**Background Information / Comments**

This project will add Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) to the crosswalks at San Bruno Avenue and Woolsey Street. This location was selected as part of the FY21 Walkfirst RRFB project based on collision history, engineering judgment and community request.

San Bruno Avenue and Woolsey Street is currently an uncontrolled crossing with existing marked crosswalks and pedestrian warning signage. San Bruno Avenue is on the 2022 Vision Zero High Injury Network at Woolsey Street.

The 8 Bayshore, 8AX Bayshore A Express, 9 San Bruno, 9R San Bruno Rapid, and 90 San Bruno Owl Muni lines run northbound and southbound on San Bruno Avenue at Woolsey Street.

Not on the bike network. Speed Limit: 20 MPH.

There has been 1 reported vehicle-pedestrian collision resulting in severe injury, and 5 other reported vehicle-pedestrian collisions in the past 5 years at the intersection.

**Hearing Notification and Processing Notes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFMTA</th>
<th>Attached</th>
<th>Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Check if Preparing Separate SFMTA Board Calendar Item for Proposal:**
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
High Injury Network Map - San Bruno Avenue and Woolsey Street

San Bruno Avenue is on the 2022 Vision Zero High-Injury Network at Woolsey Street
Existing Striping to Remain (no change) - San Bruno Avenue and Woolsey Street
Bike Network Map - San Bruno Avenue and Woolsey Street
Not on the Bike Network
### Collision/Party/Victim Table

**Showing 1 to 9 of 9 entries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case ID</th>
<th>Collision Date</th>
<th>Collision Time</th>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>Primary Road</th>
<th>Secondary Road</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Party 1 Type</th>
<th>Party 1 Movement Preceding Crash</th>
<th>Party 1 Direction of Travel</th>
<th>Party 2 Type</th>
<th>Party 2 Movement Preceding Crash</th>
<th>Party 2 Direction of Travel</th>
<th>Vehicle Code Violation</th>
<th>Highest Degree of Injury</th>
<th>Type of Collision</th>
<th>Motor Vehicle Involved With</th>
<th>Hit and Run</th>
<th>Road Surface</th>
<th>Road Condition</th>
<th>Lights</th>
<th>Days Lighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>220799409</td>
<td>11/20/2022</td>
<td>14:31</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>WOOLSEY ST</td>
<td>SAN BRUNO AVE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Making Right Turn</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Proceeding Straight</td>
<td>CVC 21950(a)</td>
<td>Injury (Other Visible)</td>
<td>Vehicle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>No Unusual Condition/ Not Stated</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220277900</td>
<td>04/28/2022</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>SAN BRUNO AVE</td>
<td>WOOLSEY ST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Proceeding Straight</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>CVC 21950(a)</td>
<td>Injury (Other Visible)</td>
<td>Vehicle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>No Unusual Condition/ Not Stated</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200084769</td>
<td>02/03/2020</td>
<td>14:28</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>SAN BRUNO AVE</td>
<td>WOOLSEY ST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Making Right Turn</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>CVC 21950(a)</td>
<td>Injury (Complaint of Pain)</td>
<td>Vehicle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>No Unusual Condition/ Not Stated</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200059079</td>
<td>01/24/2020</td>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>WOOLSEY ST</td>
<td>SAN BRUNO AVE</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Stopped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CVC Other Than Driver</td>
<td>Injury (Other Visible)</td>
<td>Rear End</td>
<td>Fixed Object</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>No Unusual Condition/ Not Stated</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200024458</td>
<td>01/10/2020</td>
<td>15:36</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>WOOLSEY ST</td>
<td>SAN BRUNO AVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Backing</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>CVC 22106</td>
<td>Injury (Complaint of Pain)</td>
<td>Vehicle/Pedestrian</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>No Unusual Condition/ Not Stated</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190226108</td>
<td>03/30/2019</td>
<td>22:42</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>SAN BRUNO AVE</td>
<td>WOOLSEY ST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Making Left Turn</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Proceeding Straight</td>
<td>CVC Not Stated</td>
<td>Injury (Severe)</td>
<td>Head-On</td>
<td>Other Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>No Unusual Condition/ Not Stated</td>
<td>Dark - Street Lights</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180770632</td>
<td>10/11/2018</td>
<td>07:29</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>SAN BRUNO AVE</td>
<td>WOOLSEY ST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Proceeding Straight</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Stopped In Road</td>
<td>CVC 21703</td>
<td>Injury (Other Visible)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>No Unusual Condition/ Not Stated</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180286322</td>
<td>04/18/2018</td>
<td>08:55</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>SAN BRUNO AVE</td>
<td>WOOLSEY ST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Making Right Turn</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Other Unsafe Turning</td>
<td>CVC 22106</td>
<td>Injury (Complaint of Pain)</td>
<td>Sideswipe</td>
<td>Other Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Unusual Condition/ Not Stated</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Count of Fatal Collisions:** 0  
**Count of Non-Fatal Injury Collisions:** 9  
**Total Count of Fatal/Non-Fatal Injury Collisions:** 9
## Case ID 180260382
### Collision Information
- **Date:** 04/08/2018
- **Time:** 21:50
- **Day:** Sunday
- **Location:** SAN BRUNO AVE and WOOLSEY ST
- **Primary Road:** SAN BRUNO AVE
- **Secondary Road:** WOOLSEY ST
- **Distance:** 0 ft
- **Direction of Travel:** Proceeding Straight
- **Type:** Driver
- **Movement Before Crash:** Proceeding Straight
- **Severity:** Injury (Severe)
- **Vehicle Code Violation:** CVC 21950(a)
- **Highest Degree of Injury:** Injury (Severe)
- **Type of Collision:** Broadside
- **Motor Vehicle Involved:** Pedestrian
- **Hit and Run:** No Unusual Condition/Not Stated
- **Road Surface:** Dry
- **Road Condition:** No Unusual Condition/Not Stated
- **Lighting:** Dark - Street Lights

### Summary
1 collision involving a vehicle and pedestrian with a severe injury, and 5 other reported collisions involving pedestrians.
Hi Joël,

I’ll work with my team to put together a list of pending TC requests for D9. In the meantime, the cost of an RRFB is more in the range of $150k-$175k, particularly if we’re doing a one-off installation where there are no economies of scale.

On a related note, we will be kicking off the new RRFB Installation program soon headed up by the signals group in Livable Streets (led by Soroush Roback in Mike Sallaberry’s section). There is $600k programmed in the CIP for each year beginning with FY21 and the plan is to submit an ARF to the TA next month to get things up and running. The idea would be to fund design and construction of about 2-4 RRFB’s each year, likely delivered through a JOC contract. The exact number will depend on several factors and I don’t know where a location like San Bruno/Woolsey will rank, but I suppose there’s a possibility that in any given year of the program the scope could be expanded if CRT (or NTIP) monies are made available to supplement the Prop K funding. Obviously there are still a lot of moving parts and details to be worked out so we shouldn’t make any assumptions or commitments just yet.

Jenn/Daniel – let’s have a quick check-in once you’ve compiled the initial list. I have a proposed project on Crescent Ave that needs to be added to the list.

Soroush – I’ll set up a meeting for us to talk about RRFB’s.

Thanks,
Damon

Hi Damon,

Can you get a status of traffic calming projects in D9 to Amy (below)?

I’ve noticed a significant increase in your workload since COVID-19, Damon, and I thank you for your continued dedication to getting these matters addressed.

Best,
Joel, forgive me if I missed it, but do you have a list of all the D9 traffic calming request that have made it to MTA attention?

Thanks,
Amy

That’s great info— thank you Joel!!

Get Outlook for iOS

Hi Jennifer,

Was in meetings all day, so I apologise I could not get back to you earlier.

Basically, CRT funding is to use for WHATEVER you want, so long as our engineers approve of the application. Amy knows the ins and outs. Believe it or not, $100k doesn’t get one much these days, but having something that can be used for expediting a project can be a great way to be as responsive as possible for community needs. I can talk more over the weekend or next week, just let me know!
From: Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.li-d9@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2021 11:42:30 AM
To: Ramos, Joel <Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com>
Cc: Beinart, Amy (BOS) <amy.beinart@sfgov.org>; Monge, Paul (BOS) <paul.monge@sfgov.org>; Lerma, Santiago (BOS) <santiago.lerma@sfgov.org>
Subject: SFMTA Community Response Team funding

This is great info, Joel! Can you give me a brief overview on what we could use CRT funding for (vs using other SFMTA routes/ processes), or what other districts have used this money for? That way, our office can figure out what projects we can most strategically apply this funding towards. I can also do a call if it’s too complicated to spell out in an email, whichever works for you! (917) 573 1488

Jennifer Li 李嘉欣
Administrative Aide, District Liaison 市参事助理
San Francisco District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen 市参事盧凱莉
Jennifer.Li-D9@sfgov.org
(415) 554-5144

From: Ramos, Joel <Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2021 5:24 PM
To: Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.li-d9@sfgov.org>
Cc: Martinsen, Janet (MTA) <Janet.Martinsen@sfmta.com>
Subject: Fw: Fw: flashing lights at San Bruno Ave & Woolsey

Hi Jennifer,

Wanted to let you know that we could use our Community Response Team funding for a flashing beacon here if Supervisor Ronen would like. Keep in mind that the CRT funding is limited to $100K per year, and given our budget constraints, what is not spent per fiscal year no longer "rolls over" into the next. Currently, we have about $114K reserved for you to use however you would like in D9. Flashing Beacons run about $50K per installation.

Please note that we did just complete that San Bruno Ave. transit / ped improvement on San Bruno, so things should be a lot better than before, and certainly better than places that haven’t recently received investment. https://www.sfmta.com/projects/san-bruno-ave-multimodal-improvement-project
Hi Joel,

Thanks for chatting with us about the other SFMTA concern over at San Bruno/Silliman.

I wanted to follow up to see if there's any new info about how to request pedestrian flashing lights at the San Bruno Ave / Woolsey St intersection.

Best,

Valerie

On Wed, Dec 23, 2020 at 1:14 PM Ramos, Joel <Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com> wrote:

Hello Ms. Luu,

Thanks for sending that!
We'll try our best, but it may take a few days given the holiday to get back to you.

I'll be in touch ASAP about what my colleagues can find.

Thanks for your patience!

Joél T. Ramos

Local Government Affairs Manager
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

(415) 646-2067

From: Valerie Luu <valerie@portolasf.org>
Sent: Wednesday, December 23, 2020 13:12
To: Ramos, Joel <Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com>
Cc: Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.li-d9@sfgov.org>; Martinsen, Janet <Janet.Martinsen@sfmta.com>
Subject: Re: Fw: flashing lights at San Bruno Ave & Woolsey

Hi Joel,

The ticket number is 12747632. Thank you for your help passing this along!

Best,

Valerie

On Wed, Dec 23, 2020 at 12:59 PM Ramos, Joel <Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com> wrote:

Hello Valerie,

Do you happen to have the 311 request number?

Also, I'm forwarding this inquiry to my colleagues who work on these projects, to see if they might have any insight.

Will let you know what we hear back.

Thanks!

Thank you!
Hi Joel,

Thanks for your response.

This request is for San Bruno Avenue, a commercial street. Would it be eligible for the Residential Traffic Calming program? If so, do you know when the applications will open up again?

Our request was to install pedestrian flashing lights on San Bruno Avenue and Woolsey, similar to the lights installed at San Bruno Avenue and Felton. Is there another program or process we can submit this request to SFMTA? This website recommended that we submit a request to 311 (the neighborhood has already submitted at least two.)

Below is the request:
San Bruno residents and merchants have requested an urgent need to install a pedestrian crosswalk button and in-roadway flashing lights on San Bruno Ave & Woolsey St. San Bruno Avenue is a commercial corridor, There is a multi-unit residential unit on the corner, so many so many families -- including children and seniors -- cross the busy intersection on a daily basis. San Bruno Avenue is a car-heavy street, so more visibility is needed for pedestrian safety.

Please let us know if there are alternative ways to submit this request to SFMTA.

Best,

Valerie

On Tue, Dec 22, 2020 at 1:58 PM Ramos, Joel <Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com> wrote:

Hello Jennifer and Ms. Luu,

Thank you for your inquiry.

Please see the following from our traffic calming program webpage:

https://www.sfmta.com/getting-around/walk/residential-traffic-calming-program
"CURRENT STATUS: The application period for the Fiscal Year 2020/2021 Traffic Calming Program Cycle ended June 30, 2020. Thank you everyone for your interest in the program as we received well over 100 submissions. In the coming weeks and months, SFMTA staff will complete the planning/evaluation phase of the application process, which includes collecting traffic speeds and volumes on each block, followed by compiling and analyzing that data to determine which applications meet the established guidelines and criteria for acceptance. Each applicant from the FY20/21 cycle will be notified of our decision in February or March 2021."

Just like everything else, the pandemic has had an impact on our ability to do work as well, and we thank the public for their patience and understanding.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Best,

Joël T. Ramos

Local Government Affairs Manager
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

(415) 646-2067

---

From: Valerie Luu <valerie@portolasf.org>
Sent: Tuesday, December 22, 2020 13:32
To: Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.li-d9@sfgov.org>
Cc: Ramos, Joel <Joel.Ramos@sfmta.com>
Subject: Re: Fw: flashing lights at San Bruno Ave & Woolsey

Hi Joel,

Nice to meet you!

Please let me know if there is someone we should be reaching out to regarding this request.

Best,

Valerie

On Thu, Dec 3, 2020 at 2:26 PM Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.li-d9@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Joel,
Can you see if you can help with with request, or help forward Valerie along to the appropriate person? Thank you!

Jennifer Li 李嘉欣
Administrative Aide, District Liaison 市參事助理
San Francisco District 9 Supervisor Hillary Ronen 市參事盧凱莉
Jennifer.Li-D9@sfgov.org
(415) 554-5144

From: Valerie Luu <valerie@portolasf.org>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 4:15 PM
To: Li-D9, Jennifer (BOS) <jennifer.li-d9@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: flashing lights at San Bruno Ave & Woolsey

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi Jennifer,

We put in a request to get pedestrian safety crossing lights installed on Woolsey and San Bruno Avenue. I wrote to SFMTA and 311 in August 2020, but never heard back.

The residents in the condo building on the corner and owner of Tierra Market expressed a need for more pedestrian visibility.

Do you have any advice on who else to contact?

Best,

Valerie

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: Valerie Luu <valerie@portolasf.org>
Date: Fri, Nov 27, 2020 at 4:12 PM
Subject: Re: flashing lights at San Bruno Ave & Woolsey
To: <livablestreets@sfmta.com>

Hello,

We are just following up on a request we made in August 2020, which I've copied below for your reference:

My name is Valerie Luu and I'm the Corridor Manager for San Bruno Avenue.

A few residents and merchants have requested an urgent need to install a pedestrian crosswalk button and in-roadway flashing lights on San Bruno Ave & Woosley St. There is a multi-unit residential unit on the corner, so there
many individuals, family and seniors that cross the busy intersection on a daily basis. San Bruno Avenue is a car-heavy street, so more visibility is needed for pedestrian safety.

Please let us know what the process is to install a pedestrian crosswalk button and flashing lights to San Bruno & Woolsey. I also submitted this request through 311 (ticket #: 12747632).

Best,

Valerie

On Fri, Nov 27, 2020 at 4:11 PM Portola Neighborhood Association <pna.portolasf@gmail.com> wrote:

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: Portola Neighborhood Association <pna.portolasf@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Aug 7, 2020 at 4:42 PM
Subject: flashing lights at San Bruno Ave & Woolsey
To: <livablestreets@sfmta.com>

Hello!

My name is Valerie Luu and I'm the Corridor Manager for San Bruno Avenue.

A few residents and merchants have requested an urgent need to install a pedestrian crosswalk button and in-roadway flashing lights on San Bruno Ave & Woosley St. There is a multi-unit residential unit on the corner, so there many individuals, family and seniors that cross the busy intersection on a daily basis. San Bruno Avenue is a car-heavy street, so more visibility is needed for pedestrian safety.

Please let us know what the process is to install a pedestrian crosswalk button and flashing lights to San Bruno & Woolsey. I also submitted this request through 311 (ticket #: 12747632).

Best,

Valerie
Hi Soroush,

The Street Design Advisory Team (SDAT) reviewed a development at 2861-2899 San Bruno Avenue today. The City may require the developer to build a pedestrian bulb at the NE corner of San Bruno/Woolsey (other 3 corners had bulbs added in 2019 by the San Bruno Multimodal Improvement Project). Bryant alerted me that you are working on an RRFB at this intersection, so wanted to give you a heads up about the possible bulb. Let me know your anticipated project schedule, and I can connect you with the developer for coordination, if needed.

Thanks,

Dustin White
Senior Transportation Planner
415.646.2353

SFMTA.com
CEQA Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFMTA_WalkFirst Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon Installation Fiscal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Permit No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2023-006660ENV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additions/Alterations</th>
<th>Demolition (requires HRE for Category B Building)</th>
<th>New Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project description for Planning Department approval.
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.

Full project description attached below.

STEP 1: EXEMPTION TYPE

The project has been determined to be exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

- [ ] Class 1 - Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.
- [ ] 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.
- [ ] 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:
  (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.
  (b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than 5 acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.
  (c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered rare or threatened species.
  (d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.
  (e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY

- [ ] Other ___

- [ ] 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Air Quality:</strong> 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.)?</th>
<th>(refer to The Environmental Information tab on the <a href="https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/">https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/</a>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazardous Materials:</strong> 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? *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 The Environmental Information tab on the <a href="https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/">https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/</a>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation:</strong> 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?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archeological Resources:</strong> 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment:</strong> Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (refer to The Environmental Information tab on the <a href="https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/">https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/</a>) If box is checked, Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Slope of Parcel = or &gt; 25%, or site is in Edgehill Slope Protection Area or Northwest Mt. Sutro Slope Protection Area:</strong> 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 The Environmental Planning tab on the <a href="https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/">https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/</a>) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is likely required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seismic Hazard: □Landslide or □Liquefaction Hazard Zone:</strong> 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 The Environmental tab on the <a href="https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/">https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/</a>) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments and Planner Signature (optional):** Jennifer M Barbour Mckellar

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED
STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE  
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: (refer to Property Information Map)

☐ Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.
☐ Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.
☒ 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.

☐ 1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included.
☐ 2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
☐ 3. Window replacement that meets the Department’s Window Replacement Standards. Does not include storefront window alterations.
☐ 4. Garage work. A new opening that meets the Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts, and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.
☐ 5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
☐ 6. Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
☐ 7. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows.
☐ 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.

☐ Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5.
☐ Project does not conform to the scopes of work. GO TO STEP 5.
☐ Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5.
☐ 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.

☐ 1. Reclassification of property status. (Attach HRER Part I)
   ☐ Reclassify to Category A
     ☐ a. Per HRER
   ☐ Reclassify to Category C
     ☐ b. Other (specify):

☐ 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.

☐ 3. Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces that do not remove, alter, or obscure character defining features.

☐ 4. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character.

☐ 5. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
6. **Raising the building** in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.

7. **Restoration** based upon documented evidence of a building's historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.

8. **Work consistent** with the *Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (Analysis required):

9. **Work compatible** with a historic district (Analysis required):

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.

   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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Approval Action:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Traffic Engineer's Directive</td>
<td>Jennifer M Barbour Mckellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08/18/2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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.
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 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?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planner Name:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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 divers 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/Location</th>
<th>Excavation Depth (Feet)</th>
<th>Excavation Diameter (Feet-Inches)</th>
<th>Excavation (Cubic Yards)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno Avenue and Woolsey Street Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One 1-A (15’) signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the northwest corner</td>
<td>6’</td>
<td>2’6”</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One 1-A (15’) signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the northeast corner</td>
<td>6’</td>
<td>2’6”</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One 1-A (15’) signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the southwest corner</td>
<td>6’</td>
<td>2’6”</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One 1-A (15’) signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the southeast corner</td>
<td>6’</td>
<td>2’6”</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brotherhood Way at Sagamore Street and Alemany Boulevard Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One 1-A (15’) signal pole on a median island adjacent to the west side of the crosswalk</td>
<td>6’</td>
<td>2’6”</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component/Location</td>
<td>Excavation Depth (Feet)</td>
<td>Excavation Diameter (Feet-Inches)</td>
<td>Excavation (Cubic Yards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One 1-A (15') signal pole on the sidewalk in advance of the crosswalk on the east side of the intersection</td>
<td>6'</td>
<td>2'6&quot;</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One pedestrian push button pole on the sidewalk adjacent to east side of the crosswalk</td>
<td>1'6&quot;</td>
<td>1'6&quot;</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/Location</th>
<th>Excavation Depth (Feet)</th>
<th>Excavation Diameter (Feet-Inches)</th>
<th>Excavation (Cubic Yards)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One 1-A (15’) signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the southwest corner</td>
<td>6’</td>
<td>2’6”</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diamond Heights Boulevard and Berkeley Way Intersection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/Location</th>
<th>Excavation Depth (Feet)</th>
<th>Excavation Diameter (Feet-Inches)</th>
<th>Excavation (Cubic Yards)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One 1-A (15’) signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the southwest corner</td>
<td>6’</td>
<td>2’6”</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One 1-A (15’) signal pole adjacent to the crosswalk on the southeast corner</td>
<td>6’</td>
<td>2’6”</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.