

File No. 170804

Committee Item No. _____

Board Item No. 15

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: _____

Date: _____

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date: September 12, 2017

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MOU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 126 – Ethics Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence |

OTHER

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Appeal Letter - July 3, 2017</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Project Sponsor Appeal Response Letter - July 17, 2017</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Planning Department Appeal Response Letter - July 17, 2017</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Public Hearing Notice and Clerical Documents</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |

Prepared by: Brent Jalipa

Date: September 7, 2017

Prepared by: _____

Date: _____



LUBIN OLSON & NIEWIADOMSKI LLP

THE TRANSAMERICA PYRAMID
600 MONTGOMERY STREET, 14TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111
TEL 415 981 0550 FAX 415 981 4343 WEB lubinolson.com

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

10:17 JUL -3 PM 2:12

u

July 3, 2017

BIJAL PATEL
Direct Dial: (415) 955-5018
E-mail: bpatel@lubinolson.com

DELIVERED IN PERSON

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

CEQA Exemption Appeal - 1850 Bryant Street

Dear Board of Supervisors:

On behalf of Franklin Square Owners Association, the homeowners association for the residents of 1800 Bryant Street, we appeal the City’s Certificate of Determination (Community Plan Evaluation) dated May 10, 2017, which was the basis of the Planning Commission’s approval of Motion No. 19933 for the proposed project at 1850 Bryant Street (“Project”) on June 1, 2017. This Determination was deficient in numerous ways and further analyses must be conducted under CEQA. These deficiencies, include without limitation, the following:

A. Inadequate Noise Study

The Project does not comply with the requisite Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-5 and use compatibility requirements set forth in the General Plan and in Police Code Section 2909d. Project applicant submitted Noise Mitigation Measure F-5 Analysis dated April 24, 2017 (“Noise Study”) to meet these requirements. The Noise Study concluded that:

“The project will comply with the nighttime criterion of Mitigation Measure F-5 set forth in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR with STC 28 windows at the PDR spaces for neighboring noise-sensitive receivers. No additional mitigation is needed to meet the daytime criterion. However, higher STC-rated windows could be required by CALGreen to meet the interior noise criterion at the PDR spaces.”

Critically, the Noise Study made the foregoing conclusions based on an inaccurate assumption: that the noise receptor 1800 Bryant Street, the “modern building to the north” of the Project, had closed windows. Conversely, the Noise Study correctly assumed open windows when testing the noise receptor of the “older building to the south” of the Project. While 1800 Bryant is a more “modern” building than its counterpart to the south of the Project, having been

built ca. 2000, it does **not** have air conditioning. As you can imagine, the building can get very hot, requiring residents to open their windows.

Given this fundamentally erroneous assumption, the Noise Study is deficient for purposes of testing noise receptor 1800 Bryant Street, and the noise testing must be redone to assume open windows for this receptor, as was done for the building to the south of the Project.

B. Incomplete Shadow Analysis

Illustrations in the Shadow Analysis conducted for the Project reveals that the Project will cause a shadow over virtually all of 1800 Bryant Street, including the building's common area courtyard. However, the Shadow Analysis fails to include any analysis regarding this widespread impact, hence violating CEQA requirements. **This net new shadow is a substantial adverse impact, and the Project applicant must be required to evaluate, under CEQA, the nature of the impact as well as any mitigations, such as design modifications that could potentially eliminate or reduce the net new shadow impacts on 1800 Bryant Street.**

C. Inadequate Geotechnical Investigation

The Project sponsor submitted a geotechnical investigation conducted by GeoForensics, Inc., titled *Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed New Commercial Building at the Bryant Street Property* and dated August, 2015 (the "Geotech Report"). **The Geotech Report is inadequate in several significant ways and further geotechnical investigation is required to adequately satisfy CEQA.**

Firstly, the Geotech Report indicates that site observations were done on August 10, 2015, which coincided with the end of a multi-year drought. Groundwater conditions could be significantly different now from August 2015 and additional soil borings should be done to reflect current conditions.

Secondly, the Geotech Report assumes inaccurate cut depths for construction of the Project's garage. The assumption is that the cuts could be up to about 10 feet deep. However, since the elevation of Bryant Street is about 15 feet above the elevation of Florida Street, the cuts would be about 10 feet (or more) deeper on Bryant Street. Furthermore, the analysis groundwater observed in "Soil Boring #3". However, this soil boring was not included in the publically made available Geotech Report. The applicant needs to reevaluate its analysis based on the correct cut depths and reconfirmation of Soil Boring #3, to ensure that the Geotech Report analyses and findings are still accurate.

Thirdly, the Geotech Report notes optional design features that actually should be required design elements of the Project. These include the addition of supplementary seismic force for the design for basement walls and the installation of the back-of-wall drainage system to prevent the build-up of hydrostatic pressure.

D. Inadequate Construction Methodology Analysis

The CEQA analysis assumes that the Project will use a shoring/underpinning construction method (as opposed to pile driving). Such a method would require the Project sponsors to obtain an agreement to access and use the adjacent property at 1800 Bryant Street. However, the Planning Commission did not impose a condition to obtain such an agreement, and the Project sponsor has failed to negotiate in good faith such an agreement. As such, the Project will likely need to use pile driving for construction of this multistory building with underground parking. Such pile driving could potentially have significant environmental impacts on the soil and groundwater. However, none of these potential impacts were analyzed.

Accordingly, to comply with CEQA, the Planning Department should be required to analyze the potential impacts of a pile driving construction methodology, or, alternatively, the Project proponent should be required, as an express Project condition of approval, to negotiate in good faith a shoring/underpinning agreement with the appellants for the use of 1800 Bryant Street.

E. Incomplete Transportation Impact Study

The Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans require project-level analyses for new development projects. As a result, the Project sponsor submitted the *Transportation Impact Study for 1850 Bryant Street* dated April 2017 and prepared by CHS Consulting Group (the "TIS"). The TIS concluded that the "proposed Project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to transportation and circulation and would not contribute considerably to cumulative transportation and circulation impacts that were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR."

However, the analysis is lacking thorough site level detail. Infill and rebuild development in the neighborhood and expansion of neighboring uses (such as 1890 Bryant, new top story and art studios, Tartine Manufacturing, etc.) have caused significant increases in all forms of traffic in the area, since the adoption of the 2008 Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR. Furthermore, Florida Street is already a heavily congested street, and many of the existing establishments on the street, such as Coffee Bar, Artaud/Z Space Theater, do not have on-site loading zones. Allowing the Project to provide these without further analysis will simply exacerbate an existing problem.

In addition, the TIS is not clear whether the proposed parking garage is planned to accommodate only employees of the facility or customers/clients as well. If the garage is for employees only, the proposed use could further negatively impact street parking.

CEQA allows a finding of plan consistency only if there: (a) have been no substantial changes since the 2008 Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR; (b) are no substantial changes in circumstances that would require major revisions to the Final EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or (c) an increase in the severity of

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors


July 3, 2017

Page 4

previously identified significant impacts; and (d) there is no new information of substantial importance that would change the conclusions set forth in the Final EIR.

As noted above the Project setting has significantly changed since 2008, and more traffic analysis is required to study these site level changes to adequately determine whether there are significant traffic impacts under CEQA and whether the Planning Department's determination of Plan Consistency with the 2008 Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR is sound.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bijal Patel', written over a horizontal line.

Bijal Patel

BP



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

CITY CLERK - 3 PM 2:12

Certificate of Determination Community Plan Evaluation

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Case No.: 2015-011211ENV
Project Address: **1850 Bryant Street**
Zoning: PDR-1-G (Production Distribution and Repair-1-General) Use District
68-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 3971/006
Lot Size: 36,500 square feet
Plan Area: Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, Mission Sub Area
Project Sponsor: Douglas Ross, Ross Construction 415-850-2515
Staff Contact: Justin Horner, Justin.horner@sfgov.org, 415-575-9023

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 36,500-square-foot (sf) project site is located in the middle of the block bordered by Bryant Street to the east, 17th Street to the north, Florida Street to the west and Mariposa Street to the south in the Mission neighborhood. The project site is currently occupied by a two-story, approximately 26 foot -tall, 13,800-sf commercial building built in 1974, and a 27,300-sf surface parking lot and storage area. The project site is located in the PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution and Repair-1-General) Zoning District and the 68-X Height and Bulk District.


(project description continued on next page)

CEQA DETERMINATION

The project is eligible for streamlined environmental review per Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and California Public Resources Code Section 21083.3

DETERMINATION

I do hereby certify that the above determination has been made pursuant to State and Local requirements.



Lisa M. Gibson
Environmental Review Officer

5/10/17

Date

cc: Douglas Ross, Project Sponsor; Supervisor Ronen, District 9; Linda Ajello Hoagland, Current Planning Division; Virna Byrd, M.D.F.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (CONTINUED)

The proposed project would demolish the existing building and the surface parking and storage lot, and construct a five-story-plus-basement, 68-foot-tall mixed use building with approximately 166,728 gross square feet of social service uses, 2,285 gross square feet of retail, approximately 18,407 gross square feet of production, distribution and repair (PDR) uses and a 17,000 square foot roof deck. The lobby entrance would be located on Bryant Street. The proposed project would provide 91 vehicle parking spaces on the second below-grade basement level, and also include 30 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, and 15 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. The proposed project would remove a curb cut on Bryant Street and relocate a curb cut on Florida Street to the center of the Florida Street frontage. Construction of the project would require approximately 40,000 cubic yards of excavation to a depth of approximately 30 feet along Bryant Street and 15 feet along Florida Street. Construction would last approximately 18 months.

PROJECT APPROVAL

The proposed project requires a Large Project Authorization (pursuant to Mission Interim Controls) from the Planning Commission, which will be the Approval Action for the proposed project. The Approval Action date establishes the start of the 30-day appeal period for this CEQA determination pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

COMMUNITY PLAN EVALUATION OVERVIEW

California Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 provide that projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, shall not be subject to additional environmental review except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: a) are peculiar to the project or parcel on which the project would be located; b) were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan or community plan with which the project is consistent; c) are potentially significant off-site and cumulative impacts that were not discussed in the underlying EIR; or d) are previously identified in the EIR, but which, as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than that discussed in the underlying EIR. Section 15183(c) specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, then an EIR need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

This determination evaluates the potential project-specific environmental effects of the 1850 Bryant Street project described above, and incorporates by reference information contained in the Programmatic EIR for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (PEIR)¹. Project-specific studies were prepared for the proposed project to determine if the project would result in any significant environmental impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

After several years of analysis, community outreach, and public review, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in December 2008. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in part to support housing development in some areas previously zoned to allow industrial uses, while preserving an

¹ Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E and State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048

adequate supply of space for existing and future production, distribution, and repair (PDR) employment and businesses.

The Planning Commission held public hearings to consider the various aspects of the proposed Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans and related Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments. On August 7, 2008, the Planning Commission certified the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR by Motion 17659 and adopted the Preferred Project for final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.^{2,3}

In December 2008, after further public hearings, the Board of Supervisors approved and the Mayor signed the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Planning Code amendments. New zoning districts include districts that would permit PDR uses in combination with commercial uses; districts mixing residential and commercial uses and residential and PDR uses; and new residential-only districts. The districts replaced existing industrial, commercial, residential single-use, and mixed-use districts.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR is a comprehensive programmatic document that presents an analysis of the environmental effects of implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, as well as the potential impacts under several proposed alternative scenarios. The Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR evaluated three rezoning alternatives, two community-proposed alternatives which focused largely on the Mission District, and a "No Project" alternative. The alternative selected, or the Preferred Project, represents a combination of Options B and C. The Planning Commission adopted the Preferred Project after fully considering the environmental effects of the Preferred Project and the various scenarios discussed in the PEIR. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR estimated that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan could result in approximately 7,400 to 9,900 net dwelling units and 3,200,000 to 6,600,000 square feet of net non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) built in the Plan Area throughout the lifetime of the Plan (year 2025). The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR projected that this level of development would result in a total population increase of approximately 23,900 to 33,000 people throughout the lifetime of the plan.⁴

A major issue of discussion in the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning process was the degree to which existing industrially-zoned land would be rezoned to primarily residential and mixed-use districts, thus reducing the availability of land traditionally used for PDR employment and businesses. Among other topics, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR assesses the significance of the cumulative land use effects of the rezoning by analyzing its effects on the City's ability to meet its future PDR space needs as well as its ability to meet its housing needs as expressed in the City's General Plan.

As a result of the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning process, the project site has been rezoned to PDR-1-G (Production Distribution and Repair-1-General) District. The PDR-1-G District is intended to retain and encourage existing PDR activities and promote new business formation. The proposed project and its relation to PDR land supply and cumulative land use effects is discussed further in the Community Plan Evaluation (CPE) Checklist, under Land Use. The 1850 Bryant Street site, which is located in the Mission District of the Eastern Neighborhoods, was designated as a site with building up to 68 feet in height.

²San Francisco Planning Department. Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E, certified August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>, accessed August 17, 2012.

³San Francisco Planning Department. San Francisco Planning Commission Motion 17659, August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=1268>, accessed August 17, 2012.

⁴Table 2 Forecast Growth by Rezoning Option Chapter IV of the Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR shows projected net growth based on proposed rezoning scenarios. A baseline for existing conditions in the year 2000 was included to provide context for the scenario figures for parcels affected by the rezoning.

Individual projects that could occur in the future under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans will undergo project-level environmental evaluation to determine if they would result in further impacts specific to the development proposal, the site, and the time of development and to assess whether additional environmental review would be required. This determination concludes that the proposed project at 1850 Bryant Street is consistent with and was encompassed within the analysis in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, including the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR development projections. This determination also finds that the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed 1850 Bryant Street project, and identified the mitigation measures applicable to the 1850 Bryant Street project. The proposed project is also consistent with the zoning controls and the provisions of the Planning Code applicable to the project site.^{5,6} Therefore, no further CEQA evaluation for the 1850 Bryant Street project is required. In sum, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and this Certificate of Determination and accompanying project-specific initial study comprise the full and complete CEQA evaluation necessary for the proposed project.

PROJECT SETTING

The project site is located in the middle of the block bordered by Bryant Street to the east, 17th Street to the north, Florida Street to the west and Mariposa Street to the south in the Mission neighborhood. Like all parcels on the block, the project site is a through lot between Bryant Street and Florida Street. The project area along Bryant Street is characterized primarily by residential uses in one- to three-story buildings ranging from 40-feet to 48-feet tall on the west side of Bryant Street, with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Potrero Division corporation yard on the east side. The project area along Florida Street is characterized by the two neighboring residential buildings along the east side, and a 40-foot, four-story theater and performing arts space with residential units on the west side. Buildings immediately adjacent to the project site include a 40-foot-tall, four-story residential live-work building to the south, and a 48-foot-tall, four-story residential building to the north. Parcels surrounding the project site are within the UMU (Urban Mixed Use), PDR-1-G (Production Distribution and Repair-1-General) and P (Public) Zoning Districts, and are within 68-X and 65-X Height and Bulk districts.

The closest Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) stop is at 16th and Mission Streets, approximately 0.4 miles northwest of the project site. The project site is within a quarter mile of several local transit lines, including Muni lines 9-San Bruno, 9R-San Bruno Rapid, 12-Folsom/Pacific, 22-Filmore, 27-Bryant, 33-Ashbury/18th Street, and 55-16th Street.

POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR included analyses of environmental issues including: land use; plans and policies; visual quality and urban design; population, housing, business activity, and employment (growth inducement); transportation; noise; air quality; parks, recreation and open space; shadow; archeological resources; historic architectural resources; hazards; and other issues not addressed in the previously issued initial study for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans. The proposed

⁵ Steve Wertheim, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 1850 Bryant Street, April 6, 2017. This document (and all other documents cited in this report, unless otherwise noted), is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2015-011211ENV.

⁶ Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 1850 Bryant Street, April 3, 2017.

1850 Bryant Street project is in conformance with the height, use and density for the site described in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and would represent a small part of the growth that was forecast for the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas. Thus, the plan analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR considered the incremental impacts of the proposed 1850 Bryant Street project. As a result, the proposed project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts than were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Significant and unavoidable impacts were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR for the following topics: land use, historic architectural resources, transportation and circulation, and shadow. The proposed project would not contribute considerably to any of these impacts.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts related to noise, air quality, archeological resources, historical resources, hazardous materials, and transportation. **Table 1** below lists the mitigation measures identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and states whether each measure would apply to the proposed project.

Table 1 – Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
F. Noise		
F-1: Construction Noise (Pile Driving)	Not Applicable: pile driving not proposed	N/A
F-2: Construction Noise	Not Applicable: no particularly noisy construction methods would be anticipated during the project's construction phase.	N/A
F-3: Interior Noise Levels	Not Applicable: CEQA no longer requires the consideration of the effects of the existing environment on a proposed project's future users or residents where that project would not exacerbate existing noise levels.	N/A
F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses	Not Applicable: CEQA generally no longer requires the consideration of the effects of the existing environment on a proposed project's future users or residents where that project would not exacerbate existing noise levels	N/A
F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses	Applicable. Project includes PDR uses.	Project sponsor has completed acoustic study and the

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
		proposed project would include STC 28 windows at the PDR spaces to ensure noise levels in compliance with the Noise Ordinance.
F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments	Not Applicable: CEQA generally no longer requires the consideration of the effects of the existing environment on a proposed project's future users or residents where that project would not exacerbate existing noise levels.	N/A
G. Air Quality		
G-1: Construction Air Quality	Not Applicable: these requirements have been superseded by the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance.	Compliance with the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance.
G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses	Not Applicable: superseded by applicable Article 38 requirements.	N/A
G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM	Not Applicable: the proposed uses are not expected to emit substantial levels of DPMs.	N/A
G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit other TACs	Not Applicable: proposed project would not include a backup diesel generator or other use that emits TACs.	N/A
J. Archeological Resources		
J-1: Properties with Previous Studies	Not Applicable: no archeological research design and treatment plan on file for this site.	N/A
J-2: Properties with no Previous Studies	Applicable. Proposed project requires Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR).	Project Mitigation Measure 1 (Accidental Discovery) has been agreed to by the project sponsor.
J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological	Not Applicable: project does not include any excavation and	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
District	is not located in Mission Dolores Archeological District.	
K. Historical Resources		
K-1: Interim Procedures for Permit Review in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Department	N/A
K-2: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Vertical Additions in the South End Historic District (East SoMa)	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Commission	N/A
K-3: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Alterations and Infill Development in the Dogpatch Historic District (Central Waterfront)	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Commission	N/A
L. Hazardous Materials		
L-1: Hazardous Building Materials	Applicable. Proposed project includes demolition of existing structures.	Project Mitigation Measure 2 (Hazardous Building Materials) has been agreed to by the project sponsor.
E. Transportation		
E-1: Traffic Signal Installation	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-3: Enhanced Funding	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
E-7: Transit Accessibility	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-8: Muni Storage and Maintenance	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-9: Rider Improvements	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-10: Transit Enhancement	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-11: Transportation Demand Management	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A

Please see the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the complete text of the applicable mitigation measures. With implementation of these mitigation measures, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT

A "Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review" was mailed on March 29, 2017 to adjacent occupants and owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site. Overall, concerns and issues raised by the public in response to the notice were taken into consideration and incorporated in the environmental review as appropriate for CEQA analysis. These include public comments regarding shadow impacts, traffic and parking, operational and construction-related noise, hazardous materials and geological concerns, as well as views, construction-related impacts (noise, vibration and air quality) and the presence of serpentine rock. The proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the issues identified by the public beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

CONCLUSION

As summarized above and further discussed in the CPE Checklist⁷:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the development density established for the project site in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans;
2. The proposed project would not result in effects on the environment that are peculiar to the project or the project site that were not identified as significant effects in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR;
3. The proposed project would not result in potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR;

⁷ The CPE Checklist is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, in Case File No. 2015-011211ENV.

4. The proposed project would not result in significant effects, which, as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was certified, would be more severe than were already analyzed and disclosed in the PEIR; and
5. The project sponsor will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR to mitigate project-related significant impacts.

Therefore, no further environmental review shall be required for the proposed project pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.

**EXHIBIT 1:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval and Proposed Improvement Measures)**

1. MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
J. Archeological Resources				
<p><i>Mitigation Measure 1 Archeological Monitoring</i> Based on the reasonable potential that archeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological monitoring program. All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of <i>construction</i> can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Sect. 15064.5 (a)(c).</p>	Project sponsor.	Prior to issuance of site permits.	Project sponsor shall retain archeological consultant to undertake archeological monitoring program in consultation with ERO.	Complete when Project sponsor retains qualified archaeological consultant.
<p><i>Archeological monitoring program (AMP).</i> The archeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the project archeologist shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the potential risk these activities pose to archaeological resources and to their depositional context; ▪ The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource; ▪ The archaeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with the archeological 	Project Sponsor	Prior to the start of renovation/const ruction activities.	Planning Department, in consultation with DPH.	Considered complete upon submittal to Planning confirming compliance with this measure.

**EXHIBIT 1:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval and Proposed Improvement Measures)**

1. MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis <p>If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction crews and heavy equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall, after making a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.</p>	<p>The archaeological consultant, Project Sponsor and project contractor.</p>	<p>Monitoring of soils disturbing activities.</p>	<p>Archaeological consultant to monitor soils disturbing activities specified in AMP and immediately notify the ERO of any encountered archaeological resource.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon completion of AMP.</p>
<p>If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or B) An archeological data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible. 	<p>ERO, archaeological consultant, and Project Sponsor.</p>	<p>Following discovery of significant archaeological resource that could be adversely affected by project.</p>	<p>Redesign of project to avoid adverse effect or undertaking of archaeological data recovery program.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon avoidance of adverse effect</p>
<p>If an archeological data recovery program is required by the ERO, the archeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The project archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP. The archeological consultant shall prepare a draft ADRP that shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable</p>	<p>Archaeological consultant in consultation with ERO</p>	<p>After determination by ERO that an archaeological data recovery program is required</p>	<p>Archaeological consultant to prepare an ADRP in consultation with ERO</p>	<p>Considered complete upon approval of ADRP by ERO.</p>

**EXHIBIT 1:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval and Proposed Improvement Measures)**

1. MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.</p> <p>The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Field Methods and Procedures. Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations. ▪ Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis. Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures. ▪ Discard and Deaccession Policy. Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies. ▪ Interpretive Program. Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archeological data recovery program. ▪ Security Measures. Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities. ▪ Final Report. Description of proposed report format and distribution of results. ▪ Curation. Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities. <p>Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects. The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, ERO, and MLD shall have up to but not beyond six days after the</p>	<p>Archaeological consultant or medical examiner</p>	<p>Discovery of human remains</p>	<p>Notification of County/City Coroner and, as warranted, notification of NAHC.</p>	<p>Considered complete on finding by ERO that all State laws regarding human remains/burial objects have been adhered to, consultation with MLD is completed as warranted, and that sufficient opportunity has</p>

**EXHIBIT 1:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval and Proposed Improvement Measures)**

1. MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>discovery to make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects with appropriate dignity (CEQA Guidelines, Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. Nothing in existing State regulations or in this mitigation measure compels the project sponsor and the ERO to accept recommendations of an MLD. The archeological consultant shall retain possession of any Native American human remains and associated or unassociated burial objects until completion of any scientific analyses of the human remains or objects as specified in the treatment agreement if such as agreement has been made or, otherwise, as determined by the archeological consultant and the ERO.</p>				<p>been provided to the archeological consultant for scientific/historical analysis of remains/funerary objects.</p>
<p>Final Archeological Resources Report. The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the draft final report.</p>	<p>Archeological consultant</p>	<p>Following completion of cataloguing, analysis, and interpretation of recovered archeological data.</p>	<p>Preparation of FARR</p>	<p>FARR is complete on review and approval of ERO</p>
<p>Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department shall receive three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.</p>	<p>Archeological consultant</p>	<p>Following completion and approval of FARR by ERO</p>	<p>Distribution of FARR after consultation with ERO</p>	<p>Complete on certification to ERO that copies of FARR have been distributed</p>

**EXHIBIT 1:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval and Proposed Improvement Measures)**

1. MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>F. Noise Mitigation Measure 2: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses To reduce potential conflicts between existing sensitive receptors and new noise-generating uses, for new development including commercial, industrial or other uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise, either short-term, at nighttime, or as a 24-hour average, in the proposed project site vicinity, the Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-sensitive uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes), prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the proposed use would comply with the use compatibility requirements in the General Plan and in Police Code Section 2909I, would not adversely affect nearby noise-sensitive uses, and that there are no particular circumstances about the proposed project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels that would be generated by the proposed use. Should such concerns be present, the Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action.</p>	<p>Project Sponsor along with Project Contractor.</p>	<p>Design measures to be incorporated into project design and evaluated in environmental/building permit review, prior to issuance of a final building permit and certificate of occupancy.</p>	<p>San Francisco Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon approval of final construction drawing set.</p>
<p>L. Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure 3: Hazardous Building Materials The project sponsor shall ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyl (PCBs) or Di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEPH), such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.</p>	<p>Project Sponsor</p>	<p>Prior to the start of renovation/const ruction activities.</p>	<p>Planning Department, in consultation with DPH.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon submittal to Planning confirming compliance with this measure.</p>



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Initial Study – Community Plan Evaluation

Case No.: 2015-011211ENV
Project Address: **1850 Bryant Street**
Zoning: PDR-1-G (Production Distribution and Repair-1-General) Use District
68-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 3971/006
Lot Size: 36,500 square feet
Plan Area: Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, Mission Sub Area
Project Sponsor: Douglas Ross, Ross Construction 415-850-2515
Staff Contact: Justin Horner, Justin.horner@sfgov.org, 415-575-9023

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 36,500-square-foot (sf) project site is located in the middle of the block bordered by Bryant Street to the east, 17th Street to the north, Florida Street to the west and Mariposa Street to the south in the Mission neighborhood (see Figures 1 and 2). The project site is currently occupied by a two-story, approximately 26-foot-tall, 13,800-sf commercial building built in 1974, and a 27,300-sf surface parking lot and storage area. The project site is located in the PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution and Repair-1-General) Zoning District and the 68-X Height and Bulk District.

The proposed project would demolish the existing building and the surface parking and storage lot, and construct a five-story-plus-basement, 68-foot-tall mixed use building with approximately 166,728 gross square feet of social service uses, approximately 2,285 gross square feet of retail and approximately 18,400 gross square feet of production, distribution and repair (PDR) uses, and a 17,000 square foot roof deck (see Figures 3-9). The lobby entrance would be located on Bryant Street. The proposed project would provide 91 vehicle parking spaces on the B2 below-grade basement level, and also include 30 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, 15 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. The proposed project would remove a curb cut on Bryant Street and move a curb cut on Florida Street to the center of the lot. Construction of the project would require approximately 40,000 cubic yards of excavation to a depth of approximately 30 feet along Bryant Street and 15 feet along Florida Street. Construction would last approximately 18 months.

The proposed 1850 Bryant Street project would require the following approvals:

Actions by the Planning Commission

- Large Project Authorization, for a "Medium Project," per the Mission 2016 Interim Zoning Controls;
- Joint determination with the Recreation and Park Commission that the project would have no adverse shadow impact on Franklin Square or other parks subject to Section 295 of the Planning Code.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

This initial study evaluates whether the environmental impacts of the proposed project are addressed in the programmatic environmental impact report for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR).¹ The initial study considers whether the proposed project would result in significant impacts that: (1) are peculiar to the project or project site; (2) were not identified as significant project-level, cumulative, or off-site effects in the PEIR; or (3) are previously identified significant effects, which as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the PEIR. Such impacts, if any, will be evaluated in a project-specific, focused mitigated negative declaration or environmental impact report. If no such impacts are identified, no additional environmental review shall be required for the project beyond that provided in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and this project-specific initial study in accordance with CEQA section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183.

Mitigation measures identified in the PEIR are discussed under each topic area, and measures that are applicable to the proposed project are provided under the Mitigation Measures section at the end of this checklist.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified significant impacts related to land use, transportation, cultural resources, shadow, noise, air quality, and hazardous materials. Additionally, the PEIR identified significant cumulative impacts related to land use, transportation, and cultural resources. Mitigation measures were identified for the above impacts and reduced all impacts to less-than-significant except for those related to land use (cumulative impacts on Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) use), transportation (program-level and cumulative traffic impacts at nine intersections; program-level and cumulative transit impacts on seven Muni lines), cultural resources (cumulative impacts from demolition of historical resources), and shadow (program-level impacts on parks).

The proposed project would include construction of a five-story, 68-foot-tall building with PDR uses and social service uses. As discussed below in this initial study, the proposed project would not result in new, significant environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already analyzed and disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

¹ San Francisco Planning Department, Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (PEIR), Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E, State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048, certified August 7, 2008. Available online at <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>, accessed August 17, 2012.

Figure 1. Project Vicinity




Figure 2. Project Site: 1850 Bryant Street




Figure 3: Proposed Basement Levels Plans





Figure 4. Proposed First Floor Plan




Figure 5 Proposed Second Floor Plan




Figure 6. Proposed Third Floor Plan




Figure 7. Proposed Fourth Floor Plan




Figure 8. Proposed Fifth Floor Plan




Figure 7. Proposed Roof Plan




Figure 8. Proposed Bryant Street (East) Elevation





Figure 9. Proposed Florida Street (West) Elevation



CHANGES IN THE REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT

Since the certification of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR in 2008, several new policies, regulations, statutes, and funding measures have been adopted, passed, or are underway that affect the physical environment and/or environmental review methodology for projects in the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas. As discussed in each topic area referenced below, these policies, regulations, statutes, and funding measures have implemented or will implement mitigation measures or further reduce less-than-significant impacts identified in the PEIR. These include:

- State legislation amending CEQA to eliminate consideration of aesthetics and parking impacts for infill projects in transit priority areas, effective January 2014.
- State legislation amending CEQA and San Francisco Planning Commission resolution replacing level of service (LOS) analysis of automobile delay with vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis, effective March 2016 (see "CEQA Section 21099" heading below).
- The adoption of 2016 interim controls in the Mission District requiring additional information and analysis regarding housing affordability, displacement, loss of PDR and other analyses, effective January 14, 2016 through April 14, 2017.
- San Francisco Bicycle Plan update adoption in June 2009, Better Streets Plan adoption in 2010, Transit Effectiveness Project (aka "Muni Forward") adoption in March 2014, Vision Zero adoption by various City agencies in 2014, Proposition A and B passage in November 2014, and the Transportation Sustainability Program (see initial study Transportation section).
- San Francisco ordinance establishing Noise Regulations Related to Residential Uses near Places of Entertainment effective June 2015 (see initial study Noise section).
- San Francisco ordinances establishing Construction Dust Control, effective July 2008, and Enhanced Ventilation Required for Urban Infill Sensitive Use Developments, amended December 2014 (see initial study Air Quality section).
- San Francisco Clean and Safe Parks Bond passage in November 2012 and San Francisco Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan adoption in April 2014 (see initial study Recreation section).
- Urban Water Management Plan adoption in 2011 and Sewer System Improvement Program process (see initial study Utilities and Service Systems section).
- Article 22A of the Health Code amendments effective August 2013 (see initial study Hazardous Materials section).

Aesthetics and Parking

In accordance with CEQA Section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for Transit Oriented Projects – aesthetics and parking shall not be considered in determining if a project has the potential to result in significant environmental effects, provided the project meets all of the following three criteria:

- a) The project is in a transit priority area;
- b) The project is on an infill site; and

c) The project is residential, mixed-use residential, or an employment center.

The proposed project meets each of the above three criteria and thus, this checklist does not consider aesthetics or parking in determining the significance of project impacts under CEQA.² Project elevations are included in the project description.

Automobile Delay and Vehicle Miles Traveled

In addition, CEQA Section 21099(b)(1) requires that the State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) develop revisions to the CEQA Guidelines establishing criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts of projects that “promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses.” CEQA Section 21099(b)(2) states that upon certification of the revised guidelines for determining transportation impacts pursuant to Section 21099(b)(1), automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment under CEQA.

In January 2016, OPR published for public review and comment a Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA³ recommending that transportation impacts for projects be measured using a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) metric. On March 3, 2016, in anticipation of the future certification of the revised CEQA Guidelines, the San Francisco Planning Commission adopted OPR’s recommendation to use the VMT metric instead of automobile delay to evaluate the transportation impacts of projects (Resolution 19579). (Note: the VMT metric does not apply to the analysis of project impacts on non-automobile modes of travel such as transit, walking, and bicycling.) Therefore, impacts and mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR associated with automobile delay are not discussed in this checklist, including PEIR Mitigation Measures E-1: Traffic Signal Installation, E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management, E-3: Enhanced Funding, and E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management. Instead, a VMT analysis is provided in the Transportation section.

² San Francisco Planning Department. Eligibility Checklist: CEQA Section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for 1850 Bryant Street, April 3, 2017. This document (and all other documents cited in this report, unless otherwise noted), is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 as part of Case File No. 2015-011211ENV.

³ This document is available online at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_sb743.php.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING—Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that adoption of the rezoning and area plans would result in an unavoidable significant impact on land use due to the cumulative loss of PDR. The proposed project would include the demolition of an existing 13,800-sf PDR use and the construction of 18,400-sf of new PDR space. This would result in a net increase of approximately 4,400-sf of PDR space and would not therefore contribute to any impact related to loss of PDR uses that was identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. In addition, the project site was zoned Manufacturing (M-1) prior to the rezoning of Eastern Neighborhoods, which permitted PDR uses and the rezoning of the project site did not contribute to the significant impact.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the area plans would not create any new physical barriers in the Eastern Neighborhoods because the rezoning and area plans do not provide for any new major roadways, such as freeways that would disrupt or divide the plan area or individual neighborhoods or subareas.

The Citywide Planning and Current Planning divisions of the planning department have determined that the proposed project is permitted in the PDR-1-G District and is consistent with the height, density and land use envisioned in the Mission Area Plan of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan. The proposed project is consistent with Mission Area Plan Objective 1.1 (strengthening the Mission’s existing mixed use character) by providing new PDR uses, as well as Mission Area Plan Objective 1.7 (retaining the Mission’s role as an important location for PDR activities). The proposed project also meets Objective 4.7 by providing bicycle parking spaces.^{4,5}

Because the proposed project is consistent with the development density established in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to land use and land use planning, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

⁴ Steve Wertheim, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 1850 Bryant Street, April 6, 2017.

⁵ Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 1850 Bryant Street, April 3, 2017.

Topics:	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
2. POPULATION AND HOUSING—				
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses), or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

One of the objectives of the Eastern Neighborhoods area plans is to identify appropriate locations for housing in the City’s industrially zoned land to meet the citywide demand for additional housing. The PEIR assessed how the rezoning actions would affect housing supply and location options for businesses in the Eastern Neighborhoods and compared these outcomes to what would otherwise be expected without the rezoning, assuming a continuation of development trends and ad hoc land use changes (such as allowing housing within industrial zones through conditional use authorization on a case-by-case basis, site-specific rezoning to permit housing, and other similar case-by-case approaches). The PEIR concluded that adoption of the rezoning and area plans: “would induce substantial growth and concentration of population in San Francisco.” The PEIR states that the increase in population expected to occur as a result of the proposed rezoning and adoption of the area plans would not, in itself, result in adverse physical effects, and would serve to advance key City policy objectives, such as providing housing in appropriate locations next to Downtown and other employment generators and furthering the City’s transit first policies. It was anticipated that the rezoning would result in an increase in both housing development and population in all of the area plan neighborhoods. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population and density would not directly result in significant adverse physical effects on the environment. However, the PEIR identified significant cumulative impacts on the physical environment that would result indirectly from growth afforded under the rezoning and area plans, including impacts on land use, transportation, air quality, and noise. The PEIR contains detailed analyses of these secondary effects under each of the relevant resource topics, and identifies mitigation measures to address significant impacts where feasible.

The PEIR determined that implementation of the rezoning and area plans would not have a significant impact from the direct displacement of existing residents, and that each of the rezoning options considered in the PEIR would result in less displacement as a result of unmet housing demand than would be expected under the No-Project scenario because the addition of new housing would provide some relief to housing market pressure without directly displacing existing residents. However, the PEIR also noted that residential displacement is not solely a function of housing supply, and that adoption of the rezoning and area plans could result in indirect, secondary effects on neighborhood character through gentrification that could displace some residents. The PEIR discloses that the rezoned districts could transition to higher-value housing, which could result in gentrification and displacement of lower-income

households, and states moreover that lower-income residents of the Eastern Neighborhoods, who also disproportionately live in crowded conditions and in rental units, are among the most vulnerable to displacement resulting from neighborhood change.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15131 and 15064(e), economic and social effects such as gentrification and displacement are only considered under CEQA where these effects would cause substantial adverse physical impacts on the environment. Only where economic or social effects have resulted in adverse physical changes in the environment, such as “blight” or “urban decay” have courts upheld environmental analysis that considers such effects. But without such a connection to an adverse physical change, consideration of social or economic impacts “shall not be considered a significant effect” per CEQA Guidelines 15382. While the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR disclosed that adoption of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans could contribute to gentrification and displacement, it did not determine that these potential socio-economic effects would result in significant adverse physical impacts on the environment.

The proposed project includes approximately 18,400 square feet of PDR space, 2,285 square feet of retail, and approximately 166,728 square feet of social service space. The proposed project would include employees, customers and those in need of social services. These direct effects of the proposed project on population and housing would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts on the physical environment beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The project’s contribution to indirect effects on the physical environment attributable to population growth are evaluated in this initial study under land use, transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, recreation, utilities and service systems, and public services.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
3. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5, including those resources listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Historic Architectural Resources

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.5(a)(1) and 15064.5(a)(2), historical resources are buildings or structures that are listed, or are eligible for listing, in the California Register of Historical Resources or

are identified in a local register of historical resources, such as Articles 10 and 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that future development facilitated through the changes in use districts and height limits under the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans could have substantial adverse changes on the significance of both individual historical resources and on historical districts within the Plan Areas. The PEIR determined that approximately 32 percent of the known or potential historical resources in the Plan Areas could potentially be affected under the preferred alternative. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR found this impact to be significant and unavoidable. This impact was addressed in a Statement of Overriding Considerations with findings and adopted as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans approval on January 19, 2009.

The project site is currently occupied by a two-story, approximately 26-foot-tall, 13,800-sf commercial building built in 1974, and a 27,300-sf surface parking lot and storage area. The existing building was previously evaluated in the Showplace Square/Northeast Mission Historic Resource Survey and was found to be ineligible for national, state, or local listing.⁶ The existing building is therefore not an historic resource under CEQA. Moreover, the project site is not located within a designated or eligible historic district. Therefore, demolition of this building would not contribute to the significant historic resource impact identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and no historic resource mitigation measures would apply to the proposed project.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on historic architectural resources that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Archeological Resources

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the Area Plan could result in significant impacts on archeological resources and identified three mitigation measures that would reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level. Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure J-2 applies to properties, such as the site of the proposed project, for which no archeological assessment report has been prepared or for which the archeological documentation is incomplete or inadequate to serve as an evaluation of potential effects on archeological resources under CEQA.

A Preliminary Archeological Review was performed for the proposed project and determined that there was a reasonable potential that archeological resources may be present within the project site. Therefore, **Project Mitigation Measure 1: Archeological Monitoring** would apply to the proposed project. See full text of Project Mitigation Measure 1: Archeological Monitoring in the Mitigation Measures Section below.

⁶ SF Planning Department, *Showplace Square/Northeast Mission Historic Resource Survey*, June, 2011. <http://sf-planning.org/showplace-square/northeast-mission-historic-resource-survey>. Accessed: May 5, 2017.

Topics:	Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site	Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR	Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information	No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR
4. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION—Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels, obstructions to flight, or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes would not result in significant impacts related to pedestrians, bicyclists, loading, or construction traffic. The PEIR states that in general, the analyses of pedestrian, bicycle, loading, emergency access, and construction transportation impacts are specific to individual development projects, and that project-specific analyses would need to be conducted for future development projects under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans.

Accordingly, the planning department conducted project-level analysis of the pedestrian, bicycle, loading, and construction transportation impacts of the proposed project.⁷ Based on this project-level review, the department determined that the proposed project would not have significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or the project site.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes could result in significant impacts on transit ridership, and identified seven transportation mitigation measures, which are described further below in the Transit sub-section. Even with mitigation, however, it was anticipated that the significant adverse cumulative impacts on transit lines could not be reduced to a less than significant level. Thus, these impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable. The project-

⁷ CHS Consulting Group, *Transportation Impact Study for 1850 Bryant Street*, April 2017.

specific Transportation Impact Study determined that the proposed project would not substantially affect the capacity utilization of local and regional transit lines and would not affect the operations of the adjacent and nearby bus transit routes; therefore, transit impacts of the proposed project would be Less Than Significant.

As discussed above under "SB 743", in response to state legislation that called for removing automobile delay from CEQA analysis, the Planning Commission adopted resolution 19579 replacing automobile delay with a VMT metric for analyzing transportation impacts of a project. Therefore, impacts and mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR associated with automobile delay are not discussed in this checklist.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR did not evaluate vehicle miles traveled or the potential for induced automobile travel. The VMT Analysis presented below evaluate the project's transportation effects using the VMT metric.

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the Initial Study Checklist topic 4c is not applicable.

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis

Many factors affect travel behavior. These factors include density, diversity of land uses, design of the transportation network, access to regional destinations, distance to high-quality transit, development scale, demographics, and transportation demand management. Typically, low-density development at great distance from other land uses, located in areas with poor access to non-private vehicular modes of travel, generate more automobile travel compared to development located in urban areas, where a higher density, mix of land uses, and travel options other than private vehicles are available.

Given these travel behavior factors, San Francisco has a lower VMT ratio than the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area region. In addition, some areas of the City have lower VMT ratios than other areas of the City. These areas of the City can be expressed geographically through transportation analysis zones. Transportation analysis zones are used in transportation planning models for transportation analysis and other planning purposes. The zones vary in size from single city blocks in the downtown core, multiple blocks in outer neighborhoods, to even larger zones in historically industrial areas like the Hunters Point Shipyard.

The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Transportation Authority) uses the San Francisco Chained Activity Model Process (SF-CHAMP) to estimate VMT by private automobiles and taxis for different land use types. Travel behavior in SF-CHAMP is calibrated based on observed behavior from the California Household Travel Survey 2010-2012, Census data regarding automobile ownership rates and county-to-county worker flows, and observed vehicle counts and transit boardings. SF-CHAMP uses a synthetic population, which is a set of individual actors that represents the Bay Area's actual population, who make simulated travel decisions for a complete day. The Transportation Authority uses tour-based analysis for office and residential uses, which examines the entire chain of trips over the course of a day, not just trips to and from the project. For retail uses, the Transportation Authority uses trip-based analysis, which counts VMT from individual trips to and from the project (as opposed to entire chain of trips). A trip-based approach, as opposed to a tour-based approach, is necessary for retail

projects because a tour is likely to consist of trips stopping in multiple locations, and the summarizing of tour VMT to each location would over-estimate VMT.^{8,9}

For office development, regional average daily work-related VMT per employee is 19.1.¹⁰ For retail development, regional average daily retail VMT per employee is 14.9.¹¹ Average daily VMT for both land uses is projected to decrease in future 2040 cumulative conditions. Refer to Table 1: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled, which includes the transportation analysis zone in which the project site is located, 538.

Table 1 Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled

<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Existing</u>			<u>Cumulative 2040</u>		
	<u>Bay Area Regional Average</u>	<u>Bay Area Regional Average minus 15%</u>	<u>TAZ 538</u>	<u>Bay Area Regional Average</u>	<u>Bay Area Regional Average minus 15%</u>	<u>TAZ 538</u>
Employment (Office)	19.1	16.2	9.6	17.0	14.5	8.5
Employment (Retail)	14.9	12.6	9.8	14.6	12.4	10.0

A project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would cause substantial additional VMT. The State Office of Planning and Research's (OPR) *Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* ("proposed transportation impact guidelines") recommends screening criteria to identify types, characteristics, or locations of projects that would not result in significant impacts to VMT. If a project meets one of the three screening criteria provided (Map-Based Screening, Small Projects, and Proximity to Transit Stations), then it is presumed that VMT impacts would be less than significant for the project and a detailed VMT analysis is not required. Map-Based Screening is used to determine if a project site is located within a transportation analysis zone that exhibits low levels of VMT; Small Projects are projects that would generate fewer than 100 vehicle trips per day; and the Proximity to Transit Stations criterion includes projects that are within a half mile of an existing major transit stop, have a floor area ratio of greater than or equal to 0.75, vehicle parking that is

⁸ To state another way: a tour-based assessment of VMT at a retail site would consider the VMT for all trips in the tour, for any tour with a stop at the retail site. If a single tour stops at two retail locations, for example, a coffee shop on the way to work and a restaurant on the way back home, then both retail locations would be allotted the total tour VMT. A trip-based approach allows us to apportion all retail-related VMT to retail sites without double-counting.

⁹ San Francisco Planning Department, Executive Summary: Resolution Modifying Transportation Impact Analysis, Appendix F, Attachment A, March 3, 2016.

¹⁰ For purposes of VMT analysis, both the social service provision use and PDR use are treated as office.

¹¹ Retail travel is not explicitly captured in SF-CHAMP, rather, there is a generic "Other" purpose which includes retail shopping, medical appointments, visiting friends or family, and all other non-work, non-school tours. The retail efficiency metric captures all of the "Other" purpose travel generated by Bay Area households. The denominator of employment (including retail; cultural, institutional, and educational; and medical employment; school enrollment, and number of households) represents the size, or attraction, of the zone for this type of "Other" purpose travel.

less than or equal to that required or allowed by the Planning Code without conditional use authorization, and are consistent with the applicable Sustainable Communities Strategy.

The proposed project would include approximately 166,728 square feet of social services space, approximately 18,400 square feet of PDR space, and approximately 2,285 square feet of retail space. Existing average daily VMT per capita for employment uses within the project site's TAZ, 538, is 9.6 miles. This is approximately 50 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per capita of 19.1. Existing average daily VMT per employee for retail uses in TAZ 538 is 9.8 miles. This is approximately 34 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per capita of 14.9. For future 2040 conditions, projected average daily VMT per capita for employment uses in TAZ 538 is 8.5 miles. This is 50 percent below the projected 2040 regional average daily VMT per capita of 17.1. Projected 2040 average daily VMT per employee for retail uses in TAZ 538 is 10.0 miles. This is 32 percent below the projected 2040 regional average daily VMT per employee of 14.6.¹² Therefore, the proposed project would not cause substantial additional VMT and impacts would be less-than-significant impact.

Trip Generation

The proposed project would include 166,728 square feet of social services space, 18,400 square feet of PDR space, and 2,285 square feet of retail space. The proposed project would also include 91 vehicle parking spaces in two below-grade basement levels, and also include 30 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, 15 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces.

Localized trip generation of the proposed project was calculated using a trip-based analysis and information in the *2002 Transportation Impacts Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review* (SF Guidelines) developed by the San Francisco Planning Department.¹³ The proposed project would generate an estimated 3,619 person trips (inbound and outbound) on a weekday daily basis, consisting of 2,226 person trips by auto, 676 transit trips, 506 walk trips and 211 trips by other modes. During the p.m. peak hour, the proposed project would generate an estimated 336 person trips, consisting of 226 person trips by auto (124 vehicle trips accounting for vehicle occupancy data for this Census Tract), 63 transit trips, 35 walk trips and 12 trips by other modes.

Transit

Mitigation Measures E-5 through E-11 in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR were adopted as part of the Plan with uncertain feasibility to address significant transit impacts. These measures are not applicable to the proposed project, as they are plan-level mitigations to be implemented by City and County agencies. In compliance with a portion of Mitigation Measure E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding, the City adopted impact fees for development in Eastern Neighborhoods that goes towards funding transit and complete streets. In addition, San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code, referred to as the Transportation Sustainability Fee (Ordinance 200-154, effective December 25, 2015).¹⁴ The fee updated, expanded, and replaced the prior Transit Impact Development Fee, which is in compliance with portions of Mitigation Measure E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding. The

¹² San Francisco Planning Department. Eligibility Checklist: CEQA Section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for 1820 Bryant Street, December 12, 2016.

¹³ CHS Consulting Group, *Transportation Impact Study for 1850 Bryant Street*, April 2017.

¹⁴ Two additional files were created at the Board of Supervisors for TSF regarding hospitals and health services, grandfathering, and additional fees for larger projects: see Board file nos. 151121 and 151257.

proposed project would be subject to the fee. The City is also currently conducting outreach regarding Mitigation Measures E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding and Mitigation Measure E-11: Transportation Demand Management. Both the Transportation Sustainability Fee and the transportation demand management efforts are part of the Transportation Sustainability Program.¹⁵ In compliance with all or portions of Mitigation Measure E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements, Mitigation Measure E-7: Transit Accessibility, Mitigation Measure E-9: Rider Improvements, and Mitigation Measure E-10: Transit Enhancement, the SFMTA is implementing the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP), which was approved by the SFMTA Board of Directors in March 2014. The TEP (now called Muni Forward) includes system-wide review, evaluation, and recommendations to improve service and increase transportation efficiency. Examples of transit priority and pedestrian safety improvements within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area as part of Muni Forward include the 14 Mission Rapid Transit Project, the 22 Fillmore Extension along 16th Street to Mission Bay (expected construction between 2017 and 2020), and the Travel Time Reduction Project on Route 9 San Bruno (initiation in 2015). In addition, Muni Forward includes service improvements to various routes with the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area; for instance the implemented new Route 55 on 16th Street.

Mitigation Measure E-7 also identifies implementing recommendations of the Bicycle Plan and Better Streets Plan. As part of the San Francisco Bicycle Plan, adopted in 2009, a series of minor, near-term, and long-term bicycle facility improvements are planned within the Eastern Neighborhoods, including along 2nd Street, 5th Street, 17th Street, Townsend Street, Illinois Street, and Cesar Chavez Boulevard. The San Francisco Better Streets Plan, adopted in 2010, describes a vision for the future of San Francisco's pedestrian realm and calls for streets that work for all users. The Better Streets Plan requirements were codified in Section 138.1 of the Planning Code and new projects constructed in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area are subject to varying requirements, dependent on project size. Another effort which addresses transit accessibility, Vision Zero, was adopted by various City agencies in 2014. Vision Zero focuses on building better and safer streets through education, evaluation, enforcement, and engineering. The goal is to eliminate all traffic fatalities by 2024. Vision Zero projects within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area include pedestrian intersection treatments along Mission Street from 18th to 23rd streets, the Potrero Avenue Streetscape Project from Division to Cesar Chavez streets, and the Howard Street Pilot Project, which includes pedestrian intersection treatments from 4th to 6th streets.

The project site is located within a quarter mile of several local transit lines including Muni lines 9-San Bruno, 9R-San Bruno Rapid, 12-Folsom-Pacific, 22-Fillmore, 27-Bryant, 33-Ashbury/18th St, and 55-Rutland. The proposed project would be expected to generate 676 daily transit trips, including 63 during the p.m. peak hour. Given the wide availability of nearby transit, the addition of 63 p.m. peak hour transit trips would be accommodated by existing capacity. As such, the proposed project would not result in unacceptable levels of transit service or cause a substantial increase in delays or operating costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service could result.

Each of the rezoning options in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts relating to increases in transit ridership on Muni lines, with the Preferred Project having significant impacts on seven lines. Of those lines, the project site is located within a quarter-mile of Muni lines 9-San Bruno, 22-Fillmore and 27-Bryant. The proposed project would not contribute considerably to these conditions as its minor contribution of 63 p.m. peak hour transit trips would not be

¹⁵ <http://tsp.sfplanning.org>

a substantial proportion of the overall additional transit volume generated by Eastern Neighborhood projects. The proposed project would also not contribute considerably to 2025 cumulative transit conditions and thus would not result in any significant cumulative transit impacts.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to transportation and circulation and would not contribute considerably to cumulative transportation and circulation impacts that were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
5. NOISE—Would the project:				
a) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, in an area within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Be substantially affected by existing noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would result in significant noise impacts during construction activities and due to conflicts between noise-sensitive uses in proximity to noisy uses such as PDR, retail, entertainment, cultural/institutional/educational uses, and office uses. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also determined that incremental increases in traffic-related noise attributable to implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would be less than significant. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified six noise mitigation measures, three of which may be applicable to subsequent

development projects.¹⁶ These mitigation measures would reduce noise impacts from construction and noisy land uses to less-than-significant levels.

Construction Noise

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 relate to construction noise. Mitigation Measure F-1 addresses individual projects that include pile-driving, and Mitigation Measure F-2 addresses individual projects that include particularly noisy construction procedures (including pile-driving). The proposed project would not include any particularly noisy construction procedures, nor would the project include pile driving. Therefore, Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 do not apply to the proposed project.

In addition, all construction activities for the proposed project (approximately 18 months) would be subject to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code) (Noise Ordinance), which regulates construction noise. The Noise Ordinance requires construction work to be conducted in the following manner: (1) noise levels of construction equipment, other than impact tools, must not exceed 80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the source (the equipment generating the noise); (2) impact tools must have intake and exhaust mufflers that are approved by the Director of Public Works (PW) or the Director of the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) to best accomplish maximum noise reduction; and (3) if the noise from the construction work would exceed the ambient noise levels at the site property line by 5 dBA, the work must not be conducted between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. unless the Director of PW authorizes a special permit for conducting the work during that period.

DBI is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance for private construction projects during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.). The Police Department is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance during all other hours. Nonetheless, during the construction period for the proposed project of approximately 18 months, occupants of the nearby properties could be disturbed by construction noise. Times may occur when noise could interfere with indoor activities in nearby residences and other businesses near the project site. The increase in noise in the project area during project construction would not be considered a significant impact of the proposed project, because the construction noise would be temporary, intermittent, and restricted in occurrence and level, as the contractor would be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance, which would reduce construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Operational Noise

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5 addresses impacts related to individual projects that include uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise in the project

¹⁶ Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-3, F-4, and F-6 address the siting of sensitive land uses in noisy environments. In a decision issued on December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require an agency to consider the effects of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project's future users or residents except where a project or its residents may exacerbate existing environmental hazards (*California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District*, December 17, 2015, Case No. S213478. Available at: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/opinions/documents/S213478.PDF>). As noted above, the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* determined that incremental increases in traffic-related noise attributable to implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would be less than significant, and thus would not exacerbate the existing noise environment. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measures F-3, F-4, and F-6 are not applicable. Nonetheless, for all noise sensitive uses, the general requirements for adequate interior noise levels of Mitigation Measures F-3 and F-4 are met by compliance with the acoustical standards required under the California Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations Title 24).

vicinity. As the proposed project includes new PDR uses, Mitigation Measure F-5 applies to the proposed project. An acoustical study was performed for the proposed project to analyze the potential noise impacts of proposed PDR uses on nearby sensitive receptors.¹⁷ In accordance with Mitigation Measure F-5, the noise analysis reviewed noise-sensitive uses (primarily residential uses) within 900 feet of the proposed project and included recommendations to reduce operational noise impacts to nearby residential uses to the levels required by the Noise Ordinance (Section 2909 of the San Francisco Police Code). According to the acoustical study, if the proposed project includes STC 28 rated windows at the PDR spaces (along Florida and Bryant Street facades), noise levels perceived by nearby sensitive receptors would comply with the Noise Ordinance. The project sponsor has agreed to accept the recommendations of the acoustical study into project design. Implementation of Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5 would ensure the proposed project would not substantially increase the ambient noise environment and noise impacts resulting from the proposed project would be less than significant. See the full text of Mitigation Measure F-5 (**Project Mitigation Measure 2**) in Mitigation Measures Section below.

The proposed project would be subject to the following interior noise standards, which are described for informational purposes. The acoustical requirements of Title 24 are incorporated into the San Francisco Green Building Code. Title 24 allows the project sponsor to choose between a prescriptive or performance-based acoustical requirement for non-residential uses. Both compliance methods require wall, floor/ceiling, and window assemblies to meet certain sound transmission class or outdoor-indoor sound transmission class ratings to ensure that adequate interior noise standards are achieved. In compliance with Title 24, DBI would review the final building plans to ensure that the building wall, floor/ceiling, and window assemblies meet Title 24 acoustical requirements. If determined necessary by DBI, a detailed acoustical analysis of the exterior wall and window assemblies may be required.

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, within two miles of a public airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, topic 12e and f from the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G is not applicable.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant noise impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
6. AIR QUALITY—Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

¹⁷ Charles Salter Associates, 1850 Bryant Street San Francisco California Noise Mitigation Measure F-5 Analysis, April 24, 2017.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified potentially significant air quality impacts resulting from construction activities and impacts to sensitive land uses¹⁸ as a result of exposure to elevated levels of diesel particulate matter (DPM) and other toxic air contaminants (TACs). The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified four mitigation measures that would reduce these air quality impacts to less-than-significant levels and stated that with implementation of identified mitigation measures, the Area Plan would be consistent with the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy, the applicable air quality plan at that time. All other air quality impacts were found to be less than significant.

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 addresses air quality impacts during construction, and PEIR Mitigation Measures G-3 and G-4 address proposed uses that would emit DPM and other TACs.¹⁹

Construction Dust Control

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 Construction Air Quality requires individual projects involving construction activities to include dust control measures and to maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions of particulates and other pollutants. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors subsequently approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes, generally referred to as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008). The intent of the Construction Dust Control Ordinance is to reduce the quantity of fugitive dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of on-site workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by DBI. Project-related construction activities would result in construction dust, primarily from ground-disturbing activities.

For projects over one half-acre, such as the proposed project, the Dust Control Ordinance requires that the project sponsor submit a Dust Control Plan for approval by the San Francisco Department of Public Health. DBI will not issue a building permit without written notification from the Director of Public

¹⁸ The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) considers sensitive receptors as: children, adults or seniors occupying or residing in: 1) residential dwellings, including apartments, houses, condominiums, 2) schools, colleges, and universities, 3) daycares, 4) hospitals, and 5) senior care facilities. BAAQMD, Recommended Methods for Screening and Modeling Local Risks and Hazards, May 2011, page 12.

¹⁹ The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also includes Mitigation Measure G-2, which has been superseded by Health Code Article 38, as discussed below, and is no longer applicable.

Health that the applicant has a site-specific Dust Control Plan, unless the Director waives the requirement. The site-specific Dust Control Plan would require the project sponsor to implement additional dust control measures such as installation of dust curtains and windbreaks and to provide independent third-party inspections and monitoring, provide a public complaint hotline, and suspend construction during high wind conditions.

The regulations and procedures set forth by the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance would ensure that construction dust impacts would not be significant. These requirements supersede the dust control provisions of PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1. Therefore, the portion of PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 Construction Air Quality that addresses dust control is no longer applicable to the proposed project.

Criteria Air Pollutants

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. These air pollutants are termed criteria air pollutants because they are regulated by developing specific public health- and welfare-based criteria as the basis for setting permissible levels. In general, the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB) experiences low concentrations of most pollutants when compared to federal or state standards. The SFBAAB is designated as either in attainment²⁰ or unclassified for most criteria pollutants with the exception of ozone, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀, for which these pollutants are designated as non-attainment for either the state or federal standards. By its very nature, regional air pollution is largely a cumulative impact in that no single project is sufficient in size to, by itself, result in non-attainment of air quality standards. Instead, a project's individual emissions contribute to existing cumulative air quality impacts. If a project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is considerable, then the project's impact on air quality would be considered significant.

While the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that at a program-level the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in significant regional air quality impacts, the PEIR states that "Individual development projects undertaken in the future pursuant to the new zoning and area plans would be subject to a significance determination based on the BAAQMD's quantitative thresholds for individual projects."²¹ The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) prepared updated *2011 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (Air Quality Guidelines)*,²² which provided new methodologies for analyzing air quality impacts. The Air Quality Guidelines also provide thresholds of significance for those criteria air pollutants that the SFBAAB is in non-attainment. These thresholds of significance are used by the City.

Construction

Construction activities from the proposed project would result in the emission of criteria air pollutants from equipment exhaust, construction-related vehicular activity, and construction worker automobile trips. Construction of the proposed project would occur over an approximately 437 working days. Construction-related criteria air pollutants generated by the proposed project were quantified using the

²¹ San Francisco Planning Department, Eastern Neighborhood's Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report. See page 346. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=4003>. Accessed June 4, 2014.

²² Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, updated May 2011. See pp. 3-2 to 3-3..

California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) and provided within an Air Quality Technical Memorandum.²³ The model was developed, including default data (e.g., emission factors, meteorology, etc.) in collaboration with California air districts' staff. Default assumptions were used where project-specific information was unknown. Emissions were converted from tons/year to lbs/day using the estimated construction duration of 437 working days.

Table 2: Daily Project Construction Emissions

	Pollutant Emissions (Average Pounds per Day)			
	ROG	NOx	Exhaust PM ₁₀	Exhaust PM _{2.5}
Unmitigated Project Emissions	13.35	14	0.67	0.62
Significance Threshold	54.0	54.0	82.0	54.0

Emissions over threshold levels are in **bold**.

Source: BAAQMD, 2011; San Francisco Planning Department

As shown in Table 2, above, unmitigated project construction emissions would be below the threshold of significance for ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. Therefore, air quality impacts would be less than significant.

Operation

The proposed project would generate criteria pollutant emissions associated with vehicle traffic (mobile sources), on-site area sources (i.e., natural gas combustion for space and water heating, and combustion of other fuels by building and grounds maintenance equipment), and energy usage. Operational-related criteria air pollutants generated by the proposed project were also quantified using CalEEMod and provided within an Air Quality Technical Memorandum. Default assumptions were used where project-specific information was unknown.

The daily and annual emissions associated with operation of the proposed project are shown in Table 3. Table 3 also includes the thresholds of significance the City utilizes.

Table 3: Summary of Operational Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

	ROG	NOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Project Average Daily Emissions (lbs/day)	23.32	36.5	0.65	0.6
Significance Threshold (lbs/day)	54	54	82	54
Project Maximum Annual Emissions (tpy)	4.26	6.66	0.0	0.0
Significance Threshold (tpy)	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0

lbs/day = pounds per day

tpy = tons per year

Source: BAAQMD, 2011; San Francisco Planning Department

²³ San Francisco Planning Department, *Air Quality Memorandum, Project File 2015.011211ENV 1850 Bryant Street*, April 20, 2017.

As shown in Table 3, the proposed project would not exceed the threshold of significance for operational criteria air pollutant emissions. For these reasons, implementation of the proposed project would not result in either project-level or cumulative significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to contribution to violations of air quality standards or substantial increases in non-attainment criteria air pollutants.

Health Risk

Since certification of the PEIR, San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes, generally referred to as the Enhanced Ventilation Required for Urban Infill Sensitive Use Developments or Health Code, Article 38 (Ordinance 224-14, amended December 8, 2014)(Article 38). The purpose of Article 38 is to protect the public health and welfare by establishing an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone and imposing an enhanced ventilation requirement for all urban infill sensitive use development within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone as defined in Article 38 are areas that, based on modeling of all known air pollutant sources, exceed health protective standards for cumulative PM_{2.5} concentration, cumulative excess cancer risk, and incorporates health vulnerability factors and proximity to freeways. Projects within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone require special consideration to determine whether the project's activities would expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations or add emissions to areas already adversely affected by poor air quality.

Construction

The project site is not located within an identified Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. Therefore, the ambient health risk to sensitive receptors from air pollutants is not considered substantial and the remainder of Mitigation Measure G-1 that requires the minimization of construction exhaust emissions is not applicable to the proposed project.

Siting New Sources

The proposed project would not be expected to generate 100 trucks per day or 40 refrigerated trucks per day. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-3 is not applicable. In addition, the proposed project would not include any sources that would emit DPM or other TACs. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-4 is not applicable and impacts related to siting new sources of pollutants would be less than significant.

For the above reasons, none of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR air quality mitigation measures are applicable to the proposed project and the project would not result in significant air quality impacts that were not identified in the PEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS— Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR assessed the GHG emissions that could result from rezoning of the Mission Area Plan under the three rezoning options. The Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning Options A, B, and C are anticipated to result in GHG emissions on the order of 4.2, 4.3 and 4.5 metric tons of CO₂E²⁴ per service population,²⁵ respectively. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that the resulting GHG emissions from the three options analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans would be less than significant. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The BAAQMD has prepared guidelines and methodologies for analyzing GHGs. These guidelines are consistent with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.4 and 15183.5 which address the analysis and determination of significant impacts from a proposed project's GHG emissions and allow for projects that are consistent with an adopted GHG reduction strategy to conclude that the project's GHG impact is less than significant. San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*²⁶ presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy in compliance with the BAAQMD and CEQA guidelines. These GHG reduction actions have resulted in a 23.3 percent reduction in GHG emissions in 2012 compared to 1990 levels,²⁷ exceeding the year 2020 reduction goals outlined in the BAAQMD's *2010 Clean Air Plan*,²⁸ Executive Order S-3-05²⁹, and Assembly Bill 32 (also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act).^{30,31} In addition, San Francisco's GHG reduction goals are consistent with, or more aggressive than, the long-term goals

²⁴ CO₂E, defined as equivalent Carbon Dioxide, is a quantity that describes other greenhouse gases in terms of the amount of Carbon Dioxide that would have an equal global warming potential.

²⁵ Memorandum from Jessica Range to Environmental Planning staff, Greenhouse Gas Analyses for Community Plan Exemptions in Eastern Neighborhoods, April 20, 2010. This memorandum provides an overview of the GHG analysis conducted for the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and provides an analysis of the emissions using a service population (equivalent of total number of residents and employees) metric.

²⁶ San Francisco Planning Department, *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions in San Francisco*, November 2010. Available at http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/GHG_Reduction_Strategy.pdf, accessed March 3, 2016.

²⁷ ICF International, *Technical Review of the 2012 Community-wide Inventory for the City and County of San Francisco*, January 21, 2015.

²⁸ Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Clean Air Plan*, September 2010. Available at <http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/air-quality-plans/current-plans>, accessed March 3, 2016.

²⁹ Office of the Governor, *Executive Order S-3-05*, June 1, 2005. Available at <https://www.gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=1861>, accessed March 3, 2016.

³⁰ California Legislative Information, *Assembly Bill 32*, September 27, 2006. Available at http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/05-06/bill/asm/ab_0001-0050/ab_32_bill_20060927_chaptered.pdf, accessed March 3, 2016.

³¹ Executive Order S-3-05, Assembly Bill 32, and the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan set a target of reducing GHG emissions to below 1990 levels by year 2020.

established under Executive Orders S-3-05³² and B-30-15.^{33,34} Therefore, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's GHG Reduction Strategy would not result in GHG emissions that would have a significant effect on the environment and would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations.

The proposed project would increase the intensity of use of the site by increasing the number of users and visitors to the site. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to annual long-term increases in GHGs as a result of increased vehicle trips (mobile sources) and commercial operations that result in an increase in energy use, water use, wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal. Construction activities would also result in temporary increases in GHG emissions.

The proposed project would be subject to regulations adopted to reduce GHG emissions as identified in the GHG reduction strategy. As discussed below, compliance with the applicable regulations would reduce the project's GHG emissions related to transportation, energy use, waste disposal, wood burning, and use of refrigerants.

Compliance with the City's Commuter Benefits Program, Emergency Ride Home Program, Transportation Sustainability Fee, bicycle parking requirements, and low-emission car parking requirements would reduce the proposed project's transportation-related emissions. These regulations reduce GHG emissions from single-occupancy vehicles by promoting the use of alternative transportation modes with zero or lower GHG emissions on a per capita basis.

The proposed project would be required to comply with the energy efficiency requirements of the City's Green Building Code, Stormwater Management Ordinance, Water Efficient Irrigation ordinances, and Energy Conservation Ordinance, which would promote energy and water efficiency, thereby reducing the proposed project's energy-related GHG emissions.³⁵ Additionally, the project would be required to meet the renewable energy criteria of the Green Building Code, further reducing the project's energy-related GHG emissions.

The proposed project's waste-related emissions would be reduced through compliance with the City's Recycling and Composting Ordinance, Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Ordinance, and Green Building Code requirements. These regulations reduce the amount of materials sent to a landfill, reducing GHGs emitted by landfill operations. These regulations also promote reuse of materials, conserving their embodied energy³⁶ and reducing the energy required to produce new materials.

³² Executive Order S-3-05 sets forth a series of target dates by which statewide emissions of GHGs need to be progressively reduced, as follows: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels (approximately 457 million MTCO₂E); by 2020, reduce emissions to 1990 levels (approximately 427 million MTCO₂E); and by 2050 reduce emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels (approximately 85 million MTCO₂E).

³³ Office of the Governor, *Executive Order B-30-15, April 29, 2015*. Available at <https://www.gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=18938>, accessed March 3, 2016. Executive Order B-30-15 sets a state GHG emissions reduction goal of 40 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2030.

³⁴ San Francisco's GHG reduction goals are codified in Section 902 of the Environment Code and include: (i) by 2008, determine City GHG emissions for year 1990; (ii) by 2017, reduce GHG emissions by 25 percent below 1990 levels; (iii) by 2025, reduce GHG emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels; and by 2050, reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels.

³⁵ Compliance with water conservation measures reduce the energy (and GHG emissions) required to convey, pump and treat water required for the project.

³⁶ Embodied energy is the total energy required for the extraction, processing, manufacture and delivery of building materials to the building site.

Compliance with the City’s Street Tree Planting requirements would serve to increase carbon sequestration. This regulation would require the project to plant 18 trees, or pay an in-lieu fee or provide in-lieu landscaping. The project proposes to plant 13 trees. Existing infrastructure and utilities would prevent the project from being able to plant the full number of trees required under this ordinance. Therefore, the project sponsor will either pay an in-lieu fee or comply with the in-lieu landscaping option, as required by PW during the permit review process. Therefore, the project would comply with this regulation. Other regulations, including those limiting refrigerant emissions and the Wood Burning Fireplace Ordinance would reduce emissions of GHGs and black carbon, respectively. Regulations requiring low-emitting finishes would reduce volatile organic compounds (VOCs).³⁷ Thus, the proposed project was determined to be consistent with San Francisco’s GHG reduction strategy.³⁸

Therefore, the proposed project’s GHG emissions would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations. Furthermore, the proposed project is within the scope of the development evaluated in the PEIR and would not result in impacts associated with GHG emissions beyond those disclosed in the PEIR. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant GHG emissions that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and no mitigation measures are necessary.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
8. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:				
a) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Wind

Based upon experience of the Planning Department in reviewing wind analyses and expert opinion on other projects, it is generally (but not always) the case that projects under 80 feet in height do not have the potential to generate significant wind impacts. Although the proposed 68-foot-tall building would be taller than the immediately adjacent buildings, it would be similar in height to existing buildings in the surrounding area. For the above reasons, the proposed project is not anticipated to cause significant impacts related to wind that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Shadow

Planning Code Section 295 generally prohibits new structures above 40 feet in height that would cast additional shadows on open space that is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park

³⁷ While not a GHG, VOCs are precursor pollutants that form ground level ozone. Increased ground level ozone is an anticipated effect of future global warming that would result in added health effects locally. Reducing VOC emissions would reduce the anticipated local effects of global warming.

³⁸ San Francisco Planning Department, *Greenhouse Gas Analysis: Compliance Checklist for 1850 Bryant Street*, April 11, 2017.

Commission between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, at any time of the year, unless that shadow would not result in a significant adverse effect on the use of the open space. Under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, sites surrounding parks could be redeveloped with taller buildings without triggering Section 295 of the Planning Code because certain parks are not subject to Section 295 of the Planning Code (i.e., under jurisdiction of departments other than the Recreation and Parks Department or privately owned). The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR could not conclude if the rezoning and community plans would result in less-than-significant shadow impacts because the feasibility of complete mitigation for potential new shadow impacts of unknown proposals could not be determined at that time. Therefore, the PEIR determined shadow impacts to be significant and unavoidable. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.


The proposed project would construct a 68-foot-tall building; therefore, the Planning Department prepared a preliminary shadow fan analysis a shadow analysis to determine whether the project would have the potential to cast new shadow on nearby parks. The shadow fan study determined that the proposed project has the potential to cast shadow on Franklin Square Park, a Recreation and Parks property covered under Section 295 of the Planning Code. Therefore, a more detailed shadow analysis was prepared for the proposed project.³⁹ According to the shadow analysis, new shadow cast by the proposed project would fall on Franklin Square Park from approximately November 1st to February 8th, in the afternoon hours only and generally only in the southwest portion of the park. New shadows would occur no earlier than 2:45pm and would, in all instances, be gone by 4:15pm. The longest period of new shadow would be 1 hour and 17 minutes. The new shadow cast by the proposed project would increase the annual square foot hours of shadow on the park by 0.00896%.⁴⁰

The largest new shadow cast would be approximately 3,550 square feet in size and would occur at around 4:00pm on December 21st. This new shadow would cover approximately 1.85% of the total square footage of the park. The shortest period of new shadow would be 12 minutes (occurring on November 1st and February 8th) and the longest period of new shadow would be 1 hour and 17 minutes (occurring on December 20th). The proposed project would not create new shadow on the soccer field, but would shade the southern pathway near the play area and portions of the southernmost softscape play area (see Figure 10). New shadow would not reach most of the main play areas, the slides, the sandbox, swings or climbing animals.

³⁹ CADP. *1850 Bryant Shadow Analysis*, April 17, 2017.

⁴⁰ Franklin Square Park has 719,447,098 square feet hours of Theoretically Available Annual Sunlight (TAAS), which is an estimated amount of sunlight that could fall on the park each year if there were no trees, buildings or other obstructions casting shadows. The proposed project would add 64,485 square feet hours of shadow per year, resulting in a 0.00896% decrease in the TAAS.

Figure 10: Worst Shadow Day: December 21st



The proposed project would also shade portions of nearby streets and sidewalks and private property at times within the project vicinity. Shadows upon streets and sidewalks would not exceed levels commonly expected in urban areas and would be considered a less-than-significant effect under CEQA. Although occupants of nearby property may regard the increase in shadow as undesirable, the limited increase in shading of private properties as a result of the proposed project would not be considered a significant impact under CEQA.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to shadow that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
9. RECREATION—Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Physically degrade existing recreational resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in substantial or accelerated deterioration of existing recreational resources or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may have an adverse effect on the environment. No mitigation measures related to recreational resources were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. However, the PEIR identified Improvement Measure H-1: Support for Upgrades to Existing Recreation Facilities. This improvement measure calls for the City to implement funding mechanisms for an ongoing program to repair, upgrade and adequately maintain park and recreation facilities to ensure the safety of users.

As part of the Eastern Neighborhoods adoption, the City adopted impact fees for development in Eastern Neighborhoods that goes towards funding recreation and open space. Since certification of the PEIR, the voters of San Francisco passed the 2012 San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond providing the Recreation and Parks Department an additional \$195 million to continue capital projects for the renovation and repair of parks, recreation, and open space assets. This funding is being utilized for improvements and expansion to Garfield Square, South Park, Potrero Hill Recreation Center, Warm Water Cove Park, and Pier 70 Parks Shoreline within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area. The impact fees and the 2012 San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond are funding measures similar to that described in PEIR Improvement Measure H-1: Support for Upgrades to Existing Recreation Facilities.

An update of the Recreation and Open Space Element (ROSE) of the General Plan was adopted in April 2014. The amended ROSE provides a 20-year vision for open spaces in the City. It includes information

and policies about accessing, acquiring, funding, and managing open spaces in San Francisco. The amended ROSE identifies areas within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area for acquisition and the locations where new open spaces and open space connections should be built, consistent with PEIR Improvement Measure H-2: Support for New Open Space. Two of these open spaces, Daggett Park and at 17th and Folsom, are both set to open in 2017. In addition, the amended ROSE identifies the role of both the Better Streets Plan (refer to "Transportation" section for description) and the Green Connections Network in open space and recreation. Green Connections are special streets and paths that connect people to parks, open spaces, and the waterfront, while enhancing the ecology of the street environment. Six routes identified within the Green Connections Network cross the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area: Mission to Peaks (Route 6); Noe Valley to Central Waterfront (Route 8), a portion of which has been conceptually designed; Tenderloin to Potrero (Route 18); Downtown to Mission Bay (Route 19); Folsom, Mission Creek to McLaren (Route 20); and Shoreline (Route 24).

As the proposed project would not degrade recreational facilities and is consistent with the development density established under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on recreation beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
10. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that would serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact to the provision of water, wastewater collection and treatment, and solid waste collection and disposal. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

Since certification of the PEIR, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) adopted the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) in June 2011. The UWMP update includes city-wide demand projections to the year 2035, compares available water supplies to meet demand and presents water demand management measures to reduce long-term water demand. Additionally, the UWMP update includes a discussion of the conservation requirement set forth in Senate Bill 7 passed in November 2009 mandating a statewide 20% reduction in per capita water use by 2020. The UWMP includes a quantification of the SFPUC's water use reduction targets and plan for meeting these objectives. The UWMP projects sufficient water supply in normal years and a supply shortfall during prolonged droughts. Plans are in place to institute varying degrees of water conservation and rationing as needed in response to severe droughts.

In addition, the SFPUC is in the process of implementing the Sewer System Improvement Program, which is a 20-year, multi-billion dollar citywide upgrade to the City's sewer and stormwater infrastructure to ensure a reliable and seismically safe system. The program includes planned improvements that will serve development in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area including at the Southeast Treatment Plant, the Central Bayside System, and green infrastructure projects, such as the Mission and Valencia Green Gateway.

As the proposed project is consistent with the development density established under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on utilities and service systems beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
----------------	---	--	--	--

11. PUBLIC SERVICES—Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services such as fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other services? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered public services, including fire protection, police protection, and public schools. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

As the proposed project is consistent with the development density established under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, the project would not result in new or substantially more

severe impacts on the physical environment associated with the provision of public services beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

As discussed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area is in a developed urban environment that does not provide native natural habitat for any rare or endangered plant or animal species. There are no riparian corridors, estuaries, marshes, or wetlands in the Plan Area that could be affected by the development anticipated under the Area Plan. In addition, development envisioned under the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan would not substantially interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory wildlife species. For these reasons, the PEIR concluded that implementation of the Area Plan would not result in significant impacts on biological resources, and no mitigation measures were identified.

The project site is located within Mission Plan area of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan and therefore, does not support habitat for any candidate, sensitive or special status species. As such,

implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to biological resources not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
13. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that implementation of the Plan would indirectly increase the population that would be subject to an earthquake, including seismically induced ground-shaking, liquefaction, and landslides. The PEIR also noted that new development is generally safer than comparable older development due to improvements in building codes and construction techniques. Compliance with applicable codes and recommendations made in project-specific geotechnical analyses would not eliminate earthquake risks, but would reduce them to an acceptable level, given the seismically active characteristics of the Bay Area. Thus, the PEIR concluded that implementation of the Plan would not result in significant impacts with regard to geology, and no mitigation measures were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

A geotechnical investigation was prepared for the proposed project.⁴¹ The report concluded that the proposed project could be developed as planned, provided the recommendations presented in the report are incorporated into the project plans and specifications and properly implemented during construction. The project site is not in a liquefaction zone and is underlain by generally non-expansive, dense sandy materials. Based on communication with the project sponsor, the most likely foundation type for the proposed project would be a mat slab, which is consistent with recommendations put forward in the geotechnical report.⁴²

The project is required to conform to the San Francisco Building Code, which ensures the safety of all new construction in the City. DBI will review the project-specific geotechnical report during its review of the building permit for the project. In addition, DBI may require additional site specific soils report(s) through the building permit application process, as needed. The DBI requirement for a geotechnical report and review of the building permit application pursuant to DBI's implementation of the Building Code would ensure that the proposed project would have no significant impacts related to soils, seismic or other geological hazards.

In light of the above, the proposed project would not result in a significant effect related to seismic and geologic hazards. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to geology and soils that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
14. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY—Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

⁴¹ GeoForensics, Inc. *Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed New Commercial Building at the Bryant Street Property*, August, 2015.

⁴² Email from Suzanne Brown, Equity Community Builders, to Justin Horner, Planning Department, January 6, 2016.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact on hydrology and water quality, including the combined sewer system and the potential for combined sewer outflows. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The proposed project would construct a 68-foot commercial building on a site currently occupied entirely by structures and a surface parking and storage lot. The proposed project would therefore not increase impervious surfaces on the project site. As a result, the proposed project would not increase stormwater runoff.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS—Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR noted that implementation of any of the proposed project's rezoning options would encourage construction of new development within the project area. The PEIR found that there is a high potential to encounter hazardous materials during construction activities in many parts of the project area because of the presence of 1906 earthquake fill, previous and current land uses associated with the use of hazardous materials, and known or suspected hazardous materials cleanup cases. However, the PEIR found that existing regulations for facility closure, Underground Storage Tank (UST) closure, and investigation and cleanup of soil and groundwater would ensure implementation of measures to protect workers and the community from exposure to hazardous materials during construction.

Hazardous Building Materials

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that future development in the Plan Area may involve demolition or renovation of existing structures containing hazardous building materials. Some building materials commonly used in older buildings could present a public health risk if disturbed during an accident or during demolition or renovation of an existing building. Hazardous building materials addressed in the PEIR include asbestos, electrical equipment such as transformers and fluorescent light ballasts that contain PCBs or di (2 ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), fluorescent lights containing mercury vapors, and lead-based paints. Asbestos and lead based paint may also present a health risk to existing building occupants if they are in a deteriorated condition. If removed during demolition of a building, these materials would also require special disposal procedures. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified a significant impact associated with hazardous building materials including PCBs, DEHP, and mercury and determined that that Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials, as outlined below, would reduce effects to a less-than-significant level. Because the proposed development includes

demolition of an existing building that may contain hazardous materials, Mitigation Measure L-1 would apply to the proposed project. See full text of Mitigation Measure L-1 (Project Mitigation Measure 3) in the Mitigation Measures Section below.

Soil and Groundwater Contamination

Since certification of the PEIR, Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance, was expanded to include properties throughout the City where there is potential to encounter hazardous materials, primarily industrial zoning districts, sites with industrial uses or underground storage tanks, sites with historic bay fill, and sites in close proximity to freeways or underground storage tanks. The over-arching goal of the Maher Ordinance is to protect public health and safety by requiring appropriate handling, treatment, disposal and when necessary, remediation of contaminated soils that are encountered in the building construction process. Projects that disturb 50 cubic yards or more of soil that are located on sites with potentially hazardous soil or groundwater within Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area are subject to this ordinance.

The proposed project would include 40,000 cubic yards of excavation to a depth of approximately 30 feet along Bryant Street and 15 feet along Florida Street. Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH). The Maher Ordinance requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6.

Where such analysis reveals the presence of hazardous substances in excess of state or federal standards, the project sponsor is required to submit a site mitigation plan (SMP) to the DPH or other appropriate state or federal agency(ies), and to remediate any site contamination in accordance with an approved SMP prior to the issuance of any building permit.

In compliance with the Maher Ordinance, the project sponsor has submitted a Maher Application to DPH⁴³ and a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) has been prepared to assess the potential for site contamination and the level of exposure risk associated with the project.⁴⁴ The Phase I did not reveal evidence of recognized environmental conditions in connection with the property, although it did note, at the time the report was prepared, that there was a lack of adequate secondary containment for several substances in use on the property, including diesel fuel, motor oil, hydraulic oil, paint and propane. While the Phase I is ten years old, its conclusions regarding subsurface conditions remain valid as no excavation, soil disturbance or any change in subsurface conditions has been noted in the past ten years. As part of compliance with the Maher Ordinance, DPH will review the Phase I and will require additional observations and analysis if conditions or new information warrant. Based on that information, the project sponsor may be required to conduct soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis.

The proposed project would be required to remediate potential soil and/or groundwater contamination revealed subsequent to the submission of the Maher Application, as described above in accordance with Article 22A of the Health Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to hazardous materials that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

⁴³ Maher Ordinance Application, dated March 29, 2017.

⁴⁴ AEI Consultants, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment 1850 Bryant Street San Francisco, CA 94110*, November 30, 2007.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
16. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the Area Plan would facilitate the construction of both new residential units and commercial buildings. Development of these uses would not result in use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy in a wasteful manner or in the context of energy use throughout the City and region. The energy demand for individual buildings would be typical for such projects and would meet, or exceed, current state and local codes and standards concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations enforced by DBI. The Plan Area does not include any natural resources routinely extracted and the rezoning does not result in any natural resource extraction programs. Therefore, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that implementation of the Area Plan would not result in a significant impact on mineral and energy resources. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

As the proposed project is consistent with the development density established under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on mineral and energy resources beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
17. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:—Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Topics:	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that no agricultural resources exist in the Area Plan; therefore the rezoning and community plans would have no effect on agricultural resources. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR did not analyze the effects on forest resources.

As the proposed project is consistent with the development density established under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on agriculture and forest resources beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Project Mitigation Measure 1: Archeological Monitoring Program (Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Mitigation Measure J-2): Based on the reasonable potential that archeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of an archaeological consultant from the rotational Department Qualified Archaeological Consultants List (QACL) maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist. The project sponsor shall contact the Department archeologist to obtain the names and contact information for the next three archeological consultants on the QACL. The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological monitoring program. All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of *construction* can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Sect. 15064.5 (a) and (c).

Consultation with Descendant Communities: On discovery of an archeological site⁴⁵ associated with descendant Native Americans or the Overseas Chinese an appropriate representative⁴⁶ of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to consult with ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated archeological site. A copy of the Final Archaeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group.

Archeological monitoring program (AMP). The archeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:

- The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the project archeologist shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the potential risk these activities pose to archaeological resources and to their depositional context;
- The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource;
- The archaeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with the archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits;
- The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis;
- If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction crews and heavy equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall, after making a

⁴⁵ By the term "archeological site" is intended here to minimally include any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

⁴⁶ An "appropriate representative" of the descendant group is here defined to mean, in the case of Native Americans, any individual listed in the current Native American Contact List for the City and County of San Francisco maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission and in the case of the Overseas Chinese, the Chinese Historical Society of America.

reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.

If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:

- A) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or
- B) An archeological data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.

If an archeological data recovery program is required by the ERO, the archeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The project archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP. The archeological consultant shall prepare a draft ADRP that shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

- *Field Methods and Procedures.* Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations.
- *Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis.* Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures.
- *Discard and Deaccession Policy.* Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies.
- *Interpretive Program.* Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archeological data recovery program.
- *Security Measures.* Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities.
- *Final Report.* Description of proposed report format and distribution of results.
- *Curation.* Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities.

Human Remains, Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects. The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal Laws, including immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission

(NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, ERO, and MLD shall have up to but not beyond six days of discovery to make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects with appropriate dignity (CEQA Guidelines. Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, curation, possession, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. Nothing in existing State regulations or in this mitigation measure compels the project sponsor and the ERO to accept recommendations of an MLD. The archeological consultant shall retain possession of any Native American human remains and associated or unassociated burial objects until completion of any scientific analyses of the human remains or objects as specified in the treatment agreement if such an agreement has been made or, otherwise, as determined by the archeological consultant and the ERO.

Final Archeological Resources Report. The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the draft final report.

Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound, one unbound and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

Project Mitigation Measure 2: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses (Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Mitigation Measure F-5): To reduce potential conflicts between existing sensitive receptors and new noise-generating uses, for new development including commercial, industrial or other uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise, either short-term, at nighttime, or as a 24-hour average, in the proposed project site vicinity, the Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-sensitive uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes), prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the proposed use would comply with the use compatibility requirements in the General Plan and in Police Code Section 2909I, would not adversely affect nearby noise-sensitive uses, and that there are no particular circumstances about the proposed project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels that would be generated by the proposed use. Should such concerns be present, the Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action.

Project Mitigation Measure 3: Hazardous Building Materials (Eastern Neighborhoods Plan EIR Mitigation Measure L-1): The project sponsor shall ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyl (PCBs) or Di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEPH), such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.

Franklin Square Owners Assoc.

1850

CHECK NO.	CHECK DATE	VENDOR NO.
1850	06/14/17	SFPLA

c/o CFM, Inc. (925) 566-6800
60 Mayhew Way
Walnut Creek CA 94597

Community Association Banc
1665 W. Alameda Drive
Tempe AZ 85282

43923/1222

FIVE HUNDRED SEVENTY-EIGHT DOLLARS and 00 CENTS

CHECK AMOUNT
\$*****578.00

PAY
TO THE
ORDER OF

San Francisco Planning Dept *****
1650 Mission St. Suite 400
San Francisco CA 94103

Alb. Lawrence

RECORDED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2017 JUL -3 PM 2:12
28

From: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
To: bpatel@lubinolson.com; thor@commongrounddev.com; "William Fleishhacker"
Cc: [Givner, Jon \(CAT\)](#); [Stacy, Kate \(CAT\)](#); [Byrne, Marlena \(CAT\)](#); [Rahaim, John \(CPC\)](#); [Sanchez, Scott \(CPC\)](#); [Gibson, Lisa \(CPC\)](#); [Rodgers, AnMarie \(CPC\)](#); [Starr, Aaron \(CPC\)](#); [Navarrete, Joy \(CPC\)](#); [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#); [Jain, Devvani \(CPC\)](#); [Horner, Justin \(CPC\)](#); [Ajello Hoagland, Linda \(CPC\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); mindy.bacharach@commongrounddev.com; mrclogan@gmail.com; adele@laurencemanagement.com
Subject: APPEAL RESPONSES: Exemption Determination Appeal - Proposed Project at 1850 Bryant Street - Appeal Hearing on July 25, 2017
Date: Monday, July 17, 2017 12:17:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Good afternoon,

Please find linked below appeal response letters received by the Office of the Clerk of the Board from the Planning Department, and William Fleishhacker of the Pelosi Law Group, representing the Project Sponsor, regarding the proposed project at 1850 Bryant Street.

[Planning Appeal Response Letter - July 17, 2017](#)

[Project Sponsor Response Letter - July 17, 2017](#)

Please note that the appeal hearing for this matter is noticed and scheduled for a 3:00 p.m. special order before the Board on July 25, 2017.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

[Board of Supervisors File No. 170804](#)

Thank you,

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
brent.jalipa@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.



July 17, 2017

Hon. London Breed
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: 1850 Bryant Street
File No. 170804 (CEQA Appeal)
Hearing Date: July 25, 2017

Dear President Breed and Supervisors,

I am writing on behalf of my client, 1850 Bryant Land, LLC, regarding the appeal of the Community Plan Exemption (“CPE”) issued under the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) for the proposed development at 1850 Bryant Street (“Project Site”).

On June 1, 2017, the Planning Commission unanimously (7-0) approved a Conditional Use authorization for the development of a five-story, 226,042 gross square foot building that will include approximately 166,483 square feet of social service/philanthropic facility uses, 18,652 square feet of production, distribution and repair uses, and 2,281 square feet of ground floor retail uses on the Project Site (the “Project”). On July 3, 2017, the Franklin Square Owners Association (“Appellant”) filed an appeal of the determination to prepare a CPE under CEQA for the Project.

The Appellant is the homeowners association for the residents of 1800 Bryant Street, the live-work building that is located to the immediate north of the Project Site. The Appellant also attempted to appeal the Conditional Use authorization granted for the Project, but was unsuccessful as they failed to secure the required number of signatures for such an appeal.¹

The Planning Department is preparing a detailed response and analysis of the Appellant’s Claims based on the evidence presented and the substantial evidence in the record. It is our understanding that the Planning Department staff is recommending that the Board of Supervisors uphold the CPE determination and deny the appeal. **For all the reasons stated below, we also believe that the Appellant’s claims are baseless and respectfully request that you deny the appeal, and uphold the decision of the Planning Commission.**

PROJECT BACKGROUND

1850 Bryant Street is a 36,500-square foot through lot with frontages on Bryant Street and Florida Street. It is in the Mission Area of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area, near the boundaries of the South of Market Area (“SoMa”) and the Potrero Hill neighborhoods. The Project

¹ Planning Code Section 308.1 requires that at least 20% of affected property owners sign the appeal. The City Surveyor determined that the signatures on the Conditional Use appeal only represented 5.46% of the affected area, and therefore the appeal failed.



Site is within the Production, Distribution and Repair: General (“PDR-1-G”) zoning district and the 68-X height and bulk district.

The Project Site is currently developed with a 2-story, 13,900 square foot building that is used as office and storage for an electrical contractor. The remainder of the lot is used for parking and outdoor storage. The Project proposes to demolish the existing building on the site and construct a five-story, 68-foot-high, approximately 226,042 gross square foot mixed-use development. The Project would include approximately 166,728 square feet of social service uses, 18,407 square feet of PDR use, 2,281 square feet of ground floor retail uses, 89 accessory off-street vehicle parking spaces (plus two car-share spaces), one (1) off-street freight loading space and four (4) service vehicle spaces, and 30 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces. It includes a 2,280-square foot interior courtyard adjacent to the live-work building to the north, and a 16,934-square foot roof deck.

The Project proposes exceptional design that responds to the neighborhood and surrounding structures. All public areas of the Project, have been conceived with a pedestrian viewpoint in mind. The proposed façade clearly designates entry points to the building and provides high quality elements such as expansive glazing and awnings to create visual interest for pedestrians as well as new streetscape adding street trees and plantings where little exist currently.

In addition to the exceptional design, the Project meets a very real need for the City and the Mission District by developing a building for social service agencies and other non-profit organizations. The Project will also help in obtaining the necessary tax credits and utilizing other financial tools and grants to allow these users to purchase commercial condominiums in the Project at rates that are approximately 25%-40% below market. The Project also includes PDR space, replacing the existing PDR on site at a 2:1 ratio, and ensuring PDR uses remain in the neighborhood and in the Mission District. **For all these reasons, the Project was unanimously approved by the Planning Commission on June 1, 2017.**

COMMUNITY PLAN EXEMPTION DETERMINATION

Planning Department staff, based on substantial evidence in the record, issued a CPE for the Project on May 10, 2017. The CPE was issued following review and analysis of various technical studies (including studies by acoustic and transportation experts) prepared under the City’s direction to analyze whether the Project would have a peculiar or new significant or potentially significant environmental impact that was not identified in the 2008 Eastern Neighborhoods Program EIR (the “PEIR”). Based on that analysis and evidence, the Project, which is consistent with the development density established for the Project Site under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning, qualified for a CPE.

The Planning Department in issuing the CPE (and the Planning Commission’s reliance upon it) complied with CEQA, and specifically CEQA Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. These provisions of CEQA mandate the issuance of a CPE for projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified and specifically provide that the City cannot require further environmental review unless necessary to examine whether there are project-specific impacts peculiar to the project or its site that were not disclosed as significant impacts in the prior Program EIR. Because the Project is consistent with the existing PDR1-G zoning and the Mission Area Plan,

and there are no impacts peculiar to the Project or Project site that were not disclosed in the PEIR, the City cannot require any further CEQA review and the Planning Department complied with CEQA in issuing the CPE.

In its appeal letter, the Appellant argues that the CPE is deficient due to inadequate studies or analysis of noise, shadow, and transportation impacts, and geotechnical conditions. However, the Appellant has not provided any **substantial evidence** to support these claims and instead is basing them on unsubstantiated opinion and speculation.²

Established case law makes clear that projects qualify for an exemption under Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and 14 Cal. Code Regs. Chapter 3 (“CEQA Guidelines”), section 15183), where **substantial evidence exists to support the decision that a project is exempt and that evidence exists in the record.**³ That evidence has been presented by the Planning Department in the preparation of the CPE and in the response to the Appellant’s Claims. In contrast, the Appellant has not presented any technical studies that counter the analysis conducted as part of the CPE or any substantial evidence that creates the necessary link between the Project and any physical environmental impacts.

As we fully support and agree with the Planning Department, instead of restating their analysis, we incorporate their responses by reference. The following are a few additional points to consider in evaluating the merits of the Appellant’s Claims.

1. **Noise Study**

The Appellant argues that the noise study prepared for the Project is inadequate because the study improperly assumed that there would be closed windows at 1800 Bryant Street. According to the Appellant, the building has no air conditioning, and therefore the windows would need to be open on hot days. However, the Appellant has not prepared a separate noise study, nor submitted any evidence as to how often the lack of air conditioning would truly require open windows at the property line facing the Project Site or, more importantly, established whether this would even make a difference for purposes of meeting the applicable noise standards. Not only it is illogical and unreasonable to assume that the lack of air conditioning in an adjacent building would somehow require a different assumption for the noise analysis, but this speculation and opinion from the Appellant is simply insufficient to second-guess the conclusions of a professionally prepared noise study included as part of the CPE.

² The courts have made clear that unsubstantiated opinion and speculation is not substantial evidence. “Substantial evidence includes facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, and expert opinion supported by facts. [Citations.] It does not include ‘[a]rgument, speculation, **unsubstantiated opinion** or narrative, [or] evidence which is clearly inaccurate or erroneous. . . .’ [Citations.]” (emphasis added) (*North Coast Rivers Alliance v. Kawamura* (2015) 243 Cal.App.4th 647.) Moreover, “[c]omplaints, fears, and suspicions about a project’s potential environmental impact . . . do not constitute substantial evidence. [Citations.]” and “in the absence of a specific factual foundation in the record, dire predictions by nonexperts regarding the consequences of a project [also] do not constitute substantial evidence. [Citations.]” (1 *Kostka & Zischke*, Practice under the Cal. Environmental Quality Act (2d ed. 2015) § 6.42, pp. 6-47-6-48; *Gentry v. City of Murrieta* (1995) 36 Cal.App.4th 1359, 1417.)

³ See *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. City of Turlock* (2006) 138 CA4th 273, overruled on other grounds in *Hernandez v. City of Hanford* (2007) 41 C4th 279; *Gentry v. City of Murrieta* at 1406 n24; *Citizens for Responsible Equitable Ent’l Dev. V. City of San Diego Redeve. Agency* (2005) 134 CA4th 598, 610.

Thus, the Appellant has not presented any substantial evidence to support overruling the CPE's determination regarding noise impacts.

2. **Geotechnical Investigation.**

The Appellant claims that the geotechnical investigation submitted by the Project Sponsor is inadequate because (1) site observations were done under drought conditions, and (2) there were inaccurate assumptions regarding the cut depths for construction of the garage. Again, these claims are illogical and unreasonable and, under the rationale proposed for adequacy, all geotechnical investigations prepared for any project over the past six (6) years, or during the drought, would be inadequate. Regarding the cut depths for construction of the garage, the Appellant has presented no substantial evidence as to how the assumptions were inaccurate. Appellant's speculation and opinion is simply insufficient to second-guess the conclusions of a professionally prepared geotechnical study included as part of the CPE.

Moreover, as noted in the CPE the Project is required to comply with the San Francisco Building Code and the Department of Building Inspection ("DBI") "may require additional site specific soils report(s) through the building permit application process, as needed." (CPE, Page 41.) Thus, even to the extent that further geotechnical investigation is required, the "DBI requirement for a geotechnical report and review of the building permit application pursuant to DBI's implementation of the Building Code would ensure that the proposed project would have no significant impacts related to soils, seismic or other geological hazards." (CPE, Page 41.)

Thus, the Appellant has not presented any substantial evidence to support overruling the CPE's determination regarding potential impacts from geotechnical hazards.

3. **Construction Methodology**

The Appellant argues that the Planning Department should analyze the potential impacts of pile driving as part of the CEQA analysis. The Appellant bases this argument on the speculative assumption that should the Project not enter into a shoring/underpinning construction agreement with the Appellants, then the Project would be required to use pile driving. Again, this assertion is unreasonable as on its face it implies that every development should analyze pile driving for "just in case" a shoring/underpinning agreement could not be reached. Not only is this not the standard under CEQA, but it simply unfounded based on the evidence presented.

Although the Project Sponsor has sought to negotiate a shoring/underpinning agreement with the Appellants, it is simply inaccurate and speculative to assume that if they are unable to come to such an agreement that pile driving will be required. In fact, other construction methods are available, and there is no plan to undertake pile driving as part of the construction of the Project.

Thus, the Appellant has not presented any substantial evidence to support a conclusion that pile driving should have been analyzed as part of the Project's CEQA analysis.

4. **Transportation Impact Analysis.**

The Appellant argues that the Transportation Impact Study ("TIS") is lacking in "thorough site level detail," but the only "evidence" that they point to in support of this assertion is that



development in the area has caused significant increases in traffic since the adoption of the 2008 PEIR. This claim is baseless for several reasons. First, the PEIR assumed that there would be growth within the Plan Area, and the Appellants have not pointed to or alleged that any of the development in the neighborhood or the project itself is inconsistent with the growth assumptions in the PEIR. In fact, none of the conditions that would require an amendment or update to the PEIR have occurred, including, but not limited to, changes to the underlying zoning. As a result, the PEIR remains current and legally adequate. Second, the TIS provided an assessment of current traffic conditions in the neighborhood, so the analysis did consider the impacts from development in the area when concluding that there would not be any site-specific significant impacts beyond what was disclosed as part of the PEIR.

Thus, the Appellant has not presented any substantial evidence to support overruling the CPE's determination regarding transportation impacts.

* * * * *

In sum, the claims raised by the Appellant are without merit. The CPE issued by the Planning Department and relied upon by the Planning Commission in **unanimously** approving the Project was legally adequate, is supported by substantial evidence in the record and should be upheld. For these reasons, we respectfully request that you reject the appeal and uphold the CPE.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Wm. M. Fleishhacker".

William M. Fleishhacker



**SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

JUL 17 AM 11:21

LAG

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Appeal of Community Plan Evaluation 1850 Bryant Street Project

DATE: July 17, 2017

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer – (415) 575-9032
Joy Navarrete, Senior Environmental Planner – (415) 575-9040
Justin Horner, Environmental Coordinator – (415) 575-9023

RE: File No. 170804, Planning Department Case No. 2015.011211ENV – Appeal of the Community Plan Evaluation for 1850 Bryant Street Project. Block/Lot: 3971/006

PROJECT SPONSOR: Douglas Ross, Ross Construction – (415) 850-2515

APPELLANT: Bijal Patel, Law Office of Lubin Olson & Niewiadomski, on behalf of the Franklin Square Owners Association – (415) 981-0550

HEARING DATE: July 25, 2017

ATTACHMENTS: A – July 3, 2017 appeal letter from Bijal Patel

INTRODUCTION

This memorandum is a response to a letter of appeal to the Board of Supervisors (the Board) regarding the Planning Department's (the "Department") issuance of a Community Plan Evaluation (CPE) under the *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report* ("Eastern

Neighborhoods PEIR” or “PEIR”)¹ in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) for the 1850 Bryant Street Project (the “project”).

The Department, pursuant to CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, 14 Cal. Code of Reg. Sections 15000 *et seq.*, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, determined that the project is consistent with the development density established by zoning, community plan, and general plan policies in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (the “Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans”) for the project site, for which a Programmatic EIR was certified, and issued the CPE for the project on May 10, 2017. The Department determined that the project would not result in new significant environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already analyzed and disclosed in the PEIR, and that the project is therefore exempt from further environmental review beyond what was conducted in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and the CPE Initial Study under CEQA in accordance with CEQA Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.

The decision before the Board is whether to uphold the Planning Department’s determination that the project is exempt from further environmental review (beyond what was conducted in the CPE Initial Study) pursuant to CEQA Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 and deny the appeal, or to overturn the Department’s CPE determination for the project and return the CPE to the Department for additional environmental review.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 36,500-square-foot (sf) project site is located in the middle of the block bordered by Bryant Street to the east, 17th Street to the north, Florida Street to the west, and Mariposa Street to the south in the Mission neighborhood. The project site is currently occupied by a two-story, approximately 26-foot-tall, 13,800-sf commercial building built in 1974, and a 27,300-sf surface parking lot and storage area. The project site is located in the PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution and Repair-1-General) Zoning District and the 68-X Height and Bulk District.

The proposed project would demolish the existing building and the surface parking and storage lot, and construct a five-story-plus-basement, 68-foot-tall mixed use building with approximately 166,728 gross square feet of social service uses, approximately 2,285 gross square feet of retail and approximately 18,400 gross square feet of production, distribution and repair (PDR) uses, and a 17,000 square foot roof deck. The lobby entrance would be located on Bryant Street. The proposed project would provide 91 vehicle parking spaces on the below-grade basement level, and include 30 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and 15

¹ The Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plan Final EIR (Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E), State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048) was certified by the Planning Commission on August 7, 2008. The project site is within the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plan project area.

Class 2 bicycle parking spaces.² The proposed project would remove a curb cut on Bryant Street and move a curb cut on Florida Street to the center of the lot. Construction of the project would require approximately 40,000 cubic yards of excavation to a depth of no more than 30 feet along Bryant Street and 15 feet along Florida Street. Construction would last approximately 18 months.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The project site is located in the middle of the block bordered by Bryant Street to the east, 17th Street to the north, Florida Street to the west and Mariposa Street to the south in the Mission neighborhood. Like all parcels on the block, the project site is a through lot between Bryant Street and Florida Street. The project area along Bryant Street is characterized primarily by artist live/work, residential uses, and light industrial uses in one- to three-story buildings ranging from 40-feet to 48-feet tall on the west side of Bryant Street, with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Potrero Division corporation yard on the east side. The project area along Florida Street is characterized by the two neighboring artist live/work buildings along the east side, and a 40-foot, four-story theater and performing arts space with residential units on the west side. Buildings immediately adjacent to the project site include a 40-foot-tall, four-story artist live-work and light industrial building to the south, and a 48-foot-tall, four-story artist live/work building to the north. Parcels surrounding the project site are within the UMU (Urban Mixed Use), PDR-1-G (Production Distribution and Repair-1-General) and P (Public) Zoning Districts, and are within 68-X and 65-X Height and Bulk districts.

The closest Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) stop is at 16th and Mission Streets, approximately 0.4 miles northwest of the project site. The project site is within a quarter mile of several local transit lines, including Muni lines 9-San Bruno, 9R-San Bruno Rapid, 12-Folsom/Pacific, 22-Filmore, 27-Bryant, 33-Ashbury/18th Street, and 55-16th Street.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

An environmental evaluation application (Case No. 2015.011211ENV) for the project was filed by the sponsor, Douglas Ross, on August 25, 2015. On May 10, 2017, the Department issued a CPE Certificate and Initial Study, based on the following determinations:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the development density established for the project site in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans;

² Class 1 bicycle spaces are spaces in secure, weather-protected facilities intended for use as long-term, overnight, and work-day bicycle storage by dwelling unit residents, non-residential occupants, and employees (Planning Code section 155.1(a)). Class 2 bicycle spaces are "bicycle racks located in a publicly-accessible, highly visible location intended for transient or short-term use by visitors, guests, and patrons to the building or use (Planning Code section 155.1 (a)).

2. The proposed project would not result in effects on the environment that are peculiar to the project or the project site that were not identified as significant effects in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR;
3. The proposed project would not result in potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR;
4. The proposed project would not result in significant effects, which, as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was certified, would be more severe than were already analyzed and disclosed in the PEIR; and
5. The project sponsor will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR to mitigate project-related significant impacts.

The project was considered by the Planning Commission on June 1, 2017. On that date, the Planning Commission affirmed the CPE with approval of the project under Planning Code Sections 210.3 and 303 (Conditional Use Authorization), which constituted the Approval Action under Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code.

On July 3, 2017, an appeal of the CPE determination was filed by Bijal Patel, Law Office of Lubin Olson & Niewiadomski, on behalf of the Franklin Square Owners Association (Appellant). The six-page appeal letter from the Appellant is included as Attachment A to this appeal response, and included as part of Board of Supervisors File No. 170804.

CEQA GUIDELINES

Community Plan Evaluations

CEQA Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 **mandate** that projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified, **shall not** require additional environmental review except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site and that were not disclosed as significant effects in the prior EIR. Guidelines Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: a) are peculiar to the project or parcel on which the project would be located; b) were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan or community plan with which the project is consistent; c) are potentially significant off-site and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the underlying EIR; or d) are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than that discussed in the underlying EIR. Guidelines Section 15183(c) specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for that project solely on the basis of that impact.

Significant Environmental Effects

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 15604(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."

SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE

Section 31.16(e)(3) of the Administrative Code states: "The grounds for appeal of an exemption determination shall be limited to whether the project conforms to the requirements of CEQA for an exemption."

San Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.16(b)(6) provides that in reviewing an appeal of a CEQA decision, the Board of Supervisors "shall conduct its own independent review of whether the CEQA decision adequately complies with the requirements of CEQA. The Board shall consider anew all facts, evidence and issues related to the adequacy, accuracy and objectiveness of the CEQA decision, including, but not limited to, the sufficiency of the CEQA decision and the correctness of its conclusions."

CONCERNS RAISED AND PLANNING DEPARTMENT RESPONSES:

The six-page appeal letter from the Appellant (Attachment A to this appeal response) contains five bulleted items expressing the general basis for the appeal. These five general concerns are listed in order below as Concerns 1 through 5.

Concern 1: The Project does not comply with the required Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-5 and the use compatibility requirements set forth in the General Plan and in Police Code Section 2909d (Noise Ordinance).

Response 1: The Noise Study prepared for the proposed project complies with Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5, and an updated Noise Study confirms its conclusions. The proposed project is consistent with the height, bulk, and uses envisioned for the project site under the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan, as well as the Noise Ordinance and the community noise compatibility requirements found in the General Plan.

The Appellant alleges that the Noise Study prepared for the proposed project is "deficient" because it includes an "erroneous assumption" that windows on the 1800 Bryant Street building would be closed, when they are in fact occasionally open. Beyond this assertion, the Appellant's letter does not include any specific evidence that contradicts the conclusion of the Noise Study prepared for the proposed

project, or any evidence that the proposed project would not meet noise standards with the recommended Sound Transmission Class 28-rated windows that have been incorporated into the project design.

A project-specific Noise Study was conducted for the proposed project in accordance with Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5 to determine whether the proposed PDR uses would generate substantial noise levels that could affect nearby residential uses. The Noise Study determined that with adequate insulation, noise from the proposed PDR uses would meet both the daytime and nighttime interior noise standards (55 dBA and 45 dBA, respectively) specified in the Police Code, Article 29 section 2909(d). The recommended Sound Transmission Class ratings for windows identified in the Noise Study are incorporated into the project design.

Despite lack of evidence that the designed Sound Transmission Class ratings are insufficient to insulate noise from the project’s PDR uses, an updated Noise Study was conducted. The updated Noise Study assessed whether an assumption of open windows at the 1800 Bryant Street property would change the conclusions of the Noise Study that the proposed project, with Sound Transmission Class 28-rated windows along the PDR spaces, would comply with the daytime and nighttime interior noise standards specified in the Police Code.³ As seen below in Table 1, the proposed project would still meet the standards in the Police Code at nearby residential uses even when windows are open at 1800 Bryant Street.

Table 1. Noise Levels at Nearby Receivers

	PDR Noise at Source (dB)	Noise Reduction from STC 28 Windows at PDR Space	Interior Noise Level at Neighboring Properties (in dB)
Residences to the North (1800 Bryant, Open Windows)	100	56	44
Residences to the South (Open Windows)	100	63	37

The Appellant also asserts that the proposed project does not comply with the “use compatibility requirements set forth in the General Plan.” It is unclear whether the Appellant is referring to the land use zoning requirements of the General Plan or more specifically to the “General Plan’s Land Use Compatibility Chart of Community Noise”. Regardless, this assertion is incorrect as discussed below.

³ Charles Salter Associates, *1850 Bryant Street, Noise Mitigation Measure F-5 Analysis*, July 11, 2017.

With regard to the land use zoning requirements of the General Plan, as stated in the Certificate of Determination (page 4), both the Citywide and Current Planning Divisions of the Planning Department determined that the proposed project would be consistent with the height, bulk, density, and land uses envisioned in the Mission Area Plan, and that the proposed project contributes to the Mission Area Plan's objectives of strengthening the Mission's existing mixed-use character and providing PDR uses.^{4,5} As the CPE Initial Study concluded:

That the proposed project at 1850 Bryant Street is consistent with and was encompassed within the analysis in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, including the Eastern Neighborhood PEIR development projections. This determination also finds that the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed 1850 Bryant Street project, and identified the mitigation measures applicable to the 1850 Bryant Street project. The proposed project is also consistent with the zoning controls and the provisions of the Planning Code applicable to the project site.

Thus, the Department determined that the proposed project is consistent with the zoning controls and provisions of the Planning Code applicable to the project site.

In regards to the "Land Use Compatibility Chart for Community Noise," the General Plan includes Table 2, below, as a guide for determining when noise reduction requirements should be included in new development because the existing noise levels in the community are not compatible with the proposed new use. The Land Use Compatibility Chart for Community Noise identifies the maximum acceptable noise environment for each newly developed land use. Although Table 2 presents a range of noise levels that are considered satisfactory for various land uses, the maximum "satisfactory" noise level, meaning the maximum noise level where no special noise insulation requirements are required to be included in the proposed new use, is 77 dBA Ldn⁶ for commercial uses such as wholesale, certain retail, industrial/manufacturing, transportation, communications, and utilities uses. If these uses are proposed

⁴ Steve Wertheim, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 1850 Bryant Street, April 6, 2017. This document (and all other documents cited in this report, unless otherwise noted), is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2015-011211ENV.





⁵ Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 1850 Bryant Street, April 3, 2017.

⁶ The day-night average sound level (Ldn or DNL) is the average noise level over a 24-hour period. The noise between the hours of 10pm and 7am is artificially increased by 10 dB.

to be located in areas with existing noise levels that exceed these guidelines, a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements will typically be necessary prior to final building review and approval.

Table 2. Land Use Compatibility Chart for Community Noise

Land Use Category	Sound Levels and Land Use Consequences (L _{dn} Values in dB)						
	55	60	65	70	75	80	85
Residential – All Dwellings, Group Quarters							
Transient Lodging - Motels, Hotels							
School Classrooms, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes, etc.							
Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Amphitheaters, Music Shells							
Sports Arenas, Outdoor Spectator Sports							
Playgrounds, Parks							
Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water-Based Recreation Areas, Cemeteries							
Office Buildings – Personal, Business, and Professional Services							
Commercial – Wholesale and Some Retail, Industrial/Manufacturing, Transportation, Communication, and Utilities							
Manufacturing – Noise-Sensitive Communications – Noise-Sensitive							

	Satisfactory, with no special noise insulation requirements. Noise levels in this range are considered "Acceptable."
	New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. Noise levels in this range are considered "Conditionally Acceptable."
	New construction or development should generally be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. Noise levels in this range are considered "Conditionally Unacceptable."
	New construction or development should generally not be undertaken. Noise levels in this range are considered "Unacceptable."

The concern expressed by the Appellant is that the proposed project would not be consistent with Table 2, above. However, this concern is misplaced. The Land Use Compatibility Chart for Community Noise is

designed to address the effect of the existing noise environment on a proposed new project, rather than the project's effect on the environment. For example, if a neighborhood has an existing sound level of 65 dBA Ldn, then a new residential use could not be located there without first conducting a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements for the new building. Here, because the proposed project is for commercial uses (wholesale, certain retail, industrial/manufacturing, etc.), existing noise levels of up to 77 dBA Ldn would be acceptable before noise reduction measures to protect the users in the new building would be required.

For the purposes of CEQA, Table 2 is not applicable. CEQA does not generally require lead agencies to consider how existing environmental conditions might impact a project's occupants, except where the project would significantly exacerbate an existing environmental condition. As discussed above and on pages 25-26 of the CPE Initial Study, additional noise analysis was performed for the proposed project, pursuant to Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5, and the proposed project was found to not result in significant noise impacts. Thus, the proposed project would not exacerbate the existing noise environment and no further consideration of how existing noise conditions might impact the project's occupants is required. For informational purposes, existing ambient noise levels in the project area are between approximately 64 to 71 dBA at the project site,⁷ which is considered satisfactory for general commercial and retail according to the General Plan's "Land Use Compatibility Chart for Community Noise".

The Appellant does not provide substantial evidence to support the contention that the project would result in significant noise-related effects that are peculiar to the project or its site and that were not previously disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Additionally, the Appellant does not provide substantial evidence that the project is inconsistent with the General Plan and that such an inconsistency would result in a significant environmental effect not previously disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Therefore, further environmental review is not required.

⁷ Charles Salter Associates, 1850 Bryant Street, Noise Mitigation Measure F-5 Analysis, July 11, 2017.

Concern 2: The Appellant asserts that the proposed project would cast new shadow on 1800 Bryant Street, which would be a substantial adverse impact under CEQA. The Appellant asserts that the shadow analysis of the proposed project fails to include an analysis of shadow impacts on 1800 Bryant Street nor does it recommend design modifications to mitigate the impact of new shadow.

Response 2: The Department's CEQA guidelines require analysis of whether a proposed project would "create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas;" it does not require analysis of new shadow cast on private properties.

The CPE Initial Study (p. 33-36) analyzes the shadow impacts of the proposed project. Consistent with Appendix B of the Planning Department's *Environmental Review Guidelines*, the shadow analysis is limited to potential impacts to "outdoor recreational facilities or other public areas;" in this case, Franklin Square Park. The CPE Initial Study found that the proposed project would result in net new shadow on Franklin Square Park. As disclosed in the CPE Initial Study, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR found shadow impacts to be significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any new, or substantially more severe shadow impacts than were disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

CEQA does not require the analysis of potential shadow impacts on nearby private property. The Appellant has not provided substantial evidence as to why net new shadow on 1800 Bryant Street constitutes an exception to this requirement or the *Environmental Review Guidelines*, nor does the Appellant offer detailed evidence as to how new shadow on the 1800 Bryant Street property would constitute a substantial adverse impact under CEQA. Therefore, no further environmental analysis is required.

Concern 3: The geotechnical report is inadequate. It potentially underestimates the groundwater level; it underestimates cut depths for the excavation, particularly along Bryant Street; and it includes optional design features that should be required design elements.

Response 3: The geotechnical report is adequate for the purposes of the CEQA analysis of the proposed project. An updated boring at the site revealed a groundwater level lower than previous borings. The Appellant provides no substantial evidence that the depth of groundwater would result in a significant environmental effect. The geotechnical report acknowledges the change in grade between Bryant Street and Florida Street. Absent any evidence that optional design features would mitigate a significant environmental impact, the determination of whether to require them is not a CEQA issue.

The Appellant asserts that the geotechnical report is "inadequate" for a number of reasons. First, as the initial geotechnical site observations were done in August, 2015, "which coincided with the end of a multi-year drought," groundwater conditions "could be" different than at the presumed time of the beginning of construction; therefore, new borings should be required.

An updated geotechnical report was prepared for the proposed project.⁸ The updated report included the drilling of an additional test boring on February 23, 2017. The 2017 boring encountered groundwater at 36.5 feet, which is deeper than the 2015 boring that hit groundwater at 29 feet, Boring 3.⁹ The fact that groundwater was found at a lower depth in 2017 than in 2015 appears to contradict the Appellant's implication that a drought year would produce an unseasonably low water table. Nevertheless, the Appellant does not provide substantial evidence as to how, if it were the case that groundwater levels were different, that could result in a new or substantially more severe geological impact than what was disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Secondly, the Appellant asserts that the geotechnical report does not take into account the need for different cut depths due to the change in grade between Florida and Bryant streets. However, on page 10 of the updated geotechnical report, the geotechnical report does account for this change:

“We estimate that the proposed basement finished floor elevation of the building will be about Elevation 23 feet, which corresponds to about 18-25 feet below grade along Bryant Street and about 10 to 12 feet below grade along Florida Street.”

The geotechnical report therefore does take into account the different cut depths.

Thirdly, the Appellant asserts that the geotechnical report includes optional design features that should be required design features. This determination is not related to the adequacy of the CEQA analysis, and the Appellant does not provide substantial evidence as to how this determination could be related to a new or more severe environmental effect that was not disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. If the Department of Building Inspection were to require some of the optional design features mentioned in the geotechnical report, these design features would not affect the environmental analysis contained in the CPE Initial Study. Therefore, additional environmental review is not required.

Concern 4: The proposed project would likely require pile driving, which was not covered in the CEQA analysis.

Response 4: The proposed project's geotechnical report determined that the proposed project could be constructed without pile driving. If the proposed project were to require pile driving in the future, additional environmental review would be required.

The Appellant states that construction of the proposed project, as approved, would require access to the 1800 Bryant Street property. The Appellant asserts that if permission to use 1800 Bryant Street is not

⁸ Rockridge Geotechnical, *Geotechnical Investigation Proposed Mixed-Use Building 1850 Bryant Street*, March 22, 2017.

⁹ Boring 3 hit groundwater at 29 feet. Borings 1 and 2 did not hit any groundwater.

forthcoming, the proposed project would require pile driving, and since pile driving was not analyzed in the CPE, the CEQA document is inadequate.

According to the geotechnical report, the proposed project could be constructed without pile driving. The project sponsor has also indicated that the proposed project would not include pile driving. Therefore, the CPE analyzed a project that does not include pile driving. If the proposed project were to include pile driving in the future, that would constitute a substantial change to the project, and would then require additional environmental review, with consideration of potential impacts to noise, soil, groundwater or other environmental topics. The Eastern Neighborhoods EIR includes a mitigation measure that specifically addresses noise from pile driving:

Mitigation Measure F-1: Construction Noise

For subsequent development projects within proximity to noise-sensitive uses that would include pile-driving, individual project sponsors shall ensure that piles be pre-drilled whenever feasible to reduce construction-related noise and vibration. No impact pile drivers shall be used unless absolutely necessary. Contractors would be required to use pile-driving equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices. To reduce noise and vibration impacts, sonic or vibratory sheetpile drivers, rather than impact drivers, shall be used whenever sheetpiles are needed. Individual project sponsors shall require that contractors schedule pile-driving activity for times of the day that would minimize disturbance to neighbors.

If the proposed project were to include pile driving in the future, the likely result of further analysis would be the imposition of the above mitigation measure. However, at this point, the assertion that pile driving would be required is speculative, and does not constitute substantial evidence of a new or more severe environmental impact than has already been disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR. Therefore, no additional environmental review is required.

Concern 5: The Transportation Impact Study is inadequate because the project setting has significantly changed since 2008, when the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan was adopted, and impacts to parking and traffic are more severe than the Transportation Impact Study discloses.

Response 5: The Transportation Impact Study relies on traffic volumes observed on November 14, 2016, not conditions in 2008. In any case, the Planning Department does not consider increased congestion or a lack of parking as physical effects on the environment.

The Appellant alleges that the Transportation Impact Study for the project is invalid because substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans were approved due to the increase in traffic from nearby new development and the lack of parking for many existing businesses.

As discussed on pages 13-14 of the CPE Initial Study, parking shall not be considered in determining if a project has the potential to result in significant environmental effects, provided the project meets all of the following three criteria:

- a) The project is in a transit priority area;
- b) The project is on an infill site; and
- c) The project is residential, mixed-use residential, or an employment center.

The proposed project meets all three of the above criteria.¹⁰ Therefore, parking impacts of the proposed project were not analyzed in the CPE Initial Study. The Appellant asserts that the assignment of spaces in the garage of the proposed project, which is unclear from the CPE Initial Study, would result in parking impacts not adequately addressed in the CPE Initial Study. However, as parking impacts shall not be considered under CEQA, the Appellant's assertion is not substantial evidence of the inadequacy of the CPE.

Similarly, as discussed on page 15 of the CPE Initial Study, pursuant to CEQA section 21099(b)(2), automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion, shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment under CEQA. Therefore, the Appellant's assertion that the Transportation Impact Study does not adequately analyze the traffic impacts of the proposed project because conditions have changed since the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan was adopted is not substantial evidence of the inadequacy of the CPE.

Parking and traffic impacts are presented in the Transportation Impact Study for informational purposes only, not for the determination of the significance of environmental impacts. In the cases of both parking and traffic impacts, the Appellant does not present specific or substantial evidence showing how the Transportation Impact Study was inadequate in its analysis. The Appellant only asserts that the Transportation Impact Study is inaccurate. The Appellant does not present examples of inaccuracies or any substantial evidence as to how any inaccuracies would result in new or more severe environmental effects than were disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR. Therefore, no additional environmental review is necessary and the Department's conclusion that the proposed project is consistent with the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan stands.

¹⁰ San Francisco Planning Department. Eligibility Checklist: CEQA Section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for 1850 Bryant Street, April 3, 2017.

CONCLUSION:

The Appellant has not demonstrated nor provided substantial evidence to support a claim that the CPE fails to conform to the requirements of CEQA for a community plan evaluation pursuant to CEQA Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. The Planning Department conducted necessary project-specific studies and analyses, and provided the Planning Commission with the information and documents necessary to make an informed decision, based on substantial evidence in the record, at a noticed public hearing in accordance with the Planning Department's CPE Initial Study and standard procedures, and pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, the Planning Department respectfully recommends that the Board of Supervisors uphold the Department's CPE and reject Appellant's appeal.



LUBIN OLSON & NIEWIADOMSKI LLP

THE TRANSAMERICA PYRAMID
600 MONTGOMERY STREET, 14TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111
TEL 415 981 0550 FAX 415 981 4343 WEB lubinolson.com

REG-1
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2017 JUL -3 PM 2:12

u
BIJAL PATEL
Direct Dial: (415) 955-5018
E-mail: bpatel@lubinolson.com

July 3, 2017

DELIVERED IN PERSON

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

CEQA Exemption Appeal - 1850 Bryant Street

Dear Board of Supervisors:

On behalf of Franklin Square Owners Association, the homeowners association for the residents of 1800 Bryant Street, we appeal the City’s Certificate of Determination (Community Plan Evaluation) dated May 10, 2017, which was the basis of the Planning Commission’s approval of Motion No. 19933 for the proposed project at 1850 Bryant Street (“Project”) on June 1, 2017. This Determination was deficient in numerous ways and further analyses must be conducted under CEQA. These deficiencies, include without limitation, the following:

A. Inadequate Noise Study

The Project does not comply with the requisite Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-5 and use compatibility requirements set forth in the General Plan and in Police Code Section 2909d. Project applicant submitted Noise Mitigation Measure F-5 Analysis dated April 24, 2017 (“Noise Study”) to meet these requirements. The Noise Study concluded that:

“The project will comply with the nighttime criterion of Mitigation Measure F-5 set forth in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR with STC 28 windows at the PDR spaces for neighboring noise-sensitive receivers. No additional mitigation is needed to meet the daytime criterion. However, higher STC-rated windows could be required by CALGreen to meet the interior noise criterion at the PDR spaces.”

Critically, the Noise Study made the foregoing conclusions based on an inaccurate assumption: that the noise receptor 1800 Bryant Street, the “modern building to the north” of the Project, had closed windows. Conversely, the Noise Study correctly assumed open windows when testing the noise receptor of the “older building to the south” of the Project. While 1800 Bryant is a more “modern” building than its counterpart to the south of the Project, having been

built ca. 2000, it does **not** have air conditioning. As you can imagine, the building can get very hot, requiring residents to open their windows.

Given this fundamentally erroneous assumption, the Noise Study is deficient for purposes of testing noise receptor 1800 Bryant Street, and the noise testing must be redone to assume open windows for this receptor, as was done for the building to the south of the Project.

B. Incomplete Shadow Analysis

Illustrations in the Shadow Analysis conducted for the Project reveals that the Project will cause a shadow over virtually all of 1800 Bryant Street, including the building's common area courtyard. However, the Shadow Analysis fails to include any analysis regarding this widespread impact, hence violating CEQA requirements. **This net new shadow is a substantial adverse impact, and the Project applicant must be required to evaluate, under CEQA, the nature of the impact as well as any mitigations, such as design modifications that could potentially eliminate or reduce the net new shadow impacts on 1800 Bryant Street.**

C. Inadequate Geotechnical Investigation

The Project sponsor submitted a geotechnical investigation conducted by GeoForensics, Inc., titled *Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed New Commercial Building at the Bryant Street Property* and dated August, 2015 (the "Geotech Report"). **The Geotech Report is inadequate in several significant ways and further geotechnical investigation is required to adequately satisfy CEQA.**

Firstly, the Geotech Report indicates that site observations were done on August 10, 2015, which coincided with the end of a multi-year drought. Groundwater conditions could be significantly different now from August 201 and additional soil borings should be done to reflect current conditions.

Secondly, the Geotech Report assumes inaccurate cut depths for construction of the Project's garage. The assumption is that the cuts could be up to about 10 feet deep. However, since the elevation of Bryant Street is about 15 feet above the elevation of Florida Street, the cuts would be about 10 feet (or more) deeper on Bryant Street. Furthermore, the analysis groundwater observed in "Soil Boring #3". However, this soil boring was not included in the publically made available Geotech Report. The applicant needs to reevaluate its analysis based on the correct cut depths and reconfirmation of Soil Boring #3, to ensure that the Geotech Report analyses and findings are still accurate.

Thirdly, the Geotech Report notes optional design features that actually should be required design elements of the Project. These include the addition of supplementary seismic force for the design for basement walls and the installation of the back-of-wall drainage system to prevent the build-up of hydrostatic pressure.

D. Inadequate Construction Methodology Analysis

The CEQA analysis assumes that the Project will use a shoring/underpinning construction method (as opposed to pile driving). Such a method would require the Project sponsors to obtain an agreement to access and use the adjacent property at 1800 Bryant Street. However, the Planning Commission did not impose a condition to obtain such an agreement, and the Project sponsor has failed to negotiate in good faith such an agreement. As such, the Project will likely need to use pile driving for construction of this multistory building with underground parking. Such pile driving could potentially have significant environmental impacts on the soil and groundwater. However, none of these potential impacts were analyzed.

Accordingly, to comply with CEQA, the Planning Department should be required to analyze the potential impacts of a pile driving construction methodology, or, alternatively, the Project proponent should be required, as an express Project condition of approval, to negotiate in good faith a shoring/underpinning agreement with the appellants for the use of 1800 Bryant Street.

E. Incomplete Transportation Impact Study

The Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans require project-level analyses for new development projects. As a result, the Project sponsor submitted the *Transportation Impact Study for 1850 Bryant Street* dated April 2017 and prepared by CHS Consulting Group (the "TIS"). The TIS concluded that the "proposed Project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to transportation and circulation and would not contribute considerably to cumulative transportation and circulation impacts that were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR."

However, the analysis is lacking thorough site level detail. Infill and rebuild development in the neighborhood and expansion of neighboring uses (such as 1890 Bryant, new top story and art studios, Tartine Manufacturing, etc.) have caused significant increases in all forms of traffic in the area, since the adoption of the 2008 Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR. Furthermore, Florida Street is already a heavily congested street, and many of the existing establishments on the street, such as Coffee Bar, Artaud/Z Space Theater, do not have on-site loading zones. Allowing the Project to provide these without further analysis will simply exacerbate an existing problem.

In addition, the TIS is not clear whether the proposed parking garage is planned to accommodate only employees of the facility or customers/clients as well. If the garage is for employees only, the proposed use could further negatively impact street parking.


CEQA allows a finding of plan consistency only if there: (a) have been no substantial changes since the 2008 Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR; (b) are no substantial changes in circumstances that would require major revisions to the Final EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or (c) an increase in the severity of

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
July 3, 2017
Page 4

previously identified significant impacts; and (d) there is no new information of substantial importance that would change the conclusions set forth in the Final EIR.

As noted above the Project setting has significantly changed since 2008, and more traffic analysis is required to study these site level changes to adequately determine whether there are significant traffic impacts under CEQA and whether the Planning Department's determination of Plan Consistency with the 2008 Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR is sound.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bijal Patel', written over a horizontal line.

Bijal Patel

BP



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

BOARD OF PLANNING
SAN FRANCISCO

JUL 13 PM 2:12

Certificate of Determination Community Plan Evaluation

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Case No.: 2015-011211ENV
Project Address: 1850 Bryant Street
Zoning: PDR-1-G (Production Distribution and Repair-1-General) Use District
68-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 3971/006
Lot Size: 36,500 square feet
Plan Area: Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, Mission Sub Area
Project Sponsor: Douglas Ross, Ross Construction 415-850-2515
Staff Contact: Justin Horner, Justin.horner@sfgov.org, 415-575-9023

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 36,500-square-foot (sf) project site is located in the middle of the block bordered by Bryant Street to the east, 17th Street to the north, Florida Street to the west and Mariposa Street to the south in the Mission neighborhood. The project site is currently occupied by a two-story, approximately 26 foot -tall, 13,800-sf commercial building built in 1974, and a 27,300-sf surface parking lot and storage area. The project site is located in the PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution and Repair-1-General) Zoning District and the 68-X Height and Bulk District.


(project description continued on next page)

CEQA DETERMINATION

The project is eligible for streamlined environmental review per Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and California Public Resources Code Section 21083.3

DETERMINATION

I do hereby certify that the above determination has been made pursuant to State and Local requirements.



Lisa M. Gibson
Environmental Review Officer

5/10/17

Date

cc: Douglas Ross, Project Sponsor; Supervisor Ronen, District 9; Linda Ajello Hoagland, Current Planning Division; Virna Byrd, M.D.F.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (CONTINUED)

The proposed project would demolish the existing building and the surface parking and storage lot, and construct a five-story-plus-basement, 68-foot-tall mixed use building with approximately 166,728 gross square feet of social service uses, 2,285 gross square feet of retail, approximately 18,407 gross square feet of production, distribution and repair (PDR) uses and a 17,000 square foot roof deck. The lobby entrance would be located on Bryant Street. The proposed project would provide 91 vehicle parking spaces on the second below-grade basement level, and also include 30 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, and 15 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. The proposed project would remove a curb cut on Bryant Street and relocate a curb cut on Florida Street to the center of the Florida Street frontage. Construction of the project would require approximately 40,000 cubic yards of excavation to a depth of approximately 30 feet along Bryant Street and 15 feet along Florida Street. Construction would last approximately 18 months.

PROJECT APPROVAL

The proposed project requires a Large Project Authorization (pursuant to Mission Interim Controls) from the Planning Commission, which will be the Approval Action for the proposed project. The Approval Action date establishes the start of the 30-day appeal period for this CEQA determination pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

COMMUNITY PLAN EVALUATION OVERVIEW

California Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 provide that projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, shall not be subject to additional environmental review except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: a) are peculiar to the project or parcel on which the project would be located; b) were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan or community plan with which the project is consistent; c) are potentially significant off-site and cumulative impacts that were not discussed in the underlying EIR; or d) are previously identified in the EIR, but which, as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than that discussed in the underlying EIR. Section 15183(c) specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, then an EIR need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

This determination evaluates the potential project-specific environmental effects of the 1850 Bryant Street project described above, and incorporates by reference information contained in the Programmatic EIR for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (PEIR)¹. Project-specific studies were prepared for the proposed project to determine if the project would result in any significant environmental impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

After several years of analysis, community outreach, and public review, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in December 2008. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in part to support housing development in some areas previously zoned to allow industrial uses, while preserving an

¹ Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E and State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048

adequate supply of space for existing and future production, distribution, and repair (PDR) employment and businesses.

The Planning Commission held public hearings to consider the various aspects of the proposed Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans and related Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments. On August 7, 2008, the Planning Commission certified the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR by Motion 17659 and adopted the Preferred Project for final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.^{2,3}

In December 2008, after further public hearings, the Board of Supervisors approved and the Mayor signed the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Planning Code amendments. New zoning districts include districts that would permit PDR uses in combination with commercial uses; districts mixing residential and commercial uses and residential and PDR uses; and new residential-only districts. The districts replaced existing industrial, commercial, residential single-use, and mixed-use districts.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR is a comprehensive programmatic document that presents an analysis of the environmental effects of implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, as well as the potential impacts under several proposed alternative scenarios. The Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR evaluated three rezoning alternatives, two community-proposed alternatives which focused largely on the Mission District, and a "No Project" alternative. The alternative selected, or the Preferred Project, represents a combination of Options B and C. The Planning Commission adopted the Preferred Project after fully considering the environmental effects of the Preferred Project and the various scenarios discussed in the PEIR. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR estimated that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan could result in approximately 7,400 to 9,900 net dwelling units and 3,200,000 to 6,600,000 square feet of net non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) built in the Plan Area throughout the lifetime of the Plan (year 2025). The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR projected that this level of development would result in a total population increase of approximately 23,900 to 33,000 people throughout the lifetime of the plan.⁴

A major issue of discussion in the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning process was the degree to which existing industrially-zoned land would be rezoned to primarily residential and mixed-use districts, thus reducing the availability of land traditionally used for PDR employment and businesses. Among other topics, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR assesses the significance of the cumulative land use effects of the rezoning by analyzing its effects on the City's ability to meet its future PDR space needs as well as its ability to meet its housing needs as expressed in the City's General Plan.

As a result of the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning process, the project site has been rezoned to PDR-1-G (Production Distribution and Repair-1-General) District. The PDR-1-G District is intended to retain and encourage existing PDR activities and promote new business formation. The proposed project and its relation to PDR land supply and cumulative land use effects is discussed further in the Community Plan Evaluation (CPE) Checklist, under Land Use. The 1850 Bryant Street site, which is located in the Mission District of the Eastern Neighborhoods, was designated as a site with building up to 68 feet in height.

² San Francisco Planning Department. Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E, certified August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>, accessed August 17, 2012.

³ San Francisco Planning Department. San Francisco Planning Commission Motion 17659, August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=1268>, accessed August 17, 2012.

⁴ Table 2 Forecast Growth by Rezoning Option Chapter IV of the Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR shows projected net growth based on proposed rezoning scenarios. A baseline for existing conditions in the year 2000 was included to provide context for the scenario figures for parcels affected by the rezoning.

Individual projects that could occur in the future under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans will undergo project-level environmental evaluation to determine if they would result in further impacts specific to the development proposal, the site, and the time of development and to assess whether additional environmental review would be required. This determination concludes that the proposed project at 1850 Bryant Street is consistent with and was encompassed within the analysis in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, including the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR development projections. This determination also finds that the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed 1850 Bryant Street project, and identified the mitigation measures applicable to the 1850 Bryant Street project. The proposed project is also consistent with the zoning controls and the provisions of the Planning Code applicable to the project site.⁵⁶ Therefore, no further CEQA evaluation for the 1850 Bryant Street project is required. In sum, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and this Certificate of Determination and accompanying project-specific initial study comprise the full and complete CEQA evaluation necessary for the proposed project.

PROJECT SETTING

The project site is located in the middle of the block bordered by Bryant Street to the east, 17th Street to the north, Florida Street to the west and Mariposa Street to the south in the Mission neighborhood. Like all parcels on the block, the project site is a through lot between Bryant Street and Florida Street. The project area along Bryant Street is characterized primarily by residential uses in one- to three-story buildings ranging from 40-feet to 48-feet tall on the west side of Bryant Street, with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Potrero Division corporation yard on the east side. The project area along Florida Street is characterized by the two neighboring residential buildings along the east side, and a 40-foot, four-story theater and performing arts space with residential units on the west side. Buildings immediately adjacent to the project site include a 40-foot-tall, four-story residential live-work building to the south, and a 48-foot-tall, four-story residential building to the north. Parcels surrounding the project site are within the UMU (Urban Mixed Use), PDR-1-G (Production Distribution and Repair-1-General) and P (Public) Zoning Districts, and are within 68-X and 65-X Height and Bulk districts.

The closest Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) stop is at 16th and Mission Streets, approximately 0.4 miles northwest of the project site. The project site is within a quarter mile of several local transit lines, including Muni lines 9-San Bruno, 9R-San Bruno Rapid, 12-Folsom/Pacific, 22-Filmore, 27-Bryant, 33-Ashbury/18th Street, and 55-16th Street.

POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR included analyses of environmental issues including: land use; plans and policies; visual quality and urban design; population, housing, business activity, and employment (growth inducement); transportation; noise; air quality; parks, recreation and open space; shadow; archeological resources; historic architectural resources; hazards; and other issues not addressed in the previously issued initial study for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans. The proposed

⁵⁵ Steve Wertheim, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 1850 Bryant Street, April 6, 2017. This document (and all other documents cited in this report, unless otherwise noted), is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2015-01121ENV.

⁵⁶ Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 1850 Bryant Street, April 3, 2017.

1850 Bryant Street project is in conformance with the height, use and density for the site described in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and would represent a small part of the growth that was forecast for the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas. Thus, the plan analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR considered the incremental impacts of the proposed 1850 Bryant Street project. As a result, the proposed project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts than were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Significant and unavoidable impacts were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR for the following topics: land use, historic architectural resources, transportation and circulation, and shadow. The proposed project would not contribute considerably to any of these impacts.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts related to noise, air quality, archeological resources, historical resources, hazardous materials, and transportation. Table 1 below lists the mitigation measures identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and states whether each measure would apply to the proposed project.

Table 1 – Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
F. Noise		
F-1: Construction Noise (Pile Driving)	Not Applicable: pile driving not proposed	N/A
F-2: Construction Noise	Not Applicable: no particularly noisy construction methods would be anticipated during the project's construction phase.	N/A
F-3: Interior Noise Levels	Not Applicable: CEQA no longer requires the consideration of the effects of the existing environment on a proposed project's future users or residents where that project would not exacerbate existing noise levels.	N/A
F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses	Not Applicable: CEQA generally no longer requires the consideration of the effects of the existing environment on a proposed project's future users or residents where that project would not exacerbate existing noise levels	N/A
F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses	Applicable. Project includes PDR uses.	Project sponsor has completed acoustic study and the

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
		proposed project would include STC 28 windows at the PDR spaces to ensure noise levels in compliance with the Noise Ordinance.
F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments	Not Applicable: CEQA generally no longer requires the consideration of the effects of the existing environment on a proposed project's future users or residents where that project would not exacerbate existing noise levels.	N/A
G. Air Quality		
G-1: Construction Air Quality	Not Applicable: these requirements have been superseded by the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance.	Compliance with the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance.
G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses	Not Applicable: superseded by applicable Article 38 requirements.	N/A
G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM	Not Applicable: the proposed uses are not expected to emit substantial levels of DPMs.	N/A
G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit other TACs	Not Applicable: proposed project would not include a backup diesel generator or other use that emits TACs.	N/A
J. Archeological Resources		
J-1: Properties with Previous Studies	Not Applicable: no archeological research design and treatment plan on file for this site.	N/A
J-2: Properties with no Previous Studies	Applicable. Proposed project requires Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR).	Project Mitigation Measure 1 (Accidental Discovery) has been agreed to by the project sponsor.
J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological	Not Applicable: project does not include any excavation and	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
District	is not located in Mission Dolores Archeological District.	
K. Historical Resources		
K-1: Interim Procedures for Permit Review in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Department	N/A
K-2: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Vertical Additions in the South End Historic District (East SoMa)	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Commission	N/A
K-3: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Alterations and Infill Development in the Dogpatch Historic District (Central Waterfront)	Not Applicable: plan-level mitigation completed by Planning Commission	N/A
L. Hazardous Materials		
L-1: Hazardous Building Materials	Applicable. Proposed project includes demolition of existing structures.	Project Mitigation Measure 2 (Hazardous Building Materials) has been agreed to by the project sponsor.
E. Transportation		
E-1: Traffic Signal Installation	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-3: Enhanced Funding	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not Applicable: automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis	N/A
E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
E-7: Transit Accessibility	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-8: Muni Storage and Maintenance	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-9: Rider Improvements	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-10: Transit Enhancement	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A
E-11: Transportation Demand Management	Not Applicable: plan level mitigation by SFMTA	N/A

Please see the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the complete text of the applicable mitigation measures. With implementation of these mitigation measures, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT

A "Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review" was mailed on March 29, 2017 to adjacent occupants and owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site. Overall, concerns and issues raised by the public in response to the notice were taken into consideration and incorporated in the environmental review as appropriate for CEQA analysis. These include public comments regarding shadow impacts, traffic and parking, operational and construction-related noise, hazardous materials and geological concerns, as well as views, construction-related impacts (noise, vibration and air quality) and the presence of serpentine rock. The proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the issues identified by the public beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

CONCLUSION

As summarized above and further discussed in the CPE Checklist⁷:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the development density established for the project site in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans;
2. The proposed project would not result in effects on the environment that are peculiar to the project or the project site that were not identified as significant effects in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR;
3. The proposed project would not result in potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR;

⁷ The CPE Checklist is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, in Case File No. 2015-011211ENV.

4. The proposed project would not result in significant effects, which, as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was certified, would be more severe than were already analyzed and disclosed in the PEIR; and
5. The project sponsor will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR to mitigate project-related significant impacts.

Therefore, no further environmental review shall be required for the proposed project pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.

**EXHIBIT 1:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval and Proposed Improvement Measures)**

1. MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
J. Archeological Resources				
<p><i>Mitigation Measure 1 Archeological Monitoring</i> Based on the reasonable potential that archeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological monitoring program. All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of <i>construction</i> can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Sect. 15064.5 (a)(c).</p>	Project sponsor.	Prior to issuance of site permits.	Project sponsor shall retain archeological consultant to undertake archaeological monitoring program in consultation with ERO.	Complete when Project sponsor retains qualified archaeological consultant.
<p><i>Archeological monitoring program (AMP).</i> The archeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the project archeologist shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the potential risk these activities pose to archaeological resources and to their depositional context; ▪ The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource; ▪ The archaeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with the archeological 	Project Sponsor	Prior to the start of renovation/const ruction activities.	Planning Department, in consultation with DPH.	Considered complete upon submittal to Planning confirming compliance with this measure.

**EXHIBIT 1:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval and Proposed Improvement Measures)**

1. MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis <p>If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction crews and heavy equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall, after making a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.</p>	<p>The archaeological consultant, Project Sponsor and project contractor.</p>	<p>Monitoring of soils disturbing activities.</p>	<p>Archaeological consultant to monitor soils disturbing activities specified in AMP and immediately notify the ERO of any encountered archeological resource.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon completion of AMP.</p>
<p>If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or B) An archeological data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archeological resource is of greater Interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible. 	<p>ERO, archaeological consultant, and Project Sponsor.</p>	<p>Following discovery of significant archeological resource that could be adversely affected by project.</p>	<p>Redesign of project to avoid adverse effect or undertaking of archeological data recovery program.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon avoidance of adverse effect</p>
<p>If an archeological data recovery program is required by the ERO, the archeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The project archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP. The archeological consultant shall prepare a draft ADRP that shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable</p>	<p>Archaeological consultant in consultation with ERO</p>	<p>After determination by ERO that an archeological data recovery program is required</p>	<p>Archaeological consultant to prepare an ADRP in consultation with ERO</p>	<p>Considered complete upon approval of ADRP by ERO.</p>

**EXHIBIT 1:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval and Proposed Improvement Measures)**

1. MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.</p> <p>The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Field Methods and Procedures. Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations. ▪ Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis. Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures. ▪ Discard and Deaccession Policy. Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies. ▪ Interpretive Program. Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archeological data recovery program. ▪ Security Measures. Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities. ▪ Final Report. Description of proposed report format and distribution of results. ▪ Curation. Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities. 	<p>Archaeological consultant or medical examiner</p>	<p>Discovery of human remains</p>	<p>Notification of County/City Coroner and, as warranted, notification of NAHC.</p>	<p>Considered complete on finding by ERO that all State laws regarding human remains/burial objects have been adhered to, consultation with MLD is completed as warranted, and that sufficient opportunity has</p>
<p>Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects. The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, ERO, and MLD shall have up to but not beyond six days after the</p>				

**EXHIBIT 1:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval and Proposed Improvement Measures)**

1. MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>discovery to make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects with appropriate dignity (CEQA Guidelines, Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. Nothing in existing State regulations or in this mitigation measure compels the project sponsor and the ERO to accept recommendations of an MLD. The archeological consultant shall retain possession of any Native American human remains and associated or unassociated burial objects until completion of any scientific analyses of the human remains or objects as specified in the treatment agreement if such as agreement has been made or, otherwise, as determined by the archeological consultant and the ERO.</p>				<p>been provided to the archaeological consultant for scientific/historical analysis of remains/funerary objects.</p>
<p>Final Archeological Resources Report. The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the draft final report.</p>	<p>Archaeological consultant</p>	<p>Following completion of cataloguing, analysis, and interpretation of recovered archaeological data.</p>	<p>Preparation of FARR</p>	<p>FARR is complete on review and approval of ERO</p>
<p>Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department shall receive three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.</p>	<p>Archaeological consultant</p>	<p>Following completion and approval of FARR by ERO</p>	<p>Distribution of FARR after consultation with ERO</p>	<p>Complete on certification to ERO that copies of FARR have been distributed</p>

**EXHIBIT 1:
 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
 (Including the Text of the Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval and Proposed Improvement Measures)**

1. MITIGATION MEASURES ADOPTED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Report Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>F. Noise Mitigation Measure 2: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses To reduce potential conflicts between existing sensitive receptors and new noise-generating uses, for new development including commercial, industrial or other uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise, either short-term, at nighttime, or as a 24-hour average, in the proposed project site vicinity, the Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-sensitive uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes), prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the proposed use would comply with the use compatibility requirements in the General Plan and in Police Code Section 2909I, would not adversely affect nearby noise-sensitive uses, and that there are no particular circumstances about the proposed project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels that would be generated by the proposed use. Should such concerns be present, the Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action.</p>	<p>Project Sponsor along with Project Contractor.</p>	<p>Design measures to be incorporated into project design and evaluated in environmental/building permit review, prior to issuance of a final building permit and certificate of occupancy.</p>	<p>San Francisco Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon approval of final construction drawing set.</p>
<p>L. Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure 3: Hazardous Building Materials The project sponsor shall ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyl (PCBs) or Di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEPH), such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.</p>	<p>Project Sponsor</p>	<p>Prior to the start of renovation/const ruction activities.</p>	<p>Planning Department, in consultation with DPH.</p>	<p>Considered complete upon submittal to Planning confirming compliance with this measure.</p>



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Initial Study – Community Plan Evaluation

Case No.: 2015-011211ENV
Project Address: 1850 Bryant Street
Zoning: PDR-1-G (Production Distribution and Repair-1-General) Use District
68-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 3971/006
Lot Size: 36,500 square feet
Plan Area: Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, Mission Sub Area
Project Sponsor: Douglas Ross, Ross Construction 415-850-2515
Staff Contact: Justin Horner, Justin.horner@sfgov.org, 415-575-9023

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 36,500-square-foot (sf) project site is located in the middle of the block bordered by Bryant Street to the east, 17th Street to the north, Florida Street to the west and Mariposa Street to the south in the Mission neighborhood (see Figures 1 and 2). The project site is currently occupied by a two-story, approximately 26-foot-tall, 13,800-sf commercial building built in 1974, and a 27,300-sf surface parking lot and storage area. The project site is located in the PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution and Repair-1-General) Zoning District and the 68-X Height and Bulk District.

The proposed project would demolish the existing building and the surface parking and storage lot, and construct a five-story-plus-basement, 68-foot-tall mixed use building with approximately 166,728 gross square feet of social service uses, approximately 2,285 gross square feet of retail and approximately 18,400 gross square feet of production, distribution and repair (PDR) uses, and a 17,000 square foot roof deck (see Figures 3-9). The lobby entrance would be located on Bryant Street. The proposed project would provide 91 vehicle parking spaces on the B2 below-grade basement level, and also include 30 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, 15 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. The proposed project would remove a curb cut on Bryant Street and move a curb cut on Florida Street to the center of the lot. Construction of the project would require approximately 40,000 cubic yards of excavation to a depth of approximately 30 feet along Bryant Street and 15 feet along Florida Street. Construction would last approximately 18 months.

The proposed 1850 Bryant Street project would require the following approvals:

Actions by the Planning Commission

- Large Project Authorization, for a "Medium Project," per the Mission 2016 Interim Zoning Controls;
- Joint determination with the Recreation and Park Commission that the project would have no adverse shadow impact on Franklin Square or other parks subject to Section 295 of the Planning Code.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

This initial study evaluates whether the environmental impacts of the proposed project are addressed in the programmatic environmental impact report for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR).¹ The initial study considers whether the proposed project would result in significant impacts that: (1) are peculiar to the project or project site; (2) were not identified as significant project-level, cumulative, or off-site effects in the PEIR; or (3) are previously identified significant effects, which as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the PEIR. Such impacts, if any, will be evaluated in a project-specific, focused mitigated negative declaration or environmental impact report. If no such impacts are identified, no additional environmental review shall be required for the project beyond that provided in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and this project-specific initial study in accordance with CEQA section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183.

Mitigation measures identified in the PEIR are discussed under each topic area, and measures that are applicable to the proposed project are provided under the Mitigation Measures section at the end of this checklist.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified significant impacts related to land use, transportation, cultural resources, shadow, noise, air quality, and hazardous materials. Additionally, the PEIR identified significant cumulative impacts related to land use, transportation, and cultural resources. Mitigation measures were identified for the above impacts and reduced all impacts to less-than-significant except for those related to land use (cumulative impacts on Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) use), transportation (program-level and cumulative traffic impacts at nine intersections; program-level and cumulative transit impacts on seven Muni lines), cultural resources (cumulative impacts from demolition of historical resources), and shadow (program-level impacts on parks).

The proposed project would include construction of a five-story, 68-foot-tall building with PDR uses and social service uses. As discussed below in this initial study, the proposed project would not result in new, significant environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already analyzed and disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

¹ San Francisco Planning Department, Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (PEIR), Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E, State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048, certified August 7, 2008. Available online at <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>, accessed August 17, 2012.

Figure 1. Project Vicinity




Figure 2. Project Site: 1850 Bryant Street



Figure 3: Proposed Basement Levels Plans





Figure 4. Proposed First Floor Plan




Figure 5 Proposed Second Floor Plan




Figure 6. Proposed Third Floor Plan




Figure 7. Proposed Fourth Floor Plan




Figure 8. Proposed Fifth Floor Plan




Figure 7. Proposed Roof Plan




Figure 8. Proposed Bryant Street (East) Elevation





Figure 9. Proposed Florida Street (West) Elevation



CHANGES IN THE REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT

Since the certification of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR in 2008, several new policies, regulations, statutes, and funding measures have been adopted, passed, or are underway that affect the physical environment and/or environmental review methodology for projects in the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas. As discussed in each topic area referenced below, these policies, regulations, statutes, and funding measures have implemented or will implement mitigation measures or further reduce less-than-significant impacts identified in the PEIR. These include:

- State legislation amending CEQA to eliminate consideration of aesthetics and parking impacts for infill projects in transit priority areas, effective January 2014.
- State legislation amending CEQA and San Francisco Planning Commission resolution replacing level of service (LOS) analysis of automobile delay with vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis, effective March 2016 (see "CEQA Section 21099" heading below).
- The adoption of 2016 interim controls in the Mission District requiring additional information and analysis regarding housing affordability, displacement, loss of PDR and other analyses, effective January 14, 2016 through April 14, 2017.
- San Francisco Bicycle Plan update adoption in June 2009, Better Streets Plan adoption in 2010, Transit Effectiveness Project (aka "Muni Forward") adoption in March 2014, Vision Zero adoption by various City agencies in 2014, Proposition A and B passage in November 2014, and the Transportation Sustainability Program (see initial study Transportation section).
- San Francisco ordinance establishing Noise Regulations Related to Residential Uses near Places of Entertainment effective June 2015 (see initial study Noise section).
- San Francisco ordinances establishing Construction Dust Control, effective July 2008, and Enhanced Ventilation Required for Urban Infill Sensitive Use Developments, amended December 2014 (see initial study Air Quality section).
- San Francisco Clean and Safe Parks Bond passage in November 2012 and San Francisco Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan adoption in April 2014 (see initial study Recreation section).
- Urban Water Management Plan adoption in 2011 and Sewer System Improvement Program process (see initial study Utilities and Service Systems section).
- Article 22A of the Health Code amendments effective August 2013 (see initial study Hazardous Materials section).

Aesthetics and Parking

In accordance with CEQA Section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for Transit Oriented Projects – aesthetics and parking shall not be considered in determining if a project has the potential to result in significant environmental effects, provided the project meets all of the following three criteria:

- a) The project is in a transit priority area;
- b) The project is on an infill site; and

- c) The project is residential, mixed-use residential, or an employment center.

The proposed project meets each of the above three criteria and thus, this checklist does not consider aesthetics or parking in determining the significance of project impacts under CEQA.² Project elevations are included in the project description.

Automobile Delay and Vehicle Miles Traveled

In addition, CEQA Section 21099(b)(1) requires that the State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) develop revisions to the CEQA Guidelines establishing criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts of projects that “promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses.” CEQA Section 21099(b)(2) states that upon certification of the revised guidelines for determining transportation impacts pursuant to Section 21099(b)(1), automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment under CEQA.

In January 2016, OPR published for public review and comment a *Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA*³ recommending that transportation impacts for projects be measured using a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) metric. On March 3, 2016, in anticipation of the future certification of the revised CEQA Guidelines, the San Francisco Planning Commission adopted OPR’s recommendation to use the VMT metric instead of automobile delay to evaluate the transportation impacts of projects (Resolution 19579). (Note: the VMT metric does not apply to the analysis of project impacts on non-automobile modes of travel such as transit, walking, and bicycling.) Therefore, impacts and mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR associated with automobile delay are not discussed in this checklist, including PEIR Mitigation Measures E-1: Traffic Signal Installation, E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management, E-3: Enhanced Funding, and E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management. Instead, a VMT analysis is provided in the Transportation section.

² San Francisco Planning Department. Eligibility Checklist: CEQA Section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for 1850 Bryant Street, April 3, 2017. This document (and all other documents cited in this report, unless otherwise noted), is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 as part of Case File No. 2015-011211ENV.

³ This document is available online at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_sb743.php.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING—Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that adoption of the rezoning and area plans would result in an unavoidable significant impact on land use due to the cumulative loss of PDR. The proposed project would include the demolition of an existing 13,800-sf PDR use and the construction of 18,400-sf of new PDR space. This would result in a net increase of approximately 4,400-sf of PDR space and would not therefore contribute to any impact related to loss of PDR uses that was identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. In addition, the project site was zoned Manufacturing (M-1) prior to the rezoning of Eastern Neighborhoods, which permitted PDR uses and the rezoning of the project site did not contribute to the significant impact.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the area plans would not create any new physical barriers in the Eastern Neighborhoods because the rezoning and area plans do not provide for any new major roadways, such as freeways that would disrupt or divide the plan area or individual neighborhoods or subareas.

The Citywide Planning and Current Planning divisions of the planning department have determined that the proposed project is permitted in the PDR-1-G District and is consistent with the height, density and land use envisioned in the Mission Area Plan of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan. The proposed project is consistent with Mission Area Plan Objective 1.1 (strengthening the Mission’s existing mixed use character) by providing new PDR uses, as well as Mission Area Plan Objective 1.7 (retaining the Mission’s role as an important location for PDR activities). The proposed project also meets Objective 4.7 by providing bicycle parking spaces.^{4,5}

Because the proposed project is consistent with the development density established in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to land use and land use planning, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

⁴ Steve Wertheim, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 1850 Bryant Street, April 6, 2017.

⁵ Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 1850 Bryant Street, April 3, 2017.

Topics:	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
2. POPULATION AND HOUSING—				
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

One of the objectives of the Eastern Neighborhoods area plans is to identify appropriate locations for housing in the City’s industrially zoned land to meet the citywide demand for additional housing. The PEIR assessed how the rezoning actions would affect housing supply and location options for businesses in the Eastern Neighborhoods and compared these outcomes to what would otherwise be expected without the rezoning, assuming a continuation of development trends and ad hoc land use changes (such as allowing housing within industrial zones through conditional use authorization on a case-by-case basis, site-specific rezoning to permit housing, and other similar case-by-case approaches). The PEIR concluded that adoption of the rezoning and area plans: “would induce substantial growth and concentration of population in San Francisco.” The PEIR states that the increase in population expected to occur as a result of the proposed rezoning and adoption of the area plans would not, in itself, result in adverse physical effects, and would serve to advance key City policy objectives, such as providing housing in appropriate locations next to Downtown and other employment generators and furthering the City’s transit first policies. It was anticipated that the rezoning would result in an increase in both housing development and population in all of the area plan neighborhoods. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population and density would not directly result in significant adverse physical effects on the environment. However, the PEIR identified significant cumulative impacts on the physical environment that would result indirectly from growth afforded under the rezoning and area plans, including impacts on land use, transportation, air quality, and noise. The PEIR contains detailed analyses of these secondary effects under each of the relevant resource topics, and identifies mitigation measures to address significant impacts where feasible.

The PEIR determined that implementation of the rezoning and area plans would not have a significant impact from the direct displacement of existing residents, and that each of the rezoning options considered in the PEIR would result in less displacement as a result of unmet housing demand than would be expected under the No-Project scenario because the addition of new housing would provide some relief to housing market pressure without directly displacing existing residents. However, the PEIR also noted that residential displacement is not solely a function of housing supply, and that adoption of the rezoning and area plans could result in indirect, secondary effects on neighborhood character through gentrification that could displace some residents. The PEIR discloses that the rezoned districts could transition to higher-value housing, which could result in gentrification and displacement of lower-income

households, and states moreover that lower-income residents of the Eastern Neighborhoods, who also disproportionately live in crowded conditions and in rental units, are among the most vulnerable to displacement resulting from neighborhood change.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15131 and 15064(e), economic and social effects such as gentrification and displacement are only considered under CEQA where these effects would cause substantial adverse physical impacts on the environment. Only where economic or social effects have resulted in adverse physical changes in the environment, such as "blight" or "urban decay" have courts upheld environmental analysis that considers such effects. But without such a connection to an adverse physical change, consideration of social or economic impacts "shall not be considered a significant effect" per CEQA Guidelines 15382. While the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR disclosed that adoption of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans could contribute to gentrification and displacement, it did not determine that these potential socio-economic effects would result in significant adverse physical impacts on the environment.

The proposed project includes approximately 18,400 square feet of PDR space, 2,285 square feet of retail, and approximately 166,728 square feet of social service space. The proposed project would include employees, customers and those in need of social services. These direct effects of the proposed project on population and housing would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts on the physical environment beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The project's contribution to indirect effects on the physical environment attributable to population growth are evaluated in this initial study under land use, transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, recreation, utilities and service systems, and public services.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
3. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5, including those resources listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Historic Architectural Resources

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.5(a)(1) and 15064.5(a)(2), historical resources are buildings or structures that are listed, or are eligible for listing, in the California Register of Historical Resources or

are identified in a local register of historical resources, such as Articles 10 and 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that future development facilitated through the changes in use districts and height limits under the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans could have substantial adverse changes on the significance of both individual historical resources and on historical districts within the Plan Areas. The PEIR determined that approximately 32 percent of the known or potential historical resources in the Plan Areas could potentially be affected under the preferred alternative. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR found this impact to be significant and unavoidable. This impact was addressed in a Statement of Overriding Considerations with findings and adopted as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans approval on January 19, 2009.

The project site is currently occupied by a two-story, approximately 26-foot-tall, 13,800-sf commercial building built in 1974, and a 27,300-sf surface parking lot and storage area. The existing building was previously evaluated in the Showplace Square/Northeast Mission Historic Resource Survey and was found to be ineligible for national, state, or local listing.⁶ The existing building is therefore not an historic resource under CEQA. Moreover, the project site is not located within a designated or eligible historic district. Therefore, demolition of this building would not contribute to the significant historic resource impact identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and no historic resource mitigation measures would apply to the proposed project.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on historic architectural resources that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Archeological Resources

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the Area Plan could result in significant impacts on archeological resources and identified three mitigation measures that would reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level. Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure J-2 applies to properties, such as the site of the proposed project, for which no archeological assessment report has been prepared or for which the archeological documentation is incomplete or inadequate to serve as an evaluation of potential effects on archeological resources under CEQA.

A Preliminary Archeological Review was performed for the proposed project and determined that there was a reasonable potential that archeological resources may be present within the project site. Therefore, **Project Mitigation Measure 1: Archeological Monitoring** would apply to the proposed project. See full text of Project Mitigation Measure 1: Archeological Monitoring in the Mitigation Measures Section below.

⁶ SF Planning Department, *Showplace Square/Northeast Mission Historic Resource Survey*, June, 2011. <http://sf-planning.org/showplace-square-northeast-mission-historic-resource-survey>. Accessed: May 5, 2017.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
4. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION—Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels, obstructions to flight, or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes would not result in significant impacts related to pedestrians, bicyclists, loading, or construction traffic. The PEIR states that in general, the analyses of pedestrian, bicycle, loading, emergency access, and construction transportation impacts are specific to individual development projects, and that project-specific analyses would need to be conducted for future development projects under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans.

Accordingly, the planning department conducted project-level analysis of the pedestrian, bicycle, loading, and construction transportation impacts of the proposed project.⁷ Based on this project-level review, the department determined that the proposed project would not have significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or the project site.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes could result in significant impacts on transit ridership, and identified seven transportation mitigation measures, which are described further below in the Transit sub-section. Even with mitigation, however, it was anticipated that the significant adverse cumulative impacts on transit lines could not be reduced to a less than significant level. Thus, these impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable. The project-

⁷ CHS Consulting Group, *Transportation Impact Study for 1850 Bryant Street*, April 2017.

specific Transportation Impact Study determined that the proposed project would not substantially affect the capacity utilization of local and regional transit lines and would not affect the operations of the adjacent and nearby bus transit routes; therefore, transit impacts of the proposed project would be Less Than Significant.

As discussed above under "SB 743", in response to state legislation that called for removing automobile delay from CEQA analysis, the Planning Commission adopted resolution 19579 replacing automobile delay with a VMT metric for analyzing transportation impacts of a project. Therefore, impacts and mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR associated with automobile delay are not discussed in this checklist.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR did not evaluate vehicle miles traveled or the potential for induced automobile travel. The VMT Analysis presented below evaluate the project's transportation effects using the VMT metric.

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the Initial Study Checklist topic 4c is not applicable.

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis

Many factors affect travel behavior. These factors include density, diversity of land uses, design of the transportation network, access to regional destinations, distance to high-quality transit, development scale, demographics, and transportation demand management. Typically, low-density development at great distance from other land uses, located in areas with poor access to non-private vehicular modes of travel, generate more automobile travel compared to development located in urban areas, where a higher density, mix of land uses, and travel options other than private vehicles are available.

Given these travel behavior factors, San Francisco has a lower VMT ratio than the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area region. In addition, some areas of the City have lower VMT ratios than other areas of the City. These areas of the City can be expressed geographically through transportation analysis zones. Transportation analysis zones are used in transportation planning models for transportation analysis and other planning purposes. The zones vary in size from single city blocks in the downtown core, multiple blocks in outer neighborhoods, to even larger zones in historically industrial areas like the Hunters Point Shipyard.

The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Transportation Authority) uses the San Francisco Chained Activity Model Process (SF-CHAMP) to estimate VMT by private automobiles and taxis for different land use types. Travel behavior in SF-CHAMP is calibrated based on observed behavior from the California Household Travel Survey 2010-2012, Census data regarding automobile ownership rates and county-to-county worker flows, and observed vehicle counts and transit boardings. SF-CHAMP uses a synthetic population, which is a set of individual actors that represents the Bay Area's actual population, who make simulated travel decisions for a complete day. The Transportation Authority uses tour-based analysis for office and residential uses, which examines the entire chain of trips over the course of a day, not just trips to and from the project. For retail uses, the Transportation Authority uses trip-based analysis, which counts VMT from individual trips to and from the project (as opposed to entire chain of trips). A trip-based approach, as opposed to a tour-based approach, is necessary for retail

projects because a tour is likely to consist of trips stopping in multiple locations, and the summarizing of tour VMT to each location would over-estimate VMT.^{8,9}

For office development, regional average daily work-related VMT per employee is 19.1.¹⁰ For retail development, regional average daily retail VMT per employee is 14.9.¹¹ Average daily VMT for both land uses is projected to decrease in future 2040 cumulative conditions. Refer to Table 1: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled, which includes the transportation analysis zone in which the project site is located, 538.

Table 1 Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled

<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Existing</u>			<u>Cumulative 2040</u>		
	<u>Bay Area Regional Average</u>	<u>Bay Area Regional Average minus 15%</u>	<u>TAZ 538</u>	<u>Bay Area Regional Average</u>	<u>Bay Area Regional Average minus 15%</u>	<u>TAZ 538</u>
Employment (Office)	19.1	16.2	9.6	17.0	14.5	8.5
Employment (Retail)	14.9	12.6	9.8	14.6	12.4	10.0

A project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would cause substantial additional VMT. The State Office of Planning and Research’s (OPR) *Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* (“proposed transportation impact guidelines”) recommends screening criteria to identify types, characteristics, or locations of projects that would not result in significant impacts to VMT. If a project meets one of the three screening criteria provided (Map-Based Screening, Small Projects, and Proximity to Transit Stations), then it is presumed that VMT impacts would be less than significant for the project and a detailed VMT analysis is not required. Map-Based Screening is used to determine if a project site is located within a transportation analysis zone that exhibits low levels of VMT; Small Projects are projects that would generate fewer than 100 vehicle trips per day; and the Proximity to Transit Stations criterion includes projects that are within a half mile of an existing major transit stop, have a floor area ratio of greater than or equal to 0.75, vehicle parking that is

⁸ To state another way: a tour-based assessment of VMT at a retail site would consider the VMT for all trips in the tour, for any tour with a stop at the retail site. If a single tour stops at two retail locations, for example, a coffee shop on the way to work and a restaurant on the way back home, then both retail locations would be allotted the total tour VMT. A trip-based approach allows us to apportion all retail-related VMT to retail sites without double-counting.

⁹ San Francisco Planning Department, Executive Summary: Resolution Modifying Transportation Impact Analysis, Appendix F, Attachment A, March 3, 2016.

¹⁰ For purposes of VMT analysis, both the social service provision use and PDR use are treated as office.

¹¹ Retail travel is not explicitly captured in SF-CHAMP, rather, there is a generic “Other” purpose which includes retail shopping, medical appointments, visiting friends or family, and all other non-work, non-school tours. The retail efficiency metric captures all of the “Other” purpose travel generated by Bay Area households. The denominator of employment (including retail; cultural, institutional, and educational; and medical employment; school enrollment, and number of households) represents the size, or attraction, of the zone for this type of “Other” purpose travel.

less than or equal to that required or allowed by the Planning Code without conditional use authorization, and are consistent with the applicable Sustainable Communities Strategy.

The proposed project would include approximately 166,728 square feet of social services space, approximately 18,400 square feet of PDR space, and approximately 2,285 square feet of retail space. Existing average daily VMT per capita for employment uses within the project site's TAZ, 538, is 9.6 miles. This is approximately 50 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per capita of 19.1. Existing average daily VMT per employee for retail uses in TAZ 538 is 9.8 miles. This is approximately 34 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per capita of 14.9. For future 2040 conditions, projected average daily VMT per capita for employment uses in TAZ 538 is 8.5 miles. This is 50 percent below the projected 2040 regional average daily VMT per capita of 17.1. Projected 2040 average daily VMT per employee for retail uses in TAZ 538 is 10.0 miles. This is 32 percent below the projected 2040 regional average daily VMT per employee of 14.6.¹² Therefore, the proposed project would not cause substantial additional VMT and impacts would be less-than-significant impact.

Trip Generation

The proposed project would include 166,728 square feet of social services space, 18,400 square feet of PDR space, and 2,285 square feet of retail space. The proposed project would also include 91 vehicle parking spaces in two below-grade basement levels, and also include 30 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, 15 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces.

Localized trip generation of the proposed project was calculated using a trip-based analysis and information in the 2002 *Transportation Impacts Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review* (SF Guidelines) developed by the San Francisco Planning Department.¹³ The proposed project would generate an estimated 3,619 person trips (inbound and outbound) on a weekday daily basis, consisting of 2,226 person trips by auto, 676 transit trips, 506 walk trips and 211 trips by other modes. During the p.m. peak hour, the proposed project would generate an estimated 336 person trips, consisting of 226 person trips by auto (124 vehicle trips accounting for vehicle occupancy data for this Census Tract), 63 transit trips, 35 walk trips and 12 trips by other modes.

Transit

Mitigation Measures E-5 through E-11 in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR were adopted as part of the Plan with uncertain feasibility to address significant transit impacts. These measures are not applicable to the proposed project, as they are plan-level mitigations to be implemented by City and County agencies. In compliance with a portion of Mitigation Measure E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding, the City adopted impact fees for development in Eastern Neighborhoods that goes towards funding transit and complete streets. In addition, San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code, referred to as the Transportation Sustainability Fee (Ordinance 200-154, effective December 25, 2015).¹⁴ The fee updated, expanded, and replaced the prior Transit Impact Development Fee, which is in compliance with portions of Mitigation Measure E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding. The

¹² San Francisco Planning Department. Eligibility Checklist: CEQA Section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for 1820 Bryant Street, December 12, 2016.

¹³ CHS Consulting Group, *Transportation Impact Study for 1850 Bryant Street*, April 2017.

¹⁴ Two additional files were created at the Board of Supervisors for TSF regarding hospitals and health services, grandfathering, and additional fees for larger projects: see Board file nos. 151121 and 151257.

proposed project would be subject to the fee. The City is also currently conducting outreach regarding Mitigation Measures E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding and Mitigation Measure E-11: Transportation Demand Management. Both the Transportation Sustainability Fee and the transportation demand management efforts are part of the Transportation Sustainability Program.¹⁵ In compliance with all or portions of Mitigation Measure E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements, Mitigation Measure E-7: Transit Accessibility, Mitigation Measure E-9: Rider Improvements, and Mitigation Measure E-10: Transit Enhancement, the SFMTA is implementing the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP), which was approved by the SFMTA Board of Directors in March 2014. The TEP (now called Muni Forward) includes system-wide review, evaluation, and recommendations to improve service and increase transportation efficiency. Examples of transit priority and pedestrian safety improvements within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area as part of Muni Forward include the 14 Mission Rapid Transit Project, the 22 Fillmore Extension along 16th Street to Mission Bay (expected construction between 2017 and 2020), and the Travel Time Reduction Project on Route 9 San Bruno (initiation in 2015). In addition, Muni Forward includes service improvements to various routes with the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area; for instance the implemented new Route 55 on 16th Street.

Mitigation Measure E-7 also identifies implementing recommendations of the Bicycle Plan and Better Streets Plan. As part of the San Francisco Bicycle Plan, adopted in 2009, a series of minor, near-term, and long-term bicycle facility improvements are planned within the Eastern Neighborhoods, including along 2nd Street, 5th Street, 17th Street, Townsend Street, Illinois Street, and Cesar Chavez Boulevard. The San Francisco Better Streets Plan, adopted in 2010, describes a vision for the future of San Francisco's pedestrian realm and calls for streets that work for all users. The Better Streets Plan requirements were codified in Section 138.1 of the Planning Code and new projects constructed in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area are subject to varying requirements, dependent on project size. Another effort which addresses transit accessibility, Vision Zero, was adopted by various City agencies in 2014. Vision Zero focuses on building better and safer streets through education, evaluation, enforcement, and engineering. The goal is to eliminate all traffic fatalities by 2024. Vision Zero projects within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area include pedestrian intersection treatments along Mission Street from 18th to 23rd streets, the Potrero Avenue Streetscape Project from Division to Cesar Chavez streets, and the Howard Street Pilot Project, which includes pedestrian intersection treatments from 4th to 6th streets.

The project site is located within a quarter mile of several local transit lines including Muni lines 9-San Bruno, 9R-San Bruno Rapid, 12-Folsom-Pacific, 22-Fillmore, 27-Bryant, 33-Ashbury/18th St, and 55-Rutland. The proposed project would be expected to generate 676 daily transit trips, including 63 during the p.m. peak hour. Given the wide availability of nearby transit, the addition of 63 p.m. peak hour transit trips would be accommodated by existing capacity. As such, the proposed project would not result in unacceptable levels of transit service or cause a substantial increase in delays or operating costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service could result.

Each of the rezoning options in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts relating to increases in transit ridership on Muni lines, with the Preferred Project having significant impacts on seven lines. Of those lines, the project site is located within a quarter-mile of Muni lines 9-San Bruno, 22-Fillmore and 27-Bryant. The proposed project would not contribute considerably to these conditions as its minor contribution of 63 p.m. peak hour transit trips would not be

¹⁵ <http://tsp.sfplanning.org>

a substantial proportion of the overall additional transit volume generated by Eastern Neighborhood projects. The proposed project would also not contribute considerably to 2025 cumulative transit conditions and thus would not result in any significant cumulative transit impacts.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to transportation and circulation and would not contribute considerably to cumulative transportation and circulation impacts that were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
5. NOISE—Would the project:				
a) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, in an area within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Be substantially affected by existing noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would result in significant noise impacts during construction activities and due to conflicts between noise-sensitive uses in proximity to noisy uses such as PDR, retail, entertainment, cultural/institutional/educational uses, and office uses. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also determined that incremental increases in traffic-related noise attributable to implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would be less than significant. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified six noise mitigation measures, three of which may be applicable to subsequent

development projects.¹⁶ These mitigation measures would reduce noise impacts from construction and noisy land uses to less-than-significant levels.

Construction Noise

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 relate to construction noise. Mitigation Measure F-1 addresses individual projects that include pile-driving, and Mitigation Measure F-2 addresses individual projects that include particularly noisy construction procedures (including pile-driving). The proposed project would not include any particularly noisy construction procedures, nor would the project include pile driving. Therefore, Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 do not apply to the proposed project.

In addition, all construction activities for the proposed project (approximately 18 months) would be subject to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code) (Noise Ordinance), which regulates construction noise. The Noise Ordinance requires construction work to be conducted in the following manner: (1) noise levels of construction equipment, other than impact tools, must not exceed 80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the source (the equipment generating the noise); (2) impact tools must have intake and exhaust mufflers that are approved by the Director of Public Works (PW) or the Director of the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) to best accomplish maximum noise reduction; and (3) if the noise from the construction work would exceed the ambient noise levels at the site property line by 5 dBA, the work must not be conducted between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. unless the Director of PW authorizes a special permit for conducting the work during that period.

DBI is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance for private construction projects during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.). The Police Department is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance during all other hours. Nonetheless, during the construction period for the proposed project of approximately 18 months, occupants of the nearby properties could be disturbed by construction noise. Times may occur when noise could interfere with indoor activities in nearby residences and other businesses near the project site. The increase in noise in the project area during project construction would not be considered a significant impact of the proposed project, because the construction noise would be temporary, intermittent, and restricted in occurrence and level, as the contractor would be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance, which would reduce construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Operational Noise

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5 addresses impacts related to individual projects that include uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise in the project

¹⁶ Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-3, F-4, and F-6 address the siting of sensitive land uses in noisy environments. In a decision issued on December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require an agency to consider the effects of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project's future users or residents except where a project or its residents may exacerbate existing environmental hazards (*California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District*, December 17, 2015, Case No. S213478. Available at: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/opinions/documents/S213478.PDF>). As noted above, the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* determined that incremental increases in traffic-related noise attributable to implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would be less than significant, and thus would not exacerbate the existing noise environment. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measures F-3, F-4, and F-6 are not applicable. Nonetheless, for all noise sensitive uses, the general requirements for adequate interior noise levels of Mitigation Measures F-3 and F-4 are met by compliance with the acoustical standards required under the California Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations Title 24).

vicinity. As the proposed project includes new PDR uses, Mitigation Measure F-5 applies to the proposed project. An acoustical study was performed for the proposed project to analyze the potential noise impacts of proposed PDR uses on nearby sensitive receptors.¹⁷ In accordance with Mitigation Measure F-5, the noise analysis reviewed noise-sensitive uses (primarily residential uses) within 900 feet of the proposed project and included recommendations to reduce operational noise impacts to nearby residential uses to the levels required by the Noise Ordinance (Section 2909 of the San Francisco Police Code). According to the acoustical study, if the proposed project includes STC 28 rated windows at the PDR spaces (along Florida and Bryant Street facades), noise levels perceived by nearby sensitive receptors would comply with the Noise Ordinance. The project sponsor has agreed to accept the recommendations of the acoustical study into project design. Implementation of Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5 would ensure the proposed project would not substantially increase the ambient noise environment and noise impacts resulting from the proposed project would be less than significant. See the full text of Mitigation Measure F-5 (**Project Mitigation Measure 2**) in Mitigation Measures Section below.

The proposed project would be subject to the following interior noise standards, which are described for informational purposes. The acoustical requirements of Title 24 are incorporated into the San Francisco Green Building Code. Title 24 allows the project sponsor to choose between a prescriptive or performance-based acoustical requirement for non-residential uses. Both compliance methods require wall, floor/ceiling, and window assemblies to meet certain sound transmission class or outdoor-indoor sound transmission class ratings to ensure that adequate interior noise standards are achieved. In compliance with Title 24, DBI would review the final building plans to ensure that the building wall, floor/ceiling, and window assemblies meet Title 24 acoustical requirements. If determined necessary by DBI, a detailed acoustical analysis of the exterior wall and window assemblies may be required.

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, within two miles of a public airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, topic 12e and f from the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G is not applicable.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant noise impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
6. AIR QUALITY—Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

¹⁷ Charles Salter Associates, 1850 Bryant Street San Francisco California Noise Mitigation Measure F-5 Analysis, April 24, 2017.

Topics:	Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site	Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR	Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information	No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified potentially significant air quality impacts resulting from construction activities and impacts to sensitive land uses¹⁸ as a result of exposure to elevated levels of diesel particulate matter (DPM) and other toxic air contaminants (TACs). The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified four mitigation measures that would reduce these air quality impacts to less-than-significant levels and stated that with implementation of identified mitigation measures, the Area Plan would be consistent with the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy, the applicable air quality plan at that time. All other air quality impacts were found to be less than significant.

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 addresses air quality impacts during construction, and PEIR Mitigation Measures G-3 and G-4 address proposed uses that would emit DPM and other TACs.¹⁹

Construction Dust Control

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 Construction Air Quality requires individual projects involving construction activities to include dust control measures and to maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions of particulates and other pollutants. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors subsequently approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes, generally referred to as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008). The intent of the Construction Dust Control Ordinance is to reduce the quantity of fugitive dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of on-site workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by DBI. Project-related construction activities would result in construction dust, primarily from ground-disturbing activities.

For projects over one half-acre, such as the proposed project, the Dust Control Ordinance requires that the project sponsor submit a Dust Control Plan for approval by the San Francisco Department of Public Health. DBI will not issue a building permit without written notification from the Director of Public

¹⁸ The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) considers sensitive receptors as: children, adults or seniors occupying or residing in: 1) residential dwellings, including apartments, houses, condominiums, 2) schools, colleges, and universities, 3) daycares, 4) hospitals, and 5) senior care facilities. BAAQMD, Recommended Methods for Screening and Modeling Local Risks and Hazards, May 2011, page 12.

¹⁹ The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also includes Mitigation Measure G-2, which has been superseded by Health Code Article 38, as discussed below, and is no longer applicable.

Health that the applicant has a site-specific Dust Control Plan, unless the Director waives the requirement. The site-specific Dust Control Plan would require the project sponsor to implement additional dust control measures such as installation of dust curtains and windbreaks and to provide independent third-party inspections and monitoring, provide a public complaint hotline, and suspend construction during high wind conditions.

The regulations and procedures set forth by the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance would ensure that construction dust impacts would not be significant. These requirements supersede the dust control provisions of PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1. Therefore, the portion of PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 Construction Air Quality that addresses dust control is no longer applicable to the proposed project.

Criteria Air Pollutants

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. These air pollutants are termed criteria air pollutants because they are regulated by developing specific public health- and welfare-based criteria as the basis for setting permissible levels. In general, the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB) experiences low concentrations of most pollutants when compared to federal or state standards. The SFBAAB is designated as either in attainment²⁰ or unclassified for most criteria pollutants with the exception of ozone, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀, for which these pollutants are designated as non-attainment for either the state or federal standards. By its very nature, regional air pollution is largely a cumulative impact in that no single project is sufficient in size to, by itself, result in non-attainment of air quality standards. Instead, a project's individual emissions contribute to existing cumulative air quality impacts. If a project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is considerable, then the project's impact on air quality would be considered significant.

While the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that at a program-level the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in significant regional air quality impacts, the PEIR states that "Individual development projects undertaken in the future pursuant to the new zoning and area plans would be subject to a significance determination based on the BAAQMD's quantitative thresholds for individual projects."²¹ The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) prepared updated *2011 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* (Air Quality Guidelines),²² which provided new methodologies for analyzing air quality impacts. The Air Quality Guidelines also provide thresholds of significance for those criteria air pollutants that the SFBAAB is in non-attainment. These thresholds of significance are used by the City.

Construction

Construction activities from the proposed project would result in the emission of criteria air pollutants from equipment exhaust, construction-related vehicular activity, and construction worker automobile trips. Construction of the proposed project would occur over an approximately 437 working days. Construction-related criteria air pollutants generated by the proposed project were quantified using the

²¹ San Francisco Planning Department, Eastern Neighborhood's Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report. See page 346. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=4003>. Accessed June 4, 2014.

²² Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, updated May 2011. See pp. 3-2 to 3-3..

California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) and provided within an Air Quality Technical Memorandum.²³ The model was developed, including default data (e.g., emission factors, meteorology, etc.) in collaboration with California air districts' staff. Default assumptions were used where project-specific information was unknown. Emissions were converted from tons/year to lbs/day using the estimated construction duration of 437 working days.

Table 2: Daily Project Construction Emissions

	Pollutant Emissions (Average Pounds per Day)			
	ROG	NOx	Exhaust PM ₁₀	Exhaust PM _{2.5}
Unmitigated Project Emissions	13.35	14	0.67	0.62
Significance Threshold	54.0	54.0	82.0	54.0

Emissions over threshold levels are in **bold**.

Source: BAAQMD, 2011; San Francisco Planning Department

As shown in Table 2, above, unmitigated project construction emissions would be below the threshold of significance for ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. Therefore, air quality impacts would be less than significant.

Operation

The proposed project would generate criteria pollutant emissions associated with vehicle traffic (mobile sources), on-site area sources (i.e., natural gas combustion for space and water heating, and combustion of other fuels by building and grounds maintenance equipment), and energy usage. Operational-related criteria air pollutants generated by the proposed project were also quantified using CalEEMod and provided within an Air Quality Technical Memorandum. Default assumptions were used where project-specific information was unknown.

The daily and annual emissions associated with operation of the proposed project are shown in Table 3. Table 3 also includes the thresholds of significance the City utilizes.

Table 3: Summary of Operational Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

	ROG	NOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Project Average Daily Emissions (lbs/day)	23.32	36.5	0.65	0.6
Significance Threshold (lbs/day)	54	54	82	54
Project Maximum Annual Emissions (tpy)	4.26	6.66	0.0	0.0
Significance Threshold (tpy)	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0

lbs/day = pounds per day

tpy = tons per year

Source: BAAQMD, 2011; San Francisco Planning Department

²³ San Francisco Planning Department, *Air Quality Memorandum, Project File 2015.011211ENV 1850 Bryant Street, April 20, 2017.*

As shown in Table 3, the proposed project would not exceed the threshold of significance for operational criteria air pollutant emissions. For these reasons, implementation of the proposed project would not result in either project-level or cumulative significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to contribution to violations of air quality standards or substantial increases in non-attainment criteria air pollutants.

Health Risk

Since certification of the PEIR, San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes, generally referred to as the Enhanced Ventilation Required for Urban Infill Sensitive Use Developments or Health Code, Article 38 (Ordinance 224-14, amended December 8, 2014)(Article 38). The purpose of Article 38 is to protect the public health and welfare by establishing an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone and imposing an enhanced ventilation requirement for all urban infill sensitive use development within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone as defined in Article 38 are areas that, based on modeling of all known air pollutant sources, exceed health protective standards for cumulative PM_{2.5} concentration, cumulative excess cancer risk, and incorporates health vulnerability factors and proximity to freeways. Projects within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone require special consideration to determine whether the project's activities would expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations or add emissions to areas already adversely affected by poor air quality.

Construction

The project site is not located within an identified Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. Therefore, the ambient health risk to sensitive receptors from air pollutants is not considered substantial and the remainder of Mitigation Measure G-1 that requires the minimization of construction exhaust emissions is not applicable to the proposed project.

Siting New Sources

The proposed project would not be expected to generate 100 trucks per day or 40 refrigerated trucks per day. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-3 is not applicable. In addition, the proposed project would not include any sources that would emit DPM or other TACs. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-4 is not applicable and impacts related to siting new sources of pollutants would be less than significant.

For the above reasons, none of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR air quality mitigation measures are applicable to the proposed project and the project would not result in significant air quality impacts that were not identified in the PEIR.

Topics:	Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site	Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR	Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information	No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS—				
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR assessed the GHG emissions that could result from rezoning of the Mission Area Plan under the three rezoning options. The Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning Options A, B, and C are anticipated to result in GHG emissions on the order of 4.2, 4.3 and 4.5 metric tons of CO₂E²⁴ per service population,²⁵ respectively. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that the resulting GHG emissions from the three options analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans would be less than significant. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The BAAQMD has prepared guidelines and methodologies for analyzing GHGs. These guidelines are consistent with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.4 and 15183.5 which address the analysis and determination of significant impacts from a proposed project's GHG emissions and allow for projects that are consistent with an adopted GHG reduction strategy to conclude that the project's GHG impact is less than significant. San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*²⁶ presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy in compliance with the BAAQMD and CEQA guidelines. These GHG reduction actions have resulted in a 23.3 percent reduction in GHG emissions in 2012 compared to 1990 levels,²⁷ exceeding the year 2020 reduction goals outlined in the BAAQMD's *2010 Clean Air Plan*,²⁸ Executive Order S-3-05²⁹, and Assembly Bill 32 (also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act).^{30,31} In addition, San Francisco's GHG reduction goals are consistent with, or more aggressive than, the long-term goals

²⁴ CO₂E, defined as equivalent Carbon Dioxide, is a quantity that describes other greenhouse gases in terms of the amount of Carbon Dioxide that would have an equal global warming potential.

²⁵ Memorandum from Jessica Range to Environmental Planning staff, Greenhouse Gas Analyses for Community Plan Exemptions in Eastern Neighborhoods, April 20, 2010. This memorandum provides an overview of the GHG analysis conducted for the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and provides an analysis of the emissions using a service population (equivalent of total number of residents and employees) metric.

²⁶ San Francisco Planning Department, *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions in San Francisco*, November 2010. Available at http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/GHG_Reduction_Strategy.pdf, accessed March 3, 2016.

²⁷ ICF International, *Technical Review of the 2012 Community-wide Inventory for the City and County of San Francisco*, January 21, 2015.

²⁸ Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Clean Air Plan*, September 2010. Available at <http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/air-quality-plans/current-plans>, accessed March 3, 2016.

²⁹ Office of the Governor, *Executive Order S-3-05*, June 1, 2005. Available at <https://www.gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=1861>, accessed March 3, 2016.

³⁰ California Legislative Information, *Assembly Bill 32*, September 27, 2006. Available at http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/05-06/bill/asm/ab_0001-0050/ab_32_bill_20060927_chaptered.pdf, accessed March 3, 2016.

³¹ Executive Order S-3-05, Assembly Bill 32, and the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan set a target of reducing GHG emissions to below 1990 levels by year 2020.

established under Executive Orders S-3-05³² and B-30-15.^{33,34} Therefore, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's GHG Reduction Strategy would not result in GHG emissions that would have a significant effect on the environment and would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations.

The proposed project would increase the intensity of use of the site by increasing the number of users and visitors to the site. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to annual long-term increases in GHGs as a result of increased vehicle trips (mobile sources) and commercial operations that result in an increase in energy use, water use, wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal. Construction activities would also result in temporary increases in GHG emissions.

The proposed project would be subject to regulations adopted to reduce GHG emissions as identified in the GHG reduction strategy. As discussed below, compliance with the applicable regulations would reduce the project's GHG emissions related to transportation, energy use, waste disposal, wood burning, and use of refrigerants.

Compliance with the City's Commuter Benefits Program, Emergency Ride Home Program, Transportation Sustainability Fee, bicycle parking requirements, and low-emission car parking requirements would reduce the proposed project's transportation-related emissions. These regulations reduce GHG emissions from single-occupancy vehicles by promoting the use of alternative transportation modes with zero or lower GHG emissions on a per capita basis.

The proposed project would be required to comply with the energy efficiency requirements of the City's Green Building Code, Stormwater Management Ordinance, Water Efficient Irrigation ordinances, and Energy Conservation Ordinance, which would promote energy and water efficiency, thereby reducing the proposed project's energy-related GHG emissions.³⁵ Additionally, the project would be required to meet the renewable energy criteria of the Green Building Code, further reducing the project's energy-related GHG emissions.

The proposed project's waste-related emissions would be reduced through compliance with the City's Recycling and Composting Ordinance, Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Ordinance, and Green Building Code requirements. These regulations reduce the amount of materials sent to a landfill, reducing GHGs emitted by landfill operations. These regulations also promote reuse of materials, conserving their embodied energy³⁶ and reducing the energy required to produce new materials.

³² Executive Order S-3-05 sets forth a series of target dates by which statewide emissions of GHGs need to be progressively reduced, as follows: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels (approximately 457 million MTCO₂E); by 2020, reduce emissions to 1990 levels (approximately 427 million MTCO₂E); and by 2050 reduce emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels (approximately 85 million MTCO₂E).

³³ Office of the Governor, *Executive Order B-30-15, April 29, 2015*. Available at <https://www.gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=18938>, accessed March 3, 2016. Executive Order B-30-15 sets a state GHG emissions reduction goal of 40 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2030.

³⁴ San Francisco's GHG reduction goals are codified in Section 902 of the Environment Code and include: (i) by 2008, determine City GHG emissions for year 1990; (ii) by 2017, reduce GHG emissions by 25 percent below 1990 levels; (iii) by 2025, reduce GHG emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels; and by 2050, reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels.

³⁵ Compliance with water conservation measures reduce the energy (and GHG emissions) required to convey, pump and treat water required for the project.

³⁶ Embodied energy is the total energy required for the extraction, processing, manufacture and delivery of building materials to the building site.

Compliance with the City's Street Tree Planting requirements would serve to increase carbon sequestration. This regulation would require the project to plant 18 trees, or pay an in-lieu fee or provide in-lieu landscaping. The project proposes to plant 13 trees. Existing infrastructure and utilities would prevent the project from being able to plant the full number of trees required under this ordinance. Therefore, the project sponsor will either pay an in-lieu fee or comply with the in-lieu landscaping option, as required by PW during the permit review process. Therefore, the project would comply with this regulation. Other regulations, including those limiting refrigerant emissions and the Wood Burning Fireplace Ordinance would reduce emissions of GHGs and black carbon, respectively. Regulations requiring low-emitting finishes would reduce volatile organic compounds (VOCs).³⁷ Thus, the proposed project was determined to be consistent with San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy.³⁸

Therefore, the proposed project's GHG emissions would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations. Furthermore, the proposed project is within the scope of the development evaluated in the PEIR and would not result in impacts associated with GHG emissions beyond those disclosed in the PEIR. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant GHG emissions that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Topics:	Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site	Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR	Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information	No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR
8. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:				
a) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Wind

Based upon experience of the Planning Department in reviewing wind analyses and expert opinion on other projects, it is generally (but not always) the case that projects under 80 feet in height do not have the potential to generate significant wind impacts. Although the proposed 68-foot-tall building would be taller than the immediately adjacent buildings, it would be similar in height to existing buildings in the surrounding area. For the above reasons, the proposed project is not anticipated to cause significant impacts related to wind that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Shadow

Planning Code Section 295 generally prohibits new structures above 40 feet in height that would cast additional shadows on open space that is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park

³⁷ While not a GHG, VOCs are precursor pollutants that form ground level ozone. Increased ground level ozone is an anticipated effect of future global warming that would result in added health effects locally. Reducing VOC emissions would reduce the anticipated local effects of global warming.

³⁸ San Francisco Planning Department, *Greenhouse Gas Analysis: Compliance Checklist for 1850 Bryant Street*, April 11, 2017.

Commission between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, at any time of the year, unless that shadow would not result in a significant adverse effect on the use of the open space. Under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, sites surrounding parks could be redeveloped with taller buildings without triggering Section 295 of the Planning Code because certain parks are not subject to Section 295 of the Planning Code (i.e., under jurisdiction of departments other than the Recreation and Parks Department or privately owned). The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR could not conclude if the rezoning and community plans would result in less-than-significant shadow impacts because the feasibility of complete mitigation for potential new shadow impacts of unknown proposals could not be determined at that time. Therefore, the PEIR determined shadow impacts to be significant and unavoidable. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.


The proposed project would construct a 68-foot-tall building; therefore, the Planning Department prepared a preliminary shadow fan analysis a shadow analysis to determine whether the project would have the potential to cast new shadow on nearby parks. The shadow fan study determined that the proposed project has the potential to cast shadow on Franklin Square Park, a Recreation and Parks property covered under Section 295 of the Planning Code. Therefore, a more detailed shadow analysis was prepared for the proposed project.³⁹ According to the shadow analysis, new shadow cast by the proposed project would fall on Franklin Square Park from approximately November 1st to February 8th, in the afternoon hours only and generally only in the southwest portion of the park. New shadows would occur no earlier than 2:45pm and would, in all instances, be gone by 4:15pm. The longest period of new shadow would be 1 hour and 17 minutes. The new shadow cast by the proposed project would increase the annual square foot hours of shadow on the park by 0.00896%.⁴⁰

The largest new shadow cast would be approximately 3,550 square feet in size and would occur at around 4:00pm on December 21st. This new shadow would cover approximately 1.85% of the total square footage of the park. The shortest period of new shadow would be 12 minutes (occurring on November 1st and February 8th) and the longest period of new shadow would be 1 hour and 17 minutes (occurring on December 20th). The proposed project would not create new shadow on the soccer field, but would shade the southern pathway near the play area and portions of the southernmost softscape play area (see Figure 10). New shadow would not reach most of the main play areas, the slides, the sandbox, swings or climbing animals.

³⁹ CADP. *1850 Bryant Shadow Analysis*, April 17, 2017.

⁴⁰ Franklin Square Park has 719,447,098 square feet hours of Theoretically Available Annual Sunlight (TAAS), which is an estimated amount of sunlight that could fall on the park each year if there were no trees, buildings or other obstructions casting shadows. The proposed project would add 64,485 square feet hours of shadow per year, resulting in a 0.00896% decrease in the TAAS.

Figure 10: Worst Shadow Day: December 21st



The proposed project would also shade portions of nearby streets and sidewalks and private property at times within the project vicinity. Shadows upon streets and sidewalks would not exceed levels commonly expected in urban areas and would be considered a less-than-significant effect under CEQA. Although occupants of nearby property may regard the increase in shadow as undesirable, the limited increase in shading of private properties as a result of the proposed project would not be considered a significant impact under CEQA.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to shadow that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
9. RECREATION—Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Physically degrade existing recreational resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in substantial or accelerated deterioration of existing recreational resources or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may have an adverse effect on the environment. No mitigation measures related to recreational resources were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. However, the PEIR identified Improvement Measure H-1: Support for Upgrades to Existing Recreation Facilities. This improvement measure calls for the City to implement funding mechanisms for an ongoing program to repair, upgrade and adequately maintain park and recreation facilities to ensure the safety of users.

As part of the Eastern Neighborhoods adoption, the City adopted impact fees for development in Eastern Neighborhoods that goes towards funding recreation and open space. Since certification of the PEIR, the voters of San Francisco passed the 2012 San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond providing the Recreation and Parks Department an additional \$195 million to continue capital projects for the renovation and repair of parks, recreation, and open space assets. This funding is being utilized for improvements and expansion to Garfield Square, South Park, Potrero Hill Recreation Center, Warm Water Cove Park, and Pier 70 Parks Shoreline within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area. The impact fees and the 2012 San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond are funding measures similar to that described in PEIR Improvement Measure H-1: Support for Upgrades to Existing Recreation Facilities.

An update of the Recreation and Open Space Element (ROSE) of the General Plan was adopted in April 2014. The amended ROSE provides a 20-year vision for open spaces in the City. It includes information

and policies about accessing, acquiring, funding, and managing open spaces in San Francisco. The amended ROSE identifies areas within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area for acquisition and the locations where new open spaces and open space connections should be built, consistent with PEIR Improvement Measure H-2: Support for New Open Space. Two of these open spaces, Daggett Park and at 17th and Folsom, are both set to open in 2017. In addition, the amended ROSE identifies the role of both the Better Streets Plan (refer to "Transportation" section for description) and the Green Connections Network in open space and recreation. Green Connections are special streets and paths that connect people to parks, open spaces, and the waterfront, while enhancing the ecology of the street environment. Six routes identified within the Green Connections Network cross the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area: Mission to Peaks (Route 6); Noe Valley to Central Waterfront (Route 8), a portion of which has been conceptually designed; Tenderloin to Potrero (Route 18); Downtown to Mission Bay (Route 19); Folsom, Mission Creek to McLaren (Route 20); and Shoreline (Route 24).

As the proposed project would not degrade recreational facilities and is consistent with the development density established under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on recreation beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Topics:	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
10. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that would serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact to the provision of water, wastewater collection and treatment, and solid waste collection and disposal. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

Since certification of the PEIR, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) adopted the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) in June 2011. The UWMP update includes city-wide demand projections to the year 2035, compares available water supplies to meet demand and presents water demand management measures to reduce long-term water demand. Additionally, the UWMP update includes a discussion of the conservation requirement set forth in Senate Bill 7 passed in November 2009 mandating a statewide 20% reduction in per capita water use by 2020. The UWMP includes a quantification of the SFPUC's water use reduction targets and plan for meeting these objectives. The UWMP projects sufficient water supply in normal years and a supply shortfall during prolonged droughts. Plans are in place to institute varying degrees of water conservation and rationing as needed in response to severe droughts.

In addition, the SFPUC is in the process of implementing the Sewer System Improvement Program, which is a 20-year, multi-billion dollar citywide upgrade to the City's sewer and stormwater infrastructure to ensure a reliable and seismically safe system. The program includes planned improvements that will serve development in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area including at the Southeast Treatment Plant, the Central Bayside System, and green infrastructure projects, such as the Mission and Valencia Green Gateway.

As the proposed project is consistent with the development density established under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on utilities and service systems beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
----------------	---	--	--	--

11. PUBLIC SERVICES—Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services such as fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other services? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered public services, including fire protection, police protection, and public schools. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

As the proposed project is consistent with the development density established under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, the project would not result in new or substantially more

severe impacts on the physical environment associated with the provision of public services beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

As discussed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area is in a developed urban environment that does not provide native natural habitat for any rare or endangered plant or animal species. There are no riparian corridors, estuaries, marshes, or wetlands in the Plan Area that could be affected by the development anticipated under the Area Plan. In addition, development envisioned under the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan would not substantially interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory wildlife species. For these reasons, the PEIR concluded that implementation of the Area Plan would not result in significant impacts on biological resources, and no mitigation measures were identified.

The project site is located within Mission Plan area of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan and therefore, does not support habitat for any candidate, sensitive or special status species. As such,

implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to biological resources not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
13. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that implementation of the Plan would indirectly increase the population that would be subject to an earthquake, including seismically induced ground-shaking, liquefaction, and landslides. The PEIR also noted that new development is generally safer than comparable older development due to improvements in building codes and construction techniques. Compliance with applicable codes and recommendations made in project-specific geotechnical analyses would not eliminate earthquake risks, but would reduce them to an acceptable level, given the seismically active characteristics of the Bay Area. Thus, the PEIR concluded that implementation of the Plan would not result in significant impacts with regard to geology, and no mitigation measures were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

A geotechnical investigation was prepared for the proposed project.⁴¹ The report concluded that the proposed project could be developed as planned, provided the recommendations presented in the report are incorporated into the project plans and specifications and properly implemented during construction. The project site is not in a liquefaction zone and is underlain by generally non-expansive, dense sandy materials. Based on communication with the project sponsor, the most likely foundation type for the proposed project would be a mat slab, which is consistent with recommendations put forward in the geotechnical report.⁴²

The project is required to conform to the San Francisco Building Code, which ensures the safety of all new construction in the City. DBI will review the project-specific geotechnical report during its review of the building permit for the project. In addition, DBI may require additional site specific soils report(s) through the building permit application process, as needed. The DBI requirement for a geotechnical report and review of the building permit application pursuant to DBI's implementation of the Building Code would ensure that the proposed project would have no significant impacts related to soils, seismic or other geological hazards.

In light of the above, the proposed project would not result in a significant effect related to seismic and geologic hazards. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to geology and soils that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Topics:	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
14. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY—Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

⁴¹ GeoForensics, Inc. *Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed New Commercial Building at the Bryant Street Property*, August, 2015.

⁴² Email from Suzanne Brown, Equity Community Builders, to Justin Horner, Planning Department, January 6, 2016.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact on hydrology and water quality, including the combined sewer system and the potential for combined sewer outflows. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The proposed project would construct a 68-foot commercial building on a site currently occupied entirely by structures and a surface parking and storage lot. The proposed project would therefore not increase impervious surfaces on the project site. As a result, the proposed project would not increase stormwater runoff.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS—Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR noted that implementation of any of the proposed project's rezoning options would encourage construction of new development within the project area. The PEIR found that there is a high potential to encounter hazardous materials during construction activities in many parts of the project area because of the presence of 1906 earthquake fill, previous and current land uses associated with the use of hazardous materials, and known or suspected hazardous materials cleanup cases. However, the PEIR found that existing regulations for facility closure, Underground Storage Tank (UST) closure, and investigation and cleanup of soil and groundwater would ensure implementation of measures to protect workers and the community from exposure to hazardous materials during construction.

Hazardous Building Materials

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that future development in the Plan Area may involve demolition or renovation of existing structures containing hazardous building materials. Some building materials commonly used in older buildings could present a public health risk if disturbed during an accident or during demolition or renovation of an existing building. Hazardous building materials addressed in the PEIR include asbestos, electrical equipment such as transformers and fluorescent light ballasts that contain PCBs or di (2 ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), fluorescent lights containing mercury vapors, and lead-based paints. Asbestos and lead based paint may also present a health risk to existing building occupants if they are in a deteriorated condition. If removed during demolition of a building, these materials would also require special disposal procedures. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified a significant impact associated with hazardous building materials including PCBs, DEHP, and mercury and determined that that Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials, as outlined below, would reduce effects to a less-than-significant level. Because the proposed development includes

demolition of an existing building that may contain hazardous materials, Mitigation Measure L-1 would apply to the proposed project. See full text of Mitigation Measure L-1 (Project Mitigation Measure 3) in the Mitigation Measures Section below.

Soil and Groundwater Contamination

Since certification of the PEIR, Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance, was expanded to include properties throughout the City where there is potential to encounter hazardous materials, primarily industrial zoning districts, sites with industrial uses or underground storage tanks, sites with historic bay fill, and sites in close proximity to freeways or underground storage tanks. The over-arching goal of the Maher Ordinance is to protect public health and safety by requiring appropriate handling, treatment, disposal and when necessary, remediation of contaminated soils that are encountered in the building construction process. Projects that disturb 50 cubic yards or more of soil that are located on sites with potentially hazardous soil or groundwater within Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area are subject to this ordinance.

The proposed project would include 40,000 cubic yards of excavation to a depth of approximately 30 feet along Bryant Street and 15 feet along Florida Street. Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH). The Maher Ordinance requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6.

Where such analysis reveals the presence of hazardous substances in excess of state or federal standards, the project sponsor is required to submit a site mitigation plan (SMP) to the DPH or other appropriate state or federal agency(ies), and to remediate any site contamination in accordance with an approved SMP prior to the issuance of any building permit.

In compliance with the Maher Ordinance, the project sponsor has submitted a Maher Application to DPH⁴³ and a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) has been prepared to assess the potential for site contamination and the level of exposure risk associated with the project.⁴⁴ The Phase I did not reveal evidence of recognized environmental conditions in connection with the property, although it did note, at the time the report was prepared, that there was a lack of adequate secondary containment for several substances in use on the property, including diesel fuel, motor oil, hydraulic oil, paint and propane. While the Phase I is ten years old, its conclusions regarding subsurface conditions remain valid as no excavation, soil disturbance or any change in subsurface conditions has been noted in the past ten years. As part of compliance with the Maher Ordinance, DPH will review the Phase I and will require additional observations and analysis if conditions or new information warrant. Based on that information, the project sponsor may be required to conduct soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis.

The proposed project would be required to remediate potential soil and/or groundwater contamination revealed subsequent to the submission of the Maher Application, as described above in accordance with Article 22A of the Health Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to hazardous materials that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

⁴³ Maher Ordinance Application, dated March 29, 2017.

⁴⁴ AEI Consultants, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment 1850 Bryant Street San Francisco, CA 94110*, November 30, 2007.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
16. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the Area Plan would facilitate the construction of both new residential units and commercial buildings. Development of these uses would not result in use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy in a wasteful manner or in the context of energy use throughout the City and region. The energy demand for individual buildings would be typical for such projects and would meet, or exceed, current state and local codes and standards concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations enforced by DBI. The Plan Area does not include any natural resources routinely extracted and the rezoning does not result in any natural resource extraction programs. Therefore, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that implementation of the Area Plan would not result in a significant impact on mineral and energy resources. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

As the proposed project is consistent with the development density established under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on mineral and energy resources beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
17. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Topics:	Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site	Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR	Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information	No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that no agricultural resources exist in the Area Plan; therefore the rezoning and community plans would have no effect on agricultural resources. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR did not analyze the effects on forest resources.

As the proposed project is consistent with the development density established under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on agriculture and forest resources beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Project Mitigation Measure 1: Archeological Monitoring Program (Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Mitigation Measure J-2): Based on the reasonable potential that archeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of an archaeological consultant from the rotational Department Qualified Archaeological Consultants List (QACL) maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist. The project sponsor shall contact the Department archaeologist to obtain the names and contact information for the next three archeological consultants on the QACL. The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological monitoring program. All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of *construction* can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Sect. 15064.5 (a) and (c).

Consultation with Descendant Communities: On discovery of an archeological site⁴⁵ associated with descendant Native Americans or the Overseas Chinese an appropriate representative⁴⁶ of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to consult with ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated archeological site. A copy of the Final Archaeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group.

Archeological monitoring program (AMP). The archeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:

- The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the project archeologist shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the potential risk these activities pose to archaeological resources and to their depositional context;
- The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource;
- The archaeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with the archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits;
- The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis;
- If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction crews and heavy equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall, after making a

⁴⁵ By the term "archeological site" is intended here to minimally include any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

⁴⁶ An "appropriate representative" of the descendant group is here defined to mean, in the case of Native Americans, any individual listed in the current Native American Contact List for the City and County of San Francisco maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission and in the case of the Overseas Chinese, the Chinese Historical Society of America.

reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.

If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:

- A) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or
- B) An archeological data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.

If an archeological data recovery program is required by the ERO, the archeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The project archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP. The archeological consultant shall prepare a draft ADRP that shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

- *Field Methods and Procedures.* Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations.
- *Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis.* Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures.
- *Discard and Deaccession Policy.* Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies.
- *Interpretive Program.* Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archeological data recovery program.
- *Security Measures.* Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities.
- *Final Report.* Description of proposed report format and distribution of results.
- *Curation.* Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities.

Human Remains, Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects. The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal Laws, including immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission

(NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, ERO, and MLD shall have up to but not beyond six days of discovery to make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects with appropriate dignity (CEQA Guidelines. Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, curation, possession, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. Nothing in existing State regulations or in this mitigation measure compels the project sponsor and the ERO to accept recommendations of an MLD. The archeological consultant shall retain possession of any Native American human remains and associated or unassociated burial objects until completion of any scientific analyses of the human remains or objects as specified in the treatment agreement if such as agreement has been made or, otherwise, as determined by the archeological consultant and the ERO.

Final Archeological Resources Report. The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the draft final report.

Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound, one unbound and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

Project Mitigation Measure 2: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses (Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Mitigation Measure F-5): To reduce potential conflicts between existing sensitive receptors and new noise-generating uses, for new development including commercial, industrial or other uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise, either short-term, at nighttime, or as a 24-hour average, in the proposed project site vicinity, the Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-sensitive uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes), prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the proposed use would comply with the use compatibility requirements in the General Plan and in Police Code Section 2909I, would not adversely affect nearby noise-sensitive uses, and that there are no particular circumstances about the proposed project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels that would be generated by the proposed use. Should such concerns be present, the Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action.

Project Mitigation Measure 3: Hazardous Building Materials (Eastern Neighborhoods Plan EIR Mitigation Measure L-1): The project sponsor shall ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyl (PCBs) or Di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEPH), such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.

Franklin Square Owners Assoc.

1850

CHECK NO.	CHECK DATE	VENDOR NO.
1850	06/14/17	SFPLA

c/o CFM, Inc. (925) 566-6800
60 Mayhew Way
Walnut Creek CA 94597

Community Association Banc
1665 W. Alameda Drive
Tempe AZ 85282

43923/1222

FIVE HUNDRED SEVENTY-EIGHT DOLLARS and 00 CENTS

CHECK AMOUNT
\$*****578.00

BY THE ORDER OF San Francisco Planning Dept *****
1650 Mission St. Suite 400
San Francisco CA 94103

John Lawrence

RECEIVED BY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2017 JUL -3 PM 2:12

From: [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#)
To: [bpatel@lubinolson.com](#); [doug@rossconstruction.com](#); [thor@commongrounddev.com](#)
Cc: [Givner, Jon \(CAT\)](#); [Stacy, Kate \(CAT\)](#); [Byrne, Marlena \(CAT\)](#); [Rahaim, John \(CPC\)](#); [Sanchez, Scott \(CPC\)](#); [Gibson, Lisa \(CPC\)](#); [Rodgers, AnMarie \(CPC\)](#); [Starr, Aaron \(CPC\)](#); [Navarrete, Joy \(CPC\)](#); [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#); [Jain, Devyani \(CPC\)](#); [Horner, Justin \(CPC\)](#); [Ajello Hoagland, Linda \(CPC\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [mindy.bacharach@commongrounddev.com](#); [mrclogan@gmail.com](#); [adele@laurencemanagement.com](#); [thor@commongrounddev.com](#); [BOS Legislation. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: HEARING NOTICE: Exemption Determination Appeal - Proposed Project at 1850 Bryant Street - Appeal Hearing on July 25, 2017
Date: Tuesday, July 11, 2017 1:27:33 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Good afternoon,

The Office of the Clerk of the Board has scheduled an appeal hearing for Special Order before the Board of Supervisors on **July 25, 2017, at 3:00 p.m.**, to hear an appeal regarding the Exemption Determination for the proposed project at 1850 Bryant Street.

Please find the following link to the hearing notice for the matter:

[Hearing Notice - July 25, 2017](#)

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

[Board of Supervisors File No. 170804](#)

Thank you,

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

brent.jalipa@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco will hold a public hearing to consider the following appeal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:

Date: Tuesday, July 25, 2017

Time: 3:00 p.m.

Location: Legislative Chamber, City Hall, Room 250
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett, Place, San Francisco, CA

Subject: File No. 170804. Hearing of persons interested in or objecting to the determination of exemption from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act issued as a Community Plan Evaluation on May 10, 2017, approved on June 1, 2017, for the proposed project at 1850 Bryant Street, to demolish an existing two-story building, and construct new five-story, 68-foot-tall building, totaling 187,416 gross square feet that includes 18,652 gross square feet of Production, Distribution and Repair, 166,483 gross square feet of Social Service/Community Facility, and 2,281 gross square feet of ground-floor retail Commercial uses; including 89 off-street; two car share, four service vehicle; and one truck loading parking space; 30 Class 1 and 15 Class 2 bike parking spaces; in the PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution & Repair - 1 - General) Zoning District and 68-X Height and Bulk District. (District 9) (Appellant: Bijal Patel, on behalf of Franklin Square Owners Association) (Filed July 3, 2017)

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102. Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board and agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, July 21, 2017.



Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

PROOF OF MAILING

Legislative File No. 170804

Description of Items: Public Hearing Notice - Hearing - Appeal of CEQA Exemption Determination - Proposed Project at 1850 Bryant Street


I, Brent Jalipa, an employee of the City and County of San Francisco, mailed the above described document(s) by depositing the sealed items with the United States Postal Service (USPS) with the postage fully prepaid as follows:

Date: July 11, 2017

Time: 8:45 a.m.

USPS Location: Repro Pick-up Box in the Clerk of the Board's Office (Rm 244)

Mailbox/Mailslot Pick-Up Times (if applicable): N/A

Signature: 

Instructions: Upon completion, original must be filed in the above referenced file.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

July 10, 2017

File No. 170804

Planning Case No. 2015-011211 ENV

Received from the Board of Supervisors Clerk's Office one check, in the amount of Five Hundred Seventy Eight Dollars (\$578) representing the filing fee paid by Bijal Patel, on behalf of the Franklin Square Owners Association, for the appeal of the CEQA Exemption Determination for the proposed project at 1850 Bryant Street.

Planning Department

By:

Tony

Print Name

[Signature] 7/11/17

Signature and Date

From: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
To: bpatel@lubinolson.com; doug@rossconstruction.com; thor@commongrounddev.com
Cc: [Givner, Jon \(CAT\)](#); [Stacy, Kate \(CAT\)](#); [Byrne, Marlena \(CAT\)](#); [Rahaim, John \(CPC\)](#); [Sanchez, Scott \(CPC\)](#); [Gibson, Lisa \(CPC\)](#); [Rodgers, AnMarie \(CPC\)](#); [Starr, Aaron \(CPC\)](#); [Navarrete, Joy \(CPC\)](#); [Lynch, Laura \(CPC\)](#); [Jain, Devyani \(CPC\)](#); [Horner, Justin \(CPC\)](#); [Ajello Hoagland, Linda \(CPC\)](#); [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); mindy.bacharach@commongrounddev.com; mrclogan@gmail.com; adele@laurencemanagement.com; thor@commongrounddev.com
Subject: Exemption Determination Appeal - Proposed Project at 1850 Bryant Street - Appeal Hearing on July 25, 2017
Date: Friday, July 07, 2017 5:20:19 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Good afternoon,

The Office of the Clerk of the Board has scheduled an appeal hearing for Special Order before the Board of Supervisors on **July 25, 2017, at 3:00 p.m.** Please find linked below a letter of appeal filed for the proposed project at 1850 Bryant Street, as well as direct links to the Planning Department's timely filing determination, and an informational letter from the Clerk of the Board.

[Exemption Determination Appeal Letter - July 3, 2017](#)

[Planning Department Memo - July 5, 2017](#)

[Clerk of the Board Letter - July 6, 2017](#)

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

[Board of Supervisors File No. 170804](#)

Please note that the hearing date is swiftly approaching. Our office must notice this appeal hearing on Tuesday, July 11, 2017. If you have any special recipients for the hearing notice, kindly provide a list of addresses for interested parties to us in Excel spreadsheet format as soon as possible.

Thank you,

Brent Jalipa

Legislative Clerk

Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-7712 | Fax: (415) 554-5163

brent.jalipa@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the




SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: July 5, 2017

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer
 Devyani Jain, Acting Environmental Review Officer 

RE: Appeal timeliness determination – 1850 Bryant Street, Planning Department Case No. 2015-011211E

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

Reception:
 415.558.6378

Fax:
 415.558.6409

Planning
 Information:
 415.558.6377

An appeal of the Community Plan Evaluation (CPE) for the proposed project at 1850 Bryant Street (Planning Department Case No. 2015-011211E) was filed with the Office of the Clerk of the Board on July 3, 2017 by Bijal Patel, on behalf of the Franklin Square Owners Association.


Timeline: The Certificate of Determination for the project at 1850 Bryant Street was issued on May 10, 2017. The Approval Action for the project was the issuance of a Conditional Use Authorization by the Planning Commission, as provided for in Planning Code Section 210.3 and 303, which occurred on June 1, 2017 (Date of the Approval Action).

Timeliness Determination: Section 31.16(a) and (e) of the San Francisco Administrative Code states that any person or entity may appeal an exemption (including CPE) determination to the Board of Supervisors during the time period beginning with the date of the exemption (including CPE) determination and ending 30 days after the Date of the Approval Action.

The 30th day after the Date of the Approval Action was Saturday, July 1, 2017. It has been the practice of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, when the 30th day falls on a weekend, to accept appeals up until the close of business of the following weekday. The appeal of the above Community Plan Evaluation (CPE) determination was filed on Monday, July 3, 2017 which is within the time frame specified above. Therefore the appeal is considered timely.

Section 31.16(b)(4) of the San Francisco Administrative Code states that the Clerk of the Board shall schedule the appeal hearing no less than 21 days and no more than 45 days following expiration of the specified time period for filing of the appeal.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 415-554-5184
Fax No. 415-554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 415-554-5227

July 6, 2017

Bijal Patel
Lubin Olson & Niewiadomski, LLP
The Transamerica Pyramid
600 Montgomery Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111

Subject: Appeal of CEQA Exemption Determination - Proposed Project at 1850 Bryant Street

Dear Ms. Patel:

The Office of the Clerk of the Board is in receipt of a memorandum dated July 5, 2017, from the Planning Department regarding their determination on the timely filing of appeal of the CEQA Exemption Determination for the proposed project at 1850 Bryant Street.

The Planning Department has determined that the appeal was filed in a timely manner.

Pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 31.16, a hearing date has been scheduled for **Tuesday, July 25, 2017, at 3:00 p.m.**, at the Board of Supervisors meeting to be held in City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Legislative Chamber, Room 250, San Francisco, CA 94102.

Please provide to the Clerk's Office by noon:

20 days prior to the hearing: names and addresses of interested parties to be notified of the hearing, in spreadsheet format; and

11 days prior to the hearing: any documentation which you may want available to the Board members prior to the hearing.


For the above, the Clerk's office requests one electronic file (sent to bos.legislation@sfgov.org) and two copies of the documentation for distribution.

Continues on next page

NOTE: If electronic versions of the documentation are not available, please submit 18 hard copies of the materials to the Clerk's Office for distribution. If you are unable to make the deadlines prescribed above, it is your responsibility to ensure that all parties receive copies of the materials.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Legislative Clerks Brent Jalipa at (415) 554-7712, or Lisa Lew at (415) 554-7718.

Very truly yours,


Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

- c: Douglas Ross, Project Sponsor, Ross Construction
- Thor Kaslofsky, Project Sponsor, Common Ground Development
- Jon Givner, Deputy City Attorney
- Kate Stacy, Deputy City Attorney
- Marlena Byrne, Deputy City Attorney
- John Rahaim, Planning Director
- Scott Sanchez, Zoning Administrator, Planning Department
- Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer, Planning Department
- Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs, Planning Department
- AnMarie Rodgers, Senior Policy Advisor, Planning Department
- Joy Navarrete, Environmental Planning
- Jeanie Poling, Environmental Planning
- Justin Horner, Staff Contact, Planning Department
- Linda Ajello Hoagland, Staff Contact, Planning Department
- Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary

Lew, Lisa (BOS)

From: Lew, Lisa (BOS)
Sent: Monday, July 03, 2017 3:16 PM
To: Rahaim, John (CPC)
Cc: Givner, Jon (CAT); Stacy, Kate (CAT); 'Marlena.Byrne@sfgov.org'; Sanchez, Scott (CPC); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Jain, Devyani (CPC); Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); Starr, Aaron (CPC); Horner, Justin (CPC); Ionin, Jonas (CPC); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: Appeal of CEQA Exemption Determination - Proposed Project at 1850 Bryant Street - Timeliness Determination Request
Attachments: COB Ltr 070317.pdf; Appeal Ltr 070317.pdf

Greetings Director Rahaim:

The Office of the Clerk of the Board is in receipt of an appeal of the CEQA Exemption Determination for the proposed project at 1850 Bryant Street. The appeal was filed by Bijal Patel on behalf of Franklin Square Owners Association on July 3, 2017.

Please find the attached letter of appeal and timely filing determination request letter from the Clerk of the Board.

Kindly review for timely filing determination.

Regards,

Lisa Lew

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
P 415-554-7718 | F 415-554-5163
lisa.lew@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.


BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

July 3, 2017

To: John Rahaim
Planning Director

From:  Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Subject: Appeal of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Determination of Exemption from Environmental Review - 1850 Bryant Street

An appeal of the CEQA Determination of Exemption from Environmental Review for the proposed project at 1850 Bryant Street was filed with the Office of the Clerk of the Board by Bijal Patel on behalf of Franklin Square Owners Association on July 3, 2017.

Pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 31.16, I am forwarding this appeal, with attached documents, to the Planning Department to determine if the appeal has been filed in a timely manner. The Planning Department's determination should be made within three (3) working days of receipt of this request.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Legislative Clerks Brent Jalipa at (415) 554-7712, or Lisa Lew at (415) 554-7718.

c: Jon Givner, Deputy City Attorney
Kate Stacy, Deputy City Attorney
Marlena Byrne, Deputy City Attorney
Scott Sanchez, Zoning Administrator, Planning Department
Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer, Planning Department
Devjani Jain, Acting Environmental Review Officer, Planning Department
AnMarie Rodgers, Senior Policy Advisor, Planning Department
Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs, Planning Department
Justin Horner, Staff Contact, Planning Department
Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary, Planning Department

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor

Time stamp
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- 1. For reference to Committee. (An Ordinance, Resolution, Motion, or Charter Amendment)
- 2. Request for next printed agenda Without Reference to Committee.
- 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.
- 4. Request for letter beginning "Supervisor [] inquires"
- 5. City Attorney request.
- 6. Call File No. [] from Committee.
- 7. Budget Analyst request (attach written motion).
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No. []
- 9. Reactivate File No. []
- 10. Question(s) submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on []

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

- Small Business Commission Youth Commission Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission Building Inspection Commission

Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use a Imperative Form.

Sponsor(s):

Clerk of the Board

Subject:

Hearing - Appeal of Community Plan Evaluation - 1850 Bryant Street

The text is listed below or attached:

Hearing of persons interested in or objecting to a Community Plan Evaluation issued by the Planning Department under the California Environmental Quality Act on May 10, 2017, for the proposed project at 1850 Bryant Street, approved on June 1, 2017, to demolish an existing two-story building, and construct new five-story, 68-foot-tall building, totaling 187,416 gross square feet that includes 18,652 gross square feet of Production, Distribution and Repair, 166,483 gross square feet of Social Service/Community Facility, and 2,281 gross square feet of ground-floor retail Commercial uses; including 89 off-street; two car share, four service vehicle, and one truck loading parking space; 30 Class 1 and 15 Class 2 bike parking spaces; in the PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution & Repair - 1 - General) Zoning District and 68-X Height and Bulk District. (District 9) (Appellant: Bijal Patel, on behalf of Franklin Square Owners Association) (Filed July 3, 2017)

