


SFMTA - TASC SUMMARY SHEET

<p>PreStaff_Date: 10/3/2023</p> <p>Requested_by: SFMTA</p> <p>Handled: Alison Mathews for ^{SMR}</p> <p>Section Head : MS</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing Consent</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing Regular</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Informational / Other PH - Regular</p>	<p>No objections: _____</p> <p>Item Held: _____</p> <p>Other: _____</p>
<p>Location: Diamond Heights Boulevard at Duncan Street (north)</p>		
<p>Subject: Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon</p>		
<p>PROPOSAL / REQUEST: ESTABLISH – RECTANGULAR RAPID FLASHING BEACON (RRFB) Diamond Heights Boulevard at Duncan Street (north)</p> <p>(Supervisor District 8)</p> <p>Alison Mathews, alison.mathews@sfmta.com</p>		
<p>BACKGROUND INFORMATION / COMMENTS</p> <p>This project will add Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) to the crosswalks at Diamond Heights Boulevard and Duncan Street. This location was selected as part of the FY21 Walkfirst RRFB project based on collision history, engineering judgment and community request.</p> <p>Diamond Heights Boulevard and Duncan Street is currently an uncontrolled crossing with an existing marked crosswalk and pedestrian warning signage. The 52 Excelsior Muni line runs westbound and southbound at the intersection.</p> <p>Not on the bike network. Speed limit: 30 MPH.</p> <p>There has been 1 reported vehicle-pedestrian collision resulting in a severe injury in the past 5 years at the intersection.</p>		
<p>HEARING NOTIFICATION AND PROCESSING NOTES:</p>	<p>ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE BY: <input type="checkbox"/> SFMTA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Pending</p>	
<p>CHECK IF PREPARING SEPARATE SFMTA BOARD CALENDAR ITEM FOR PROPOSAL: <input type="checkbox"/></p>		


FY21 Walkfirst RRFB Locations

RRFB Location

- 1 Cortland Avenue & Moultrie Street
- 2 Brotherhood Way at Alemany Boulevard and Sagamore Street
- 3 Diamond Heights Boulevard & Berkeley Way
- 4 San Bruno Avenue & Woolsey Street
- 5 Gough Street & Clay Street
- 6 **Diamond Heights Blvd & Duncan St**
- 7 Fulton Street & Clayton Street
- 8 Castro Street & Henry Street
- 9 Turk Boulevard & Willard North



Map data ©2023 Google



POLE AND EQUIPMENT SCHEDULE										
POLE No.	TYPE OF POLE	LUMINAIRE TYPE	VEHICLE SIGNAL				PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL			REMARKS
			No.	TYPE	MOUNTING	VISORS	LOUVERS/BP	No.	TYPE	
①	1-A (15')		22 61	①	SIDE MOUNT SIDE MOUNT					TOP MOUNT SOLAR PANEL & TRANSMITTER ②
②	(E) MARBELITE STREET LIGHT W/ 2 LUMINAIRE ARMS		23 63	①	SIDE MOUNT SIDE MOUNT					TOP MOUNT SOLAR PANEL & TRANSMITTER
③	1-A (15')		21 62	①	SIDE MOUNT SIDE MOUNT					TOP MOUNT SOLAR PANEL & TRANSMITTER ②
④	(E) MARBELITE STREET LIGHT W/ 2 LUMINAIRE ARMS									

GENERAL NOTES:

1. POLE FOUNDATION TYPE TO BE CONSTRUCTED BY SFPW FORCES: 1-A PER CTSP ES-7B, DATED 10/30/2015, DIMENSION: 2' DIA. X 3'-6" DEPTH (REFERENCE ATTACHED)
2. POLE AND OTHER TRAFFIC EQUIPMENT TO BE PROCURED AND INSTALLED BY SFMTA.
3. EXACT POLE LOCATIONS TO BE COORDINATED WITH SFMTA SIGNAL SHOP.

SHEET NOTES:

- ① F/I JSF TECHNOLOGIES AB-9407 SOLAR DUAL SIDED RECTANGULAR RAPID FLASHING BEACON ASSEMBLY OR ACCEPTED EQUAL.
- ② F/I ASSEMBLY R62E(CA) AND PEDESTRIAN PUSH BUTTON ON POLE.

95% SUBMITTAL
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	APPROVED
TABLE OF REVISIONS CHECKOUT DRAWING THROUGH THE SID CUSTODIAN FOR THE LATEST REVISION				



DESIGNED BY:	DATE:
CHECKED BY:	DATE:
APPROVED BY:	DATE:




SCALE	1"=10'
SHEET OF SHEETS	XX OF XX

DIAMOND HEIGHTS BOULEVARD AND DUNCAN STREET		CNN NO:
		REV NO:


Drawing Path: C:\Users\omathews\SFMFA\WalkFirst_RRFBs - Documents\01_Design\ACAD\F21_L_RRFB_Signals_All.dwg, Login: omathews
 Plot Time: Thu, 07 Sep 2023 - 11:59am
 Model Units: Undefined
 Dimension Scale: 10
 Xrefs: \SFMFA SID Title Block (2020)_DRAFT.dwg
 \x SID Title Block (2020).rvt



High Injury Network Map - Diamond Heights Boulevard and Duncan Street
Diamond Heights Boulevard is not on the 2022 Vision Zero High-Injury Network at Duncan Street



**Existing Striping to Remain (no change) -
Diamond Heights Boulevard and Duncan Street**



NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	APP
1	10/07/22	① CARNELIAN: REMOVED EBLT GUIDELINES AND STOP BAR; SBRT ARROW AND HATCHING; DY & SY WITHIN INTERSECTION. ADDED EB STOP BARS	E.TANG	A.LAM
2	10/04/22	UPDATED PER FIELD: PED XING & TURN MARKINGS @ CLIPPER ST, CARNELIAN WAY	E.TANG	A.LAM
3	03/02/22	ADDED 8\"/>		



SUPERSEDES: STR-3588 REV8	APPROVED	SCALE:
SUPERSEDES: STR-3588.1 REV9	BRIDGET SMITH 11/04/09	1" = 50'
DRAWN: A.PICCAGLI	DATE: 09/2009	SENIOR ENGINEER
CHECKED: M.SALLABERRY	DATE: 09/2009	JACK L. FLECK 11/04/09
		DATE: CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER

SHEET/SHEETS:	1 OF 3
---------------	--------


TRAFFIC STRIPING

**DIAMOND HEIGHTS BOULEVARD
FROM CLIPPER TO SUSSEX STREETS**

CONTRACT NO.	
DRAWING NO.	STR-7809.1
FILE NO.	
REV. NO.	11


FILE NAME:
DATE: --/--

Aerial Photo - Diamond Heights Boulevard and Duncan Street



Transit Map - Diamond Heights Boulevard and Duncan Street

The 52 Excelsior runs on Diamond Heights Boulevard at Duncan Street




Bike Network Map - Diamond Heights Boulevard and Duncan Street

Not on the Bike Network

Bikeway Network

- Separated Bikeway
- Bike Lane
- Neighborway
- Bike Route



Street View - Diamond Heights Boulevard and Duncan Street
Facing east



Street View - Diamond Heights Boulevard and Duncan Street
Facing west



TransBASE Internal Dashboard

Geographic Extent: 22335000: DUNCAN ST at DIAMOND HEIGHTS BLVD
Spatial Intersect: SFMTA Intersection Related (<=20ft or <=150ft if Rear End)
Data Range: 04/01/2018 to 03/31/2023
Pull Date: 9/5/2023

Collision/Party/Victim Table Showing 1 to 1 of 1 entries

Count of Fatal Collisions: 0
Count of Non-Fatal Injury Collisions: 1
Total Count of Fatal/Non-Fatal Injury Collisions: 1

Case ID	Collision Date	Collision Time	Day of Week	Primary Road	Secondary Road	Distance	Direction	Party 1 Type	Party 1 Direction of Travel	Party 1 Movement Preceding Crash	Party 2 Type	Party 2 Direction of Travel	Party 2 Movement Preceding Crash	Vehicle Code Violation	Highest Degree of Injury	Type of Collision	Motor Vehicle Involved With	Hit and Run	Road Surface	Road Condition	Lighting
200681707	11/11/2020	15:12	Wednesday	DIAMOND HEIGHTS BLVD	DUNCAN ST	18	West	Driver	East	Proceeding Straight	Pedestrian	North	Other	CVC 21950(a)	Injury (Severe)	Sideswipe	Pedestrian	Felony	Dry	No Unusual Condition/ Not Stated	Daylight

Summary: 1 injury collision involving a vehicle and pedestrian resulting in severe injury.

Mathews, Alison

From: Lee, Chadwick
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 4:12 PM
To: Jeff Rubin
Cc: Prager, Jackie (BOS); Ramos, Joel; Martinsen, Janet; Roback, Soroush
Subject: RE: Contact Us Submission - Supervisor Mandelman

Hi Jeff,

Thank you for your patience. I've received an update from staff. They've informed me the intersection is part of the Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacon (RRFB) project. It is currently under design and will be advertised in the Summer of 2023. My colleague, Soroush Roback will be able to assist you further if you wish to receive an update.

Thank you again for your on-going efforts advocating for safer street in San Francisco.

From: Jeff Rubin <jeffrubin58@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 2:25 PM
To: ConstituentRqst <ConstituentRqst@sfmta.com>
Cc: Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>; Prager, Jackie (BOS) <jackie.prager@sfgov.org>; Ramos, Joel <Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com>; Martinsen, Janet <Janet.Martinsen@sfmta.com>
Subject: Re: Contact Us Submission - Supervisor Mandelman

EXT

Mr Lee,

I have not heard back from anyone at SFMTA about this request. I wanted to follow up with you as well as ask if I could find out who was leading the review of the intersection. I would like to be in the loop if and when this comes up for public review.

Jeff Rubin

On Aug 19, 2022, at 11:15 AM, ConstituentRqst <ConstituentRqst@sfmta.com> wrote:

Thank you Jackie for connecting us with Mr. Rubin.

Good morning Jeff,

Thank you for contacting your Supervisor's office. We appreciate your efforts advocating safe street for pedestrians. I believe the intersection of Duncan and Diamond is currently being reviewed by my Traffic

Engineering colleagues. They understand this issue is important to the Supervisor and his community. Let me follow up with the team to see if they have an update to share regarding the evaluation. We appreciate your patience.

Thanks again for bringing the item back to everyone's attention. Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Chadwick Lee

Senior Administrative Analyst
Government Affairs



Office 415.646.4264

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 7th floor
San Francisco, CA 94103



From: Prager, Jackie (BOS) <jackie.prager@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2022 10:20 AM
To: jeffrubin58@gmail.com
Cc: ConstituentRqst <ConstituentRqst@sfmta.com>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Contact Us Submission - Supervisor Mandelman

Hi Jeff,

Thank you for reaching out to our office. I have copied SFMTA's constituent request team to inquire about whether or not there has been an assessment made on traffic calming at the locations mentioned.

Thank you,

Jackie Prager
Legislative Aide
Office of Supervisor Rafael Mandelman, District 8
jackie.prager@sfgov.org | 415-554-6986
Pronouns: she/her/hers

Here are the results.

Jeff Rubin

Dangerous Cross Walks in Diamond Heights

5072 Diamond Heights Blvd, Unit A , 94131

4156479201

jeffrubin58@gmail.com

I am inquiring about the proposal to put an additional stop sign at Carnelian Way. There is a bigger problem at the corner of Diamond Heights and Duncan near Clipper Cars do not stop for pedestrians. in addition to that people are constantly honking their horns either at the few cars that do stop or the pedestrians trying to cross. This would be a more appropriate place to add a three way stop. also a lighted crosswalk similar to the one on Diamond heights near the SafeWay would make it safer for pedestrians. Similarly a lighted Crosswalk on Clipper just around the corner would improve pedestrian Safety as well.

Sent via [Google Form Notifications](#)

This message is from outside of the SFMTA email system. Please review the email carefully before responding, clicking links, or opening attachments.

Mathews, Alison

From: Tsui, Eddie
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 9:04 AM
To: Lee, Chadwick; Roback, Soroush
Cc: Ramos, Joel; Martinsen, Janet; Lam, Alvin
Subject: RE: D8 Constituent Request Status of Evaluation of Diamond Height/Duncan

Looping in Soroush who is handling the RRFB project.

Hi Soroush,

Is Diamond Heights/Duncan still included in the next RRFB project? Is there a status update?

Thanks,

Eddie

From: Lee, Chadwick <Chadwick.Lee@sfmta.com>
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 2:42 PM
To: Tsui, Eddie <Eddie.Tsui@sfmta.com>
Cc: Ramos, Joel <Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com>; Martinsen, Janet <Janet.Martinsen@sfmta.com>; Lam, Alvin <Alvin.Lam@sfmta.com>
Subject: RE: D8 Constituent Request Status of Evaluation of Diamond Height/Duncan

Hi Eddie,

The constituent reached out to me for an update regarding Diamond Height and Duncan safety improvement. I think we last discussed in August it was part of the RRFB project. Please let me know if there an update we can share with the constituent.

Thank you!

From: Tsui, Eddie <Eddie.Tsui@sfmta.com>
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2022 2:13 PM
To: Lee, Chadwick <Chadwick.Lee@sfmta.com>
Cc: Ramos, Joel <Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com>; Martinsen, Janet <Janet.Martinsen@sfmta.com>
Subject: RE: D8 Constituent Request Status of Evaluation of Diamond Height/Duncan

If I'm not mistaken, he was in attendance at the hearing this morning.

From: Lee, Chadwick <Chadwick.Lee@sfmta.com>
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2022 2:11 PM
To: Tsui, Eddie <Eddie.Tsui@sfmta.com>
Cc: Ramos, Joel <Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com>; Martinsen, Janet <Janet.Martinsen@sfmta.com>
Subject: RE: D8 Constituent Request Status of Evaluation of Diamond Height/Duncan

Thanks Eddie for the update. I'll let the constituent know about the result of the hearing.

From: Tsui, Eddie <Eddie.Tsui@sfmta.com>
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2022 1:31 PM
To: Lee, Chadwick <Chadwick.Lee@sfmta.com>
Cc: Ramos, Joel <Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com>; Martinsen, Janet <Janet.Martinsen@sfmta.com>
Subject: RE: D8 Constituent Request Status of Evaluation of Diamond Height/Duncan

Hi Chadwick,

STOP sign at Diamond Heights Blvd and Carnelian Way was heard at this morning's engineering public hearing. There were comments in support and no comments in opposition so it would most likely be approved by the City Traffic Engineer next week. Installation will follow but timeline is uncertain due to the shops' backlog.

A separate proposal from last year to reduce the speed limit on Diamond Heights Blvd is being packaged with other speed limit changes in the city and will be headed to the SFMTA Board soon (we don't have a specific meeting date yet). Diamond Heights/Duncan is on the list of candidate locations for the next RRFB project, but the project scope/list of locations have not been finalized yet.

We also received the same requests from Mr. Rubin and we are logging it in for engineering review. Please see attached.

Thanks,

Eddie

From: Lee, Chadwick <Chadwick.Lee@sfmta.com>
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2022 11:23 AM
To: Tsui, Eddie <Eddie.Tsui@sfmta.com>
Cc: Ramos, Joel <Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com>; Martinsen, Janet <Janet.Martinsen@sfmta.com>
Subject: D8 Constituent Request Status of Evaluation of Diamond Height/Duncan

Hi Eddie,

There was a D8 constituent request for additional stop signs at Diamond and Carnelian Wy. However, he also mentioned a larger issue on Diamond and Duncan. I reviewed our issue tracking log and it appears Duncan & Diamond was/currently being reviewed by your team. Here's the latest notes I had on the item:

12/2021 - See Sept update - we provided update for the Sept meeting: speed limit reduction will be taken to MTAB as part of a larger package with other speed limit changes in the city. Also considering adding Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) as part of an upcoming project.

Is there an update the team can share?

Thanks!

From: ConstituentRqst <ConstituentRqst@sfmta.com>
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2022 11:16 AM
To: jeffrubin58@gmail.com
Cc: Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>; Prager, Jackie (BOS) <jackie.prager@sfgov.org>; Ramos, Joel <Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com>; Martinsen, Janet <Janet.Martinsen@sfmta.com>
Subject: RE: Contact Us Submission - Supervisor Mandelman

Thank you Jackie for connecting us with Mr. Rubin.

Good morning Jeff,

Thank you for contacting your Supervisor's office. We appreciate your efforts advocating safe street for pedestrians. I believe the intersection of Duncan and Diamond is currently being reviewed by my Traffic Engineering colleagues. They understand this issue is important to the Supervisor and his community. Let me follow up with the team to see if they have an update to share regarding the evaluation. We appreciate your patience.

Thanks again for bringing the item back to everyone's attention. Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Chadwick Lee
Senior Administrative Analyst
Government Affairs



Office 415.646.4264

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 7th floor
San Francisco, CA 94103



From: Prager, Jackie (BOS) <jackie.prager@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2022 10:20 AM
To: jeffrubin58@gmail.com
Cc: ConstituentRqst <ConstituentRqst@sfmta.com>; Bintliff, Jacob (BOS) <jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: Contact Us Submission - Supervisor Mandelman

Hi Jeff,

Thank you for reaching out to our office. I have copied SFMTA's constituent request team to inquire about whether or not there has been an assessment made on traffic calming at the locations mentioned.

Thank you,

Jackie Prager
Legislative Aide
Office of Supervisor Rafael Mandelman, District 8
jackie.prager@sfgov.org | 415-554-6986
Pronouns: she/her/hers

Here are the results.

Jeff Rubin

Dangerous Cross Walks in Diamond Heights

5072 Diamond Heights Blvd, Unit A , 94131

4156479201

jeffrubin58@gmail.com

I am inquiring about the proposal to put an additional stop sign at Carnelian Way. There is a bigger problem at the corner of Diamond Heights and Duncan near Clipper Cars do not stop for pedestrians. in addition to that people are constantly honking their horns either at the few cars that do stop or the pedestrians trying to cross. This would be a more appropriate place to add a three way stop. also a lighted crosswalk similar to the one on Diamond heights near the SafeWay would make it safer for pedestrians. Similarly a lighted Crosswalk on Clipper just around the corner would improve pedestrian Safety as well.

Sent via [Google Form Notifications](#)

Mathews, Alison

From: Betsy Eddy <betsy.eddy@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 9:32 AM
To: Folks, Tom
Cc: Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Mundy, Erin (BOS); Sallaberry, Mike; Mike Kramer; Pooja Sabharwal; Roback, Soroush
Subject: Re: Diamond Heights Boulevard and Berkeley Way

EXT

Hi Tom,

Thank you for the update on means to protect pedestrians crossing Diamond Heights Blvd. at Berkeley Way.

Here are my comments in **bold**. I have asked nearby neighbors of the crosswalk for their comments.

- A pedestrian warning sign supplemented with a 150 feet distance on uphill side - **sounds good**
- Moving 30 miles per hour sign down the hill - **sounds good**
- You stated: I don't think a warning sign is needed for the southbound direction because of the excellent visibility of the crosswalk on that straight-away section. **I think "excellent visibility" is an overstatement. This morning I stood at the crosswalk to cross from west to east. You cannot see cars starting off down the road at Addison until they come farther down the hill. The problem remains that some drivers exceed the speed limit going down the hill and may not be able to stop to avoid hitting pedestrians. I think a pedestrian warning sign is needed in the south direction as well.**
- Install a flashing warning light at this intersection. **I hope funding will be found for flashing warning signs in both directions.**

Do the potential signs flash only when cars approach or pedestrians activate them?

Though MTA does not think the intersection needs STOP signs, STOP signs may be the only means to keep traffic moving too fast down the hill.

The DHCA and nearby neighbors do appreciate that MTA is making changes to make the crosswalk safer.

Gratefully,

Betsy Eddy

415-867-5774

DHCA Co-President

On Mon, May 24, 2021 at 5:05 PM Folks, Tom <Tom.Folks@sfmta.com> wrote:

Hi Betsy,

I'm following up on your concerns about the new crosswalk at Berkeley Way and Diamond Heights Boulevard.

As a near term measure, I am recommending that we replace the 30 MPH sign in the northbound direction near this crosswalk with a pedestrian warning sign supplemented with a 150 feet distance plate to warn drivers of the proximity of this crosswalk as they are approaching it going up the hill. The 30 MPH sign would be located further down the hill so that it comes before the existing 25 MPH curve warning sign. We do not want drivers to think that they should increase their speed right after the 25 MPH sign before approaching the crosswalk.

I don't think a warning sign is needed for the southbound direction because of the excellent visibility of the crosswalk on that straight-away section. The aforementioned sign changes have been written up in a work order and submitted to our Sign Shop to be completed as soon as their scheduling permits.

I have also copied other SFMTA staff members to consider the possibility of programming funds to install a flashing warning light at this intersection. Due to limited funding, we are unable to install warning lights at all potential locations. This intersection would have to be considered in relation to the other candidate locations on a priority basis.

Although we can also appreciate the suggestion to install STOP signs at this intersection, we feel that would not be the proper form of traffic control for a street like Diamond Heights Boulevard at an intersection with infrequent pedestrian crossings.

We appreciate your concerns about the safety of this intersection and thank you for contacting the City.

Sincerely,

Thomas Folks

Senior Engineer



CEQA Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address		Block/Lot(s)
SFMTA_WalkFirst Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon Installation Fiscal		
Case No.		Permit No.
2023-006660ENV		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addition/ Alteration	<input type="checkbox"/> Demolition (requires HRE for Category B Building)	<input type="checkbox"/> New Construction
<p>Project description for Planning Department approval.</p> <p>The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) proposes to install new Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) at nine intersections across San Francisco to improve pedestrian safety. RRFBs would be installed at the intersections of San Bruno Avenue at Woolsey Street, Brotherhood Way at Sagamore Street and Alemany Boulevard, Gough Street at Clay Street, Fulton Street at Clayton Street, Turk Boulevard at Willard North, Castro Street at Henry Street, Diamond Heights Boulevard at Duncan Street, Cortland Avenue at Moultrie Street, and Diamond Heights Boulevard at Berkeley Way. The proposed project (project) would involve the installation of new RRFB signal poles and foundations, pull boxes, and conduits. The project would also upgrade curb ramps in select locations, in addition to grade adjustment for select existing stormwater catch basins.</p> <p>Full project description attached below.</p>		

STEP 1: EXEMPTION TYPE

The project has been determined to be exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Class 1 - Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Class 3 - New Construction. Up to three new single-family residences or six dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Class 32 - In-Fill Development. New Construction of seven or more units or additions greater than 10,000 sq. ft. and meets the conditions described below:</p> <p>(a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.</p> <p>(b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than 5 acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.</p> <p>(c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered rare or threatened species.</p> <p>(d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.</p> <p>(e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.</p> <p>FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____
<input type="checkbox"/>	Common Sense Exemption (CEQA Guidelines section 15061(b)(3)). It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility of a significant effect on the environment. FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY

STEP 2: ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING ASSESSMENT

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Air Quality: Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g. use of diesel construction equipment, backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks, etc.)? (refer to <i>The Environmental Information tab on the https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/</i>)</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Hazardous Materials: If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks): Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance - or a change of use from industrial to residential?</p> <p>Note that a categorical exemption shall not be issued for a project located on the Cortese List if box is checked, note below whether the applicant has enrolled in or received a waiver from the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, or if Environmental Planning staff has determined that hazardous material effects would be less than significant. (refer to <i>The Environmental Information tab on the https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/</i>)</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Transportation: Does the project involve a child care facility or school with 30 or more students, or a location 1,500 sq. ft. or greater? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities?</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Archeological Resources: Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? If yes, archeology review is required.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment: Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (refer to <i>The Environmental Information tab on the https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/</i>) If box is checked, Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Average Slope of Parcel = or > 25%, or site is in Edgehill Slope Protection Area or Northwest Mt. Sutro Slope Protection Area: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) New building construction, except one-story storage or utility occupancy, (2) horizontal additions, if the footprint area increases more than 50%, or (3) horizontal and vertical additions increase more than 500 square feet of new projected roof area? (refer to <i>The Environmental Planning tab on the https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/</i>) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is likely required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Seismic Hazard: <input type="checkbox"/> Landslide or <input type="checkbox"/> Liquefaction Hazard Zone:</p> <p>Does the project involve any of the following: (1) New building construction, except one-story storage or utility occupancy, (2) horizontal additions, if the footprint area increases more than 50%, (3) horizontal and vertical additions increase more than 500 square feet of new projected roof area, or (4) grading performed at a site in the landslide hazard zone? (refer to <i>The Environmental tab on the https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/</i>) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.</p>
<p>Comments and Planner Signature (optional): Jennifer M Barbour Mckellar</p> <p>PLEASE SEE ATTACHED</p>	

**STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: <i>(refer to Property Information Map)</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6.

**STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

Check all that apply to the project.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Window replacement that meets the Department's <i>Window Replacement Standards</i> . Does not include storefront window alterations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Garage work. A new opening that meets the <i>Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts</i> , and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	6. Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <i>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows</i> .
<input type="checkbox"/>	8. Addition(s) that are not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way for 150 feet in each direction; does not extend vertically beyond the floor level of the top story of the structure or is only a single story in height; does not have a footprint that is more than 50% larger than that of the original building; and does not cause the removal of architectural significant roofing features.
Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project does not conform to the scopes of work. GO TO STEP 5.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project involves less than four work descriptions. GO TO STEP 6.

**STEP 5: ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW
TO BE COMPLETED BY PRESERVATION PLANNER**

Check all that apply to the project.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Reclassification of property status. <i>(Attach HRER Part I)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category A a. Per HRER b. Other <i>(specify):</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category C <i>(No further historic review)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces that do not remove, alter, or obscure character defining features.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.

<input type="checkbox"/>	6. Raising the building in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. Restoration based upon documented evidence of a building's historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.
<input type="checkbox"/>	8. Work consistent with the <i>Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Analysis required)</i> :
<input type="checkbox"/>	9. Work compatible with a historic district (Analysis required):
<input type="checkbox"/>	10. Work that would not materially impair a historic resource (Attach HRER Part II).
Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST sign below.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project can proceed with exemption review. The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with exemption review. GO TO STEP 6.
Comments (optional):	
Preservation Planner Signature:	

**STEP 6: EXEMPTION DETERMINATION
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No further environmental review is required. The project is exempt under CEQA. There are no unusual circumstances that would result in a reasonable possibility of a significant effect.	
	Project Approval Action: City Traffic Engineer's Directive	Signature: Jennifer M Barbour Mckellar
		08/18/2023
	<p>Supporting documents are available for review on the San Francisco Property Information Map, which can be accessed at https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/. Individual files can be viewed by clicking on the Planning Applications link, clicking the "More Details" link under the project's environmental record number (ENV) and then clicking on the "Related Documents" link.</p> <p>Once signed and dated, this document constitutes an exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the SF Admin Code. Per Chapter 31, an appeal of an exemption determination to the Board of Supervisors shall be filed within 30 days after the Approval Action occurs at a noticed public hearing, or within 30 days after posting on the Planning Department's website a written decision or written notice of the Approval Action, if the approval is not made at a noticed public hearing.</p>	

Step 2: Environmental Screening Comments

The proposed project meets the definition of a class 1 (CEQA Guidelines section 15301) categorical exemption, as a minor alteration of an existing public structure, because it would install new Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) to improve pedestrian visibility and safety at nine intersections across San Francisco.

San Francisco Public Works Standard Construction Measures would be implemented, as applicable, as part of the project: (1) Seismic and Geotechnical Studies; (2) Air Quality; (3) Water Quality; (4) Traffic; (5) Noise; (6) Hazardous Materials; (7) Biological Resources; (8) Visual and Aesthetic Considerations (Project Site); and (9) Cultural Resources: Archeological Resources (Public Works Standard Archeological Measure I: Discovery during Construction) and Historic (Built Environment) Resources. Project-related physical environmental impacts would be less than significant.

None of the CEQA Guidelines section 15300.2 exceptions apply to the proposed project.

STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, when a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempt project changes after the Approval Action and requires a subsequent approval, the Environmental Review Officer (or his or her designee) must determine whether the proposed change constitutes a substantial modification of that project. This checklist shall be used to determine whether the proposed changes to the approved project would constitute a "substantial modification" and, therefore, be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

MODIFIED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Modified Project Description:

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption? |

If at least one of the above boxes is checked, further environmental review is required

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes. |
|--------------------------|---|

If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice. In accordance with Chapter 31, Sec 31.08j of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of this determination can be filed to the Environmental Review Officer within 10 days of posting of this determination.

Planner Name:

Date:



Date: August 18, 2023
To: Jennifer McKellar, San Francisco Planning Department
From: Alison Mathews, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
Through: Forrest Chamberlain, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
Re: WalkFirst Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon Installation Fiscal Year 2021
Case No.: 2023-006660ENV

Project Description

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) proposes to install new Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) at nine intersections across San Francisco to improve pedestrian safety by alerting drivers that pedestrians are crossing the street. RRFBs would be installed at the intersections of San Bruno Avenue at Woolsey Street, Brotherhood Way at Sagamore Street and Alemany Boulevard, Gough Street at Clay Street, Fulton Street at Clayton Street, Turk Boulevard at Willard North, Castro Street at Henry Street, Diamond Heights Boulevard at Duncan Street, Cortland Avenue at Moultrie Street, and Diamond Heights Boulevard at Berkeley Way. The proposed project (project) would involve the installation of new RRFB signal poles and foundations, pull boxes, and conduits. The project would also upgrade curb ramps in select locations, in addition to grade adjustment for select existing stormwater catch basins.

At the intersection of San Bruno Avenue and Woolsey Street, one new RRFB signal pole would be installed on each corner (four new poles in total). One existing curb ramp on the northeast corner of the intersection would be upgraded.

At the intersection of Brotherhood Way at Sagamore Street and Alemany Boulevard, one new RRFB pole would be installed along the eastern side and one new RRFB signal pole would be installed on the western side on the median island (two new poles in total). One new pedestrian push button pole would be installed on the eastern side of the intersection. Partial curb ramp wing reconstruction would occur for two curb ramps.

At the intersection of Gough Street and Clay Street, one new RRFB signal pole would be installed at three of the four corners (three new poles in total). No new RRFB signal pole would be installed at the northwest corner of the intersection.

At the intersection of Fulton Street and Clayton Street, one new RRFB signal pole would be installed at

the northeast corner and one new RRFB signal pole would be installed at the southeast corner (two new poles in total). One streetlight pole would be installed on the southeast corner of the intersection, and one pedestrian push button pole would be installed on the northwest corner of the intersection.

At the intersection of Turk Boulevard and Willard North, one new RRFB signal pole would be installed at the northeast corner.

At the intersection of Castro Street and Henry Street, one new RRFB signal pole would be installed at the northeast corner.

At the intersection of Diamond Heights Boulevard and Duncan Street, one new RRFB signal pole would be installed at the northeast corner and one new RRFB signal pole would be installed at the southeast corner (two new poles in total). One dual streetlight pole would be installed within the median of the intersection.

At the intersection of Cortland Avenue and Moultrie Street, one new RRFB signal pole would be installed at the southwest corner. Curb ramps would be reconstructed on the northeast corner of the intersection. Two existing on-street metered parking spaces (approximately 20 feet each in length) would be removed to improve visibility of the new RRFBs.

At the intersection of Diamond Heights Boulevard and Berkeley Way, one new RRFB signal pole would be installed at the southwest corner and one new RRFB signal pole would be installed at the southeast corner (two new poles in total). Partial curb ramp reconstruction would occur for one curb ramp on the southwest corner of the intersection.

Table 1 – Detailed Excavation Information Per Component

Component/Location	Excavation Depth (Feet)	Excavation Diameter (Feet-Inches)	Excavation (Cubic Yards)
San Bruno Avenue and Woolsey Street Intersection			
One 1-A (15') signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the northwest corner	6'	2'6"	1.09
One 1-A (15') signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the northeast corner	6'	2'6"	1.09
One 1-A (15') signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the southwest corner	6'	2'6"	1.09
One 1-A (15') signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the southeast corner	6'	2'6"	1.09
Brotherhood Way at Sagamore Street and Alemany Boulevard Intersection			
One 1-A (15') signal pole on a median island adjacent to the west side of the crosswalk	6'	2'6"	1.09

Component/Location	Excavation Depth (Feet)	Excavation Diameter (Feet-Inches)	Excavation (Cubic Yards)
One 1-A (15') signal pole on the sidewalk in advance of the crosswalk on the east side of the intersection	6'	2'6"	1.09
One pedestrian push button pole on the sidewalk adjacent to east side of the crosswalk	1'6"	1'6"	.10
Gough Street and Clay Street Intersection			
One 1-A (15') signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the northeast corner	6'	2'6"	1.09
One 1-A (15') signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the southwest corner	6'	2'6"	1.09
One 1-A (15') signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the southeast corner	6'	2'6"	1.09
Fulton Street and Clayton Street Intersection			
One pedestrian push button pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the northwest corner	1'6"	1'6"	.10
One 1-A (15') signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the northeast corner	6'	2'6"	1.09
One 1-A (15') signal pole near the crosswalk on the southeast corner	6'	2'6"	1.09
One streetlight pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the southeast corner	9'	2'6"	1.64
Turk Boulevard and Willard North Intersection			
One 1-A (15') signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the northeast corner	6'	2'6"	1.09
Castro Street and Henry Street Intersection			
One 1-A (15') signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the northeast corner	6'	2'6"	1.09
Diamond Heights Boulevard and Duncan Street Intersection			
One 1-A (15') signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the northeast corner	6'	2'6"	1.09
One 1-A (15') signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the southeast corner	6'	2'6"	1.09
One dual streetlight pole within the median on the east side of the intersection	9'	2'6"	1.64
Cortland Avenue and Moultrie Street Intersection			

Component/Location	Excavation Depth (Feet)	Excavation Diameter (Feet-Inches)	Excavation (Cubic Yards)
One 1-A (15') signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the southwest corner	6'	2'6"	1.09
Diamond Heights Boulevard and Berkeley Way Intersection			
One 1-A (15') signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the southwest corner	6'	2'6"	1.09
One 1-A (15') signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the southeast corner	6'	2'6"	1.09

The following proposed project locations are adjacent to historic resources:

- Gough/Clay streets intersection (historic buildings on adjacent block/lots 0617/008-010)
- Castro/Henry streets intersection (historic building on adjacent block/lot 3540/092)
- Diamond Heights Boulevard/Duncan Street intersection (historic buildings on adjacent block/lots 7515A/001-012 and 7504A/005-018; these buildings comprise part of the Diamond Heights Historic District)

The proposed work would be carried out by SFMTA and San Francisco Public Works crews, in addition to a licensed contractor managed by San Francisco Public Works with funding/oversight from SFMTA. Construction is anticipated to last approximately three months at each intersection. San Francisco Public Works Standard Construction Measures would be implemented, as applicable, as part of the project: (1) Seismic and Geotechnical Studies; (2) Air Quality; (3) Water Quality; (4) Traffic; (5) Noise; (6) Hazardous Materials; (7) Biological Resources; (8) Visual and Aesthetic Considerations (Project Site); and (9) Cultural Resources: Archeological Resources (Public Works Standard Archeological Measure I: Discovery during Construction) and Historic (Built Environment) Resources. Contractors would use concrete saws and jackhammers but no pile-drivers. The project would not result in the removal of any existing trees or on-street loading spaces.

There are no past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects within the vicinity of each of the proposed project sites that would combine with the project to result in a cumulative impact.

Attachments

Attachment A: WalkFirst FY21 Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon Location Map

Attachment B: Site Plans

Approval Action

The project would be approved by the City Traffic Engineer's Directive, which does not occur at a noticed public hearing. Therefore, as defined by San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 31, Sections 31.04(h)(2) and 31.08(g), the Approval Action for the purpose of CEQA would be the posting of the date of the Engineer's Directive on the Planning Department website. The Approval Action starts the 30-day exemption appeal period.