

Monthly Project Check-in Meeting

469 Stevenson Street / Case No. 2017-014833ENV

Date/Time: August 29, 2018 / 2:30 PM
Place: Conference Call: Dial-in Number: 1-866-434-5269; Participant Code: 8740112
Attendees: Jessica Range (SF Planning)
Lana Wong (SF Planning)
Katie O'Brien (Build)
Miriam Montesinos (Pelosi Law Group)
Trevor Macenski (Stantec)
Anna Radonich (Stantec)

Items:

Project updates:

- No project changes.
- Sponsor submitted all project application components on August 23, 2018.
- Sponsor to resend traffic scope of work to Lana.

CEQA Streamlining Memo:

- Trevor running through summary of memo.
- Stantec prepared a memo per the action item last month.
- Stantec looked at five streamlining options, a few were not applicable but are included in memo.
- Memo identified two feasible paths but it's ultimately up to City as to how the CEQA doc will be prepared.
 - Class 32 infill exemption would apply. Trevor provided a summary of this exemption per what's presented in the memo.
 - SB 375 21155.2 – SCEA. This utilizes concept of tiering under the Plan Bay Area EIR. Benefit is that there are certain items that are statutorily not required to analyze. Higher level legal review standard – more equivalent to EIR than ISMND. Level of effort is equivalent to robust ISMND but with the level of defensibility of an EIR.
- City Class 32 – the City feels that the project will have significant Air and possible Archaeo impacts so the City does not feel this option is a good choice. I.e., there will be mitigation measures so this would not be an option.
 - Project is located in an air pollutant zone.
 - For those areas, the City's Health Risk Analysis is that the project can adhere to the standard measure the City has identified and use these as the MMs for the project. OR, do a quantitative analysis (HRA) and then likely have to apply the MMs.
 - This is not Article 38, it is project feature mitigations.
 - Project's impact on the environment.
 - City experience in this area is typically sensitive to archaeo resources so therefore there are typically MMs for inadvertent discovery.
 - The location and size of the project and various characteristics of the project do not qualify it for Class 32.
- City feels that an SCEA or ISMND is the appropriate approach.
- The City does a high-level review of the policies of the General Plan (GP) but City doesn't do a detailed environmental review of the GP. There isn't an area-specific EIR to tier-off of.

August 29, 2018

Monthly Project Check-in Meeting

Page 2 of 3

- The City is open to SCEA but have not done one before.
- SCEA:
 - Benefit: standard of review; new; City would support moving forward with this option. But, it's up to Sponsor.
 - Downside: City would be reviewing SCEA very carefully to the Plan Bay Area to ensure it's done appropriately; may include City attorney to ensure documentation is done properly; more staff time; new to the public so therefore could be confusing; perception of different path also creates confusion.
 - MND typical timeline at City is one year after IS complete and a solid Project Description is prepared.
 - City feels an SCEA would be double effort because they have to double check everything.
 - In an SCEA, if there is a MM that the City does not feel is sufficient, the City, as the lead agency, can still prescribe mitigation, as long as there is a legal nexus requiring it.
 - Katie – asks if it's possible to do any of the upfront review with City legal now since it's new to the City, maybe the City legal can get involved now to get up to speed to understand Plan Bay Area. Jessica reply was that the City attorneys would review during review period.
 - Miriam – question: Can we provide a preliminary summary of Plan Bay Area applicability to the project ahead of time?
 - City – given that the City is promoting SCEA on another project that is currently wanting to do an EIR, the City is open to doing SCEA on this project.
 - Feedback on Outreach: Katie has been doing outreach since October 2017. Additionally, she has gone door to door in the vicinity.
 - Sponsor to talk with her attorney to decide how they want to move forward with ISMND or SCEA.
 - City will provide Stantec with comments on the proposal for Stantec to revise.
 - City notes it's Sponsor's decision on which route to go; better to decide sooner than later.

Sponsor Updates

- Lana did receive the Article 38.
- Sponsor to submit the GHG checklist (Stantec scope)
- City has received the wind and shadow scope
- Sponsor to submit AQ and noise scope (Stantec)
- Sponsor to submit the Maher application.
- City still waiting to confirm that the application is complete. After that, they will approve the scopes for wind and shadow. Application was submitted to Current Planning on August 23, 2018.
- City to submit their comments on the scope to Stantec August 30, 2018.

Action Items

- *Sponsor to resend traffic scope of work to Lana*
- *Sponsor to talk with her attorney to decide how they want to move forward with ISMND or SCEA.*
- *Sponsor to submit the GHG checklist (Stantec scope)*
- *Sponsor to submit AQ and noise scope (Stantec)*
- *Sponsor to submit the Maher application.*
- *City to submit their comments on the scope to Stantec August 30, 2018.*

August 29, 2018

Monthly Project Check-in Meeting

Page 3 of 3

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

Stantec Consulting Services Inc.



Trevor Macenski

Senior Principal, Project Manager

Phone: 916.508.4170

trevor.macenski@stantec.com



Anna Radonich

Environmental Planner, Deputy Project Manager

Phone: 925.285.6541

anna.radonich@stantec.com