

CHAPTER 2

Project Description

2.A Project Overview

The proposed Balboa Reservoir Project is located on a 17.6-acre site in the West of Twin Peaks area of south central San Francisco (see **Figure 2-1, Location Map**). The site is north of the Ocean Avenue commercial district, west of the City College of San Francisco Ocean Campus, east of the Westwood Park neighborhood, and south of Archbishop Riordan High School. The project site is owned by the City and County of San Francisco ([City](#)) under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). The City, acting by and through the SFPUC, selected Reservoir Community Partners LLC (a joint venture between BRIDGE Housing Corporation [a nonprofit affordable housing developer] and Avalon Bay Communities) to act as master developer for the project site.¹ The proposed project would develop the site with mixed-income housing, open space, a childcare facility/community room available for public use, retail space, on- and off-street parking, and new streets, utilities, and other infrastructure. This subsequent environmental impact report (SEIR) will analyze two different sets of options for the site's residential density to capture a range of possible development on the project site: The first is the Developer's Proposed Option (1,100 dwelling units), proposed by Reservoir Community Partners LLC. The second is the Additional Housing Option (1,550 dwelling units), developed by the City to fulfill the objectives of the San Francisco General Plan (the general plan) to maximize affordable housing and housing in transit-rich neighborhoods. Development under each of the two options would entail the same land uses and street configurations, and similar site plans.

Under each option, the proposed project would amend the general plan and the San Francisco Planning Code, and would create a new Balboa Reservoir Special Use District (SUD). The special use district would establish land use zoning controls and incorporate design standards and guidelines for the site. The San Francisco Zoning Map would be amended to show changes from the current zoning (P [Public]) to the proposed zoning and would modify the existing height limits of 40 to 65 feet to heights of up to 78 feet in the Developer's Proposed Option and up to 88 feet in the Additional Housing Option.

¹ The build-out of the development would involve additional partner firms, including nonprofits Mission Housing Development Corporation and Habitat for Humanity of Greater San Francisco, along with Pacific Union Development Company.

Commented [WE(1)]: Comment from SFMTA (M. Hunter): Most streets in the area are regulated, all "internal streets", those new for this development, will be regulated too whether the freight and passenger loading identified in this doc or basic time limits or metered. This ensures the most efficient use of the curb and helps mitigate what is considered a parking shortfall as noted on p. 3.B-4

Comment from L White: Please explain this in the project description section.

Commented [SY2R1]: [ESA: done and acknowledged in 2.E.8.](#)

Figure 2-1 Location Map

Overall, the proposed project would construct up to approximately 1.8 million gross square feet (gsf) of uses, including between approximately 1.3 and 1.5 million gsf of residential space (1,100 to 1,550 dwelling units plus residential amenities), approximately 10,000 gsf of community space (childcare and a community room for public use), approximately 7,500 gsf of retail, up to 550 residential parking spaces and 750 public parking spaces in the Developer's Proposed Option, and up to 650 residential parking spaces (with no public parking spaces) in the Additional Housing Option.² The buildings would range in height from 25 to 78 feet in the Developer's Proposed Option and from 25 to 88 feet in the Additional Housing Option. Approximately 4 acres would be devoted to publicly accessible open space under each option. Also under each option, the SFPUC would retain ownership of an 80-foot-wide strip of land located along the southern edge of the site where an underground water transmission pipeline is located.

The proposed project (both options) would include transportation and circulation changes, including the extension of existing north-south Lee Avenue across the site, and a new internal street network. The project would include a roadway network that would be accessible for people walking, including people with disabilities, bicycling, and driving. The project would also include new utility infrastructure to supply the site with potable water, wastewater collection, stormwater collection and treatment, electricity, natural gas, and communications.

The proposed project also includes four variants that consider modifications to a limited feature or aspect of the project (e.g., street and garage configurations). Each of the variants are described and analyzed in SEIR Chapter 5, Variants. A brief description is provided under SEIR Section 2.F, Project Variants, p. 2-39.

Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to occur in three main phases over the course of six years, from 2021 to approximately 2027. The initial phase (Phase 0) would include grading, excavation, and construction of site infrastructure over 12 months. During the initial portion of Phase 0, the site may not be available for public parking due to mass grading activities. Two phases of vertical construction would follow, each lasting approximately 24 to 30 months. During construction of Phase 1, unused portions of the site would be paved to allow surface vehicular parking until Phase 2 construction begins. During construction of Phase 2 and operation of Phase 1, some surface vehicular parking areas would be available along streets constructed during Phase 1 and the SFPUC open space area; however, the public parking garage would not be yet available, as it would be under construction during Phase 2. Public parking would be accommodated in the public parking garage (under the Developer's Proposed Option), when it is completed.

² Gross square feet includes residential circulation and common area, and it is different from the planning code definition.

Commented [WE(3)]: Comment from SFMTA (Mari Hunter) confirming the reduction of public parking to zero is with regard to a garage, not on-street public parking (this is made clear on p. 2-13) >> up to 550 residential parking spaces and 750 public parking spaces in the Developer's Proposed Option, and up to 650 residential parking spaces (with no public parking spaces) in the Additional Housing Option.

[JP: ESA/sponsor, please confirm my edit to address this comment.]

Commented [SY4R3]: ESA: sponsor team confirmed and detailed further in section 2.G.4

2.B Project Objectives

2.B.1 Project Objectives

The City and County of San Francisco and the SFPUC, as the current owner of the project site, and Reservoir Community Partners LLC, the project sponsor, seek to fulfill the following shared objectives associated with the Balboa Reservoir project:

- Implement the goals of the City’s 2014 Public Land for Housing program and the Surplus Public Lands Initiative (Proposition K), passed by the voters in November 2015, by replacing an underused surface parking lot located on surplus public land with a substantial amount of new housing, including a high percentage of affordable housing.
- Implement the objectives and goals of the General Plan Housing Element and of the 2009 Balboa Park Station Area Plan that calls for the development of a mixed-use residential neighborhood on the west reservoir to address the citywide demand for housing.
- Contribute to the City’s goal of creating 5,000 housing units each year on a site specifically identified in the general plan for additional housing in close proximity to local and regional public transportation by maximizing the number of housing units in the project.
- Build a high-quality residential community with a wide range of building types and heights, and a range of dwelling unit type and tenure, which will provide new residents with the greatest variety of housing options.
- Build a mixed-income community with a high percentage of affordable units to provide housing options for households at a range of income levels, and by doing so facilitate a neighborhood that fosters personal connections across income ranges.
- Replace the reservoir’s abandoned infrastructure with new infrastructure improvements, including new streets and sidewalks, bicycle and pedestrian amenities, pedestrian paseos and multiuse paths, water, sewer and gas/electric utilities, new fire hydrant infrastructure and an extension of the City’s Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS), and community facilities including one new public park, another major open space, a community center, and a childcare facility.
- Establish pedestrian and bicycle connections from the p-Project site to adjacent neighborhoods including City College of San Francisco, Ocean Avenue, Sunnyside and Westwood Park, and increase and improve pedestrian access to transit connections in the area including Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), Municipal Railway (Muni) light-rail and bus lines, and Muni’s City College loop Terminal.³
- As stated in the City’s Balboa Reservoir Request for Proposals, work with City College to address parking needs by identifying alternative parking and transportation solutions.
- Develop a project that is financially feasible and able to support the financial investment that will be required to realize it, including equity and debt return levels that will be required by investors and lenders to finance residential developments, as well as eligibility for required federal, state, regional, and local sources of subsidy for infrastructure and utility construction and affordable housing.

³ The City College Terminal was formerly known as the Phelan Loop.

Commented [PJ(5)]: Global edit: call this City College Terminal.

Commented [SY6R5]: ESA: noted

Commented [WW(7)]: What does this mean?

Commented [SY8R7]: ESA: per the sponsor - this language is from the RFP: ""As stated in the City’s Balboa Reservoir Request for Proposals, work with City College to identify alternative parking facilities and/or alternative transportation management policies to reduce parking demand."

Commented [HSY(9)]: Why don’t we delete “alternative?”

Commented [SY10R9]: ESA: since ‘alternative’ has another meaning under CEQA, suggest deleting.

Commented [HSY(11)]: Planning recommends moving this objective to the Shared Objectives [JP: I agree]

WW: The city sponsor team should decide on this.

Commented [SY12R11]: ESA: sponsor team agreed. This has been moved into the shared objectives.

The City and SFPUC have the following additional objective:

- Provide SFPUC's water utility ratepayers with fair market value for this utility land asset as required by the City's Charter and applicable law.

Reservoir Community Partners LLC has the following additional objective:

- ~~Develop a project that is financially feasible and able to support the financial investment that will be required to realize it, including equity and debt return levels that will be required by investors and lenders to finance residential developments, as well as eligibility for required federal, state, regional, and local sources of subsidy for infrastructure and utility construction and affordable housing.~~

Commented [HSY(13)]: Planning recommends removing this from the EIR project objectives [JP: I agree]

WW: The city sponsor team should decide on this.

Commented [SY14R13]: ESA: per Jeanie 4/23, leave in and flag for discussion.

Commented [HSY(15)]: Planning recommends moving this objective to the Shared Objectives [JP: I agree]

WW: The city sponsor team should decide on this.

Commented [SY16R15]: ESA: sponsor team agreed. This has been moved into the shared objectives.

2.C Background

SEIR Chapter 1, Introduction, presents a detailed discussion of the area plan approval process, prior environmental review of the area plan, and the relationship of this SEIR to the Balboa Park Station Area Plan [Program] Environmental Impact Report (area plan PEIR, or PEIR). The following provides a description of the project site development background.

2.C.1 Public Lands for Housing and Proposition K

The City established a Public Land for Housing program in 2014 (formerly the Public Sites Program), wherein City agencies examined underutilized City-owned sites for housing potential. The interagency committee site selection process was informed by the general plan, Planning Code section 101.1(b), the Surplus City Property Ordinance (San Francisco Administrative Code chapter 23A), San Francisco Charter section 8A.115 (the Transit First Policy), the San Francisco Health Care Services Master Plan, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA's) Real Estate & Facilities Vision for the 21st Century, the SFPUC Land Use Framework, and the City & County of San Francisco Consolidated Plan. In 2014, the City, in coordination with a robust public outreach process, selected the Balboa Reservoir as the first site identified for housing through this process.

In April 2015, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors established the Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee to solicit public input for the site. Between August 2015 and September 2016, the committee advised the City and developed the Balboa Reservoir Development Principles & Parameters. The principles and parameters guided the selection process of a developer partner to finance and construct a residential development at the site.

In November 2015, the San Francisco electorate approved Proposition K. The ballot measure expanded allowable uses of surplus public land to include affordable housing. Under Proposition K, surplus property developments with 200 or more units would allow mixed-income projects and would also require at least 33 percent of the housing in each such development to be made permanently affordable to low- and moderate-income households.

2.C.2 Competitive Solicitation and Exclusive Negotiation Agreement

In November 2016, the City, through the SFPUC, issued a request for qualifications to initiate a developer solicitation and selection process. Out of nine request for qualifications respondents, the City identified three development teams most qualified to develop the project site. In March 2017 the City invited these development teams to submit comprehensive proposals in response to a request for proposals. The request for proposals panel selected Reservoir Community Partners LLC, and in August 2017 recommended its selection to the SFPUC General Manager.

The City and Reservoir Community Partners, LLC entered into an exclusive negotiating agreement, as authorized by SFPUC Commission resolution no. 17-0225 in November 2017. In April 2018, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted resolution no. 85-18, finding the proposed development of the Balboa Reservoir site to be fiscally feasible under San Francisco Administrative Code chapter 29. This resolution authorized the filing of the environmental application and the San Francisco Planning Department to undertake environmental review as required by San Francisco Administrative Code chapter 31 and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

2.D Project Setting

2.D.1 Balboa Park Station Area Plan

The City adopted the area plan into the general plan in May 2009. The Balboa Reservoir project site comprises the central portion of the plan area, as shown in Figure 2-1, p. 2-2. The 210-acre plan area is generally bounded by parcels along the northern edge of Ocean Avenue, the southern boundary of Archbishop Riordan High School, Judson Avenue and Havelock Street to the north; the northeastern edge of City College, and San Jose and Delano avenues to the east; Niagara and Mount Vernon avenues, and parcels along the southern edges of Geneva and Ocean avenues to the south; and Manor Drive to the west.

The area plan's objectives and policies were developed to implement a set of land use and zoning controls; urban design and architectural guidelines; and transportation/infrastructure, streetscape, and open space improvements that would enhance the overall urban environment and encourage new development, particularly housing and neighborhood-serving commercial uses.⁴ The area plan PEIR estimated that implementation of the area plan would result in a net increase of 1,780 residential units and 104,620 net new gsf of commercial development in the plan area by 2025.⁵ As of September 2018, 273 dwelling units and 40,904 gsf of commercial uses have been built in the

⁴ City and County of San Francisco, *Balboa Park Station Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, December 4, 2008.

⁵ City and County of San Francisco, *Balboa Park Station Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, December 4, 2008.

plan area. Excluding the proposed Balboa Reservoir project, an additional 209 dwelling units and 10,995 gsf of commercial uses are under construction or review in the plan area.⁶

Commented [PJ(17)]: Jeanie to provide update at Screencheck DEIR.

Commented [SY18R17]: ESA: noted

The project site is the western portion of the larger Balboa Reservoir basin. The area plan includes policies to develop the east basin with classroom, administrative, a performing arts center, and other uses in accordance with City College's master plan; and policies to develop the west basin (the project site) with residential and open space uses, and to prioritize affordable housing.⁷

2.D.2 Project Site

The project site is a 17.6-acre rectangular parcel and encompasses Assessor's Block 3180/Lot 190. As shown in **Figure 2-2, Project Site and Adjacent Uses**, the site is bounded by City College to the east, Archbishop Riordan High School to the north, the Westwood Park neighborhood to the west, and multifamily residential development along Ocean Avenue to the south. The site is less than 0.25 mile north of Ocean Avenue, the primary retail corridor in the Ingleside-Westwood Park neighborhood.

Balboa Reservoir Background

The project site is the western portion of a once-larger 28-acre Balboa Reservoir site. In 1957, the San Francisco Water Department (now the SFPUC) began excavation with water storage in mind, creating north and south basins separated by an east-west berm. The SFPUC never filled or used the basins for water storage. In 2011–2012, a series of land transfers between various public agencies resulted in the reconfiguration of the SFPUC's original Balboa Reservoir land holdings. The City removed the east-west berm and reconfigured the 28-acre property into western and eastern portions. City College now owns the 10.4-acre east basin, and the City, through the SFPUC, owns the 17.6-acre west basin (the project site). City College filled and developed the east basin in 2010 with a surface parking lot and its four-story Multi-Use Building.

Existing Uses

The project site is bounded on three sides by sloping western, northern, and eastern edges that surround a sunken paved surface at the center. An approximately 30-foot-tall earthen berm is located at the western edge of the property. The asphalt-paved surface is relatively level with a slope of 0 to 5 percent, sloping gently up from west to east. There is an approximately 18- and 30-foot increase in elevation between the project site bottom and the top of the eastern and northern slopes, respectively. Along the southern boundary of the site is an 80-foot-wide section of the parcel where a high-pressure underground pipeline maintained by the SFPUC is located ([SFPUC right-of-way](#)). The pipeline runs east-west and delivers water across San Francisco. [Although the SFPUC right-of-way is not part of the project real estate, it is shown within the project boundaries of the figures in this SEIR to capture uses proposed by the project. Uses within the right-of-way are subject to SFPUC standards and regulations, which prohibit the placement of permanent structures above water and wastewater](#)

⁶ San Francisco Planning Department, *Development Status of Balboa Park Area Plan Land Use Program – Updated September 2018*, September, 2018.

⁷ In 2010, the east basin, also known as the "upper basin," was filled and its grade raised to match surrounding terrain to the east.

[assets \(such as pipelines\). These regulations are considered in the proposed project configuration and further described in Section 2.E.8, Transportation and Circulation Plan.](#)

The site does not contain any permanent structures and currently contains 1,007 surface vehicular parking spaces. The lot provides overflow vehicular parking for City College students, faculty, and staff.⁸ A cargo storage container is located on the west side of the site, at the foot of the berm slope. The parking lot is entirely paved with no vegetation. The western and northern slopes contain scattered trees and shrubs, with paved pathways along the tops of these slopes. Paved walkways, stairs, vegetation, and lighting are located on the eastern slope, providing pedestrian connections between the project site and adjacent City College property containing parking and the Multi-Use Building.

Figure 2-2 Project Site and Adjacent Uses

⁸ City College uses the site under a revocable license granted by the SFPUC.

Direct vehicular access into and out of the site is provided along the north side of the east basin by an east-west access road immediately south of Archbishop Riordan High School, and accessed from Frida Kahlo Way (formerly Phelan Avenue).

2.D.3 Zoning and Land Use Designations

Zoning

The project site is within a P (Public) Use District and located in 40-X and 65-A Height and Bulk Districts (see **Figure 2-3, Existing Zoning on Project Site**). The project site is within the central portion of the Balboa Park Station Plan Area (see Figure 2-1, p. 2-2). The City adopted the area plan in 2009, but the City did not rezone the site as part of plan adoption.

General Plan Land Use Designation

The project site is currently designated P (Public Use) in the Balboa Park Station Area Plan of the general plan.

2.D.4 Existing Streets and Public Transit

Major roadways in the project vicinity include Ocean Avenue, a major east-west roadway, approximately 0.1 mile to the south, Frida Kahlo Way, a north-south roadway 0.1 mile to the east, and the north-south-running I-280 freeway, located about 0.3 mile to the east. The site is less than 0.1 mile from a number of Muni stops at Ocean and Lee avenues, including the KT Ingleside/ Third Street Muni line, and the 29 Sunset, along with overnight service on the 91 Third Street and K Owl. The site is less than 0.2 mile away from the Muni stops at City College ~~Terminal Loop~~, including the 8 Bayshore, 8BX Bayshore Express, and 49 Van Ness/Mission.⁹ The site is also approximately 0.5 mile from the Balboa Park BART Station with its East Bay and Peninsula lines and which also has stops for the KT-Ingleside/Third Street, K Owl, J and M light rail lines, along with bus routes 43 Masonic, 54 Felton, 88 BART Shuttle, 8 Bayshore, 8BX Bayshore, 49 Van Ness/Mission, and 91 Third Street.

Commented [PJ(19)]: Move footnote to first mention of City College Terminal.

Commented [SY20R19]: ESA: done

2.D.5 Adjacent Uses

Land uses immediately surrounding the project site consist primarily of mixed-use commercial and residential buildings, high school buildings and athletic fields, surface parking lots, City College's four-story Multi-Use Building, and single- and two-story single-family housing (see Figure 2-2, p. 2-8).

⁹ ~~The City College Loop was formerly known as the Phelan Loop.~~

Figure 2-3 Existing Zoning on Project Site

Commented [WW(21)]: It is unclear to me if ESA/team addressed SFPUC Deputy General Manager’s comment 17 from IS-1. Please clarify.

Commented [SY22R21]: SY: added text to clarify SFPUC area under “existing uses” above. Figure 2-3 has been updated to show cross hatching of the SFPUC right of way area with a note in the legend. We agreed on one of our check in calls that ‘retained in fee’ terminology is too confusing.

City College of San Francisco Ocean Campus

The 67.4-acre City College Ocean Campus is to the east and includes academic and support buildings, commons, open spaces, walkways and roads, and parking facilities. City College is a public, two-year community college that serves approximately 70,000 students each year at its Ocean Campus, eight centers, and various other instructional sites throughout San Francisco. The Ocean Campus serves just over half (55.8 percent) of City College's total full time equivalent students, with the remaining balance served at the other centers.¹⁰ City College's Ocean Campus contains approximately 726,800 square feet of existing building space that includes classrooms, labs, offices, library, study space, and other support spaces (e.g., gym, food service, and health service).¹¹

The campus is roughly bounded by the project site to the west, Archbishop Riordan High School and Judson Avenue to the north, Ocean Avenue to the south, and I-280 to the east. The western-most area of the Ocean Campus, which comprises the eastern portion of the Balboa Reservoir, contains approximately 1,167-space surface vehicle parking spaces for students, faculty, and staff, and the Multi-Use Building. The Multi-Use Building is located on the southeast portion of the east basin and includes academic counseling services, health education, and other outreach and resource centers.

Archbishop Riordan High School

Directly north of the project site is the approximately 9.4-acre Archbishop Riordan High School campus, a private Catholic all-male high school that opened in 1949. The campus is bounded by Judson Avenue to the north, Frida Kahlo Way to the east, Westwood Park to the west, and the east-west access road to the proposed project site to the south. The high school has a student population of approximately 680 day and boarding students. The school's campus contains two- and three-story buildings, athletic fields, and a parking lot.

Westwood Park

The Westwood Park residential neighborhood is to the west of the project site and includes approximately 650 one- to two-story bungalow-style homes, generally dating from the 1920s. The neighborhood's systematic street layout generally contains curved roads that form larger ovals within the neighborhood. Miramar Avenue bisects the Westwood Park neighborhood, connecting Ocean Avenue from the south to Monterey Boulevard from the north.

¹⁰ City College of San Francisco Office of Research & Planning, *Fact Sheet: Full Time Equivalent Students by Center*, August 2018, https://www.ccsf.edu/dam/Organizational_Assets/Department/Research_Planning_Grants/Reports/FactSheets2018/Factsheet_FTESbyCenter_Aug2018.pdf, accessed January 29, 2019.

¹¹ City College of San Francisco, CCSF Facilities Master Plan Board of Trustees Update, April 27, 2017, https://www.ccsf.edu/dam/Organizational_Assets/About_CCSF/Admin/facilities_planning/2017FMP/20170427FMPUpdateBoT/2017.0427_IV.%20A%20FMP%20Update.pdf, accessed October 15, 2018.

Ocean Avenue Development

Directly south of the project site are three multifamily mixed-use commercial and residential buildings, each with neighborhood-serving retail uses at the ground floor and four stories of residential units above. The building at 1100 Ocean Avenue is bounded by Lee Avenue to the west, Ocean Avenue to the south, San Francisco Fire Department Station 15 to the east, and Balboa Reservoir to the north. This site is a mixed-use development with residential above ground floor retail and public open space (Unity Plaza). The two buildings at 1150–2000 Ocean Avenue are bounded by Ingleside Branch Library and courtyard (under the SFPUC’s jurisdiction) to the west, Ocean Avenue to the south, Lee Avenue to the east, and the Balboa Reservoir to the north. This site is a mixed-use development with residential above ground floor retail.

Other Uses

The Ingleside Branch of the San Francisco Public Library is located on Ocean Avenue less than 100 feet from the project’s southwestern border. The library has an outdoor courtyard and garden (under the SFPUC’s jurisdiction) that is open to the public during library hours, and includes seating areas, a play-to-learn area for children, fencing, gates, and landscaping. Unity Plaza, located at the corner of Ocean Avenue and City College ~~Loop~~Terminal, approximately 200 feet from the project site’s southeastern border, is a landscaped, publicly accessible open space with benches, pedestrian lighting, artistic pavement, a domed play structure, and photography displays depicting the history of the area. The space serves as a pedestrian link between Muni’s KT-Ingleside/Third Street stop on Ocean Avenue, the City College campus, and the City College ~~Loop~~Terminal Muni bus terminal. San Francisco Fire Department Station 15 is located on the corner of Ocean Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way approximately 500 feet from the project site’s southeastern border.

Formatted: Condensed by 0.1 pt

2.E Project Characteristics

The proposed project would rezone the site and establish development controls for the development of mixed-income housing, open space, community facilities, small retail, parking, streets, and other infrastructure. The project would include amendments to the general plan and the planning code, and would create a new Balboa Reservoir SUD. The special use district would establish land use zoning controls and incorporate design standards and guidelines for the site. The Zoning Map would be amended to show changes from the current use district (P [Public]) to the proposed special use district. The existing height limits of 40 to 65 feet would be modified to varying heights up to 78 feet in the Developer’s Proposed Option and up to 88 feet in the Additional Housing Option, as measured by the planning code. (The planning code permits minor rooftop appurtenances, such as elevator and stair penthouses to exceed height limits.) The proposed project would include new publicly accessible open space, transportation and circulation changes, and new utilities and other infrastructure. Transportation and circulation changes would include the extension of the existing north–south Lee Avenue across the site and a new internal street network. The project would include a roadway network to be accessible for people walking, including people with disabilities, bicycling, and driving.

This SEIR, [including the initial study](#), analyzes two different options for the site's residential density to capture a range of possible development on the project site. The two options are the Developer's Proposed Option of 1,100 dwelling units, and the Additional Housing Option of 1,550.¹² Overall, the proposed project would construct up to approximately 1.6 million gsf of development in the Developer's Proposed Option, or 1.8 million gsf of development in the Additional Housing Option. The Developer's Proposed Option includes a 750-space public parking garage, and the Additional Housing Option does not include a public parking garage.

Development under each of the project options would entail the same land uses and street configurations, and similar site plans. Both project options could include approximately 7,500 gsf of retail space such as a café provided on the ground level of Block C, D, E, or F to help activate the approximately 2-acre central park open space area. Under both options, the ground floor of Block B would contain approximately 10,000 gsf of childcare and community space. Additional information on the project options is provided below.

Table 2-1, Balboa Reservoir Project Characteristics, summarizes the project characteristics of the two proposed project options, including the types and amounts of land uses, proposed dwelling units, building heights, vehicle and bicycle parking, and other features. In this SEIR, the term "proposed project" is used when project features of the Developer's Proposed Option and the Additional Housing Option would be the same.

2.E.1 Developer's Proposed Option

The Developer's Proposed Option would include up to 1.64 million gsf in new construction on 10 blocks (**Figure 2-4, Developer's Proposed Option Site Plan and Height Ranges**). Construction under this option would provide 1,100 residential units totaling about 1.3 million gsf. Housing would be provided on each block. A total of up to 50 percent of the new units would be designated affordable to persons earning between 55 and 120 percent of the area median income, depending on market surveys, funding source restrictions and other stakeholder input on the affordable housing plan. Affordable housing would be distributed throughout the site. For purposes of this SEIR, the unit mix is assumed to be 40 percent studio/one bedroom units and 60 percent two-or-more-bedroom units. **Figure 2-5, Ground Floor Use Plan for Developer's Proposed Option**, presents the proposed ground floor use plan at the project site. With the exception of the townhome blocks (Blocks TH1 and TH2), the ground floor areas on all blocks could include common spaces, building lobbies, residential units, as well as utility and parking access. As shown in Figure 2-5, the ground floor of Block B would contain approximately 10,000 gsf of childcare and community space. Approximately 7,500 gsf of retail space including a café could be provided on the ground level of any block.

¹² In an effort to fulfill general plan objectives to maximize affordable housing and housing in transit-rich neighborhoods, the City developed a policy assumption consisting of 1,550 dwelling units (the Additional Housing Option) that envisions more housing for all incomes than the Developer's Proposed Option.

**TABLE 2-1
BALBOA RESERVOIR PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS**

Project Characteristic	Developer's Proposed Option		Additional Housing Option	
	Metric			
Proposed Land Use Program	Area (gross square feet)		Area (gross square feet)	
Residential	1,283,000		1,588,000	
Commercial (retail)	7,500		7,500	
Community facilities (childcare and community room for public use)	10,000		10,000	
Parking	339,900 (residential and public)		231,000 (residential only)	
Total Building Area	1,640,400		1,836,500	
Proposed Dwelling Units	Number	Percentage (approximate)	Number	Percentage (approximate)
Studio and 1-bedroom	440	40%	620	40%
2- and 3-bedroom	660	60%	930	60%
Total Dwelling Units	1,100	100%	1,550	100%
Proposed Parking	Number		Number	
Vehicle Parking Spaces	1,300 [550 residential + 750 public garage]		650 [residential only]	
Car share spaces	7 minimum		12 minimum	
Bicycle parking ^a	936		1,100	
Bicycle parking class 1				
Bicycle parking class 2	75		80	
Total Bicycle Parking	1,011		1,180	
Open Space	Area (gross square feet)		Area (gross square feet)	
Publicly accessible open space	174,240		174,240	
Private open space	36 square feet per unit if located on balcony, or 48 square feet per unit if commonly accessible to residents			
Building Characteristics				
Stories	2 to 7 stories		2 to 8 stories	
Height	25 to 78 feet		25 to 88 feet	
Ground floor	Blocks A through H could include residential units, lobbies, retail, and common space. Block B would include childcare and community space.		Blocks A through J could include residential units, lobbies, retail, and common space. Block B would include childcare and community space.	
Basements	Blocks A through H would allow but not require one below-grade level of vehicle parking spaces.		Blocks A through J would allow but not require one below-grade level of vehicle parking spaces.	

SOURCES: Reservoir Community Partners LLC, 2018; San Francisco Planning Department, 2018.

NOTE:

^a Planning Code section 155.1(a) defines class 1 bicycle spaces as "spaces in secure, weather-protected facilities intended for use as long-term, overnight, and workday bicycle storage by dwelling unit residents, nonresidential occupants, and employees" and defines class 2 bicycle spaces as "spaces located in a publicly accessible, highly visible location intended for transient or short-term use by visitors, guests, and patrons to the building or use."

Figure 2-4 Developer's Proposed Option Site Plan and Height Ranges

Commented [PJ(23)]: In the figure legend, add the word 'height' after the numbers, e.g., "Maximum 35' height."

Commented [SY24R23]: ESA: VMW made global changes to address comments.

Figure 2-5 Ground Floor Use Plan for Developer's Proposed Option

2.E.2 Additional Housing Option

Development under the Additional Housing Option would include up to 1.8 million gsf in new construction on 12 blocks (Figure 2-6, **Additional Housing Option Site Plan and Height Ranges**). Construction under this assumption would provide 1,550 residential units totaling about 1.5 million gsf. Under this option and as shown in Figure 2-6, four-story stacked townhomes are proposed on Blocks I and J, which would be one story taller than the Developer's Proposed Option for the same area. Under the Additional Housing Option, a four- to five-story residential building is proposed on Block H. With the exception of the townhome blocks (Blocks TH1, TH2, I, and J), the ground floor areas on all blocks could include residential units, common spaces, and building lobbies, as well as utility and parking access. For purposes of this SEIR, the unit mix is assumed to be 40 percent studio/one bedroom units and 60 percent two-or-more-bedroom units. **Figure 2-7, Ground Floor Use Plan for Additional Housing Option**, presents the proposed ground floor use plan for this option.

2.E.3 Building Heights

Figure 2-4 and Figure 2-6 present the proposed height limits for the Developer's Proposed and Additional Housing Options, respectively. The proposed project would include amendments to the Zoning Map to modify the existing height limits to up to 78 feet in the Developer's Proposed Option and to up to 88 feet in the Additional Housing Option. As shown in Figure 2-4 and Figure 2-6, the proposed height limits for both options would generally step up from west to east across the project site, with lower permitted heights being adjacent to the Westwood Park neighborhood and greater permitted heights nearer to Lee Avenue, City College, and the existing multistory development along Ocean Avenue. In general, most buildings under the Additional Housing Option would be one story taller than the Developer's Proposed Option. The maximum building heights for the Developer's Proposed Option would generally be 25 to 78 feet, and the maximum building heights for the Additional Housing Option would generally be 25 to 88 feet. **Figure 2-8, Site Sections**, is a representative north-south and east-west illustration of the site for both project options.

Commented [PJ(25)]: Figure 2-6 shows 5-7 and 6-8 stories on Block G. Plus Seung Yen told me on 3/12/19 that we are considering an eight-story residential building on Block G for the Additional Housing Option. To be confirmed after 3/27/19.

Commented [WW(26R25)]: Ok, wind and shadow analysis may need to be updated.

Commented [SY27R25]: ESA: Seung Yen provided a markup of which additional portion of Block G could be 6-8 stories. The shadow modeling is based on the max height of each option and includes this additional 6-8 story portion on Block G.

Figure 2-6 Additional Housing Option Site Plan and Height Ranges

Commented [PJ(28)]: In the figure legend, add the word 'height' after the numbers, e.g., "Maximum 35' height."

Commented [SY29R28]: ESA: VMW made global changes to address comments.

Figure 2-7 Ground Floor Use Plan for Additional Housing Option

Figure 2-8 Site Sections

Commented [PJ(30)]: Change “Frida Kahlo Ave” to “Frida Kahlo Way.”

Commented [SY31R30]: ESA: VMW made global changes to address comments.

2.E.4 Design Standards and Guidelines

As part of the proposed special use district, the planning department would adopt design standards and guidelines for building design, streets and circulation, utilities and infrastructure, open space and the public realm. Standards would be measurable and include quantitative design specifications that developers would have to meet. Guidelines would be qualitative that the developers would be required to follow to the maximum extent possible. The design standards and guidelines would establish controls for bulk restriction, articulation and modulation, building materials and treatment, building frontage utilization, setbacks, design parameters for open space, streets, and parking and loading standards. Certain architecture requirements would apply to the entire project-site and others would be block-specific. The design standards and guidelines would require street trees to be planted in appropriate locations to create new landscape compatible with the proposed project. The proposed planning code amendments included in the special use district and the design standards and guidelines would together guide and control all development at the project site after the project obtains entitlements. In addition to AvalonBay Communities and Bridge Housing, build-out of the project site would involve additional partner firms. Each of the developers would be bound by the design standards and guidelines. The City would evaluate subsequent submittals of proposed building designs for consistency with both the special use district and the design standards and guidelines.

2.E.5 Open Space Improvements

As shown in **Figure 2-9, Proposed Open Space Plan**, and further described below, the proposed project would provide approximately 4 acres of publicly accessible open space. The open spaces and parks would be connected by new internal networks such as pedestrian passages, sidewalks, and roadways. The proposed pedestrian network is described under SEIR Section 2.E.8, Transportation and Circulation Plan, p. 2-25. The proposed project would also include balconies, rooftops, and courtyards accessible only to building occupants, as well as publicly accessible open space. The City and sponsor would detail the shape and design of open spaces in the design standards and guidelines.

Central Park

This proposed approximately 2-acre park would be located at the center of the project site, generally surrounded by Blocks C, D, E, and F. Potential programming could include a multiuse lawn and terraces, a playground, community garden, picnic area, stormwater gardens and a terrace overlooking the park from the community room.

Figure 2-9 Proposed Open Space Plan

SFPUC Open Space

South of Blocks A and B along the south side of the project site is the 80-foot-wide section of the parcel that contains a large underground water main. SFPUC regulations state that no structures, trees, or woody shrubs are allowed in this space.¹³ Thus, while technically not part of the project, the sponsor proposes this area to serve as an active flexible urban recreation space subject to a license from the SFPUC. The City, through the SFPUC, would continue to own the space for utility use. The space could potentially accommodate both the SFPUC's utility use and temporary programming such as a farmers market, sports court, childcare overflow play area, and multiuse lawn.

Gateway Landscape

The proposed 0.15-acre landscaped area would be located at the project site's entrance east of the Lee Avenue and South Street intersection. The landscaped area could also include neighborhood serving uses such as a dog park, subject to approval by the SFPUC.

2.E.6 Vehicle Parking and Loading

Under both project options, all blocks would be allowed, but not required, to provide parking below grade or at ground level wrapped with active uses (e.g., residential, retail, or childcare). As shown in Table 2-1, p. 2-14, the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option include a different number of off-street vehicle parking spaces. With the exception of the townhomes, all residential parking would be unbundled.¹⁴ The differences between the two project options are as follows:

- **Developer's Proposed Option:** The Developer's Proposed Option would provide a total of up to 1,300 off-street vehicle parking spaces. **Figure 2-10, Developer's Proposed Option Parking Facilities and Street Parking Plan**, illustrates the proposed off-street parking locations. Up to 550 off-street parking spaces for project residents may be located in parking garages below grade at Blocks C, D, F, and G and in the townhomes. In addition to resident parking, the Developer's Proposed Option would include a below-grade multilevel public garage of up to 750 spaces located under Blocks A and B and accessed from South Street. The Developer's Proposed Option would include a minimum of seven car-share parking spaces located on streets and in buildings. In addition, the Developer's Proposed Option would include approximately six on-street freight loading areas and approximately eight passenger loading areas along the internal streets. **[Note to Reviewer: Off-street loading is being discussed by the project sponsor and Planning, Planning and SFMTA review of loading will be included with comments.]**

¹³ The SFPUC Asset Protection Standards are regulations that provide guidance to projects in the public right-of-way to protect, maintain the intended function, maintain system performance and level of service requirements, and minimize the risk of damage of SFPUC assets while still being accessible for regular and emergency operations and maintenance. The standards prohibit the placement of permanent structures above water and wastewater assets (such as pipelines).

¹⁴ Private parking spaces are leased or sold separately from dwelling units, allowing residents or tenants the option of renting or buying a parking space at an additional cost.

Commented [PJ(32): The asterisk after the 10 on Block E in this figure [also in Figures 2-11, 5-2 and 5-3] is explained the legend as "Parked in Adjacent Garage." I don't see this discussion anywhere in the project description. Either explain it or delete it from the figures.

Commented [SY33R32]: ESA: The asterisk has been deleted from the figure. The 10 spaces are now factored into the adjacent parking garage.

Commented [WW(34): We need to discuss the sponsor's edits in the transportation section about no off-street loading. That is not the agreement we reached previously. We accepted the project application without loading detailed with the agreement from the sponsor that they would provide loading to meet the demand. Off-street loading was not listed here previously because we (I thought) were waiting for the transportation analysis to identify that demand (for large trucks) and then the project description was going to be updated to reflect that demand.

Commented [WW(35R34): **Jeannie** please discuss with Seung Yen whether they are supportive of no off-street loading.

Commented [SY36R34]: ESA: A 'note to reviewer' has been added at Jeannie's direction (4/25/19) as a placeholder

Figure 2-10 Developer's Proposed Option Parking Facilities and Street Parking Plan

Commented [WW(37)]: Is the note related to the "On-street parking" still in the project and relevant to any analysis? Consider deleting. Same comment applies to figure 2-11. [Jeanie to review figures again]

Commented [SY38R37]: ESA: We removed "on-street parking" from the figures and text per SFMTA's comment. They had commented in the IS-1/PD submittal to remove revise the legend to "potential on-street spaces and/or loading"

- **Additional Housing Option:** The Additional Housing Option would provide a total of up to 650 off-street parking spaces for the residents. **Figure 2-11, Additional Housing Option Parking Facilities and Street Parking Plan**, illustrates the proposed off-street parking locations. The residential parking for the project could be located in parking garages at or below grade at Blocks A, B, C, D, F, and G. A public parking garage is not proposed as part of this project option. The Additional Housing Option would include a minimum of 12 car-share parking spaces located on streets and in buildings. Vehicle parking would also be available along the internal streets. In addition, the Additional Housing Option would include approximately six on-street freight loading areas and approximately eight passenger loading areas along the internal streets. **[Note to Reviewer: This note has been added at the direction of EP. Off-street loading is being discussed by the project sponsor and Planning. Planning and SFMTA review of loading will be included with ADSEIR-2 comments.]**

2.E.7 Bicycle Parking

Both project options would provide: class 1 bicycle parking spaces located either on the ground floor or in the first below-grade level of each building in the locations compliant with the planning code; and class 2 bicycle parking spaces, all of which would be located in the right-of-way adjacent to each building or in the publicly accessible open space.¹⁵ The Developer's Proposed Option would provide at least 936 class 1 and 75 class 2 bicycle parking spaces. The Additional Housing Option would provide at least 1,100 class 1 and 80 class 2 bicycle parking spaces.

2.E.8 Transportation and Circulation Plan

Vehicular access to the project site would be provided via the intersection of Ocean and Lee avenues from the south, and the access road that would connect to the north end of the project site via Frida Kahlo Way (formerly Phelan Avenue) from the north. Lee Avenue would be extended, as described below, along the eastern project site border and connect to proposed interior streets (see **Figure 2-12, Proposed Street Type Plan**).

The proposed interior streets, which would include the extension of Lee Avenue and new streets designated North, South, and West streets, would be designed according to the principles of the Better Streets Plan.¹⁶ The new internal streets would include street trees and other streetscape elements to encourage walking, biking, and access to nearby public transit. The street network would also provide access for delivery and emergency vehicles, and on-street freight and passenger loading areas.

¹⁵ Planning Code section 155.1(a) defines class 1 bicycle spaces as "spaces in secure, weather-protected facilities intended for use as long-term, overnight, and workday bicycle storage by dwelling unit residents, nonresidential occupants, and employees" and defines class 2 bicycle spaces as "spaces located in a publicly accessible, highly visible location intended for transient or short-term use by visitors, guests, and patrons to the building or use."

¹⁶ San Francisco Planning Department, *San Francisco Better Streets Plan*, adopted December 2010.

Figure 2-11 Additional Housing Option Parking Facilities and Street Parking Plan

Commented [PJ(39)]: Delete “Potential Below Grade Public Parking” from the legend.

Commented [SY40R39]: ESA: done

Figure 2-12 Proposed Street Type Plan

Commented [WW(41)]: No intersection controls proposed at the Access Road and Lee Avenue? Also, I seem to recall some access discussions at this location and the high school. Did these get resolved and included in the project description?

Commented [SY42R41]: ESA: done

- **Lee Avenue between Ocean Avenue and the Project Site.** Lee Avenue between Ocean Avenue and the project site is an existing 56-foot-wide right-of-way with one travel lane in each direction and currently terminates at the southeast corner of the project site. Sidewalks on the east and west side of Lee Avenue between the project site and Ocean Avenue are 11 feet wide and 8 feet wide, respectively, including a 3- to 4-foot-wide planting strip. As shown in Figure 2-13a, Proposed Street Section (Lee Avenue between Ocean Avenue and the Project Site), the proposed project would include one 10-foot-wide northbound lane and would reconfigure the southbound Lee Avenue approach to Ocean Avenue from one all-movement lane to one 10-foot-wide southbound through/right-turn lane and 10-foot-wide one southbound left-turn lane. [Note to Reviewer: We understand this design is still being finalized. The configuration described here is consistent with the analysis in the transportation section.]

- **Lee Avenue.** The proposed project would extend Lee Avenue along the east side of the site.¹⁷ Lee Avenue would include one travel lane in each direction. As shown in Figure 2-13b, Proposed Street Section (Lee Avenue), Lee Avenue would include an approximately 10-foot-wide vehicle travel lane in each direction, approximately 12-foot-wide sidewalks, and an 8-foot-wide parking lane on both sides of the street. The Lee Avenue right-of-way would be approximately 72 feet wide. In the sidewalks, a 6.5-foot-wide throughway zone would be buffered from vehicular traffic by a 6-foot-wide planting/furnishing strip.

A raised crossing with a rectangular rapid flashing beacon would be installed at the Lee Avenue and SFPUC Open Space intersection as a traffic calming measure and to emphasize pedestrian priority. At the south of the project site, Lee Avenue would cross SFPUC's 80-foot-wide right-of-way. No structures, street lights, poles, trees, or woody shrubs would be installed along Lee Avenue over this SFPUC right-of-way due to the presence of underlying pipelines.

- **North and South Streets.** North and South streets would be east-west interior neighborhood residential streets and would provide pedestrian, vehicular, and bike access to the individual buildings. As shown in Figure 2-14, Proposed Street Section (North and South Streets), North and South streets would have rights-of-way approximately 64 feet wide and would include a single 12-foot-wide lane of travel in each direction. North and South streets would also include 8-foot-wide parking lanes and 12-foot-wide sidewalks on both sides of the street. In the sidewalks, a 6-foot-wide throughway zone would be buffered from vehicular traffic by a 6-foot-wide planting/furnishing strip. ~~Bike lanes could potentially replace the access road along the north edge of the east basin from Lee Avenue to Frida Kahlo Lane.~~ As shown in Figure 2-14c, North Street would be located between Blocks G and E/F, and South Street would be located between Blocks C/D and A/B. North and South streets would be shared roadways¹⁸ that would include bicycle facilities.
- **West Street.** West Street would be a north-south interior neighborhood residential street, and would provide pedestrian, vehicular, and bike access to individual buildings and to the townhome blocks. As shown in Figure 2-15, Proposed Street Section (West Street), West Street would include a 12.5-foot-wide single lane of travel in each direction and would have an approximately 54-foot right-of-way. A 10.5-foot-wide sidewalk would be provided on both sides of the street and an 8-foot-wide parking lane would be provided on the east side of the street. This street would be a shared roadway that would include bicycle facilities. A raised crossing would be installed at the central park open space entry point.

¹⁷ The Lee Avenue right-of-way would travel along what is currently the western boundary of the surface parking lot behind City College's Multi-Use Building; this portion of the existing parking lot is within the project site.

¹⁸ Bicycles share the travel lane with vehicles.

Commented [PJ(43)]: In light of loading issues at Whole Foods, we may want to have a separate bullet point that describes Lee Avenue between Ocean Avenue and the project site.

Commented [SY44R43]: ESA: added

Commented [PJ(45)]: Wade had commented in the previous draft, "I think the cross-section to the south of the one shown is critical for the EIR and/or a more thorough description of it." Lee Ave roadway descriptions and figures to change.

Commented [WW(46R45)]: Thank you; this comment still not addressed, and the description also does not reflect options for bicycle facilities. MTA had also previously commented to that they did not sign off on the raised crossing. If that raised crossing is there, I suspect it will affect CEQA and non-CEQA (e.g., LOS) transportation analysis.

Commented [SY47R45]: ESA: VMW has provided a figure for Lee Ave between Ocean Ave and the project site. Per 4/11 and 4/18 meetings, and email between EP/MTA, MTA is ok with the raised sidewalk with rectangular rapid flashing beacon.

Commented [SY48]: ESA: added to reflect 4/18 call discussion

Commented [PJ(49)]: Really? Would this be an element of Variant 4, where the vehicle access road through the east basin is relocated further south? The variants chapter says the relocated access road "North Street Extension" would include bicycle facilities.

Commented [SY50R49]: ESA: these would not be a separate bike lane, but class III facilities (Shared bicycle/vehicle lane). Deleted this because we describe bicycle facilities separately in the next section.

Commented [PJ(51)]: Global: clarify whether 'shared roadway' means bikes/peds share with vehicles.

Commented [SY52R51]: Shared roadway is used to describe bicycle/vehicle

|

|

Figure 2-13a Proposed Street Section (Lee Avenue [between Ocean Avenue and the Project Site](#))

Figure 2-13b [Proposed Street Section \(Lee Avenue\)](#)

Figure 2-14 Proposed Street Section (North and South Streets)

Commented [PJ(53)]: Fix typo 'Propsoed' in figure

Commented [SY54R53]: ESA: corrected

Figure 2-15 Proposed Street Section (West Street)

The street network designs would be required to undergo detailed design and review to ensure that they are designed to meet City design standards. The street designs would be subject to approval by SFMTA, San Francisco Department of Public Works, and the San Francisco Fire Department, along with other City agencies, to ensure that the streets are designed consistent with City policies and design standards. The interior streets would also be regulated by SFMTA with regard to loading and parking spaces.

Ocean Avenue Streetscape Modifications

As described above, the proposed project would extend Lee Avenue, which is currently a dead-end street into a through street along the east side of the project site. Currently, Lee Avenue between Ocean Avenue and the project site provides on-street supply to meet Whole Foods (1150 Ocean Avenue) loading operation demand. The changes to the Lee Avenue configuration between Ocean Avenue and the project site would effectively reduce the supply of on-street loading available to Whole Foods and other nearby uses, as existing loading activity occurs in the No Parking zones on Lee Avenue.¹⁹ Therefore, as part of the proposed project, five 21-foot-long metered parking spaces (totaling 105 feet) along the frontage of 1150 Ocean Avenue would be converted to metered loading spaces between the hours of 6 a.m. and 2 p.m. (subject to SFMTA approval) to replace the informal on-street loading on Lee Avenue. This proposed modification is analyzed in SEIR Section 3.B, Transportation and Circulation.

Commented [SY55]: ESA: added this direction per 4/23 call re: loading.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Network

The proposed project would include a new pedestrian and bicycle network. As shown in Figure 2-16, **Proposed Dedicated and Shared Bicycle Circulation**, the proposed project would include class II, class III, or ~~Class IV~~ bicycle facilities.²⁰ ~~Class II facilities (bicycle lanes) or class IV facilities (protected bike lane) are proposed on Lee Avenue between South Street and the north access road and shown in Figure 2-13a, p. 2-30. South of South Street, Lee Avenue would gradually narrow to meet the existing 56-foot-wide right-of-way at the project boundary and would have class II facilities (bicycle lanes) along this portion. As shown in Figure 2-13b, p. 2-31, class III facilities (shared lanes) are proposed between the project boundary and Ocean Avenue.~~ Class III facilities (shared lanes) are proposed on North, South, and West streets. Bicycle access to the project site would be via class III bicycle facilities on Ocean Avenue, and via class II bike lanes on Frida Kahlo Way.

Commented [PJ(56)]: Confirm this.

Commented [SY57R56]: ESA: confirmed by sponsor team 4/10/19.

¹⁹ The existing loading operations currently do not adhere to the measures outlined in the 1150 Ocean Avenue Whole Food conditions of approval, 1150 Ocean Avenue, Case No. 2006.0884CEU Motion No. 17885, Hearing date: May 21, 2009, <http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcpackets/2016-003525CUA.pdf>, accessed April 26, 2019.

²⁰ Class II bikeways are bike lanes striped within the paved areas of roadways and established for the preferential use of bicycles. Class III bikeways are signed biked routes that allow bicycles to share the travel lane with vehicles. Class IV bikeways, often referred to as cycle tracks, are for the exclusive use of bicycles, physically separated from motor traffic with a vertical feature. The separation may include, but is not limited to, grade separation, flexible posts, inflexible barriers, or on-street parking.

Figure 2-16 Proposed Dedicated and Shared Bicycle Circulation

Figure 2-12, p. 2-27, illustrates the proposed pedestrian access and connections on the project site. As shown in Figure 2-12 and Figure 2-16, p. 2-35, shared pedestrian and bicycle access to the site would be provided at Brighton Avenue on the south side, and San Ramon Way on the west side of the site. The project site would also be accessible via a shared pedestrian and bicycle connection along the access road along the north of the east basin (City College property). Pedestrian access to the site would also be provided at Unity Plaza (see Figure 2-12). As shown in Figure 2-12, the central park and SFPUC open space areas would be linked by the landscaped shared pedestrian and bicycle passages through the site.²¹ The proposed buildings and residential lobbies would be accessible from the interior streets, connected directly to public sidewalks. The pedestrian and bicycle crossings at Lee Avenue and North, South, and West streets may be raised slightly to emphasize the pedestrian priority of the open space network. A representation of the proposed pedestrian paseos is included in **Figure 2-17, Representative Proposed Pedestrian Paseo Section**.

Commented [PJ(58)]: Figure 2-16 doesn't show bike access at Brighton Ave. Need to label Brighton Avenue on Figure 2-12 and maybe on Figure 2-16.

Commented [SY59R58]: ESA: VMW updated figures 2-12 and 2-16

Commented [PJ(60)]: Confirm edit.

Commented [SY61R60]: ESA: confirmed

Transportation Demand Management

The proposed project would include a transportation demand management (TDM) program that would implement measures to reduce vehicle trips and encourage sustainable modes of transportation. The TDM program may include both physical (e.g., bicycle and car-share parking) and programmatic (e.g., incentives) measures.

Towards the goal of achieving a sustainable land use development, the TDM program would prioritize pedestrian and bicycle access and implement measures to encourage alternative modes of transportation. Onsite childcare and affordable housing would be among the features of the TDM program. Sustainable modes of transportation would be encouraged through building a walkable, mixed-use, transit-oriented development, encouraging bicycling and walking, and reduced parking ratios for residential uses. Sidewalk and streetscapes would be designed to prioritize safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Key strategies in the TDM plan include improved walking conditions and bike lanes, unbundled parking, car-share parking, and other approaches to discourage use of single-occupant private vehicles. See the additional discussion of the TDM plan in SEIR Section 3.B, Transportation and Circulation.

²¹ SFPUC high-pressure water transmission pipelines are situated under the SFPUC Open Space and Unity Plaza and prohibit the installation of any structures. The maintenance, repair, and installation of new pipelines may temporarily disrupt the pedestrian and bicycle access over the SFPUC right-of-way.

Figure 2-17 Representative Proposed Pedestrian Paseo Section

2.E.9 Infrastructure and Utilities

The proposed project would develop infrastructure and utility systems to support the proposed uses at the site. This would include the following:

- **Potable Water.** The project would include construction of potable water distribution piping located under the planned streets and open spaces. These water distribution pipelines would connect to the existing water lines in Ocean Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way adjacent to the project site. To reduce potable water demand, high-efficiency fixtures and appliances would be installed in new buildings.
- **Non-potable Water.** To meet the goals of Health Code article 12C, some or all of the buildings onsite would be piped with dedicated non-potable water piping supplied to each toilet and urinal and for irrigation purposes. Graywater (the wastewater from lavatories, showers, baths, and washing machines) would be diverted from the sewers by capturing, treating onsite, and reusing it to satisfy these non-potable water demands. ~~Since there would be different developers for each building, a shared district graywater treatment system is not proposed; rather, as each building is constructed, a dedicated graywater treatment system would be installed for that building. Since there are multiple developers for the site, a shared district graywater treatment system would not be a viable option.~~ Therefore, a dedicated graywater treatment system would be fully developed and coordinated with SFPUC as the project evolves.
- **Wastewater.** The project would include construction of wastewater collection lines throughout the site. These wastewater pipelines would connect to the existing combined sewer system in Ocean Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way. The wastewater from the site would be collected and conveyed to the Westside Pump Station for treatment at the Oceanside Treatment Plant.
- **Stormwater.** The proposed project would include a stormwater management system that would comply with the City's stormwater management ordinance. The system would be designed with low-impact design concepts and stormwater management systems, designed to retain and reuse some of the stormwater captured onsite. As required, proposed streets would also incorporate bio-filtration via bioswales or pervious surfaces where feasible.
- **Electricity.** Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) has both overhead and underground lines along Frida Kahlo Way and underground lines along Ocean Avenue. The proposed project would extend electrical distribution lines to serve the project site.
- **Natural Gas.** There are existing natural gas lines in Ocean Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way. The proposed project would extend natural gas distribution lines throughout the site, connecting to the existing lines.
- **Emergency Generators.** The Developer's Proposed and Additional Housing Options would include two and six backup emergency generators, respectively.²² No emergency generators would be installed near the SFPUC right-of-way due to the presence of subsurface high-pressure water transmission pipelines.

Commented [WW(62)]: I don't understand the difference between a shared district system described here, which would not be a "viable option", and the dedicated system in the next sentence which appears to be viable. Please clarify.

Commented [SY63R62]: ESA: the project sponsor provided clarification text. See edits.

Commented [SY64]: ESA: added per comment in AQ section

²² Emergency diesel generators are only required if the top floor level is higher than 75 feet. It is unlikely that the top floor level for each proposed project option would be higher than 75 feet. However, the analysis in this SEIR conservatively assumes that the proposed project options would include emergency diesel generators.

2.E.10 Sustainability Plan

The proposed project would establish a sustainability plan that outlines performance and monitoring criteria for its operation. The project would comply with the state's Title 24 and San Francisco Green Building Code requirements for energy efficiency and the San Francisco Water Efficient Irrigation Ordinance (San Francisco Administrative Code chapter 63) for water efficiency. The project sponsor would evaluate renewable energy approaches such as solar and living roofs as part of the sustainability plan to be included in the proposed project. The project would pursue Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design™ (LEED®) Gold® certification for the proposed buildings.²³

2.F Project Variants

In addition to the specific characteristics of the proposed project described above, there are four proposed variants: (1) Aboveground Public Parking; (2) South Street Alignment and Aboveground Public Parking at North End of Site; (3) Assumes Pedestrians and Bicycles Would Not Access the Site via San Ramon Way; and (4) North Street Extension. The variants modify one limited feature or aspect of the Developer's Proposed Option, unlike the alternatives to the proposed project analyzed in SEIR Chapter 6, Alternatives, which provide a different features or characteristics to the proposed project. Therefore, each variant is the same as the Developer's Proposed Option except for the specific variation described. The variants are being considered by the project sponsor but have not been confirmed to be part of the Developer's Proposed Option. Only Variant 4 applies to both project options. These variants are analyzed in SEIR Chapter 5, Variants, at a sufficient level of detail so that any variant or combination of variants could be included in the Developer's Proposed Option (Variants 1–4) and the Additional Housing Option (Variant 4 only) as part of an approval action.

2.G Project Construction Overview and Schedule

Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to occur in three main phases over the course of six years, from 2021 to 2027, as depicted in **Table 2-2, Preliminary Construction Schedule by Phase**. The construction phasing and durations would be similar for both project options.

²³ LEED is a green building certification program developed by U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC). LEED v4 is the newest version of the program. LEED uses a green building rating system designed to reduce the negative environmental impacts of buildings and improve occupant health and well-being. Building projects satisfy prerequisites and earn points to achieve different levels of certification. Based on the number of points achieved, a project then earns one of four LEED® rating levels: Certified®, Silver®, Gold®, or Platinum®.

**TABLE 2-2
PRELIMINARY CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE BY PHASE**

Construction Stage	Proposed Development under Developer's Proposed Option	Proposed Development under the Additional Housing Option	Start	Finish	Duration
Phase 0 (Grading and Site Infrastructure)			2021	2022	1 year
Phase 1	Block TH 1 Block TH 2 Block C Block D Block E Block F	Block TH 1 Block TH 2 Block C Block D Block E Block F Block I Block J	2022	2024	2.5 years
Phase 2	Block A Block B Block G Block H	Block A Block B Block G Block H	2024	2027	2.5 years

SOURCE: Reservoir Community Partners, LLC, 2018.

NOTES:

All dates and construction phasing estimates are subject to change by market conditions and other factors. Under an extended construction schedule, construction activities would be less intensive and would have less overlap between the phases. If construction occurs over a shorter period, Phases 1 and 2 could occur simultaneously following Phase 0.

The initial phase (Phase 0) would include demolition of the west side berm, and north and east embankments, followed by grading, excavation, and construction of site infrastructure over 12 months from 2021 to 2022. Two phases of vertical construction would follow, each lasting approximately 24 months. The construction activities during Phases 1 and 2 would include, but not be limited to, finish grading, excavation for subgrade parking, construction of building foundations, building construction, architectural coatings, and paving. **Figure 2-18, Proposed Developer's Option Construction Phasing**, and **Figure 2-19, Additional Housing Option Construction Phasing**, shows the vertical construction phasing on the project site. As shown in Figure 2-18 and Figure 2-19, the townhome and inner blocks first during Phase 1, followed by development of the south and north ends of the site during Phase 2. As shown in Table 2-2, multiple blocks would be developed under each Phases 1 and 2 for both project options. In general, the construction of each block and associated buildings would occur in parallel for each phase for both project options. Construction of Phase 1 would occur from 2022 to 2024. Construction of Phase 2 would occur from 2024 to 2027, after Phase 1 is complete. Buildings constructed in Phase 1 would be occupied during construction of Phase 2.

Figure 2-18 Proposed Developer's Option Construction Phasing

Figure 2-19 Additional Housing Option Construction Phasing

As stated in the footnote to Table 2-2, the phasing of project implementation would be subject to changes due to market conditions and other unanticipated factors. ~~As such~~ Consequently, construction could be complete as early as 2024 or extend beyond 2027. If construction occurs over a shorter period than shown in Table 2-2 (e.g., Phases 1 and 2 occurring simultaneously following Phase 0), a relatively larger amount of construction would take place during a relatively shorter period of time, thereby increasing the typical daily construction activity. The construction analysis in SEIR Chapter 3, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, is generally based on conservative assumptions where appropriate and described in the "Approach to Analysis" section of the resource topic area.

Commented [WW(65)]: Let us leave this out of the project description and subsequent analysis (unless somehow this is more impactful in a topic). We don't want to confuse the reader that this is somehow more impactful.

Commented [SY66R65]: ESA: ok. Deletion accepted.

Construction would generally occur between the hours of 7 a.m. and 8 p.m., up to seven days a week, consistent with San Francisco Police Code section 2908. Certain construction activities such as large concrete pours, may require earlier start or later finish times to accommodate such time-specific activities. Construction activities that extend beyond normal hours would be subject to review, permitting, and approval by the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection.

2.G.1 Grading, Soil Excavation, and Hauling

Currently, the grade of the site along the west side is approximately at the same elevation as the adjacent residential area along Plymouth Avenue within Westwood Park; however, the two areas are separated by the 30-foot-tall berm. As described under SEIR Section 2.D.2, Project Site, p. 2-7, the project site slopes gently upward from west to east. There are also 18- and 30-foot increases in elevation between the project site bottom and the top of the eastern and northern slopes, respectively.

The proposed project would require removal of the west side berm, and north and east embankments, with the soil redistributed and used as fill to raise the grade of the project site such that once constructed, the ground floor levels of the buildings, pathways, and roadways would match the grades of adjacent areas along each side of the site (see Figure 2-8, p. 2-20).

Soil excavation and grading of the site would occur during Phase 0 of construction. The proposed grading plan intends to balance the site and use as much cut soil as fill soil in other areas of the site, minimizing ~~or eliminating~~ the need for either soil import or export. The Developer's Proposed Option would require approximately 171,000 cubic yards of cut and excavated material would include concrete, asphalt, and soil from the berms and embankments and the parking lot, of which approximately 115,000 cubic yards would be recycled and reused onsite. The Additional Housing Option would require approximately 108,000 cubic yards of cut and excavated material, which would be recycled and reused onsite. Graders, excavators, and dozers would be used to remove and redeposit soil on the project site. During Phase 0, excess soil would be stockpiled onsite on Blocks B and H. Under the Developer's Proposed Option only, the below-grade public parking garage on Blocks A and B would require excavation to a depth of approximately 20 feet at the beginning of Phase 2. Approximately 56,000 cubic yards of stockpiled and excavated soil would be exported at the beginning of Phase 2 over 2 months. Under the Additional Housing Option only, no below-grade public parking garage would be constructed and approximately 9,000 cubic yards of soil would be imported at the beginning of Phase 2. The maximum depth of excavation under the Additional Housing Option would be approximately 5 feet.

Commented [SY67]: Note to reviewers: this information was added based on confirmation provided by sponsor team re: geology/soils in the initial study. The Additional Housing Option would not include a below grade public parking lot, and therefore would have similar earthwork numbers as Variants 1 and 2.

2.G.2 Construction Employment

The number of daily construction workers at the project site would vary over the course of construction, depending on the specific construction activities being performed, and overlap between block construction. The number of construction workers per day at the project site would range from an average 33 workers per day (during Phase 0 for both project options) to a maximum of 460 workers per day (during Phase 1 for the Additional Housing Option).

2.G.3 Construction Equipment and Staging

A variety of mobile and stationary construction equipment would be used at the project site during construction. Track/tire-mounted cranes and/or tower cranes would also be used for building construction, including but not limited to, precast or prefabricated erection, and building façades. Other mobile equipment such as excavators, graders, backhoes, loaders, dump trucks, compactors, pavers and forklifts would be used at the project site for a range of other construction tasks on the project site, including excavation, site clearing and grading, building construction, and/or hardscape and landscape materials installation.

In order to minimize the need for exporting materials, a recycling facility would be located onsite during Phase 0 to crush and recycle asphalt, rock, and concrete from demolition of the berm and parking lot.

Project construction would also generate offsite truck trips for deliveries of concrete and other building materials, transportation of construction equipment to and from the site, hauling soils and debris from the site, and street sweepers. Miscellaneous stationary equipment would include generators, crushing and processing equipment, and cement and mortar mixers. A variety of smaller, mechanical equipment would also be used at the project site during the construction period, such as jackhammers/pavement breakers, saw cutters, chopping saws, tile saws, stud impact guns, impact drills, torque wrenches, welding machines, and concrete pumps.

2.G.4 Parking During Construction

On-site parking would be provided for construction worker vehicles throughout the construction period. During Phase 0, construction worker parking would be provided in areas not under construction. Public parking would not be available at the site during Phase 0. During the initial portion of Phase 0, the site may not be available for public parking for safety reasons and due to mass grading and construction activities. During construction of Phase 1, unused portions of the site would be paved to allow surface vehicular parking until Phase 2 construction begins. The central park area of the site would also be available for construction worker parking during Phase 1 until it is constructed. During construction of Phase 2 and operation of Phase 1, on-street parking would be available along streets constructed during Phase 1 and in the SFPUC open space area; however, the public parking garage would not be yet available, as it would be under construction during Phase 2. ~~no surface vehicular parking areas would be available.~~ Public parking would be accommodated in the public parking garage (under the Developer's Proposed Option), when it is completed.

2.G.5 Building Foundations

The proposed buildings are planned as ~~±~~type III or ~~±~~type V wood-framed construction²⁴ over a ground floor of ~~±~~type I reinforced-concrete construction²⁵ that would accommodate parking, amenity spaces, and in some cases residential units. The foundations for the townhomes, multifamily structures, and parking structures are anticipated to be of conventional spread footings. The project would not require pile driving.

2.H Graphic Exhibits of Proposed Project

~~[Note to Reviewer: Axonometric drawings from vantage points to be provided by sponsor team for submittal with DSEIR-2.]~~

~~A number of graphic exhibits depicting the proposed project development are presented in Figure 2-20, Aerial View of Project Site Looking Southeast, through Figure 2-24, View of Project Site Looking North from Unity Plaza, pp. 2-48 through 2-52, for informational purposes. These figures are conceptual drawings of one potential massing scheme and do not represent the final design of the individual buildings. Detailed drawings and visual renderings of the buildings that would comply with the proposed special use district massing controls and associated zoning map amendments for the site would be included with subsequent project approvals.~~

Commented [PJ(68)]: Also need to say here that more detailed drawings would be included with subsequent project approvals (i.e., not with the SUD approvals that will happen immediately after CEQA clearance).

Commented [SY69R68]: ESA: Done

2.I Required Project Approvals

The proposed project is subject to review and approvals by several local, regional, state, and federal agencies. Certification of the final SEIR by the San Francisco Planning Commission, which would be appealable to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, is required before any other discretionary approval or permits would be issued for the proposed project. The proposed project may require project approvals, recommendations, consents, and/or plan amendments from the following:

Commented [WW(70)]: We will provide further input in the next round of review.

Commented [SY71R70]: ESA: noted.
Edits provided on 4/24/19 and 4/25/19 have been incorporated.

2.I.1 State and Regional Agencies

Regional Water Quality Control Board – San Francisco Bay Region

- Approval of Section 401 water quality certification
- Approval of General Construction Stormwater Permit

²⁴ Type III construction is defined as construction in which the exterior walls are of noncombustible materials and the interior building elements are of any material permitted by the California Building Code. Type V construction is defined as construction in which the structural elements, exterior walls, and interior walls are of any materials permitted by the California Building Code.

²⁵ Type I construction is defined as construction in which the building primary structural frame, bearing walls, nonbearing walls and partitions, floor construction, and roof construction are of noncombustible materials, except as permitted in the California Building Code.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District

- Approval of any necessary air quality permits (e.g., Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate) for individual air pollution sources, such as emergency diesel generators

Figure 2-20 Aerial View of Project Site Looking Southeast

Figure 2-21 View of Project Site Looking West from Cloud Hall

[Figure 2-22 View of Project Site Looking South from Montecito and Colon Avenues](#)

Figure 2-23 View of Project Site Looking North from Lee and Lakeview Avenues

[Figure 2-24 View of Project Site Looking North from Unity Plaza](#)

2.I.2 Local Agencies

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

- Approval of general plan amendments
- Approval of planning code amendments (SUD) and associated zoning map and height map amendments
- Approval of a development agreement
- Approval of final subdivision map
- Approval of ~~street vacations~~, dedications and easements for public improvements, and acceptance of ~~(or delegation to Public Works Director to accept)~~ public improvements, as necessary
- Agreement with City College of San Francisco for roadway access and any joint development of streets, if applicable

San Francisco Planning Commission

- Certification of the final SEIR
- Adoption of CEQA findings
- Approval of special use district design standards and guidelines
- Initiation and recommendation to [the San Francisco](#) Board of Supervisors to approve amendments to the general plan
- Initiation and recommendation to the [San Francisco B](#)oard of [S](#)upervisors to approve planning code amendments adopting an SUD and associated zoning map amendments
- Recommendation to [the San Francisco](#) Board of Supervisors to approve a development agreement

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission or General Manager

- ~~Approval of purchase and sale agreement for sale of the land~~
- ~~Issuance of a real estate license for proposed uses on the SFPUC Open Space~~
- ~~License for construction equipment and staging in SFPUC's right of way, which would be subject to SFPUC engineering regulations~~
- ~~Consent to development agreement~~
- ~~Approval of changes to connections to the sewer system~~
- ~~Approval of an erosion and sediment control plan per San Francisco Public Works Code article 4.1~~
- ~~Approval of a post construction stormwater design guidelines, including a stormwater control plan that complies with the city's 2016 Stormwater Management Requirements and Design Guidelines~~
- ~~Approval of any changes to existing publicly owned fire hydrants, water service laterals, water meters, and/or water mains~~
- ~~Approval of the size and location of the project's new fire, standard, irrigation, and/or recycled water service laterals~~

- ~~Approval of the landscape plan per the Water Efficient Irrigation Ordinance~~
- ~~Approval of required documentation on potable water (joint approval by the health department)~~
- ~~Approval of a water supply assessment~~
- ~~Actions and approvals related to its jurisdictional authority~~
- Actions and approvals related to a development agreement and a purchase and sale agreement, and other actions and approvals related to its jurisdictional authority

Formatted: Not Highlight

San Francisco Department of Public Works

- Actions and approvals related to its jurisdictional authority

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

- Approval of transit improvements, public improvements and infrastructure, including certain roadway improvements, stop controls, bicycle infrastructure and loading zones, to the extent included in the project
- ~~Consent to development agreement~~

San Francisco Fire Department

- Actions and approvals related to its jurisdictional authority
- ~~Consent to development agreement~~

San Francisco Department of Building Inspection

- Approval and issuance of demolition, grading, and site construction permits
- Nighttime construction permit, if required

San Francisco Department of Public Health

- Actions and approvals related to its jurisdictional authority
- ~~Oversee compliance with San Francisco Health Code article 22A (Maher Ordinance)~~
- ~~Approval of a construction dust control plan per San Francisco Health Code article 22B~~
- ~~(joint approval by the public utilities commission)~~

City College of San Francisco

- ~~Agreement with the City for roadway access and any joint development of streets, if applicable~~ Act as responsible agency under CEQA

Commented [PJ(72)]: Please make sure that somewhere else in the document it says that City College is acting as a responsible agency under CEQA. If not, keep it here but the bullet should say "Act as responsible agency under CEQA"

Commented [SY73R72]: ESA: done

[This page intentionally left blank]