

SFMTA - TASC SUMMARY SHEET

<p>PreStaff_Date: 9/13/2022</p> <p>Requested_by: SFMTA</p> <p>Handled: Jarrett Hornbostel, 646-2723 GD</p> <p>Section Head : BW </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>
--	--	--

Location: 4th Street and Mission Rock Street

Subject: Contract 66 - New Traffic Signals

PROPOSAL / REQUEST:

ESTABLISH – RECTANGULAR RAPID FLASHING BEACON (RRFB)
4th Street and Mission Rock Street

(Supervisor District 6)

A new rectangular rapid flashing beacon is proposed as part of SFMTA's Contract 66 – New Traffic Signals project to improve pedestrian right-of-way allocation. The installation will include beacons, warning signs, and accessible pedestrian signal (APS) push buttons.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION / COMMENTS

In anticipation of further increased pedestrian and vehicular volumes as a result of continued development, the SFMTA recommends installing a rectangular rapid flashing beacon to better alert motorists of pedestrian activity. Beacons like these have been shown to increase driver yielding behavior.

This intersection is currently side-street STOP controlled.

Although the intersection is located on the Vision Zero High Injury Network, this intersection has an excellent safety record with no reported injury collisions in the last five years.

This segment of 4th Street is on the San Francisco Bicycle Network with existing class 2 bike lanes.

Along with construction of a new traffic signal at 4th and Long Bridge streets, the proposed beacon is funded by a one million dollar contribution from the nearby Mission Rock development.


HEARING NOTIFICATION AND PROCESSING NOTES:

ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE BY:

SFMTA Attached Pending

CHECK IF PREPARING SEPARATE SFMTA BOARD CALENDAR ITEM FOR PROPOSAL:

4th Street and Mission Rock Street Network Map




4th Street and Mission Rock Street Bicycle Network




4th Street and Mission Rock Street Bicycle Network





POLE No.	TYPE OF POLE	LUMINAIRE TYPE	VEHICLE SIGNAL				PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL			REMARKS
			No.	TYPE	MOUNTING	VISORS	LOUVERS/BP	No.	TYPE	
①	(E) MISSION BAY STREET LIGHT		21 66	RRFB RRFB	SIDE MOUNT					SIDE MOUNT SOLAR PANEL & TRANSMITTER APS FOR RRFB
②	(E) MISSION BAY STREET LIGHT		25 62	RRFB RRFB	SIDE MOUNT					SIDE MOUNT SOLAR PANEL & TRANSMITTER APS FOR RRFB
③	(E) MISSION BAY STREET LIGHT		26 61	RRFB RRFB	SIDE MOUNT					SIDE MOUNT SOLAR PANEL & TRANSMITTER APS FOR RRFB
④	(E) MISSION BAY STREET LIGHT		22 65	RRFB RRFB	SIDE MOUNT					SIDE MOUNT SOLAR PANEL & TRANSMITTER APS FOR RRFB

PHASE DIAGRAM



30% SUBMITTAL
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	APP.
TABLE OF REVISIONS				
THIS DRAWING WAS LAST MODIFIED: 05/10/22 11:41, BY: bhr1				

REFERENCE INFORMATION & FILE NO. OF SURVEYS



BUREAU OF ENGINEERING
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS
49 SOUTH VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 600
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

Acting Section Mgr:	KENNY CHIN	Date:	
Acting Deputy Bureau Mgr:	LESLEY WONG	DESIGNED: DATE:	JH 3/2022
Acting Bureau Mgr:	IGBAL DHAPA	DRAWN: DATE:	BL 3/2022
		CHECKED: DATE:	SD 3/2022




SCALE:
AS SHOWN
SHEET OF SHEETS
X OF X

CONTRACT 66
NEW TRAFFIC SIGNALS
4TH STREET AND MISSION ROCK STREET
TRAFFIC SIGNAL PLAN

CONTRACT NO.	XXXXXXXX
DRAWING NO.	E-6.0
FILE NO.	
REV. NO.	0

Project: P:\E-66\Submittal\Submittal\4th & Mission\Traffic Signal\Traffic Signal Plan.dwg, Logic: 0/1
 Plot Date: Tue, 10 May 2022 10:22:00 AM
 User: bhr1
 Scale: As Shown
 Sheet: 1 of 1
 Title: Block/Draw

MATCH LINE "A"



33/05/18	UPDATED PER FIELD CONDITIONS @ 16TH	K.SHUE	M.VELASCO
32/15/18	ADDED BUS TAXI RT ONLY ON 16TH	K.SHUE	M.VELASCO
10/12/17	ADD WHITE STAGS CONT @ LONG BRIDGE/MISSION ROCK/CHINA BASIN/MISSION BAY BLVD NMS/NELSON RISING LANE/CAMPUS WAY	S.WONG	C.HUI
5/18/11	ADD BIKE LANE/SHARROWS/LT LANE	A.WONG	A.HERCE
NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY
			APP

TABLE OF REVISIONS
CHECK WITH TRACING TO SEE IF YOU HAVE LATEST REVISION



DRAWN:		DATE:		APPROVED:		SCALE:	
A.WONG		03/09		DANIEL ARELLANO 10/29/09		1" = 50'	
CHECKED:		DATE:		SENIOR ENGINEER		SHEET/SHEETS:	
A.HERCE		03/09		JACK L. FLECK 10/29/09		OF	
				CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER			

TRAFFIC STRIPING		CONTRACT NO.
4TH STREET OWENS TO 16TH STREET		DRAWING NO. STR-7642.3
		FILE NO.
		REV. NO. 4

FILE NAME: /-/-
DATE: /-/-

TransBASE Internal Dashboard

Geographic Extent: 34169000: MISSION ROCK ST at 04TH ST
Spatial Intersect: SFMTA Intersection Related (<=20ft or <=150ft if Rear End)
Data Range: 01/01/2017 to 12/31/2021
Pull Date: 4/13/2022

Collision/Party/Victim Table Showing 0 to 0 of 0 entries

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

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	Weather	Lighting
None																			

TransBASE Internal Dashboard

Geographic Extent: 34169000: MISSION ROCK ST at 04TH ST
Spatial Intersect: SFMTA Intersection Related (<=20ft or <=150ft if Rear End)
Data Range: 01/01/2017 to 12/31/2021
Pull Date: 4/13/2022

Metadata Information

Collision Filters

Database Source: TransBASESF.org
Database Pull Date: 4/13/2022
Collision Level: Injury Collisions
Boundary: 34169000: MISSION ROCK ST at 04TH ST
Collision Dates: 01/01/2017 to 12/31/2021
Collision Month Filter(s): No Restrictions
Collision Distance: Any Distance
Collision Severity Filter(s): No Restrictions
Primary Collision Factor Filter(s): No Restrictions
Collision Type Filter(s): No Restrictions
Intersection/ Midblock: SFMTA Intersection Related (<=20ft or <=150ft if Rear End)

Party Filters

Party Involved Type: No Restrictions
Party Involved Gender: No Restrictions
Party Involved at Fault: No Restrictions
Party Involved Age: No Restriction
Party Involved Sobriety: No Restrictions
Party Involved Condition: No Restrictions
Party Involved Direction of Travel: No Restrictions
Party Involved Safety Equipment 1: No Restrictions
Party Involved Safety Equipment 2: No Restrictions
Party Involved Insurance: No Restrictions
Party Involved Other Associated Factors : No Restrictions
Party Involved Movement Preceding Collision: No Restrictions
Party Involved Vehicle Type: No Restrictions
Party Involved Race: No Restrictions
Party Involved Special Info: No Restrictions

Victim Filters

Victim Involved Role: No Restrictions
Victim Involved Degree of Injury: No Restrictions
Victim Involved Age: No Restriction
Victim Involved Seating Position: No Restrictions
Victim Involved Safety Equipment: No Restrictions
Victim Involved Ejected: No Restrictions

Environmental Filters

Nearest Traffic Control: No Restriction
Intersecting Speed Limit: No Restriction
Intersecting Network: No Restriction
Intersecting Street Class: No Restriction
Weather Description: No Restrictions
Lighting Description: No Restrictions



CEQA Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address		Block/Lot(s)
SFMTA_Contract 66: New Traffic Signals and Rectangular Rapid Flashing		
Case No.		Permit No.
2022-006667ENV		
<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 the installation of new traffic signals at ten intersections and a rectangular rapid flashing beacon (RRFB) at one intersection to improve traffic, pedestrian, bicycle safety, and traffic operations. All intersections are currently STOP-controlled. The scope of work would include the installation of new traffic signals (mast arms, signal heads, controllers, conduit, wiring, and poles), pedestrian countdown signals, and accessible (audible) pedestrian signals. Curb ramps would be upgraded at all intersections. A new rectangular rapid flashing beacon would be installed at the intersection of 4th Street and Mission Rock Street to improve safety. The project would implement the following San Francisco Public Works Standard Construction Measures as part of the project: (1) Seismic and Geotechnical Studies; (2) Air Quality; (3) Water Quality; (6) Hazardous Materials; and (9) Cultural Resources, Archeological Resources (Public Works Standard Archeological Measure I: Accidental Discovery).</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.)? <i>(refer to The Environmental Information tab on the San Francisco Property Information Map)</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 The Environmental Information tab on the San Francisco Property Information Map)</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? <i>(refer to The Environmental Information tab on the San Francisco Property Information Map)</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? <i>(refer to The Environmental Planning tab on the San Francisco Property Information Map)</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? <i>(refer to The Environmental tab on the San Francisco Property Information Map)</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 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 McKellar
		08/15/2022
<p>Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a n exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31of the Administrative Code.</p> <p>In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination to the Board of Supervisors can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the approval action.</p>		

Step 2: Environmental Screening Comments

AIR QUALITY: The proposed project's construction would be subject to the Dust Control Ordinance (Article 22B of the Health Code). The following project intersections are located in an air pollutant exposure zone: 4th Ave/Fulton St; 10th Ave/Lincoln Way; 4th St/Long Bridge St; 4th St/Mission Rock St; 28th St/Guerrero St; Alemany Blvd/Cotter St; Cesar Chavez St/Florida St; and Mary St/Mint St/Mission St. If project construction at these locations would require 20 or more days of cumulative days of work, San Francisco Public Works Standard Construction Measure (2) Air Quality would be implemented at these locations as part of the project. Therefore, air quality impacts would be less than significant.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Project construction, including excavation, would occur only in the public right of way. Excavation would result in the removal of between 0 and 100 cubic yards of soil at each intersection. None of the project intersections are listed on the GeoTracker database as a Cortese site (California Government Code Section 65962.5). The following intersections are on the Maher map: 4th St/Long Bridge St; 4th St/Mission Rock St; and Castro St/Divisadero St/Waller St; Mary St/Mint St/Mission St (south side of intersection only). San Francisco Public Works Standard Construction Measure (6) Hazardous Materials would be implemented as part of the project. Therefore, hazardous materials impacts would be less than significant.

ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: All project intersections, except for 4th St/Mission Rock St, would require excavation to a maximum depth of 12 feet below ground surface. Planning staff conducted preliminary archeological review of the project and determined on August 4, 2022, that the project would be required to implement San Francisco Public Works Standard Construction Measure (9) Cultural Resources, Standard Archeological Measures I (Accidental Discovery). Therefore, impacts on archeological resources would be less than significant.

GEOLOGY & SOILS: The following project intersections are within a liquefaction hazard zone: 4th St/Long Bridge St; 4th St/Mission Rock St (RRFB location); and Mary St/Mint St/Mission St. San Francisco Public Works Standard Construction Measure (1) Seismic and Geotechnical Studies would be implemented as applicable.

The project scope, the installation of new traffic signals at ten intersections and installation of a rectangular rapid flashing beacon (RRFB) at one intersection, is not large enough to combine with nearby land use or roadworks projects to result in a cumulative impact.

For the reasons above, none of the CEQA 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 15, 2022
 To: Jennifer McKellar, San Francisco Planning Department
 From: Jarrett Hornbostel, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
 Through: Forrest Chamberlain, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
 Re: Contract 66: New Traffic Signals and Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon at Various Locations
 Case No.: 2022-06667ENV

Project Description

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) proposes the installation of new traffic signals at ten intersections and a rectangular rapid flashing beacon (RRFB) at one intersection to improve traffic, pedestrian, bicycle safety, and traffic operations. All intersections are currently STOP-controlled. New traffic signals would be installed at the locations summarized in Table 1 below (see Attachment A for maps of locations):

Table 1. Project Description Summary.

#	Intersection	Maximum Excavation Depth (Feet)	Excavation (Cubic Yards)	Improvement Description	Historic Districts or Adjacent Historic Structures
1	4th Ave / Fulton St	12	100	New traffic signals, ADA compliant curb ramps.	None
2	10th Ave / Lincoln Way	12	100	New traffic signals, ADA compliant curb ramps, crosswalk changes	None
3	39th Ave / Fulton St	12	100	New traffic signals, ADA compliant curb ramps.	None
4	41st Ave / Lincoln Way	12	80	New traffic signals, ADA compliant curb ramps.	None
5	4th St / Long Bridge St	12	80	New traffic signals, ADA compliant curb ramps.	None
6	4th St / Mission Rock St	0	0	New rectangular rapid flashing beacons	None
7	28th St / Guerrero St	12	40	New traffic signals	None
8	Alemany Blvd / Cotter St	12	100	New traffic signals, turn	None

#	Intersection	Maximum Excavation Depth (Feet)	Excavation (Cubic Yards)	Improvement Description	Historic Districts or Adjacent Historic Structures
				restriction changes	
9	Castro St / Divisadero St / Waller St	12	60	New traffic signals, ADA compliant curb ramps, corner bulb-out, crosswalk changes, turn restriction changes	None
10	Cesar Chavez St / Florida St	12	60	New traffic signals, ADA compliant curb ramps.	None
11	Mary St / Mint St / Mission St	12	60	New traffic signals, ADA complaint curb ramps.	Not within a historic district. <u>Adjacent historic resources:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 66-90 Mint St (Listed in Mint-Mission Conservation District) • 88 5th St (The Old Mint) • 901-925 Mission St

The Mary Street/Mint Street/Mission Street intersection project location is not located within the Mint-Mission Conservation District but is adjacent to three historic buildings: 66-90 Mint St (listed in the Mint-Mission Conservation District); 88 5th St (The Old Mint); and 901-925 Mission St. All other project locations are not within any historic district and are not adjacent to any historic buildings.

The scope of work would include the installation of new traffic signals (mast arms, signal heads, controllers, conduit, wiring, and poles), pedestrian countdown signals, and accessible (audible) pedestrian signals. Curb ramps would be upgraded at all intersections. A new rectangular rapid flashing beacon would be installed at the intersection of 4th Street and Mission Rock Street to improve safety.

The project would also construct a corner bulbout at the southwest corner of Castro, Divisadero, and Waller streets. No-left turn restrictions would be implemented on Castro Street at Waller Street and on Castro Street at Divisadero Street in the northbound direction. A right-only lane would be established on Divisadero Street at the approach to Castro Street in the northbound direction (south of Waller Street). New turn restrictions would be marked with signage. An existing right-turn only

restriction would be rescinded on Waller Street at Divisadero Street and Castro Street in the westbound direction. Existing right-turn only restrictions would also be rescinded on Cotter Street at Alemany Boulevard.

At the intersection of 10th Avenue and Lincoln Way, the existing unmarked crosswalk crossing Lincoln Way on the eastern side of the intersection would be closed and a new crosswalk would be established crossing Lincoln Way along the western side of the intersection. At the intersection of Castro, Divisadero, and Waller streets, the existing crosswalk crossing Castro Street east of Divisadero Street would be closed and a new crosswalk would be established crossing Castro Street along the southern side of Waller Street. The proposed changes are shown in Attachment B: Traffic Signal Plans.

The maximum depth of excavation would be twelve (12) feet for pole foundations, eighteen (18) inches for the pull boxes, sixteen (16) inches for the cabinet foundation, and twenty-four (24) inches for the underground conduits. The installation of the rectangular rapid flashing beacon would not require excavation. All excavation would occur only within the public right-of-way. The project would not employ pile driving; all pole foundations would be cast in drilled holes. Concrete saws/jackhammers would be used to demolish the roadway during construction.

The proposed work would be carried out by a licensed contractor managed by San Francisco Public Works with funding/oversight from SFMTA. The project would implement the following San Francisco Public Works Standard Construction Measures as part of the project: (1) Seismic and Geotechnical Studies (as applicable); (2) Air Quality (as applicable); (3) Water Quality; (6) Hazardous Materials; and (9) Cultural Resources, Archeological Resources (Public Works Standard Archeological Measure I: Accidental Discovery).

Attachments:

Attachment A: Maps of Locations
Attachment B: Traffic Signal Plans

Approval Action:

City Traffic Engineer's Directive

Attachment A - Maps of Contract 66 Traffic Signals

