in **Table 5** below.

TABLE 5: WEEKDAY AM AND PM PEAK HOUR TRANSIT PERSON TRIPS				
Scenario	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour		
EIR	884	1,801		
Revised Project	878	1,818		
Delta	-6 (<-1%)	+17 (<+1%)		

Notes:

1. Office to retail land use change results in slight change in AM and PM peak hour vehicle trips then reported in the EIR.

2. Assumes no major event during the AM peak hour, however does account for arena employees.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2015

Additionally, the revised Project's impacts to traffic operations are expected to be similar to those described in the EIR, and the revised Project is not likely to result in any new significant impacts to

<sup>4</sup> Since the EIR was approved, TR-23 and TR-MM-23 were reviewed and a revised TR-MM-23 was proposed. The revised mitigation measure would result in better operations along Gilman Avenue than what was reported in the approved EIR, however, would still result in a significant and unavoidable impact. Detailed analysis and discussion are included in an addendum addressed to the SF Planning Department and Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure in August 2015, titled *Draft Analysis of Transportation Effects of Proposed Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue in Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan.* 

transit operations. Therefore, the revised Project is not expected to change the results of the impacts described in TR-17 through TR-30 in the EIR.

#### IMPACTS TR-31 AND TR-32: BICYCLE CIRCULATION

The EIR described impacts to bicycle circulation in Impacts TR-31 and TR-32. Impact TR-31 identified that through the implementation of the Project, bicycle facilities in the form of off-street Class I pathways, bicycle lanes (Class II facilities), or signed routes (Class III facilities) would be expanded to serve additional users, resulting in a beneficial impact of the Project or no impact. TR-31 concluded that the overall bicycle access and bicycling environment would improve within and in the vicinity of the Project and the proposed facilities would be adequate to meet the bicycle demand associated with the Project uses.

Impact TR-32 identified that the Project's proposed transit treatments and the increase in traffic volumes on Palou Avenue would result in impacts on bicycle travel between Griffith Street and Third Street (Bicycle Routes #70 and #170). Implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-32 (MM TR-32), determine the feasibility of relocating Bicycle Routes #70 and #170), would result in a significant and unavoidable impact because the feasibility of the relocation of the routes is uncertain at the time of the EIR. Since the EIR has been approved, SFMTA has studied possible alternatives, although the results of that study have yet to be determined; therefore TR-32 remains a significant and unavoidable impact.

The revised Project would include additional development within Candlestick Point with the addition of the movie theater and may increase bicycle travel within and adjacent to the Project area. The revised Project will not remove or add bicycle facilities to the proposed network. However, because the revised Project is only slightly changing the total peak hour traffic generation within the Project site and is not affecting the bicycle infrastructure proposed as part of the Project, the revised Project is not likely to result in any new significant impacts to bicycle circulation. Therefore, the revised Project is not expected to change the results of the impacts described in TR-31 and TR-32.

#### IMPACTS TR-33 AND TR-34: PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION

The EIR described impacts of pedestrian circulation in TR-33 and TR-34. Similar to TR-31, the implementation of the Project would expand pedestrian facilities in the form of sidewalks and

#### Exhibit M Page 16 of 21

connecting the Project site to existing neighborhoods, resulting in a beneficial impact of the Project or no impact. TR-34 identified that implementation of the Project would result in an increase in traffic volumes in the Project vicinity that could increase pedestrian-vehicle and pedestrian-bicycle conflicts. However, the existing and proposed pedestrian facilities would be adequate to meet the pedestrian demand associated with the project land uses and the Project impacts on pedestrian circulation within and in the vicinity of the Project would be less than significant.

The revised Project would include additional development within Candlestick Point with the addition of the movie theater and may increase pedestrian travel within and adjacent to the Project area. However, the revised Project is not likely to result in any new significant impacts to pedestrian circulation; therefore, the revised Project is not expected to change the results of the impacts described in TR-33 and TR-34.

#### IMPACTS TR-35 AND TR-36: PARKING

The EIR identified Impacts TR-35 and TR-36, which determined that although the Project would result in a shortfall of parking spaces compared to its projected demand and would remove some existing on-street parking spaces, the Project's impacts to parking conditions would be less than significant. The EIR concluded there would be a range of between approximately 2,800 spaces and 20,000 spaces in the entire development area. The revised Project would include additional off-street parking supply in CP 02-03-04 as documented in **Table 6** below.

TABLE 6: SUMMARY OF PARKING SUPPLY COMPARISON IN CP 02-03-04 (ORIGNAL 2010 PLAN VS REVISED PROJECT)						
	Maximum Supply Rate	Original 2010 Plan		Revised Project		
Land Use		Proposed Amount	Maximum Number of Spaces	Proposed Amount	Maximum Number of Spaces	
Office	1 space / ksf	150 ksf	150	134.5	135	
Regional Retail	2.7 space / ksf	635 ksf	1,715	635 ksf	1,715	
Local Serving Retail						
Grocery Store	2.7 space / ksf			35 ksf	95	
Other Local Serving Retail	1 space / ksf	125 ksf	125	96 ksf	96	
International African Market Place & CPSRA Welcome Center	1 space / 2 ksf			8 ksf	4	
Performance Venue	1 space / 15 seats	10,000 seats	667	4,400 seats	147	
Movie Theater	1 space / 8/10 seats <sup>1</sup>			1,200 seats	145	
Harney/Ingerson Housing	1 space / unit			265 units	265	
SFPD	1 space / 2 ksf			1 ksf	1	
Community Serving Uses	1 space / 2 ksf			41 ksf	21	
Residential Tower	1 space / unit	280 units	280	220 units	220	
Other Residential	1 space / unit	745 units	745	1,080 units	1,080	
Hotel	0.25 spaces / room	220 rooms	55	220 rooms	55	
				-269		
	Grand Total		3,737		4,245	

Notes:

1. 1/8/10 seats = 1 parking space / 8 seats up to 1,000 seats + 1 parking space / 10 seats above 1,000 seats Source: Fehr & Peers, 2015

The revised Project would include additional development within Candlestick Point with the addition of the movie theater and may increase parking demand within and adjacent to the Project area. However, the revised Project is not likely to result in any new significant impacts to parking; therefore, the revised Project is not expected to change the results of the impacts described in TR-35 and TR-36.

#### IMPACT TR-37: LOADING

The EIR identified Impact TR-37 and determined that the Project would provide adequate loading supply and therefore concluded that impacts related to loading would be less than significant, and that no mitigation measures would be required.

The revised Project would include additional development within Candlestick Point with the addition of the movie theater and may increase daily and peak hour loading space demand within the Project area. However, the revised Project is not likely to result in any new significant impacts to loading; therefore, the revised Project is not expected to change the results of the impacts described in TR-37.

#### IMPACTS TR-38 THROUGH TR-50: STADIUM IMPACTS

The revised Project does not include construction of a new stadium. Furthermore, the existing stadium at Candlestick Point has already been demolished and the 49ers games are played elsewhere. Game day impacts for the revised Project are not applicable.

#### IMPACT TR-51 THROUGH TR-55: ARENA IMPACTS

The EIR included a 10,000 seat arena in the Candlestick Point area. As described in the section above, the revised Project would substantially reduce the capacity of the proposed event space from 10,000 seats to 4,400 seats. As shown in Table 2, above, the peak hour travel demand associated on conditions with an arena event would be lower with the revised Project compared to the project described in the EIR. Therefore, the implementation of the revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Exhibit M Page 19 of 21

#### IMPACT TR-56: AIR TRAFFIC IMPACTS

The EIR determined that the Project would have a less than significant impact on air traffic. The revised Project would contain the same overall land uses and general development form and would not change the EIR's conclusion regarding air traffic. The revised Project would not create any new significant impacts with respect to air traffic and no additional mitigation measures are required.

#### IMPACT TR-57: HAZARDS DUE TO DESIGN FEATURES

The EIR determined that the Project's transportation infrastructure would be designed in accordance with City standards, and would be reviewed and approved by the City prior to construction. As a result the Project's impacts to hazards would be less than significant. The revised Project would also be designed accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. Therefore, no new significant impacts to design features have been identified and no mitigation measures are required.

#### IMPACT TR-58: EMERGENCY ACCESS

The EIR determined that the Project's transportation infrastructure would adequately facilitate emergency access and be designed to City standards, which include provisions that address emergency vehicles. The revised Project would also be designed accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. Therefore, no new significant impacts to emergency access have been identified and no mitigation measures are required.

#### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

As noted in the EIR, the discussion of cumulative impacts was included with the discussion of project-related impacts in Impacts TR-1 through TR-58 and no additional cumulative impact discussion is necessary. Similar to what is described above and in the EIR, since the revised design would generate similar levels of travel demand at buildout and would have a similar transportation infrastructure, the modified Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be the same as what is described in the EIR.

#### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the revised Project would not change or alter any of the EIR's findings with respect to transportation impacts. All impacts would remain less than significant, less than significant with mitigation, or significant and unavoidable, as previously identified, and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the EIR's transportation cumulative impact conclusions would not be altered.

For questions or comments please contact Chris Mitchell or Sarah Nadiranto.

Sincerely,

FEHR & PEERS

Chris Mitchell, PE Principal

Jehn

Sarah Nadiranto, PE Transportation Engineer

SF08-0407

Attachments Appendix A – AM and PM Peak Hour Results Summary



Keymap



Existing

Proposed - October 26 2010

Proposed - August 06 2015



**Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations** August 10, 2015

06 – NB 101 Harney Way Off-Ramp





2015 RESIDENTIAL TOWER



### Exhibit N Page 1 of 18

### Existing





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

06 – NB 101 Harney Way Off-Ramp



# Exhibit N Page 2 of 18

Proposed October 26 2010





**Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations** August 10, 2015

06 – NB 101 Harney Way Off-Ramp





# Exhibit N Page 3 of 18

Proposed June 03 2010





**Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations** August 10, 2015

06 – NB 101 Harney Way Off-Ramp





# Exhibit N Page 4 of 18



Keymap



Existing

Proposed - October 26 2010

Proposed - August 06 2015



**Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations** August 10, 2015

09 – Open Space South of Harney towards Candlestick



CPHPS PHASE II 2010 RESIDENTIAL TOWER 2015 RESIDENTIAL TOWER

Exhibit N Page 5 of 18



### Existing





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations September 2, 2015

09 – Open Space South of Harney towards Candlestick



# Exhibit N Page 6 of 18

Proposed October 26, 2010





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations September 2, 2015

09 – Open Space South of Harney Towards Candlestick



### Exhibit N Page 7 of 18



# Exhibit N Page 8 of 18

Tower Design Scenario #1 - Tower G: East-West Orientation





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations September 2, 2015

09 – Open Space South of Harney Towards Candlestick



### Exhibit N Page 9 of 18

Tower Design Scenario #2 - Tower G: North-South Orientation





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations September 2, 2015

09 – Open Space South of Harney Towards Candlestick



Exhibit N Page 10 of 18



Keymap



Existing

Proposed - October 26 2010

Proposed - August 06 2015



**Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations** August 10, 2015

11 – SRA Towards Candlestick



2015 RESIDENTIAL TOWER



### Existing





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

11 – SRA Towards Candlestick



# Exhibit N Page 12 of 18

Proposed October 26 2010





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

11 – SRA Towards Candlestick



# Exhibit N Page 13 of 18

Proposed June 03, 2015





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

11 – SRA Towards Candlestick



# Exhibit N Page 14 of 18



Keymap



Existing

Proposed - October 26 2010

Proposed - August 06 2015



**Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations** August 10, 2015

17 – Mariner Village Towards Candlestick





- 2015 RESIDENTIAL TOWER



# Exhibit N Page 15 of 18

Existing





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

17 – Mariner Village Towards Candlestick



Exhibit N Page 16 of 18

Proposed October 26 2010





**Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations** August 10, 2015

17 – Mariner Village Towards Candlestick







Exhibit N Page 17 of 18

Proposed June 03, 2015





**Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations** August 10, 2015

17 – Mariner Village Towards Candlestick





Exhibit N Page 18 of 18



xhibit O: IBI Shadow Analysis and Memo

700–1285 West Pender Street Vancouver BC V6E 4B1 Canada tel 604 683 8797 fax 604 683 0492 ibigroup.com

February 5, 2016

#### SHADOW STUDY OVERVIEW

#### Purpose

This shadow analysis has been prepared in order to identify the shadow impact from project changes at Candlestick Point on City parks outside of the Candlestick redevelopment project boundary. Specifically, these parks are Bayview Hill Park and Gilman Park. In addition, the analysis considers shadow impacts of the parks within the project boundary, including:

- Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA), which is under State jurisdiction
- Bayview Gardens / Wedge Destination Park (BGWDP)
- Mini-Wedge Community Park (MWCP)
- Jamestown Hillside Community Park (JHCP)

The project changes that require shadow analysis are:

- Revised locations of Towers G, J, and K
  - Revised building heights along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue:
    - Mixed-use Residential from 65' max height to 80' max height
    - Film Arts Center from 85' max height to 120' max height

These changes are described in more detail in Addendum 4 to the Candlestick Point - Hunters Point Phase 2 Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR).

#### Process

The shadow impacts were measured at three times during the day on Winter Solstice (10 am, 12 pm and 3 pm), which is consistent with the Shadow Analysis in the FEIR.

#### Methodology

The shadows from both the 2010 layout and 2016 layout were generated in Google Sketchup. The topography within the model is based upon the survey of surrounding lands at 5 foot contour intervals, and the proposed topography within the site at 1 foot contour intervals.

Shadow differences have been measured by creating the shadows from the 2010 model in a different colour than those in the 2016 model, and using Photoshop to indicate areas where there is no overlap (i.e. there is a difference in shadow). Those areas that are consistent are not indicated, resulting in a clear picture that identifies shadow differences between the two models, seen by differing colors.

Two analyses are prepared as part of the analysis:

- 1. The first examines the shadow impact from all buildings at Candlestick. This analysis has been prepared to ensure there is clarity on the overall project shadow impact, beyond those that result from the design changes.
- 2. The second examines only the shadows from the building design changes. This analysis has been prepared to assist in the review of the impact based solely on the specific changes.

#### Results

The results of the analysis are based on a qualitative assessment of the shadow impact, focusing on the City parks outside of the project boundary, and the CPSRA and City parks noted above within the project boundary. The vast majority of increased shadow impact, especially in relation to the increased building height of the Mixed-use Residential buildings from 65' to 80', results in additional shadows cast on city streets at all three times analyzed (10am; 12pm; 3pm). Specific park related shadow impacts are discussed below.

#### **City Parks outside Project Boundary**

There are no shadow impacts on parks outside of the project boundary at any of the times analyzed when compared to the 2010 building layout.

IBI Group is a group of firms providing professional services. IBI Group Architects, formerly IBI/HB Architects, is a member of the IBI Group of firms. Principals in IBI Group Architects are: Martin G. B. Brückner, Architect AIBC, Ronald J. Eagleston, Architect AIBC, Tony S. Gill, Architect AIBC, Anita Leonoff, Architect AIBC, David M. Thom, Architect AIBC

Exhibit O Page 1 of 5

### Exhibit O: IBI Shadow Analysis and Memo

#### **CPSRA**

There are no changes to the shadow impact on the CPSRA at 10am or 12pm. At 3 pm, there is a change in impact based on the relocation of Tower J, which shifted south due to a revision of the overall streets and blocks pattern within CP South. The relocation of Tower J results in a slight increase in shadow on the CPSRA at 3 pm when examining the shadows cast from all buildings (~10,000 sq.ft / 0.2 ac of additional shadow); however, when considering the shadows from only those blocks that have resulted in changes in tower locations and/or building heights, there is a sight decrease of shadow. The discrepancy in shadowing is because, when considering only those blocks that have changed, the shift in location of the tower to the south results in a net decrease in shadow, as more shadow was cast by Tower J at the north side in 2010 than at the south side in 2016. However, when considering all buildings, most of the shadow at the north from the 2010 placement falls within the shadow cast from other towers within CP South, and is therefore cancelled out by the other tower shadows. As a result, when considering the shadow cast from all buildings, there is a net increase in shadow.

It is noted that there has always been modest shadow impacts on the CPSRA, generally in the late afternoon / early evening, as described in the FEIR, and the new Tower J shift results in a very small impact on these results (0.2% extra shadow across the entire CPSRA area).

#### **City Parks within Project Boundary**

The 2016 tower locations show both an increase and decrease in overall shadow impact, dependent on the park and the time of the day.

At 10am, there is a no significant change in shadow across the BGWDP. At JHCP, the shifting of Tower G southwest has resulted in a minor increase of shadowing; however, the shadows in 2016 fall upon a very steep section of the park, well away from any areas suitable for outdoor activity. There is no net impact of shadows across the MWCP.

At 12pm, the shifting of Tower J southwest has resulted in a minor increase in the shadowing on BGWDP. Despite the increase in shadowing, the shadow has shifted from the location of the proposed Bus Rapid Transit, which will be a high-pedestrian zone, to a different section of the park that is less likely to be as heavily used. The shifting of Tower K to the southeast and the increased height of mid-rise buildings along CP South block 8a results in an increase of shadowing across the western most portion of the BGWDP, representing a band that is ~15-18' wide by approximately 200' in length. This shadow lies in the central portion of the park, keeping the northern end out of shadow. At the MWCP, there is an insignificant increase in shadowing at the western tip of the Park due to the shifting of Tower J eastward.

At 3pm, there is an increase in shadow impact on the MWCP resulting from the shifting of Tower J to the southeast. This increased shadow results in the entirety of the park being shadowed; however, it should be noted that in the 2010 building locations, the vast majority of the park was shadowed.

#### Other Considerations

Finally, though not related to the shadow impact on City Parks or the CPSRA specifically, the shift in the location of tower G results in the following positive changes to the experience of users within the City Parks:

- Significantly increases the distance of the tower from Gilman Park, resulting in a less visible tower skyline and visual impact from the park; and
- Greatly improves the view to the Bay from the primary lookout point atop the Bayview Hill.

In addition, the shifting of Tower G results in less shadow across the primary pedestrian pathways within CP Center - the regional retail center - which will improve the pedestrian experience.

Gavin Blackstock, MCIP RPP

tebruary

### Exhibit O Page 2 of 5

# Exhibit O: IBI Shadow Analysis and Memo SHADOW STUDY: DECEMBER 21 - 10AM

2010 Tower Locations/ Building Heights



Shadow Study Based on Building Heights of 2010 D4D

- 1 CP State Recreation Area
- 2 Gilman Park (outside project)
- 3 Bayview Hill Park (outside project)
- 4 Yosemite Slough (outside project)

-	-	-
6	Mini-wedge Community	/ Park

**5** Bayview Gardens / Wedge Destination Park

- 7 Jamestown Hillside Community Park
- G Tower Name





2016 Tower Locations/ Building Heights



Shadow Study Based on Building Heights of 2016 D4D

- **Project Boundary** State Recreation Area Boundary
- City Park Boundary (outside project)
- City Park Boundary (inside project)
- Boundaries of Revised Blocks in 2016



Hill Park) or the CPSRA.

Difference

• No impact to City Parks outside of the project boundary (Gilman Park and Bayview

• Tower J results in a minor increase in park shadowing across the Bayview Gardens Wedge Park (~10' wide shadow band).

· Tower G relocation results in a minor increase of shadow on the to Jamestown Hillside Community Park (~ 3%); however, the shadowing has shifted to the steepest portion of the park, which will not be usable due to grades.

# Exhibit O Page 3 of 5

# Exhibit O: IBI Shadow Analysis and Memo SHADOW STUDY: DECEMBER 21 - 12PM

2010 Tower Locations/ Building Heights



Shadow Study Based on Building Heights of 2010 D4D

- 1 CP State Recreation Area
- 2 Gilman Park (outside project)
- 3 Bayview Hill Park (outside project)
- 4 Yosemite Slough (outside project)

6	Mini-wedge Community Park	
6	Mini-wedge Community Park	

**5** Bayview Gardens / Wedge Destination Park

- 7 Jamestown Hillside Community Park
- G Tower Name



**Candlestick Point** Shadow Study В February 5, 2016



Shadow Study Based on Building Heights of 2016 D4D

- Project Boundary State Recreation Area Boundary
- City Park Boundary (outside project)
- City Park Boundary (inside project)
- Boundaries of Revised Blocks in 2016



#### Analysis

- Hill Park) or the CPSRA.
- east of Ingerson.
- the northwest end.
- length (~200').

• No impact to City Parks outside of the project boundary (Gilman Park and Bayview

• Shadowing from Tower J on the Bayview Gardens Wedge Park has shifted from the proposed BRT stop (Harney Way @ Ingerson) to a less activated portion of the park,

• Tower J results in an insignificant increase in shadowing to the Mini-wedge Park at

• Tower K and the midrise building along Harney Way (CP South Block 8a) result in an increase of shadowing to the Bayview Gardens Wedge Park of ~15-18' for one block

# Exhibit O Page 4 of 5

# Exhibit O: IBI Shadow Analysis and Memo SHADOW STUDY: DECEMBER 21 - 3 PM

2010 Tower Locations/ Building Heights



Shadow Study Based on Building Heights of 2010 D4D

- 1 CP State Recreation Area
- 2 Gilman Park (outside project)
- 3 Bayview Hill Park (outside project)
- 4 Yosemite Slough (outside project)

5	Bayview Gardens / Wedge Destination Park
6	Mini-wedge Community Park

- 7 Jamestown Hillside Community Park
- G Tower Name





2016 Tower Locations/ Building Heights



Shadow Study Based on Building Heights of 2016 D4D

- Project Boundary State Recreation Area Boundary
- City Park Boundary (outside project)
- City Park Boundary (inside project)
- Boundaries of Revised Blocks in 2016



Hill Park).

Difference

- Park.

· No impact to City Parks outside of the project boundary (Gilman Park and Bayview

· Minor increase in shadow within the CPSRA based on shift in location of Tower J due to road realignment within CP South.

· Towers J relocation results in minor increase of shadow to Mini-wedge Park; however, the shadow impact results in virtually no solar access onto the entirety of the

# Exhibit O Page 5 of 5

### Exhibit P: 1.22.16 Ramboll Environ Letter

Via electronic mail

Joy Navarrete Senior Environmental Planner San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103 joy.navarrete@sfgov.org

#### RE: EVALUATION OF AIR QUALITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS OF PROPOSED PROJECT REVISIONS ASSOCIATED WITH DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPLICATION FOR CP SUB-PHASE 02-03-04, CANDLESTICK POINT/HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD PHASE II PROJECT, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Dear Ms. Navarrete:

The Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project Final EIR (herein referred to as "EIR") was certified by the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission and the San Francisco Planning Commission in June 2010. We understand that the City and Office of Community Investment & Infrastructure are evaluating several Project Revisions associated with the development plan application for Sub-Phase 02-03-04 at Candlestick Point (CP). These Project Revisions include:

- 1. Relocation of three towers (Towers G, J and K);
- 2. Height increases for several locations in CP Center, specifically
  - (a) Increasing the height of buildings on both sides of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue from 65 feet to 80 feet;
  - (b) Increasing the height of the building at the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue from 85 feet to 120 feet; and
  - (c) Increasing the height for the building at the corner of Arelious Walker and Harney Way from65 feet to 80 feet.
- 3. Conversion of 15,500 square feet approved office space to 6,000 square feet of local-serving retail;
- 4. Relocation of on-street parking spaces to the CP Center garage;
- 5. Dividing the construction the first phase of Harney Way improvements into two phases; and
- 6. Revising the cross-section of Gilman Avenue to reduce travel lanes and provide larger sidewalks.

### Exhibit P: 1.22.16 Ramboll Environ Letter

This memorandum evaluates whether the air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts disclosed in the EIR are affected by these changes.

#### 1. Relocation of Towers

The relocation of three towers would not affect the analysis of criteria air pollutant (CAP) and GHG emissions in the EIR as the overall square footage of the Project would not be altered. This Project revision would also have a negligible effect on the health risk assessment (HRA) from construction emissions as the towers would be relocated within the same sub-phases as previously analyzed. The HRA analysis in the EIR assumes construction emissions are distributed throughout the sub-phase, so relocation of the towers within the respective sub-phases would not change the analysis.

#### 2. Height Increases in CP Center

The increase in maximum building height for three locations in CP Center would not affect the analysis of CAP and GHG emissions in the EIR because the overall square footage of the Project would not be altered. We understand that this would change the massing of the buildings; however, not the overall floor space for entitlements. Because the models used in the EIR to estimate construction emissions are based on square footage and not overall area; there would not be a material difference in the way the emissions are estimated. Therefore, this overall emissions for the Project revision would not change and therefore the revised analysis would be identical to the analysis in the EIR. This Project revision would also have a negligible effect on the HRA because total construction emissions would be unchanged from the EIR.

#### 3. Conversion Office Floor Space to Local-Serving Retail

This analysis evaluates the proposed conversion of office floor space to local-serving retail floor space. The analysis is structured to determine the necessary reduction in the amount of office square footage that would be required to allow a 6,000 square foot increase in Local-serving Retail without increasing any of the Project criteria air pollutant (CAP) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions evaluated in the EIR. The detailed evaluation of operational criterial pollutant emission, operational GHG emissions, and construction emissions are discussed below.

#### 3.1 Operational Criterial Pollutant Emissions

To evaluate the minimum size of office land use to be converted to 6,000 square feet of local-serving retail without increasing the total Project operational criteria pollutant emissions, Ramboll Environ estimated 2030 criteria pollutant emissions associated with the proposed 6,000 square feet of local-serving retail using California Emission Estimator Model version 2013.2.2 (CalEEMod®).<sup>1</sup> The proposed local-serving retail is modeled as "Strip Mall", which is consistent with the land use category used for the Local-serving Retail in the EIR. The mobile source emission factors generated using California Air Resources Board (ARB)'s EMFAC2014 model are used to replace the CalEEMod® default that was based on EMFAC2011. EMFAC2014 incorporates new vehicle emissions standards and rules and regulations (e.g., Advanced Clean Cars and Truck & Bus Rule).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> CalEEMod® is a statewide program designed to calculate both criteria and GHG emissions from development projects in California. It was developed in collaboration with California air districts led by South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and is currently supported by several lead agencies for use in quantifying the emissions associated with development projects undergoing environmental review.


The Project criteria pollutant emissions presented in the EIR were previously modeled using URBEMIS 2007 version 9.2.4 for year 2030.<sup>2</sup> The minimum square footage of the previously approved office floor space entitlement that would be converted and its associated CAP emissions were scaled from the previous calculation presented Appendix H1 of the EIR by matching the worst case pollutant (i.e., NOx) of the local-serving retail emissions discussed above. The emission comparison is summarized in Table 1.

As presented in Table 1, adding 6,000 square feet local-serving retail development to the Project without increasing the emissions of any criteria pollutant previously estimated in the EIR would require a removal of at least 10,300 square feet of office.

The proposed local-serving retail development is designed to offer the community retail services (e.g., dry clean, barbershop, grocery and other businesses) within walking distance. The mobile source emissions in this analysis were evaluated using CalEEMod® default trip rates based on ITE Trip Generation, which does not reflect low trip generation rate due to the transit-oriented nature of the development plan. Therefore, the estimated emissions for the proposed local-serving retail uses are conservative. If a detailed site specific trip generation rate were available, it would be likely that less office space would need to be replaced due to lower emissions from mobile sources.

### 3.2 Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

To evaluate the minimum size of office land use to be converted to 6,000 square feet of local-serving retail without increasing the total Project operational GHG emissions, Ramboll Environ estimated the 2020 GHG emissions associated with proposed 6,000 square feet of local-serving retail using CalEEMod®. The mobile source emission factors generated using California Air ARB's EMFAC2014 model are used to replace the CalEEMod® default as discussed in the previous section. In addition, the GHG emissions associated with energy incorporate the 2013 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24) and Pacific Gas and Electric's 2020 carbon intensity factor.

The Project GHG emissions presented in the 2009 EIR were previously calculated for year 2020. In this analysis, the minimum square footage of the previously approved office land use that would be converted and its associated GHG emissions are calculated using the same methodology presented in Appendix S (Climate Change Technical Report) and are summarized in Table 2.

As presented in Table 2, an addition of 6,000 square feet local-serving retail development to the Project without increasing the GHG emissions previously estimated would require a removal of at least 9,200 square feet of previously approved office land use.

As discussed earlier, the CalEEMod® default trip rates does not reflect low trip generation rate due to the nature of the development plan. Therefore, the estimated GHG emissions for the proposed local-serving retails are conservative.

### 3.3 Construction Emissions

The construction emissions presented in the EIR were calculated based on the Project specific construction schedule and equipment list. It is reasonable to assume the proposed local-serving retail

<sup>2</sup> URBEMIS was the land use emissions inventory model recommended used for the EIR. It was widely used before the development of CalEEMod®.

would be constructed over the same construction duration with the same equipment list. In addition, based on the operational criteria pollutant and GHG emission comparison discussed above, the equivalent local-serving retail would be smaller in size. Therefore, converting office into local-serving retail would not generate increased criteria pollutant emissions, GHG emissions, cancer risks, noncancer chronic hazard index (HI), or acute HI associated with the construction activities presented in the EIR.

## 3.4 Summary

Based on the results of the comparison, the proposed addition of 6,000 square feet of local-serving retail would require a reduction of office floor space of at least 10,300 square feet to avoid increasing criteria pollutant emissions, or 9,200 square feet to avoid increasing GHG emissions. Criteria pollutant emissions would be the limiting factor for determining the size of the converted office land use. Therefore, a minimum of 10,300 square feet of office evaluated in the EIR is recommended as a like-for-like replacement for the proposed addition of 6,000 square feet of local-serving retail. The developer is proposing to convert 15,500 square feet of office, which would not increase the Project air quality or GHG impacts anticipated in the EIR.

# 4. Relocation of on-street parking spaces

The developer is proposing to relocate on-street parking to the CP Center garage. This is expected to have negligible effect on construction activity because we understand that the overall building envelope of the CP Center garage will not change from the garage size anticipated in the EIR. As such, there would be no change in the overall CAP and GHG emissions from that evaluated in the EIR. This would also have a negligible effect on the HRA as total construction emissions are unchanged from the EIR.

## 5. Dividing Harney Way improvements into two phases

We understand that this modification results from the need to bifurcate construction on Harney Way into two phases in order to harmonize phasing with other transportation improvements planned for this area. This would not change the overall work planned for the Harney Way improvements; it would merely mean the same amount of work spread over a longer time. As this revision only splits the Harney Way improvements into two phases and does not increase the amount of activity, there is no change in the overall CAP and GHG emissions. This would also have a negligible effect on the HRA as total construction emissions are unchanged from the EIR.

## 6. Revising Gilman Avenue cross-section

We understand that this modification will result in less construction. The original cross-section proposed to widen the Gilman to accommodate two lanes in each direction, whereas under the revised proposal there will be one lane in each direction plus a left turn lane in the middle – the curb to curb width will be 49 feet 9 inches instead of 56 feet. As this revision reflects a reduction in the construction activity (i.e., building a smaller roadway), the construction activity will be lower than that which was analyzed in the EIR. As such, there would be no increase in the overall CAP and GHG emissions. This would also have a negligible effect on the HRA as total construction emissions are reduced from the EIR.

# 7. Conclusion

As discussed for each change above, the Project Revisions are not expected to materially change the results of the analyses conducted in support of the EIR.

If you have any questions about this analysis, please feel free to contact me. Thank you for the opportunity to assist you with this matter.

Yours sincerely

Michael Keinath, PE Principal

D +1 415 796 1934 kaizhao@ramboll.com

**Kai Zhao** Manager

mkeinath@ranboll.com

Attachments:

Tables

 Table 1. Conversion of Office to Local-serving Retail with Equivalent Worst Case

 Criterial

 Pollutant Emissions

 Table 2. Comparison of Office to Local-serving Retail with Equivalent CUC Emissions

Table 2. Conversion of Office to Local-serving Retail with Equivalent GHG Emissions

Exhibit P Page 5 of 8

**TABLES** 

Exhibit P Page 6 of 8

### Table 1

### Conversion of Office to Local-Serving Retail with Equivalent Worst Case Criterial Pollutant Emissions Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan San Francisco, California

Land Use	Size (KSF)	Criteria Pollutant Emissions <sup>4</sup> (Ib/day)					
		ROG	NOx <sup>3</sup>	со	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Local Retail <sup>1</sup>	6	0.27	0.32	1.6	0.008	0.88	0.24
Office (to be replaced) <sup>2,3</sup>	-10.3	-0.34	-0.32	-3.54	-0.010	-1.69	-0.32

### Notes:

1. The criteria pollutant emissions associated with proposed local-serving retail land use are modeled for operation year 2030 using CalEEMod® with the incorporation of the mobile emissions factor generated using ARB's EMFAC 2014 model. The local-serving retail is modeled as a strip mall, which was consistent with the land used category for local-serving retail used in the EIR (see Appendix H1).

2. The criteria pollutant emissions associated with the office land use to be placed (presented as negative emissions) are scaled from the URBEMIS model output presented in Appendix H1 of the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan Project EIR by matching the emissions of the worst case pollutant (i.e., NOx) from the proposed local retail. The office land use was modeled as an office park in the URBEMIS model.

3. Based on the analysis, an addition of 6 KSF local-serving retail to the Project without exceeding the emissions of any criteria pollutant previously estimated in the EIR would require a removal of 10.3 KSF of previously approved office land use.

### Abbreviations:

ARB: California Air Resources Board CalEEMod®: California Emissions Estimator Model CO: carbon monoxide EIR: Environmental impact Report KSF: thousand square feet lb: pound NOx: nitrogen oxides ROG: reactive organic gas SO<sub>2</sub>: sulfur dioxide URBEMIS: Urban Emissions Model

#### References:

San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and San Francisco Planning Commission. Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II EIR: Volume IV Appendix H1.

Available at: http://www.sf-planning.org/modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=334



# Table 2

# Conversion of Office to Local-Serving Retail with Equivalent GHG Emissions Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan San Francisco, California

	GHG Emissions (tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> e/year)			
Source	Local Retail <sup>1</sup>	Office (to be replaced) <sup>2</sup>		
Energy	10.1	-41.3		
Mobile	137	-108		
Water	1.0	-0.9		
Area	0	0		
Waste	2.9	-0.5		
Total (annual emissions)	151	-151		
Size (KSF) <sup>3</sup>	6	-9.2		

### Notes:

1. The greenhouse gas emissions associated with proposed local-serving retail land use are modeled for year 2020 using CalEEMod® with the incorporation of the most recent carbon intensity factor published by PG&E, 2013 California Building Efficiency Standards (Title 24), and mobile emissions factor generated using ARB's EMFAC 2014 model. The local-serving retail is modeled as a strip mall, which was consistent with the land used category for local-serving retail used in the EIR.

2. The greenhouse gas emissions associated with the office land use to be replaced (presented as negative emissions) are calculated for year 2020 using the same methodology presented in Appendix S (Climate Change Technical Report).

3. Based on the comparison, an addition of 6 KSF local-serving retail to the Project without exceeding the greenhouse gas emissions previously estimated in the EIR would require a removal of 9.2 KSF of previously approved office land use.

### Abbreviations:

ARB: California Air Resources Board CalEEMod®: California Emissions Estimator Model CO<sub>2</sub>e: carbon dioxide equivalent EIR: Environmental impact Report KSF: thousand square feet Ib.: pound

## References:

San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and San Francisco Planning Commission. Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II EIR: Volume IV Appendix S. Available at: http://www.sf-planning.org/modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=316



# MEMORANDUM

- To: Joy Navarette Senior Environmental Planner San Francisco Planning Department
- From: B.H. Bronson Johnson Director of Land Development CP Development Co., LP
- Date: January 26, 2016
- Subject: Excavation Quantities at Candlestick Point

Per the request of the City Planning Department, we have prepared the following memorandum to provide an update on excavation quantities at the Candlestick Point Redevelopment Project ("CP") as they compare to the certified Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan Environmental Impact Report (the "EIR"). The design of the CP Retail Center ("CP Center"), which includes an underground parking structure, is still in schematic design and is subject to change prior to issuance of the final permit. Nonetheless, the information presented herein is based on the most recent design information we as the Master Developer, CP Development Co., LP have received from the CP Retail Center Developer.

# EXCAVATION QUANTITY

There are currently 18 Sub-phases in the Candlestick Point Redevelopment Plan.

Page II-54 of the EIR presents Table II-12, *Summary of Project Site Grading Requirements*. At Candlestick Point, the estimated excavation quantity in Development Areas is 1,111,000 CY and the estimated excavation quantity in Open Space Areas is 156,000 CY. As an overall project analysis, we will compare the total estimated excavated quantity of 1,267,000 CY per the EIR, to the current estimated excavation quantities of each Sub-Phase of Development.

The current estimated quantities of excavation are shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Estimated quantities of Excavation at Candlestick Point.

Sub-Phase	<b>Excavation Quantity</b>	Construction Status	
CP-01 Excavation	14,390 CY	Complete	
CP-02 Pad Grading	571,000 CY	Approx. 30% Complete	
CP-02 Soil Nail Wall Excavation	137,300 CY	Not Started	
CP-02 Jamestown Re- Alignment	35,000 CY	Not Started	
CP-05 Excavation	22,100 CY	Not Started	
CP-08 Excavation	415,350 CY	Not Started	
CP-09 Excavation	74,450 CY	Not Started	
Total	1,269,590 CY		



LENNARURBAN.COM

# Exhibit Q: CP Dev Co Excavation Quantities Memo

All other Sub-phases not listed in this table have only fill quantities associated with the grading plan and no additional excavation is proposed.

Based on these current design quantities, we are within 0.2% of the estimated quantities of excavation contemplated in the EIR.

### EXCAVATION DEPTH

Page III.L-25 of the EIR presents Table III.L-5, *Grading and Fill Conditions for Candlestick Point Geotechnical Subparcels*. This Table shows that Geotech Subparcel K1 (Candlestick Point Center) was estimated to have cuts up to 40 ft. The current grading design for the CP Center includes cuts between 15 feet and 25 feet in depth on the majority of the site, and up to approximately 46 ft in select areas where the existing site grades had been built up around the western perimeter of the former football stadium to provide access.

It is not anticipated that this increased excavation depth in a centralized location at CP Center will result in any additional impacts beyond what was considered in the EIR. The increased depth will occur in an area that has the same San Franciscan rock formations present in other areas of excavation within the Project site, and no new soil type is anticipated to be encountered. Additionally, although the excavation depth at this localized area would have a minor increase over the EIR estimate, the overall excavation volume for the site has not increased, resulting in no new impacts due to excavation quantity. Moreover, the minor increase in excavation depth would not require any additional mitigation measures because all impacts associated with excavation would be addressed through the requirement for site specific geotechnical investigations and resulting requirements for excavation and structural protective measures.

### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is our opinion that the proposed excavation at Candlestick Point remains consistent with the approved EIR, will not generate any additional adverse environmental impacts nor necessitate any additional mitigation measures.



LENNARURBAN.COM

Exhibit Q Page 2 of 2

# Exhibit R: Fehr & Peers Loading Letter (2/18/16) FEHR / PEERS

February 18, 2016

Ms. Joy Navarette San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Ms. Lila Hussain Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure One South Van Ness, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, CA 94103

Cc: Therese Brekke, Lennar Urban Chris O'Conner, Lennar Urban Maria Pracher, Sheppard Mullin

# Subject: Candlestick Point – Office to Local Serving Retail Conversion

Dear Joy and Lila,

The *Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project Final EIR* (herein referred to simply as "EIR") was certified by the San Francisco Planning Commission and the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission in June 2010. Since that time, the Housing/R&D Variant (Variant 2A) has been advanced as the project. Variant 2A assumed the Candlestick Point site would include:

- 150,000 square feet of office
- 6,225 residential dwelling units (includes replacement of 256 then-existing units at Alice Griffith)
- 635,000 square feet of regional retail
- 125,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving retail
- 220 room hotel
- 50,000 square feet of community-serving uses
- 10,000-seat arena

Since the Project has been approved, the project sponsor has proposed to replace 15,500 square feet of office with 6,000 square feet of local serving retail and replace the 10,000 seat arena with a 4,400 seat performing arts venue and a 1,200 seat theater. This letter assesses the effects of converting a portion of the approved land uses as it relates to loading demand. **Table 1** summarizes the loading demand calculations for daily and peak hour truck trips and **Table 2** compares the daily truck trip generation and peak hour loading demand.

# Exhibit R: Fehr & Peers Loading Letter (2/18/16)

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure February 18, 2016 Page 2 of 3

#### **TABLE 1: CANDLESTICK POINT LOADING DEMAND** Peak Hour **Daily Truck Trip Daily Truck** Land Use Size Loading Generation Rate<sup>1</sup> Trips Space 635 ksf 0.22 9 **Regional Retail** 140 2 0.22 131 ksf 29 Local Serving Retail Office 134.5 ksf 0.21 29 2 0.22 8 Performing Arts Venue<sup>2</sup> 4.400 seats 1 0.22 **Community Center** 50 ksf 11 1 County Park<sup>3</sup> 0.00 0 0 97 acres Hotel<sup>4</sup> 220 rooms 0.09 14 1 Residential Units<sup>5</sup> 6,225 dwelling units 0.03 234 14 Movie Theater<sup>6</sup> 1,200 seats 0.22 1 10 475 Total 31

Notes:

1. Daily Truck Trip Generation Rates based on rates determined in the SF Guidelines. Rates based on 1,000 gross square feet of use.

2. Performing Arts Venue: 4,400 seats = 33 ksf

3. It was assumed that the County Park would not generate daily truck trips; therefore, was not included in this analysis.

4. Hotel: 220 rooms = 150 ksf

5. Residential Units: 6,225 dwelling units = 7,800 ksf

6. Movie Theater: 1,200 seats = 42 ksf

Fehr & Peers, 2015

### TABLE 2: PROJECT LOADING DEMAND COMPARISON IN CANDLESTICK POINT 1

Scenario	Daily Truck Trip Generation	Peak Hour Loading Space Demand
Project Proposal (2010) <sup>1</sup>	507	29
Project Variant 2A <sup>2</sup>	448	25
Current Proposal	475	31

Notes:

1. Information based on EIR results presented in Table III.D-22 (2010).

2. Information based on Project Variant 2A Memorandum provided by LCW Consulting (March 2010).

Fehr & Peers, 2015

# Exhibit R: Fehr & Peers Loading Letter (2/18/16)

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure February 18, 2016 Page 3 of 3



Impact TR-37 of the EIR states that loading operations would not result in a significant impact associated with a lack of adequate supply. Additionally, the EIR states that if the loading demand is not met on site and could not be accommodated within on-street loading zones, trucks would temporarily double-park and partially block local streets while loading and unloading goods which would result in disruptions and impacts to traffic and transit operations, as well as bicycles and pedestrians. However, because any effects of unmet loading demand would be a temporary inconvenience, any excess demand would not be significant.

As shown in Table 2, the estimated daily truck trip generation will decrease from the total estimated in the EIR and increase from Project Variant 2A. The peak hour loading space demand would slightly increase from the EIR and Project Variant 2A by 2 and 6 loading spaces, respectively. Neither the EIR nor Project Variant 2A included the Arena as part of the Candlestick Point loading demand calculations because Arena loading estimates were provided separate from the rest of the Project. Therefore, the slight increase in peak hour demand is a result of the inclusion of the revised land uses in Candlestick Point. The peak loading demand will likely be met on site, although trucks may temporarily double park for convenience, which would be a short-term inconvenience and would not be significant. Therefore, the Project's impacts related to loading operations would continue to be less than significant.

For questions or comments please contact Chris Mitchell or Sarah Nadiranto.

Sincerely,

FEHR & PEERS

Chris Mitchell, PE Principal

Sarah Nadiranto, PE Transportation Engineer

SF08-0407

# Exhibit R Page 3 of 3