



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

Categorical Exemption Appeal 3637-3657 Sacramento Street

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

DATE: January 7, 2019
TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer – (415) 575-9032
Don Lewis – (415) 575-9168
RE: Planning Case No. 2007.1347E
Appeal of Categorical Exemption for 3637-3657 Sacramento Street
HEARING DATE: January 15, 2019
ATTACHMENT: A – Air Quality Memorandum
B – Review of Historic Resource Determination

PROJECT SPONSOR: Annie Chen, Litke Properties, Inc., (415) 922-0178

APPELLANT: Brandon Ponce, Jennifer Kopczynski, Alexander W. Thompson, Marcia E. Herman, Susan Foslien, Jack Kaus, Patrick Richards, John M. Burns, and Douglas Engmann, on behalf of the California-Locust Neighbors' Association

INTRODUCTION

This memorandum is a response to the original appeal letter (dated December 7, 2018) and the supplemental appeal letter (dated January 4, 2019) from the appellant to the board of supervisors (the board) regarding the planning department's (the department) issuance of a categorical exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA determination) for the proposed 3637-3657 Sacramento Street project.

The department, pursuant to article 19 of the CEQA Guidelines, issued a categorical exemption for the project on September 20, 2018 finding that the proposed project is exempt from CEQA as a class 32 categorical exemption for infill development.

The decision before the board is whether to uphold the department's decision to issue a categorical exemption and deny the appeal, or to overturn the department's decision to issue a categorical exemption and return the project to department staff for additional environmental review.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND EXISTING USE

The project site is located on the south side of Sacramento Street on the block surrounded by Sacramento, Spruce, Locust, and California streets in the Presidio Heights neighborhood. The site is comprised of two lots. Lot 012, located at 3657 Sacramento Street, contains a single-story, 12,250-square-foot, 75-space parking garage that was constructed in 1920. Lot 020 contains two structures: 3637 Sacramento Street, a two-story,

5,523-square-foot medical office building with three surface parking spaces (constructed in 1966); and 3641 Sacramento Street, a three-story, 7,615-square-foot office building (constructed in 1974).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project sponsor proposes the demolition of three existing buildings and construction of a 40-foot-tall, four-story, 45,233-square-foot mixed-use building.^{1,2} The building would contain approximately 6,500 square feet of retail use on the first floor, 10,000 square feet of medical office use on the second floor, and 18 dwelling units (17,100 square feet) on the third and fourth floors. The project proposes 64 parking spaces on three below-grade levels consisting of 45 short-term public parking spaces (13 retail spaces and 32 medical spaces) and 18 long-term residential parking spaces.

The garage would also provide 21 class 1 bicycle parking spaces and family amenity lockers. The project would provide 14 class 2 bicycle parking spaces on Sacramento Street. The residential lobby and commercial entrances would be accessible via Sacramento Street. The project would remove three existing curb cuts along Sacramento Street and the parking garage would be accessed from a new approximately 21-foot-wide curb cut on Sacramento Street. The three existing trees on the project site would be removed and four new trees would be planted. The project proposes approximately 2,800 square feet of open space, including 2,390 square feet of common open space at the ground floor and 400 square feet of private open space. The project would require 18,000 cubic yards of soil removal with approximately 45 feet excavation below ground surface. Construction is anticipated to last up to 20 months. During construction the project may include sidewalk, parking, and travel lanes closures along Sacramento Street. Underpinning and temporary shoring would be required during the proposed excavation operations and construction of the subsurface garage level retaining walls. The proposed building would be supported by a reinforced mat foundation.

BACKGROUND

On November 20, 2007, Gary Gee Architects, Inc. (hereinafter “project sponsor”) filed an application with the planning department (hereinafter “department”) for CEQA determination for the project described above.

On September 20, 2018, the department determined that the project was categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines section 15332 (Class 32: in-fill development), and that no further environmental review was required.

On November 8, 2018, the planning commission approved the proposed project by granting a conditional use authorization. As a condition of project approval, the project sponsor agreed to remove one underground parking level or approximately 14 spaces of the 64 proposed spaces described in the Class 32 exemption.

On December 7, 2018, Brandon Ponce, Jennifer Kopczynski, Alexander W. Thompson, Marcia E. Herman, Susan Foslien, Jack Kaus, Patrick Richards, John M. Burns, and Douglas Engmann, on behalf of the

¹ The building would include a 9-foot-tall elevator penthouse and a 4-foot-tall parapet.

² The total gross square footage of the proposed building, which includes the underground levels, would be 71,398 square feet.

California-Locust Neighbors' Association (hereinafter "appellant"), filed an appeal of the CEQA determination. The appeal letter was dated and filed with the Clerk of the Board on December 7, 2018.

On January 4, 2018, the appellant filed a supplemental appeal letter with the Clerk of the Board.

CEQA GUIDELINES

Categorical Exemptions

In accordance with CEQA section 21084, CEQA Guidelines sections 15301 through 15333 list classes of projects that have been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and are exempt from further environmental review.

CEQA Guidelines section 15332, or Class 32, consists of in-fill development projects that meet the conditions described in that section:

- (a) The project is consistent with applicable general plan designations and policies as well as with applicable zoning designations.
- (b) The development occurs within city limits on a site of less than five acres surrounded by urban uses.
- (c) The project site has no 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.

Additionally, CEQA Guidelines section 15300.2 establishes exceptions to the application of a categorical exemption. When any of the below exceptions apply, a project that otherwise fits within a categorical exemption must undergo some form of environmental review.

- (a) Location. Classes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 are qualified by consideration of where the project is to be located - a project that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may in a particularly sensitive environment be significant. Therefore, these classes are considered to apply all instances, except where the project may impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, state, or local agencies.
- (b) Cumulative Impact. All exemptions for these classes are inapplicable when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant.
- (c) Significant Effect. A categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.
- (d) Scenic Highways. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may result in damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, historic buildings, rock outcroppings, or similar resources, within a highway officially designated as a state scenic

highway. This does not apply to improvements which are required as mitigation by an adopted negative declaration or certified EIR.

- (e) Hazardous Waste Sites. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project located on a site which is included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.
- (f) Historical Resources. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

In determining the significance of environmental effects caused by a project, CEQA Guidelines section 15064(f) states that the decision as to whether a project may have one or more significant effects shall be based on substantial evidence in the record of the lead agency. CEQA Guidelines section 15064(f)(5) offers the following guidance: "Argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative, or evidence that is clearly inaccurate or erroneous, or evidence that is not credible, shall not constitute substantial evidence. Substantial evidence shall include facts, reasonable assumption predicated upon facts, and expert opinion supported by facts."

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RESPONSES

The concerns raised in the appeal letters are addressed in the responses below.

Response 1: The proposed project is appropriately exempt from environmental review, none of the exceptions apply, and mitigation is not required.

As discussed above, the Class 32 exemption applies to projects characterized as in-fill developments that are: (a) consistent with the general plan; (b) occur within City limits on a site no larger than five acres that is substantially surrounded by urban uses; (c) has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species; (d) would not result in significant traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality effects; and (e) can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

The proposed project demonstrates each of the required factors for a Class 32 exemption: (a) the proposed four-story building with medical, residential, and retail uses on the project site is entirely consistent with the general plan; (b) the project site is less than five acres and is located in an urban setting; (c) the project site is not valued habitat for endangered, rare, or threatened species; (d) the proposed project would not result in any significant impact to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality; and (e) the proposed project would be served by existing utilities and public services. As discussed in the CEQA determination, the proposed project is eligible for an infill exemption, and potential impacts would be addressed by the project's adherence to normal requirements for San Francisco construction projects, including the San Francisco Building Code, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA) Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets, the Noise Ordinance, the Dust Control Ordinance, the Maher Ordinance and Bay Area Air Quality Management District regulations.

The CEQA Guidelines include exceptions to the applicability of categorical exemptions. When any of the enumerated exceptions apply, a project that otherwise fits within a categorical exemption must undergo

some form of environmental review. As discussed below, none of the exceptions to the categorical exemptions apply to the proposed project.

Location

Certain classes of exemptions may not be applied “where the project may impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, state, or local agencies.” Because the department did not issue a class 3, 4, 5, 6, or 11 exemption for this project, this exception does not apply.

Cumulative Impacts

An exemption may not be applied “when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant.” This exception applies when a project, in combination with other projects in the same place over time, could create significant environmental impacts. The proposed project does not present the possibility of cumulative impacts. See Responses 2, 3, 4, and 5 below for more details.

Significant Effect Due to Unusual Circumstances

A categorical exception may not be applied for activities that create a reasonable possibility of having a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances. This exception is only invoked when both: (1) unusual circumstances exist; and (2) as a result of these unusual circumstances, a project could create significant environmental impacts. The proposed project presents no “unusual circumstances” that would subject it to this exception. The proposed project would demolish three existing structures and construct a new four-story, mixed-use building in an urban setting. The proposed building would contain uses that are permitted by the planning code, and the proposed subsurface parking immediately adjacent to existing structures is a common condition in San Francisco. The alleged issues raised by the appellant are typical of those encountered in San Francisco during project development, are not unusual, and are addressed by existing legal requirements applicable to all similar projects. The use of the Class 32 exemption is entirely appropriate for the proposed project.

Scenic Highways

Categorical exemptions may not be applied to projects that “may result in damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, historic buildings, rock outcroppings, or similar resources, within a highway officially designated as a state scenic highway.” The project site is not located near a designated state scenic highway.

Hazardous Waste

A project that is located on a site that is listed as a hazardous waste site pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code may not be categorically exempt. The project site is not listed as a hazardous waste site by the state.

Historical Resources

A categorical exemption cannot be applied to a project that “may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.” As discussed in the CEQA determination and in Response 8 below, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

In light of the above, the proposed project fits within the Class 32 categorical exemption and none of the exceptions are triggered. As such, the project is not required to undergo further environmental review. Moreover, since the proposed project qualifies for an exemption, mitigation measures cannot be applied to the project. Should the Board deny the appeal of the CEQA determination, the Board could decide to apply conditions of approval on the conditional use authorization. The appellant has not demonstrated that the department's CEQA determination for the proposed project is not supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Response 2: The proposed project would not result in a project-specific or cumulative construction transportation impact.

Construction of the proposed project would be similar to other infill development that occurs in the urban setting of San Francisco.

Construction of the proposed project is expected to occur over the course of 18 to 20 months. During construction, the project may include sidewalk, parking, and travel lane closures along Sacramento Street. To stem any potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts during construction, the following steps would be taken to ensure safe vehicle and pedestrian travel within the vicinity of the project site. Any pedestrian walkways fronting construction areas would be covered, and temporary fencing would be installed as needed. The impact of construction truck traffic would be a temporary lessening of the capacities of Sacramento Street due to the slower movement and larger turning radii of trucks, which may block travel lanes, and affect both traffic and Muni operations during project construction. It is anticipated that the addition of the worker-related vehicle- or transit-trips would not substantially affect transportation conditions.

Prior to construction, as part of the building permit process, the project sponsor and construction contractor(s) would be required to meet with public works and municipal transportation authority (SFMTA) staff to develop and review truck routing plans for demolition, disposal of excavated materials, materials delivery and storage, as well as staging for construction vehicles. Construction activities in San Francisco that have the potential to affect the transportation network are subject to SFMTA's Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets, also known as the "blue book," as well as the public works code and public works department orders.³ The blue book is a manual for City agencies (public works, SFMTA, public utilities commission, the port, etc.), utility crews, private contractors, and others doing work in San Francisco's public right-of-way, and it establishes rules for working safely and in a manner that will cause the least possible interference with people walking, bicycling, taking transit and/or transit operations, as well as people driving. Therefore, there would not be an unusual circumstance. Based on the above, there would be no significant construction impact on transportation in the project area as a result of the proposed project, and mitigation would not be required.

³ San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, *City and County of San Francisco Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets*, 8th Edition, January 2012, accessed June 12, 2018 at: https://www.sfmta.com/sites/default/files/reports-and-documents/2017/10/blue_book_8th_edition_pdf.pdf.

Construction of the proposed project may overlap with construction of other reasonably foreseeable future developments, including the 3700 California Street project⁴ and the 3333 California Street project.⁵ The 3700 California Street project site is approximately 430 feet away from the 3637-3657 Sacramento Street project while the 3333 California Street project is approximately 720 feet away. Construction of the 3333 California Street project is expected to start spring 2020 with an estimate duration of approximately 7 to 15 years since this project is anticipated to be constructed in phases (start/stop construction). Construction of the 3700 California Street project is expected to begin January 2021 with an estimated duration of 41 months. Construction of the proposed 3637-3657 Sacramento Street project anticipates a construction start date of May 2019 with a completion date of November 2020. Due to the limited construction overlaps, the distances between these cumulative nearby projects, different construction intensity by phase, and the potential for construction vehicles to use different immediate travel routes in the project vicinity, the 3637-3657 Sacramento Street project would not combine substantially with the construction of the 3700 California Street and 3333 California Street projects to create a significant cumulative construction-related transportation impact. Additionally, these reasonably foreseeable construction projects would also have their own construction management plans to minimize impacts.

Construction of the reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the project site could temporarily generate increased traffic at the same time and on the same roads as the proposed project. In the event that the construction timeframes of the proposed project and other development projects overlap, the project sponsor would be required to work with the transportation advisory staff committee (TASC), the SFMTA, and the adjacent developers to minimize any potential overlapping construction transportation impacts. As part of the construction permitting process and similar to the requirements for the proposed project, each development project would be required to work with the various city departments to develop detailed and coordinated construction logistics and contractor parking plans, as applicable, that would address construction vehicle routing, traffic control, transit movement, pedestrian movement issues, and bicycle movement adjacent to the construction area. The proposed construction activities of the cumulative projects would, to the maximum extent feasible, accommodate construction and staging activities on their respective project sites, and would also be required to conduct construction in accordance with City requirements. Project mitigation would not be required.

Response 3: The proposed project would not result in a project-specific or cumulative significant air quality impact.

In accordance with the state and federal Clean Air Acts, air pollutant standards are identified for the following six criteria air pollutants: ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter (PM), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and lead. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District in its CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, has developed screening criteria to determine if projects would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively

⁴ The existing California Pacific Medical Center campus spans 14 parcels on three blocks. Sutter Health is expected to vacate the campus and move to a new location by 2020. The 3700 California Street project would demolish five buildings and construct 31 new buildings. In total, the project would result in 273 dwelling units, requiring excavation of approximately 61,800 cubic yards of soil to a maximum depth of 75 feet.

⁵ The project site is currently occupied by the University of California San Francisco. The project would demolish an existing annex building, surface parking lots, and circular garage ramp structures. Thirteen new mixed-use buildings would be constructed on the site. In total, the project would result in 558 dwelling units, 49,999 square feet of office floor area, 54,117 square feet of retail floor area, and a 14,690-square-foot child care center.

considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. If a proposed project meets the screening criteria, then the project would result in less-than-significant criteria air pollutant impacts. A project that exceeds the screening criteria may require a detailed air quality assessment to determine whether criteria air pollutant emissions would exceed significance thresholds.

Criteria air pollutant screening sizes for a low-rise apartment building is 451 dwelling units for operation and 240 dwelling units for construction.⁶ For a medical office use, it is 117,000 square feet for operation and 277,000 square feet for construction. For a free-standing discount store it is 76,000 square feet for operation and 277,000 square feet for construction.⁷ The proposed project, which would construct approximately 18 dwelling units, 10,000 square feet of medical office use, and 6,500 square feet of retail, would not exceed the criteria air pollutant screening levels for operation or construction.

Additionally, the air district provides another screening criteria for projects that propose extensive material transport (e.g., greater than 10,000 cubic yards of soil import/export). Projects requiring more than 10,000 cubic yards of soil import/export would have considerable haul truck activity that could potentially generate substantial construction-related criteria air pollutants. The proposed project would exceed this screening criteria since the project proposes 18,000 cubic yards of excavation.⁸ However, based upon experience of the planning department conducting and reviewing detailed air quality assessments, projects with similar amounts of excavation would not exceed the air district's recommended significance thresholds for daily project construction emissions.⁹

Nonetheless, the planning department quantified the proposed project's construction-related criteria air pollutants using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod).^{10,11} A 409-day project completion period was assumed, which includes the demolition of the existing structures on-site, excavation and grading of the project site, building construction, and architectural coating phases.¹² The project sponsor provided the durations for each construction phase. The CalEEMod results were converted from tons to pounds and divided by the assumed number of working days (409) to yield average daily construction emissions calculation. The project-related average daily emissions were then compared to the air district's recommended thresholds of significance for construction criteria air pollutants. As shown below in table 1, the proposed project's daily construction-related criteria air pollutants emissions would not exceed the thresholds of significance. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed any of the air district's recommended significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants and would not result in significant impacts with respect to criteria air pollutants.

⁶ Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, Updated May 2017.

⁷ Free-standing discount store was used as this is the most similar use to commercial.

⁸ The approved project, which eliminates one underground parking level, would require 15,261 cubic yards of excavation.

⁹ The air district has recommended significance thresholds for average daily emissions (pounds per day). For reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x), it is 54 lbs/day; for inhalable coarse particulate matter (PM₁₀) it is 82 lbs./day; and for fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) it is 54 lbs./per day.

¹⁰ CalEEMod is a statewide model that assists project proponents, land use jurisdictions, consultants, and air districts in complying with CEQA by estimating emissions of criteria pollutant emissions from land use development projects. The model was developed for the California Air Pollution Officers Association (CAPCOA) in collaboration with the California Air Districts. CalEEMod version 2013.3.2, available online at <http://www.caleemod.com>. CalEEMod was used to estimate CAP emissions from construction vehicle activity.

¹¹ San Francisco Planning Department, *Air Quality Memorandum for 3637-3657 Sacramento Street, San Francisco*, December 20, 2018.

¹² The air quality analysis assumed 18,000 cubic yards of excavation. With the elimination of one underground parking level, the approved project would result in 2,739 fewer cubic yards of excavation. Therefore, the air quality analysis is conservative

Table 1: Construction Criteria Air Pollutants Emissions

Pollutant¹³	Construction Thresholds¹⁴ Average Daily Emissions (lbs./day)	Proposed Project Construction Emissions Average Daily Emissions (lbs./day)
ROG	54	2.66
NO _x	54	5.74
PM ₁₀	82 (exhaust)	0.25
PM _{2.5}	54 (exhaust)	0.23
Fugitive Dust	Construction Dust Ordinance or other Best Management Practices	San Francisco Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance No. 176-08) applies to the proposed project

The contribution of a project’s individual air emissions to regional air quality impacts is, by its nature, a cumulative effect. Emissions from past, present, and future projects in the vicinity also have or will contribute to adverse regional air quality impacts on a cumulative basis. No single project by itself would be sufficient in size to result in non-attainment of ambient air quality standards. Instead, a project’s individual emissions contribute to existing cumulative air quality conditions. Therefore, if a project’s emissions are below the project-level thresholds, such as the proposed project, the project would not be considered to result in a considerable contribution to cumulative regional air quality impacts. Project mitigation would not be required.

Response 4: The CEQA determination correctly relies on established regulatory framework that addresses potential impacts related to asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint.

Asbestos-containing materials must be removed in accordance with local and state regulations, the air district, the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal OSHA), and California Department of Health Services requirements. This includes materials that could be disturbed by the proposed demolition and construction activities.

Specifically, California Health and Safety Code section 19827.5 requires that local agencies not issue demolition permits until an applicant has demonstrated compliance with notification requirements under applicable federal regulations regarding hazardous air pollutants, including asbestos. The California legislature vests the air district with the authority to regulate airborne pollutants, including asbestos, through both inspection and law enforcement, and the air district is to be notified 10 days in advance of any proposed demolition work. Any asbestos-containing material disturbance at the project site would be subject to the requirements of air district Regulation 11, Rule 2: Hazardous Materials—Asbestos Demolition, Renovation, and Manufacturing. The local office of Cal OSHA must also be notified of asbestos abatement to be carried out. Asbestos abatement contractors must follow state regulations contained in Title 8 of California Code of Regulations section 1529 and sections 341.6 through 341.14, where there is asbestos related work involving 100 square feet or more of asbestos-containing material. The owner of the property where abatement is to occur must have a hazardous waste generator number assigned by and registered with the Office of the California Department of Health Services. The contractor and hauler of the material are required to file a hazardous waste manifest that details the hauling of the material from the

¹³ ROG: reactive organic gases; NO_x: nitrogen oxides; PM₁₀: inhalable coarse particulate matter; PM_{2.5}: fine particulate matter.

¹⁴ Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines*, May 2017.

site and the disposal of it. Pursuant to California law, the department of building inspection (DBI) would not issue the required permit until the applicant has complied with the requirements described above.

Work that could result in disturbance of lead paint must comply with San Francisco Building Code Section 3426, Work Practices for Lead-Based Paint on Pre-1979 Buildings and Steel Structures. Where there is any work that may disturb lead paint on the exterior of any building built prior to 1979, Section 3426 requires specific notification and work standards, and identifies prohibited work methods and penalties.¹⁵

Section 3426 applies to the exterior of all buildings or steel structures on which original construction was completed prior to 1979. The ordinance contains performance standards, including establishment of containment barriers, at least as effective at protecting human health and the environment as those in the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Guidelines (the most recent Guidelines for Evaluation and Control of Lead-Based Paint Hazards) and identifies prohibited practices that may not be used in disturbances or removal of lead-based paint. Any person performing work subject to the ordinance shall, to the maximum extent possible, protect the ground from contamination during exterior work; protect floors and other horizontal surfaces from work debris during interior work; and make all reasonable efforts to prevent migration of lead paint contaminants beyond containment barriers during the course of the work. Clean-up standards require the removal of visible work debris, including the use of a High Efficiency Particulate Air Filter (HEPA) vacuum following interior work.

The ordinance also includes notification requirements and requirements for signs. Prior to the commencement of work, the responsible party must provide written notice to the Director of DBI, of the address and location of the project; the scope of work, including specific location within the site; methods and tools to be used; the approximate age of the structure; anticipated job start and completion dates for the work; whether the building is residential or nonresidential, owner-occupied or rental property; the dates by which the responsible party has fulfilled or will fulfill any tenant or adjacent property notification requirements; and the name, address, telephone number, and pager number of the party who will perform the work. Further notice requirements include a posted sign notifying the public of restricted access to the work area, a notice to residential occupants, availability of pamphlet related to protection from lead in the home, and notice of early commencement of work (by owner, requested by tenant), and notice of lead contaminated dust or soil, if applicable. Section 3426 contains provisions regarding inspection and sampling for compliance by DBI, as well as enforcement, and describes penalties for non-compliance with the requirements of the ordinance.

Demolition would also be subject to the Cal OSHA Lead in Construction Standard (8 CCR Section 1532.1). This standard requires development and implementation of a lead compliance plan when materials containing lead would be disturbed during construction. The plan must describe activities that could emit lead, methods that will be used to comply with the standard, safe work practices, and a plan to protect workers from exposure to lead during construction activities.

In light of the above, the proposed project would not result in unusual circumstances or a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Project mitigation would not be required.

¹⁵ Notices are commonly placed on residential and other buildings in San Francisco that are undergoing re-painting. These notices are generally affixed to a drape that covers all or portions of a building and are a required part of the Section 3426 notification procedure.

Response 5: The proposed project would not result in a project-specific or cumulative significant noise impact.

Project Operational Noise

The appellant states that the project's mechanical equipment could produce operational noise that would disturb nearby sensitive receptors. As stated in the CEQA determination, noise is regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance, which is codified in article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code. Article 29 establishes property line and other limits for fixed noise sources. Under section 2909(b), fixed noise sources (e.g. mechanical equipment) from commercial properties are limited to 8 dBA¹⁶ above ambient noise levels and section 2909(d) also establishes that such noise not exceed an interior daytime (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.) noise limit of 55 dBA or nighttime noise limit (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) of 45 dBA at the nearest residential receptor. The requirements of the Noise Ordinance are designed to prevent sleep disturbance, protect public health, and prevent the acoustical environment from progressive deterioration. The project would comply with applicable requirements of the Noise Ordinance (Section 2909). The Noise Ordinance provides adequate assurance that noise generated from project-related mechanical equipment would not adversely affect sensitive receptors. The CEQA determination for the proposed project correctly relies on the Noise Ordinance to address potential noise impacts of the project. Therefore, the project would not result in unusual circumstances or a significant impact related to project operational noise.

Project Construction Noise

The proposed project would involve demolition of three structures on-site and construction of a four-story building with two underground levels. The proposed building would be supported by a shallow building foundation consisting of a reinforced mat slab; no pile driving is required or proposed. The project site consists of two lots and is surrounded by commercial and residential uses. Construction of the proposed project would be similar to other infill developments that occur in the urban setting of San Francisco. There are no unusual circumstances related to the proposed development on the project site.

The appellant states that during excavation, groundwater would need to be pumped out during the nighttime and weekend, and that this noise could result in sleep disturbance. The proposed project does not involve nighttime or weekend construction noise. If dewatering activities are needed at nighttime, the water pumps would be electrical and would not generate noise that is greater than five dBA over ambient noise levels. Section 2908 of the Police Code prohibits construction work between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. if the construction noise would exceed the ambient noise level by 5 dBA at the project property line. Therefore, the use of electrical water pumps would not have the potential to result in sleep disturbance.

Cumulative Construction Noise

The appellant states that construction noise of the proposed project could combine with the construction noise from the 3333 California Street and 3700 California Street projects to create a construction noise impact that is cumulatively significant. During construction of the 3637-3657 Sacramento Street project, all diesel and gasoline-powered engines would be equipped with noise-arresting mufflers. Delivery truck trips and construction equipment would generate noise that may be considered an annoyance by occupants of nearby properties; however, this noise is typical in an urban setting. Construction noise is regulated by

¹⁶ The standard method used to quantify environmental noise involves evaluating the sound with an adjustment to reflect the fact that human hearing is less sensitive to low-frequency sound than to mid-and high-frequent sound. This measurement adjustment is called "a" weighting, and the data are reported in A-weighted decibel (dBA). A -10dB (decibel) increase in noise level is generally perceived to be twice as loud.

the Noise Ordinance. Section 2907 of the Police Code requires that noise levels from individual pieces of construction equipment, other than impact tools, not exceed 80 A-weighted dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the source. Impact tools (such as jackhammers and impact wrenches) must have both intake and exhaust muffled to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works. Section 2908 of the Police Code prohibits construction work between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. if the construction noise would exceed the ambient noise level by 5 dBA at the project property line, unless a special permit is authorized by the Director of Public Works. Construction noise impacts related to the project would be temporary and intermittent in nature.

Construction activities for the 3333 California Street and the 3700 California Street projects would also be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance requirements. Project construction noise would be temporary, intermittent and localized, and would be limited to a few hundred feet from the project site. Construction noise would attenuate due to distance and the presence of barriers, such as intervening buildings and structures. There are no development projects planned in the project vicinity that are close enough to have the potential to result in cumulative construction noise contributions. Both the 3700 California Street project and the 3333 California Street project are separated from the proposed project by multiple buildings that would provide shielding of construction noise and would be unlikely to noticeably combine with the proposed 3637-3657 Sacramento Street project construction noise at the nearest sensitive receptor locations, even if they were to be constructed simultaneously. Department staff do not anticipate a cumulative significant impact related to construction noise.

The appellant questions why the CEQA determination did not provide an analysis to determine if the project could result in a persistent construction-related increase of 10 decibels or more over ambient levels. This type of analysis was not required for the proposed project for the following reasons. First, the project's construction activities are typical of infill projects in San Francisco and not unusual. While the project involves excavation, although less than originally anticipated in the exemption due to the removal of one underground parking level, the project site is underlain with surficial fills, native dune sands, native sand-clay soil mixtures, and potentially deeper Franciscan bedrock. Project construction would not require a substantial amount of rock fragmentation. Since the project would not require a substantial amount of bedrock excavation, it is anticipated that impact equipment use during project construction would be limited to the sporadic use of a jackhammer. Section 2907 of the Police Code requires that noise levels from individual pieces of construction equipment, other than impact tools, not exceed 80 A-weighted dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the source. Impact tools (such as jackhammers) must have both intake and exhaust muffled to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works. Other impact tools such as a pile driver or a hoe ram are not proposed or required. Project construction would also use a concrete saw, which is a non-impact piece of equipment that may exceed the Noise Ordinance standard. Concrete saws are generally used for relatively detailed demolition work, such as opening up a specific area of roadway or sidewalk. Similar to the jackhammer, the project's use of a concrete saw would be sporadic in frequency and limited in duration. Additionally, it is anticipated that the jackhammer and concrete saw, the project's two loudest pieces of equipment, would not operate simultaneously. Therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels.

The appellant questions why a similar construction noise mitigation measure from the 3333 California Street draft environmental impact report would not apply to the proposed project. The 3333 California project is a substantially larger development with a substantially longer construction duration that involves substantially more excavation. The 3333 California Street project site is significantly larger (10.25 acres in

size compared to the proposed project's 0.33 acres in size) and the project proposes four below-grade garages, requiring approximately 288,300 cubic yards of excavation.¹⁷ Unlike the 3637-3657 Sacramento Street project, the 3333 California Street project would be constructed in four overlapping development phases, with full build-out expected to take seven to fifteen years (compared to the proposed project's less than two year construction duration). The 3333 California Street project would also require an extensive amount of excavation (including considerable rock fragmentation) and heavier construction equipment (e.g. excavator with hoe ram) with greater potential to create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, the 3333 California Street DEIR appropriately includes a noise mitigation measure, but a noise mitigation measure is not required for the proposed project.

In light of the above, the proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in significant cumulative impact related to construction noise and no mitigation would be required.

Response 6: The proposed project would not result in a project-specific or cumulative significant impact related to hydrology or geology.

The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering of the groundwater table. The project site is entirely covered in impervious surfaces; therefore, the proposed project would not increase the amount of impervious surface and would not result in any substantial change in infiltration or runoff on the project site. Groundwater was encountered at approximately 35 feet below ground surface per the geotechnical investigation.¹⁸ In addition, saturated soil and /or minor seepage was encountered at 27 feet. With the removal of one underground parking level, the project would necessitate ground disturbance to a maximum depth of approximately 35 feet below ground surface for construction of the foundation and the two (2) below-grade parking levels. If groundwater were encountered on-site during construction, which is likely, then temporary dewatering activities would be necessary. Groundwater dewatering does not represent an unusual circumstance but is a common requirement for construction projects in San Francisco and is regulated under existing building and public works codes. The Bureau of Systems Planning, Environment, and Compliance of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) is required to be notified of projects necessitating dewatering. The SFPUC may require water quality analysis before discharge. The proposed project would be required to obtain a Batch Wastewater Discharge Permit from the SFPUC Wastewater Enterprise Collection System Division prior to any dewatering activities. Groundwater encountered during construction of the proposed project would be subject to requirements of Public Works Code article 4.1, Industrial Waste, requiring that groundwater meet specified water quality standards before it may be discharged into the sewer system. These measures would ensure protection of water quality during construction of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not result or in an unusual circumstance or result in a significant impact on groundwater.

¹⁷ The 3333 California Street project would demolish an existing annex building, surface parking lots, and circular garage ramp structures. Thirteen new mixed-use buildings would be constructed on the site. The proposed project would result in 558 dwelling units, 49,999 gross square feet (gsf) office floor area; 54,117 gsf of retail floor area; and a 14,690-gsf child care center. The total size of the development would be 1,372,270 gsf.

¹⁸ Harold Lewis & Associates Geotechnical Consultants, *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Mixed-Use Building at 3637 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, California*, July 15, 2009.

The project site is underlain by San Francisco's Los Lobos Groundwater Basin, which covers approximately 2,400 acres.¹⁹ Recharge to the Los Lobos Groundwater Basin was estimated at 1,570 acre-feet per year, half of which was accounted for by leakage from municipal water and sewer pipes. This basin is not part of San Francisco's Groundwater Management Program and does not contribute to San Francisco's municipal water supply. The appellant claims that the use of a permanent perforated pipe subdrain would result in the substantial loss of groundwater to the Lobos Groundwater Basin as rainwater would be directed to city storm drainage facilities. Based on the recommendations of the geotechnical investigation, the proposed project would include a subdrain system beneath the mat slab foundation.²⁰ To provide adequate drainage, the subdrain system would consist of either permeable material and weep holes spaced at a maximum of four feet or four-inch diameter perforated pipes bedded in permeable material. Considering the 2,400 acres of the Los Lobos Groundwater Basin relative to the size of the project site (14,580 square feet or 0.33 acres), the proposed subdrain system on the project site would not be substantial enough to considerably affect the groundwater basin. Furthermore, the proposed project would not extract any underlying groundwater supplies. There is nothing unusual about a project proposing a subdrain system to direct surface water runoff away from a building foundation to a discharge facility.

Nearby cumulative development projects would be subject to the same water conservation, stormwater management, and wastewater discharge ordinances applicable to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, compliance with these ordinances would reduce the effects of nearby cumulative development projects to less-than-significant levels. For these reasons, the proposed project would not combine with nearby cumulative projects to create a significant impact related to hydrology and water quality.

The appellant states that the project could overburden the existing sanitary sewer system if "clean" groundwater from the project site is unnecessarily discharged to the sanitary system.²¹ The project site is in an urban area where all required utilities and public services are available. The proposed project would be connected to existing wastewater services. Prior to receiving a building permit, the project would be reviewed by the department of building inspection (DBI), SFPUC, and public works (DPW) to ensure compliance with city and state regulations concerning building standards, sewer connections, and hydrology. The proposed project would be adequately served by all required utilities and public services. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an unusual circumstance or a significant impact on utilities and service systems.

The proposed project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that could become unstable as a result of the proposed project. A preliminary geotechnical investigation²² was conducted for the proposed project. It is anticipated that the proposed excavation for the project would encounter thin surficial fills, native dune sands, underlying native sand-clay soil mixtures, and potentially Franciscan bedrock; groundwater is also likely to be encountered. The geotechnical investigation recommends that the proposed building be supported on a reinforced mat foundation. Underpinning and temporary shoring would be required during the proposed excavation operations and construction of the garage-level

¹⁹ SFPUC, Groundwater Management Program, <http://sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=194>, accessed December 20, 2018.

²⁰ Harold Lewis & Associates Geotechnical Consultants, *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Mixed-Use Building at 3637 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, California*, July 15, 2009.

²¹ As discussed in the CEQA determination, the department of public health reviewed the project site and subsurface investigations and found that no further action is required under the voluntary remedial action program.

²² Harold Lewis & Associates Geotechnical Consultants, *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Mixed-Use Building at 3637 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, California*, July 15, 2009.

retaining walls. To ensure settlement of adjacent structures does not occur, the geotechnical investigation recommends that the dune sand underlying the adjacent building foundations and any slabs-on-grade be chemically grouted prior to installation of the underpinning. Additionally, it was recommended that the immediately adjacent buildings should be surveyed and monitored prior to and through-out construction. The project sponsor has agreed to implement the recommendations of the geotechnical investigation for the design and construction of the proposed project.

The geotechnical investigation concludes that the site is suitable for the proposed construction, provided that a final foundation investigation is performed to develop the detailed geotechnical engineering recommendations required for the final design and construction of the proposed building. In 2018 a geotechnical memorandum was proposed for the proposed project by a different geotechnical consultant.²³ The memorandum's findings concur with the recommendations of the preliminary geotechnical investigation and concludes that the proposed development's structural design and construction plan are feasible.

Final plans for the proposed building would be reviewed by DBI for conformance with recommendations in the site-specific design-level geotechnical investigation. The building department would also review the proposed building permit applications for compliance with the 2016 San Francisco Building Code and California Building Code. In particular, California Building Code Chapter 18, Soils and Foundations, provides the parameters for geotechnical investigations and structural considerations in the selection, design, and installation of foundation systems to support the loads from the structure above. Adherence to building code requirements would minimize any risk of damage to onsite or offsite structures and adjacent sidewalks. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an unusual circumstance or have significant impact related to geology and soils.

Geology and soil impacts are generally site specific and localized. The San Francisco Building Code regulates construction in San Francisco, and all development projects would be required to comply with its requirements to ensure maximum feasible seismic safety and minimize geologic impacts. Compliance with the seismic safety standards and the design review procedures would ensure that the effects from nearby cumulative projects would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, in combination with nearby cumulative projects, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact, nor would it contribute considerably to any significant cumulative impacts.

In light of the above, there are no unusual circumstance related to the project site or the proposed construction activities that could result in a significant impact related to hydrology or geology. The appellant has not demonstrated that the department's determination is not supported by substantial evidence.

Response 7: Construction of the proposed project does not involve pile driving or other construction methods that have the potential to create excessive groundborne vibration levels.

The proposed project involves the demolition of three structures on-site and the construction of a four-story building with two underground parking levels in an urban setting. Excavation near adjacent

²³ Murray Engineers Inc., *Memorandum, New Engineer-of-Record Preliminary Geotechnical Feasibility Review & Update, New Mixed-Use Building 3637-3657 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, California*, June 6, 2018.

structures does not represent an unusual circumstance but is a common occurrence for construction projects in San Francisco and is regulated under the building code.²⁴

The appellant questions why a vibration mitigation measure from the draft environmental impact report (DEIR) for the 3333 California Street project does not apply to the proposed project. As discussed above, the 3333 California project is a substantially larger development with a substantially longer construction duration that involves substantially more excavation. The 3333 California Street project, unlike the proposed project, would require extensive amount of excavation (including considerable rock fragmentation) and heavier construction equipment (e.g. excavator with hoe ram) with greater potential to result in in groundborne vibration. Considering this, the DEIR for the 3333 California Street project conservatively applied a vibration monitoring program as a mitigation measure to protect the immediately adjacent San Francisco Fire Credit Union building.²⁵

In contrast, the proposed project at 3637-3657 Sacramento Street would use smaller equipment that would not result in vibration levels that could damage nearby buildings. Potential vibration-related impacts to structures from construction are generally limited to the use of impact equipment such as pile drivers, hoe rams, and vibratory compactors. Since the project sponsor does not propose the use of pile drivers, hoe rams, and vibratory compactors, construction of the proposed project is not anticipated to expose structures to excessive groundborne vibration. Furthermore, as discussed above, the building code would require the project sponsor's construction contractor to adequately protect adjacent structures during project construction. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an unusual circumstance or a significant vibration impact.

Response 8. The proposed demolition of the parking garage at 3657 Sacramento Street would not result in a project-specific or cumulative significant impact related to historical resources.

The appellant asserts that the parking garage at 3657 Sacramento Street is a historic resource and references a book that was published in 2013. As discussed in the CEQA determination, a property may be considered a historic resource if it meets any of the criteria related to (1) events, (2) persons, (3) architecture, or (4) information potential that make it eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or if it is considered a contributor to an eligible historic district.

An historic resource evaluation report prepared by Kelley and Verplanck Historical Resources Consulting²⁶ for the parking garage located on 3657 Sacramento Street found that the garage, constructed in 1920, does not qualify for individual listing on the California Register under any of the four criteria for significance, nor is it eligible as a contributor to a historic district. The on-site garage structure was determined not to be historically significant for its minor association with the development of the Presidio Heights area, and there was no evidence of association with other historic events. A search of biographical and newspaper indexes yields no indication that the building is associated with historically important individuals. While Henry C. Smith, the design architect of the structure, was a well-known professional of the period, the on-site garage building is a distinctly minor example of his work and does not display high artistic values. In addition, there is no indication that this building is likely to yield information important in prehistoric or

²⁴ International Building Code, Section 3307.1: Protection of Adjoining Property.

²⁵ This commercial building is located at the southwest corner of California Street and Presidio Avenue.

²⁶ Kelley and Verplanck Historical Resources Consulting, *Historic Resource Evaluation Report for 3657 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, California*, September, 2007.

history. Planning department staff prepared an historic resource evaluation response²⁷ which concurred with the historic consultant's finding that the garage was not eligible for listing in the California Register as an individual resource for events, persons, architecture, and information potential or as a contributor to a historic district. Therefore, the property was found to not be an historic resource as defined by CEQA.

Planning department staff reviewed the book referenced by Appellant, Mark Kessler's *The Early Public Garages of San Francisco*, and have determined that the findings of the 2008 historic resource evaluation response remain valid.²⁸ The appellant has not demonstrated that the department's determination is not supported by substantial evidence in the record. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact on a historic resource.

Response 9: The proposed project would comply with the City's local tree ordinance and would not result in a significant tree impact.

The proposed project would remove three existing trees on the project site and would plant four new street trees in front of the project site to meet the requirements of planning code section 138.1. There are no unusual circumstances related to the proposed development on the project site. Construction activities near adjacent trees is a common condition in an urban area. The city's urban forestry ordinance, public works code sections 801 et seq., requires a permit from public works to remove any protected trees. Protected trees include landmark trees, significant trees, or street trees located on private or public property anywhere within the territorial limits of San Francisco. The designations are defined as follows:

- A landmark tree is designated by the board of supervisors following nomination of a tree by the urban forestry council. The urban forestry council determines whether a nominated tree meets the qualification for landmark designation by using established criteria set forth in section 810(f)(4)(A)–(E) of the public works code. Special permits are required to remove a landmark tree.
- A significant tree is defined either on property under the jurisdiction of public works, or on privately-owned property with any portion of its trunk within 10 feet of the public right-of-way and that satisfies at least one of the following criteria: (a) diameter at breast height in excess of 12 inches, (b) a height in excess of 20 feet, or (c) a canopy in excess of 15 feet.²⁹ The director of public works may authorize removal of a significant tree.
- Street trees are trees within the public right-of-way or on land within the jurisdiction of public works. Their removal by abutting property owners requires a permit (section 806(b)(3)).

The proposed project would not remove any landmark, significant, or street tree. Additionally, there are no known landmark or significant trees adjacent to the project site. The existing street tree immediately adjacent to the project site would be retained. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant tree impact and mitigation is not required.

²⁷ San Francisco Planning Department, *Historic Resource Evaluation Response 3637-3657 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, California*, July 18, 2008.

²⁸ San Francisco Planning Department, *Review of Historic Resource Determination, 3637-3657 Sacramento Street*, January 3, 2019.

²⁹ Public Works Code, Section 810A (a).

CONCLUSION

The department has determined that the proposed project is categorically exempt from environmental review under CEQA on the basis that: (1) the project meets the definition of one or more of the classes of projects that the Secretary of Resources has found do not have a significant effect on the environment, and (2) none of the exceptions specified in CEQA Guidelines section 15300.2 prohibiting the use of a categorical exemption are applicable to the project. The appellant has not demonstrated that the department's determination is not supported by substantial evidence in the record.

For the reasons stated above, and in the September 20, 2018 CEQA categorical exemption determination, the CEQA determination complies with the requirements of CEQA and the project is appropriately exempt from environmental review pursuant to the cited exemption. The department therefore respectfully recommends that the board uphold the CEQA categorical exemption determination and deny the appeal of the CEQA determination.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: December 20, 2018
TO: Project File 2007.1347ENV – 3637-3657 Sacramento Street
FROM: Justin Horner, Environmental Planning
RE: Air Quality Memorandum

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

This memorandum documents the air quality analysis performed for the project proposed for 3637-3657 Sacramento Street. This memorandum discusses the project's potential criteria air pollutant (CAP) emissions. The appendix attached to this memorandum provide further details about the air quality analysis.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located on the south side of Sacramento Street on the block surrounded by Sacramento, Spruce, Locust, and California Streets in the Presidio Heights neighborhood. The site is comprised of two lots. Lot 012, located at 3657 Sacramento Street, contains a single-story, 12,250-square-foot, 75-space parking garage that was constructed in 1920. Lot 020, contains two structures: 3637 Sacramento Street, a two-story, occupied medical office building with three surface parking spaces that was constructed in 1966, and 3641 Sacramento Street, an occupied three-story office building constructed in 1974. Within the existing medical office building 16 offices are present, 13 are currently occupied and three are vacant. The project proposes to demolish the existing buildings and construct a 40-foot-tall, four-story building with a 9-foot-tall elevator penthouse and 4-foot-tall parapet. The building would contain approximately 6,500 square feet of retail on the first floor, 10,000 square feet of medical office use on the second floor, and 18 dwelling units (17,100 square feet) on the third and fourth floors. The project proposes 64 parking spaces on three below-grade levels consisting of 45 short-term public parking spaces on the first and second levels (13 retail spaces and 32 medical spaces), 18 residential parking spaces on the third level, and one car share parking space.

CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS

Methodology

The total CAP emissions from construction equipment were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod)¹ based on the construction phasing schedule provided by the project sponsor.² This analysis utilized CalEEMod's defaults for the types of equipment used, and the duration of their use, during each phase.

¹ CalEEMod version 2013.3.2, available online at <http://www.caleemod.com>. CalEEMod was used to estimate CAP emissions from construction vehicle activity.

² Project equipment and phasing information provided by Don Lewis, Environmental Planner, on December 17, 2018. This document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor, as part of Case File 2007.1347ENV.

- 1) A 409-day project completion period was assumed, which includes the demolition of the existing structures, grading of the project site, building construction and architectural coating phases. The project sponsor provided the durations for all phases.
- 2) The total construction-related CAP emissions were modeled using CalEEMod.³ The CalEEMod results were then converted from tons to pounds and divided by the assumed number of working days (409) to yield average daily construction emissions calculation. The average daily emissions were then compared to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) thresholds of significance for construction CAPs.

Results

Table 1 shows the total CAP emissions associated with unmitigated project construction and provides a comparison to the BAAQMD thresholds of significance. As demonstrated in the table, the proposed project's unmitigated daily construction-related CAP emissions would not exceed BAAQMD thresholds of significance.

Table 1 Construction CAP Emissions

Pollutant⁴	Construction Thresholds⁵ Average Daily Emissions (lbs./day)	Proposed Project Construction Emissions Average Daily Emissions (lbs./day)
ROG	54	2.66
NO _x	54	5.74
PM ₁₀	82 (exhaust)	0.25
PM _{2.5}	54 (exhaust)	0.23
Fugitive Dust	Construction Dust Ordinance or other Best Management Practices	San Francisco Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance No. 176-08) applies to the proposed project

OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS

Methodology

The total CAP emissions from operations were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod).⁶ This analysis utilized CalEEMod's defaults for the types of likely vehicle trips, energy usage and consumer goods-related emissions.

The total operations-related CAP emissions were modeled using CalEEMod.⁷ The CalEEMod results were then converted from tons to pounds and divided by 365 (days per year) to yield average daily operational emissions calculation. The average daily emissions were then compared to the

³ The CalEEMod output (report) is included in Attachment A.

⁴ ROG: reactive organic gases; NO_x: nitrogen oxides; PM₁₀: inhalable coarse particulate matter; PM_{2.5}: fine particulate matter

⁵ Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines*, May 2011

⁶ CalEEMod version 2013.3.2, available online at <http://www.caleemod.com> (accessed December 17, 2018). CalEEMod was used to estimate CAP emissions from construction vehicle activity.

⁷ The CalEEMod output (report) is available for review.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) thresholds of significance for operational CAPs.

Results

Table 2 shows the total CAP emissions associated with unmitigated project operation and provides a comparison to the BAAQMD thresholds of significance. As demonstrated in the table, the proposed project’s unmitigated daily operational-related CAP emissions would not exceed BAAQMD thresholds of significance.

Table 2 Operational CAP Emissions

	ROG	NOx	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}
Project Average Daily Emissions (lbs/day)	1.94	4.23	0.05	0.05
Significance Threshold (lbs/day)	54	54	82	54
Project Maximum Annual Emissions (tpy)	0.35	0.77	0.01	0.01
Significance Threshold (tpy)	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: January 3, 2019
TO: Don Lewis
FROM: Jørgen G. Cleemann
RE: 3637-3657 Sacramento Street (2007.1347APL)
Review of Historic Resource Determination

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

In response to the appeal of the environmental evaluation of the project at 3637-3657 Sacramento Street (2007.1347E), preservation staff is providing this memorandum to state that no new information has become available that would change the findings of the July 18, 2008 Historic Resource Evaluation Response (HRER) regarding the garage building at 3657 Sacramento Street (1018/012). The 2008 HRER, which was based on a September 2007 Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) prepared by historic resource consultants Kelley and VerPlanck, found that the subject building is not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, and thus is not a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA review. (Hereafter, the 2007 HRE and 2008 HRER are collectively referred to as “the original determination.”) In preparing the current memorandum, preservation staff reviewed *The Early Public Garages of San Francisco: an Architectural and Cultural Study, 1906-1929*, a book written by Professor Mark D. Kessler of the University of California, Davis. Although this book was published in 2013 and was not considered at the time that the original determination was issued, the book does not contain new information that would change the 2008 findings.

The Early Public Garages does not refer specifically to the subject building. The sections of the book that pertain most directly to the subject building and that were not addressed in the original determination are the information relating to builder Joseph A. Pasqualetti of the American Concrete Company, and the detailed analysis of different garage typologies addressed in Chapter 3. Although the original determination did refer to the American Concrete Company, it did not mention Pasqualetti by name and did not include a discussion of the builder’s potential status as a master in his field. Instead, the original determination focused on the subject building’s architect, Henry C. Smith, who is considered a master architect. *The Early Public Garages* provides evidence for the assertion that Pasqualetti can be considered a master builder responsible for numerous accomplished commissions throughout San Francisco. Furthermore, *The Early Public Garages* calls attention to the architectural significance of another collaboration between Pasqualetti and Smith, the multi-story garage building at 265 Eddy Street. However, in reviewing Pasqualetti’s oeuvre—including the buildings listed in Kessler’s book as well as numerous buildings that the Planning Department has previously identified as historic resources (e.g., the Admiral Garage at 550 Turk St., the Inverness Garage at 1565 Bush St.)—it is clear that the subject building is neither an outstanding nor a particularly representative example of Pasqualetti’s work. It exhibits none of the builder’s characteristic attention to façade organization or ornamental embellishment. This is equally the case when comparing the subject building to Pasqualetti and Smith’s collaboration at 265 Eddy Street, which successfully incorporates stylistic expression into a functional

multi-story garage building. 265 Eddy has been identified as a contributing building in the National Register-listed Uptown Tenderloin Historic District.

Chapter 3 of *The Early Public Garages* proposes a framework for classifying garage buildings by façade type. The intent of introducing such a framework is to “foster[] an awareness of the continuities and discontinuities among the examples.”¹ In doing so, the author hopes to promote the preservation of modest garage buildings: “A building may merit preservation not for its individual excellence but for its continuity with other examples of the type.”² In general the Planning Department supports this approach and finds that it can be a useful tool in identifying the historical significance of buildings that might not otherwise be recognized. Similar approaches have resulted in the identification of numerous historic resources throughout the city (e.g., many of the automotive buildings identified as significant in the Van Ness Auto Row Support Structures survey.) The subject building at 3657 Sacramento Street, however, does not fit easily into any of the different façade types proposed in the book. The closest fit is the “Narrow ABCBA” façade type, which “assembles an odd number of bays into an elaborate symmetry about a center entry bay.”³ Typical examples of this type feature facades that employ a logic in which the arrangement of openings at the ground story are somehow reflected in the organization of windows and ornament on the upper stories and parapet. While some such logic does exist at the subject building, the relationship is made awkward by the fact that the crenellated buttresses on the parapet are significantly narrower than the ground-floor openings that they cover, and the central gable is far wider than the central ground floor opening. Furthermore, the subject building lacks the expressed second story possessed by all of the examples of the type presented in the book. Therefore, the information presented in *The Early Public Garages* does not elevate the significance of the subject building by virtue of its association with other examples of the same type. If anything, it calls attention to the awkwardness of the subject building’s façade design.

In sum, while *The Early Public Garages* presents some new information that was not considered at the time that the subject building’s historical significance was determined in 2008, the information does not ultimately change the finding that the subject building at 3657 Sacramento Street is not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources and therefore is not a historical resource under CEQA.

¹ Mark D. Kessler, *The Early Public Garages of San Francisco: An Architectural and Cultural Study, 1906-1929*, (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co., 2013), 55.

² *Ibid.*, 136.

³ *Ibid.*, 68.