San Francisco Planning

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
628.652.7600
www.sfplanning.org

ATTACHMENT A

SAN FRANCISCO GATEWAY PROJECT

749 Toland Avenue and 2000 McKinnon Street

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS:
FINDINGS OF FACT, EVALUATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND ALTERNATIVES

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION

MAY 22, 2025

PREAMBLE

In determining to approve the San Francisco Gateway Project located at 749 Toland Avenue and 2000 McKinnon Street ("Project"), as described in Section I.A, Project Description, the San Francisco Planning Commission (the "Commission") makes and adopts the following findings of fact and decisions regarding the Project description and objectives, significant impacts, mitigation measures, and alternatives, based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding and pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Section 21000 *et seq.* ("CEQA"), particularly Section 21081 and 21081.5, the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 *et seq.* ("CEQA Guidelines"), particularly Sections 15091 through 15093, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code ("Chapter 31"). The Commission adopts these findings in conjunction with the Approval Actions described in Section I(c), below, as required by CEQA, separate and apart from the Commission's certification of the Project's Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR"), which the Commission certified prior to adopting these CEQA findings.

This document is organized as follows:

Section I provides a description of the Project proposed for adoption, Project objectives, the environmental review process for the Project, the City approval actions to be taken and the location and custodian of the record;

Section II identifies the impacts found not to be significant that do not require mitigation;

Section III identifies potentially significant impacts that can be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through the mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR and sets forth findings as to the mitigation measures;

Section IV identifies that there would not be any significant impacts that cannot be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels;

Section V identifies the project alternatives that were analyzed in the Final EIR and discusses the reasons for their rejection; and

Section VI presents the San Francisco Planning Commission's (the "Commission's") determination that, because the Project will have no impacts that remain significant and unavoidable with incorporation of mitigation measures, no statement of overriding considerations is warranted for the Project.

The Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR") and the Comments and Responses document ("RTC") together comprise the Final EIR (or "FEIR"). Attachment B to the Planning Commission Motion contains the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"), which provides a table setting forth the full text of each mitigation measure listed in the Final EIR that is required to reduce a significant adverse impact. The MMRP (Attachment B) is required by CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. The MMRP also specifies the party responsible for implementation of each mitigation measure and establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule.

These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the entire record before the Commission. The references set forth in these findings to certain pages or sections of the Final EIR, are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these findings.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION, OBJECTIVES, ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS, APPROVAL ACTIONS, AND RECORDS

A. Project Description.

1. Project Location and Site Characteristics.

The approximately 743,800-gross-square-foot (17.1 gross total acres) Project site is in the Bayview neighborhood of San Francisco, California and is located in the PDR-2 Zoning District and the 65-J Height and Bulk district. The street addresses of the existing buildings are 749 Toland Street and 2000 McKinnon Avenue. The Project site consists of Assessor's Block 5284A, Lot 008, and Block 5287, Lot 002. The Project site is currently occupied by four single-story structures totaling approximately 448,000 square feet of PDR space, and is relatively flat and rectangular. As shown in Figure 2.C-2 and Figure 2.C-3 in the Draft EIR (pp. 2-5 and 2-6), the Project site is fully developed, is covered in impermeable surfaces, and contains a small amount of vegetation and no street trees.

The Project site is bounded by Kirkwood Avenue to the north, Rankin Street to the east, McKinnon Avenue to the south, and Toland Street to the west. An elevated portion of Interstate 280 (I-280) bisects the Project site, running in a north-south direction above the existing Selby Street right-of-way; the uppermost roadbed deck is approximately 55 feet above-grade. The Project site parcels owned by the Project sponsor include portions of the surrounding paved streets (i.e. portions of Kirkwood and McKinnon Avenues, and Rankin, Selby, and Toland Streets).

2. Project Characteristics.

The Project would construct two new multi-story PDR buildings that would provide new PDR space in the industrial area of the Bayview neighborhood of San Francisco. The Project would demolish the existing four PDR buildings onsite and would construct two new three-story buildings, totaling approximately 1,646,000 gross square feet of enclosed floor area, or 2,160,000 gross square feet including active roofs. The Project would construct new sidewalks along the site's perimeter, including Selby Street, and would create seven new curb cuts for access to each new building (14 total). The new sidewalks would be designed in accordance with San Francisco's Better Streets Plan standards for industrial roads. The Project also would include a total of approximately 543,500 gross square feet of parking, on the first story and an active roof of each building. Approximately 1,125 parking spaces for standard automobiles would be provided, and each building would include 36 loading dock doors at level 1 with additional tenant-specific loading on the upper levels. The Project would provide 116 bicycle parking spaces in total: 100 Class 1 and 16 Class 2 spaces.

The proposed buildings would be taller than the 65 feet allowed by the existing 65-J Height and Bulk district; therefore, approval of a Height and Bulk district Zoning Map Amendment would be required for the Project. As such, the Project requires approval of an ordinance to allow proposed modifications to the existing Height and Bulk district. The Project also requires the approval of a Zoning Map Amendment and Planning Code Text Amendment to establish a new Special Use District

a. Proposed Buildings.

The proposed building west of I-280 at 749 Toland Street is identified as "Building A," and the proposed building east of I-280 at 2000 McKinnon Street is identified as "Building B." Each building would have a

maximum height of approximately 97 feet (115 feet with rooftop appurtenances included). Buildings A and B would be approximately the same size, shape, and dimensions, and would be oriented similarly on site. Both Building A and Building B would include three levels of PDR space with direct access to vehicle circulation, logistics yards, and rooftop parking, vehicle staging, and storage. Each of these two buildings would include a one-way ramp system designed to provide full-service, upper-level truck access and PDR spaces for its tenants. In addition, a total of approximately 8,400 gross square feet of ground floor retail space and 35,000 gross square feet of ground-floor maker space would be included in the two buildings. The active roof would be a screened, open-air, multipurpose deck that could be used for materials staging and vehicle staging for box trucks, vans, and personal vehicles.

b. Proposed Project Uses and Analyzed Tenant Use Mix.

The Project sponsor proposes to build a flexible PDR space that could accommodate an evolving mix of users or tenants for a 100-year period or longer. The Project includes PDR (and other uses principally permitted in the PDR-2 zoning district) and retail uses. The Project sponsor has proposed a Special Use District that would retain all principally or conditionally permitted uses within the PDR-2 Zoning District with the exception that Parcel Delivery Service and Private Parking Garage (with exceptions set forth in the SUD) uses will be principally permitted. The SUD would modify the use size limitations listed in Planning Code Section 210.3A, increasing the maximum use size of non-accessory retail uses from 2,500 square feet per lot (5,000 square feet total) to 8,500 square feet of retail space district-wide; and clarify the maximum allowable number of vehicle parking spaces.

Given that there are no identified tenants at this time, the draft EIR describes and analyzes a mix of PDR uses that are likely to occur based on the Project Sponsor's familiarity with leasing trends for PDR facilities in San Francisco and the Bay Area and that represent reasonably conservative assumptions about possible tenants' environmental impacts. The term "Project" means the construction and operation of the San Francisco Gateway facility, the operation of which is based on the analyzed tenant use mix, and the related streetscape improvements. The analyzed tenant use mix for the purpose of the Project's environmental review is identified in the following table:

San Francisco Gateway Project Analyzed Tenant Use Mix (by square feet)

Uses below are a combination of areas in buildings A and B					
Uses	**Level 1**	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Roof**	**Project Total**
PDR Uses					
Light Manufacturing/Maker	35,000	0	0	0	35,000
Parcel Delivery/Last Mile	0	381,000	369,600	8,800	759,400
Wholesale and Storage	372,400	0	0	0	372,400
PDR Support Spaces					
Logistics Yard	0	72,400	73,400	0	145,800
Vehicle/Pedestrian Circulation	69,700	112,800	95,400	17,600	295,500
Parking	55,900	0	0	487,600	543,500
Retail	8,400	0	0	0	8,400
Total – Including Active Roof	***541,400***	***566,200***	***538,400***	***514,000***	**2,160,000**
Total – Not Including Active Roof				--	**1,646,000**

While other uses, such as laboratory and certain automotive uses, are principally or conditionally permitted in both the existing PDR-2 zoning and proposed SUD, only the uses listed in the table above are specifically included in the San Francisco Gateway Project's analyzed tenant use mix. However, the SUD establishes a use consistency review process to ensure that site and/or building permits are consistent with the Project's Development Agreement; the Planning Code; the Project entitlement's conditions of approval, including the mitigation measures adopted as part of the Project's approval; and the EIR. If the uses are not consistent, further analysis may be required pursuant to CEQA.

c. Sustainability

The Project has been designed to be sustainable and resilient by providing flexible PDR space that could accommodate an evolving mix of tenants or users for a 100-year period or longer. Additionally, the Project would seek LEED Gold certification or higher. Buildings A and B would be designed to contain sustainability features such as a rooftop screen containing a solar array. This array would be sized to meet the San Francisco Better Roof Ordinance requirements and would generate electricity that could be used to offset the electrical use of the building, and/or the electric vehicles housed and/or visiting the site. In addition, all docking stations would be designed to support electric plug-in of trucks to reduce idling time during loading and unloading of trucks serving future land uses on site, thereby further minimizing onsite idling and resultant fuel use. Additional features to achieve LEED Gold certification would include the use of sustainable building materials, water- and energy-efficient mechanisms in the building design, bicycle facilities to encourage alternate modes of transportation, and indoor air quality measures to ensure tenant safety.

d. Streetscape Improvements

Proposed on-street parking would consist of 217 diagonal and parallel striped parking stalls. As set forth in the Infrastructure Plan attached as Exhibit P to the Development Agreement, the Project Sponsor shall continue to work with Planning Department staff, in consultation with other City agencies, to refine the design and programming of the Streetscape Plan so that the plan generally meets the standards of the Better Streets Plan and all applicable City standards. For each phase of the Project, the Project Sponsor shall submit a Street Improvement Permit application for all required street improvements prior to issuance of a building permit, and shall complete construction of all required street improvements prior to issuance of temporary certificate of occupancy for a building, except as otherwise provided in the Development Agreement.

Pursuant to the Better Streets Plan, the Project would provide streetscape improvements to the streets immediately adjacent to the Project site. The Project area is classified as an industrial street type under this plan, and would require new sidewalks, street trees, stormwater control measures, and accessible curb ramps. There are currently no sidewalks adjacent to the Project site. Pursuant to Public Works Code Section 806(d), the Project would be required to provide 216 street trees along the Project's 4,300 linear feet of street frontages, or to pay the appropriate in-lieu fees. Due to Project and site constraints (e.g., curb cuts, I-280 overpass, line-of-sight restrictions, and location of site utilities), the Project Sponsor would plant approximately 124 street trees and pay the corresponding in-lieu fee for the remaining required trees that cannot be accommodated on site. These 124 street trees would be consistent with the Better Streets Plan, and subject to review and approval by the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Urban Forestry. The nine street trees on the eastern sidewalk of Toland Street along the northern half of the building (from the Building A entrance to Kirkwood Street) would serve as wind mitigation measures,

based on the wind impact analysis conducted for the Project and described in the initial study (see draft EIR Appendix B, Initial Study, Section E.9, Wind); they would be approximately 25-foot-tall evergreen street trees with a 15-foot-diameter canopy.

The streetscape improvements to Toland Street would involve constructing a new 10-foot-wide sidewalk with street trees. An approximately 6-foot-wide, mid-block *bulb-out* with planters and street trees would be constructed along the main pedestrian entrance. This portion of the sidewalk would be 16 feet wide. The Project would provide an improved vehicular travel lane. In addition, two approximately 34-foot-wide driveways would be added along Toland Street to provide vehicular access onto the site. This portion of Toland Street would be resurfaced.

Along Kirkwood Avenue, a new 12-foot-wide sidewalk would be constructed, and street trees would be installed adjacent to the Project site. Each building would provide two 24-foot-wide curb cuts to access the PDR and/or maker space loading areas. The Project would provide an improved vehicular travel lane and a curb and gutter system on the northern side of Kirkwood Avenue. The full width of Kirkwood Avenue along the Project limits would be resurfaced.

Along Rankin Street, new 10-foot-wide sidewalks with street trees would be installed. An approximately 6-foot-wide, mid-block bulb-out with planters and street trees would be constructed along the main pedestrian entrance. This portion of sidewalk would be 16 feet wide. The Project would provide an improved vehicular travel lane and up to five striped parallel spaces. In addition, one approximately 34-foot-wide driveway and one approximately 50-foot-wide driveway would be added along Rankin Street to provide site access. This portion of Rankin Street would be resurfaced.

Along McKinnon Avenue, a new 12-foot-wide sidewalk would be constructed, and street trees would be installed adjacent to the Project site. Two approximately 6-foot-wide, mid-block bulb-outs with planters and street trees would be installed adjacent to each building's retail space. These two portions of the sidewalk would be 18 feet wide. Each building would provide a 40-foot-wide curb cut to provide site access. The Project would provide an improved vehicular travel lane, and the portions of McKinnon Avenue that extend from the centerline of the right-of-way and the site would be resurfaced.

e. Transportation Demand Management Plan.

The findings for San Francisco Planning Code Section 169 related to TDM plans state: "For Projects that use Development Agreements and may not be required to comply fully with the requirements of Section 169, it is the San Francisco Board of Supervisors' (Board of Supervisors') strong preference that Development Agreements should include similar provisions that meet the goals of the TDM Program." The Project Sponsor has committed to meet the goals of the TDM program by achieving a baseline required point target of 10 points per building, plus 6 points per building between 50-75% approved parking, and 12 points per building if a building exceeds 75% of its approved number of parking stalls (22 points total per building at project buildout). These commitments exceed the standard requirements pursuant to Planning Code Section 169 for a Project proposing PDR land uses.

Additional TDM requirements of the Project are specified in the Development Agreement, Exhibit J.

f. Construction Activities.

Construction would include demolition and site preparation, grading and ground improvements, building construction, building envelope and interior buildout, sitework, and startup and commissioning.

The Project's foundation design is expected to be concrete spread footings and/or grade beams on improved and engineered soil, with excavation for the foundations likely to extend 10 feet below existing grade. Typical foundation excavation is expected to extend to 7 feet below-grade, with elevator pits and utility trenching extending to 10 feet below existing grade.

Ground improvements, such as stone columns, drill displacement columns, geopiers, soil-cement mixing, or other similar methods, would provide vertical support through the existing soils to strengthen the undocumented fill that underlies the Project site. Using drill rigs, approximately 7,000 vibratory replacement stone columns or drill displacement columns would be extended 25 feet deep, and approximately 900 auger cast piles would be extended 60 feet deep to support the buildings on site. The Project would not require pile-driving activities. Approximately 140,600 cubic yards of soil would be excavated for the Project. Of this total, approximately 42,600 cubic yards would be improved and reused, and the remaining 98,000 cubic yards would be exported off site. Ground improvements, such as extended piles, stone columns, drill displacement columns, geopiers, soil-cement mixing, or other similar methods, would provide vertical support through the existing soils to strengthen the undocumented fill that underlies the Project site. The Project would import approximately 2,000 cubic yards of soil to the site. At least four underground storage tanks were historically present on the Project site along Selby Street, and one additional underground storage tank may have been present near the site's easternmost corner. Although the number of underground storage tanks present on site is not known, the Project sponsor will coordinate with the San Francisco Department of Public Health and comply with all permit requirements under the city's Hazardous Materials and Waste Program, which may result in the need for soil excavation and remediation activities. The total soil excavation volume (140,600 cubic yards) and the total volume of exported soil off site (98,000 cubic yards) included in the estimates above accounts for potential excavation, export, and remediation activities.

Because of the presence of shallow groundwater 3 to 6 feet below ground surface, temporary dewatering and shoring of utility trenches is anticipated to be required in some areas of the site.

g. Construction Schedule.

Construction is anticipated to occur over a total of approximately 31 months. The construction of each building would take approximately 27 months; however, the start of construction for Building A would be approximately 4 months before the start of construction for Building B, resulting in a total construction duration of approximately 31 months.

Construction work would typically occur five to six workdays per week for eight hours per day. Nighttime construction activities are anticipated to occur during specific phases of building construction—specifically, the building envelope and interior buildout phase, and the sitework phase. Nighttime construction activities, as defined by article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code, are construction activities occurring between 8 p.m. and 7 a.m. The Project Sponsor must obtain a permit from the San Francisco Public Works or the Department of Building Inspection (building department) to extend construction activities beyond the allowable construction hours (7 a.m. to 8 p.m.).

The total number of temporary/short-term workers during the approximate 31-month duration of

construction is anticipated to range from approximately 2,500 to 3,000.

3. Expanded Streetscape Variant

The Expanded Streetscape Variant is the project proposed for approval.

An Expanded Streetscape Variant was analyzed in the draft EIR in the event the identified improvements are carried out by the Project Sponsor or other parties in the future. The Expanded Streetscape Variant would include the same land uses and site plan as the Project, but would improve the remainder of adjacent public rights-of-way to Better Streets standards. The Expanded Streetscape Variant would include improvements from the center line of each adjacent street outward to the property line of the adjacent lots. These improvements would include new roadway surfaces, curb cuts, sidewalks, street trees, and other amenities.

Along Toland Street, between Kirkwood and McKinnon Avenues, the Expanded Streetscape Variant would include resurfacing the western (southbound) side of the street. It would include extending the existing 10-foot sidewalk and planting approximately 13 street trees from the Kirkwood intersection to the McKinnon intersection. New curb ramps would be provided at both sides of the Toland Place intersection. Curb ramps and crosswalks would be provided at the southern and western sides of the Toland Street and McKinnon Avenue intersection. Five curb cuts of varying widths (24 to 40 feet) would be provided to maintain existing building access points.

Along Kirkwood Avenue, between Toland and Rankin streets, the Expanded Streetscape Variant would include building a 12-foot sidewalk, and planting approximately 55 street trees on the northern side of the street.

Along Rankin Street, between Kirkwood and McKinnon avenues, the eastern (northbound) side of the street would be resurfaced. A 10-foot sidewalk with approximately 11 street trees and curb and gutter would connect the existing sidewalk at 901 Rankin Street to McKinnon Avenue. One approximately 30-foot-wide curb cut would be added to maintain existing access to the 1900 Newcomb Avenue site.

Along McKinnon Avenue, between Selby and Toland streets, the Expanded Streetscape Variant would include resurfacing the southern side of the street, installing a new curb and gutter, providing approximately 16 back-in diagonal parking spaces, and building a 12-foot sidewalk with approximately 17 street trees. Six approximately 24-foot-wide curb cuts would be added to maintain existing access to properties on the southern side of McKinnon Avenue. Curb ramps would be included on the southwestern and southeastern corners of the intersection with Selby Street. On McKinnon Avenue, between Selby and Rankin streets, the Expanded Streetscape Variant would include resurfacing the southern side of the street, installing a new curb and gutter, and building a 12-foot sidewalk with approximately 12 street trees. Eight curb cuts of varying widths (10 to 50 feet) would be added to maintain existing access to properties on the southern side of McKinnon Avenue.

The maximum depth of ground disturbance associated with the streetscape improvements would be no more than 3 feet. Less than 100,000 square feet of additional surface area would be disturbed as part of the Expanded Streetscape Variant.

For every environmental topic, the environmental impacts of the Expanded Streetscape Variant would be the same as those of the Project as defined in the EIR, and all mitigation measures that would be required

to reduce impacts associated with the Project would also be applicable to the Expanded Streetscape Variant. Accordingly, each of the findings set forth below applies to the Expanded Streetscape Variant in the same manner and to the same extent that it applies to the Project as it is defined in the EIR. As discussed above, the Expanded Streetscape Variant is the project proposed for approval, and all remaining references to the "Project" include the Expanded Streetscape Variant.

B. Project Objectives

The Project Sponsor, Prologis, L.P., would develop the Project. Its underlying objective is to develop a modern, flexible, and durable PDR facility for a diverse and evolving range of uses in a central urban environment. The Project's more specific objectives are to:

1. Advance progress toward the City's long-standing goals to preserve, upgrade, and expand PDR space, including those reflected in the General Plan, Bayview Hunters Point Area Plan, Five-Point Plan for PDR (2012), Make to Manufacture Advanced Manufacturing Playbook (2016), Proposition X (2016), and Economic Recovery Task Force Report (2020).

2. Replace functionally outdated PDR space on the Project site with first- and best-in-class facilities and replenish the supply of PDR space in the City that has been displaced by other development.

3. Redevelop underutilized property to make efficient use of existing utilities, circulation, and complementary uses in the surrounding PDR-2 Zoning District.

4. Use innovative design at a size and scale that accommodates a range of large and small PDR uses, and can adapt over time to different industries and market needs, including anticipated growing demand for parcel delivery and/or last-mile delivery services, in an economically feasible way.

5. Site PDR uses in a dense infill setting to create employment near housing and reduce vehicle miles traveled for potential distribution uses by locating such uses in San Francisco proximate to multiple freeways, rather than traditional suburban locations.

6. Provide a positive fiscal impact by creating jobs at a variety of experience levels, including career-building and advancement opportunities, enhancing property values, generating property taxes, and introducing workers that will support direct and indirect local business growth in the Bayview.

7. Boost resiliency in the local supply chain and disaster response capabilities by providing large-scale, adaptable facilities that can be rapidly mobilized in a central location.

8. Further progress toward local and state goals in transitioning toward carbon-efficient vehicle fleets, building construction, and operations as cost-effective technology becomes available.

9. Create a safe and compelling streetscape, consistent with Better Streets standards, with green infrastructure and active ground floors, accessible by multiple modes of transportation, including bicycles and pedestrians.

C. Environmental Review

The environmental review for the Project is described in Planning Commission Motion No. _____, to

which this Attachment A is attached.

D. Approval Actions.

The Project requires the following approvals:

1. San Francisco Planning Commission Approvals.

- Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to approve the Planning Code Text and Zoning Map Amendments for height district reclassification and to adopt a new Special Use District.
- Approval of a Conditional Use Authorization in accordance with Planning Code Sections 303 and 304 for a Planned Unit Development (PUD).
- Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to approve a Development Agreement.
- Adoption of the proposed Design Standards and Guidelines document.
- Adoption of findings under the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. San Francisco Board of Supervisors Actions.

- Approval of Planning Code Text and Zoning Map Amendments for height district reclassification and to adopt a new Special Use District.
- Approval of the Development Agreement.

3. San Francisco Department of Building Inspection.

- Approval of demolition, grading, and building permits for the demolition of the existing buildings, and construction of the new building.
- Approval of night noise permit for work performed outside the normal 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. construction hours.

4. San Francisco Department of Public Works Actions.

- Approval of a permit to remove and replace street trees adjacent to the Project site, and a partial waiver from Public Works Code section 806(d) to provide fewer street trees than required.
- Approval of Street Improvement Permits for streetscape improvements.
- Approval of one or more encroachment permits and/or overwide driveway permits.
- Approval of night noise permit for work performed outside the normal 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. construction hours.

5. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Actions.

- Approval of temporary use permits during construction.
- Approval of permanent curb modifications, and modifications to the roadway directions and lane configurations on the streets surrounding the Project site.

6. San Francisco Department of the Environment Actions.

- Approval of a Demolition Debris Recovery Plan.

7. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Actions.

- Approval of any changes to sewer laterals.
- Approval of a modified Stormwater Control Plan.
- Approval of an erosion sediment control plan before the start of construction, compliance with post-construction stormwater design guidelines, including a stormwater control plan, new curb and gutter system, cistern design, and groundwater dewatering wells per San Francisco Health Code article 12B (joint approval with the San Francisco Department of Public Health).

8. San Francisco Department of Public Health Actions.

- If applicable, approval of a hazardous materials release plan and inventory program pursuant to San Francisco Health Code articles 21 and 21A.
- Approval of a dust control plan pursuant to San Francisco Building Code section 106 and San Francisco Health Code article 22B.
- Approval of a site mitigation plan and soil mitigation plan in compliance with San Francisco Health Code article 22A (the Maher Ordinance).
- Review and approval of groundwater dewatering wells (joint approval with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission [SFPUC]).

9. Actions By Other Agencies.

a. Bay Area Air Quality Management District Actions.

- Issuance of permits for the installation and operation of emergency generators.
- Approval that the Project complies with the air board's asbestos airborne toxic control measure related to naturally occurring asbestos (if applicable, the preparation and approval of an asbestos dust mitigation plan may be required).
- Certification to the building department that all asbestos-containing building materials have been removed and properly disposed in accordance with the law before demolition of the existing buildings.

- Approval of permits for installation, operation, and testing of individual air pollution sources associated with tenant-specific activities, as required by air district rules and regulations.

b. Caltrans Actions.

- Coordination, review, and issuance of a Caltrans standard encroachment permit.

E. Findings about Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

The following Sections II, III and IV set forth the findings about the determinations of the Final EIR regarding significant environmental impacts and the mitigation measures proposed to address them. These findings provide written analysis and conclusions regarding the environmental impacts of the Project, and the mitigation measures included as part of the Final EIR and adopted as part of the Project.

In making these findings, the opinions of the Planning Department and other City staff and experts, other agencies and members of the public have been considered. These findings recognize that the determination of significance thresholds is a judgment within the discretion of the City and County of San Francisco; the significance thresholds used in the Final EIR are supported by substantial evidence in the record, including the expert opinion of the Final EIR preparers and City staff; and the significance thresholds used in the Final EIR provide reasonable and appropriate means of assessing the significance of the adverse environmental effects of the Project.

These findings do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final EIR. Instead, a full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Final EIR and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the Final EIR supporting the determination regarding the Project impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the determinations and conclusions of the Final EIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, are hereby ratified, adopted and incorporated in these findings, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

As set forth below, the mitigation measures set forth in the Final EIR and the attached MMRP are hereby adopted and incorporated, to substantially lessen or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the Project as indicated. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR has inadvertently been omitted in these findings or the MMRP, such mitigation measure is nevertheless hereby adopted and incorporated in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language describing a mitigation measure set forth in these findings or the MMRP fails to accurately reflect the mitigation measure in the Final EIR due to a clerical error, the language of the mitigation measure as set forth in the Final EIR shall control. The impact numbers and mitigation measure numbers used in these findings reflect the numbers contained in the Final EIR.

These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the entire record before the Planning Commission. The references set forth in these findings to certain pages or sections of the EIR or responses to comments in the Final EIR are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these findings.

II. IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT AND THUS NOT REQUIRING MITIGATION

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Pub. Res. Code § 21002; CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091). As more fully described in the Final EIR and the Initial Study, and based on the evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, , the Planning Commission finds that implementation of the Project would not result in any significant impacts in the following areas and that these impact areas therefore do not require mitigation:

Land Use and Planning

- **Impact LU-1:** The Project would not physically divide an established community. (Initial Study, pp. 56-57)
- **Impact LU-2:** The Project would not cause a significant physical environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. (Initial Study, pp. 57-58)
- **Impact C-LU-1:** The Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to land use and planning. (Initial Study, pp. 58-59)

Population and Housing

- **Impact PH-1:** The Project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth beyond that projected by regional forecasts, either directly or indirectly. (Initial Study, pp. 60-63)
- **Impact C-PH-1:** The Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to population and housing. (Initial Study, p. 63)
- **Impacts Determined in the Initial Study to Be Inapplicable to the Project:** Because there are no residences on the project site, the Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. (Initial Study, p. 60)

Cultural Resources

- **Impact CR-1:** The Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in section 15064.5, including those resources listed in article 10 or article 11 of the planning code. (Initial Study, pp. 64-66)
- **Impact C-CR-1:** The Project would have no cumulative impact on historical resources of the built environment (Initial Study, p. 76)

Transportation and Circulation

- **Impact TR-1**: Construction of the Project would require a substantially extended duration or intense activity due to construction, but the secondary effects of that construction would not create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, or driving, or public transit

operations, or interfere with emergency access or accessibility for people walking or bicycling, or substantially delay public transit. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.B-42 – 3.B-45)

- **Impact TR-2:** Operation of the Project would not create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, or driving, or public transit operations. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.B-46 – 3.B-49)
- **Impact TR-3:** Operation of the Project would not interfere with accessibility of people walking or bicycling to and from the Project site and adjoining areas, or result in inadequate emergency access. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.B-49 – 3.B-50)
- **Impact TR-4:** Operation of the Project would not substantially delay public transit. (Draft EIR, pp.3.B-50 – 3.B-53)
- **Impact TR-5:** Operation of the Project would not cause substantial additional VMT or substantially induce automobile travel. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.B-53 – 3.B-57)
- **Impact TR-6:** Operation of the Project would not result in a loading deficit. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.B-57 – 3.B-59)
- **Impact C-TR-1:** The Project, in combination with cumulative Projects, would not result in significant construction-related transportation impacts. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.B-59 – 3.B-60)
- **Impact C-TR-2:** The Project, in combination with cumulative Projects, would not create potentially hazardous conditions. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.B-60 – 3.B-61)
- **Impact C-TR-3:** The Project, in combination with cumulative Projects, would not interfere with accessibility. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.B-61 – 3.B-62)
- **Impact C-TR-4:** The Project, in combination with cumulative Projects, would not substantially delay public transit. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.B-62 – 3.B-63)
- **Impact C-TR-5:** The Project, in combination with cumulative Projects, would not cause substantial additional VMT or substantially induce automobile travel. (Draft EIR, p. 3.B-63)
- **Impact C-TR-6:** The Project, in combination with cumulative Projects, would not result in significant cumulative loading impacts. (Draft EIR, p. 3.B-64)

Noise

- **Impact NO-1:** Construction of the Project would not generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project area in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.C-26 – 3.C-31)
- **Impact NO-2:** Construction of the Project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.C-31 – 3.C-32)
- **Impact C-NO-1:** Construction of the Project, in combination with construction of cumulative

projects, would not result in the generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.C-48 – 3.C-49)

- **Impact C-NO-2:** Construction of the Project, in combination with construction of cumulative projects, would not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. (Draft EIR, p. 3.C-49)

- **Impact C-NO-3:** Operation of the Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in the generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.C-49 – 3.C-50)

- **Impacts Determined in the Initial Study to Be Inapplicable to the Project:** The Project would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels related to private airstrips or public or public use airports in the Project vicinity. (Initial Study, p. 83)

Air Quality

- **Impact AQ-2:** Construction of the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in a criteria air pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment status under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.D-38 – 3.D-41)

- **Impact AQ-4:** The Project would not result in emissions of fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) and toxic air contaminants (TACs) that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.D-60 – 3.D-70)

- **Impact AQ-5:** The Project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.D-70 – 3.D-71)

- **Impact C-AQ-1:** The Project, in combination with existing conditions and cumulative projects, would result in a significant cumulative health risk impact. The Project's contribution would be less than cumulatively considerable. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.D-71 – 3.D-77)

- **Impact C-AQ-2:** The Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not combine with other sources of emissions, such as those leading to odors, that would adversely affect a substantial number of people. (Draft EIR, p. 3.D-78)

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- **Impact C-GG-1:** The Project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, but not at levels that would result in a significant impact on the environment or conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. (Initial Study, pp. 97-101)

Shadow

- **Impact SH-1:** The Project would not create new shadow in a manner that substantially and adversely affects the use and enjoyment of publicly accessible open spaces. (Initial Study, pp.

114-115)

- **Impact C-SH-1:** The Project, in combination with cumulative projects in the project site vicinity, would result in less-than-significant cumulative shadow impacts. (Initial Study, pp. 115-116)

Recreation

- **Impact RE-1:** The Project would not increase the use of existing parks and recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated. (Initial Study, pp. 117-119)

- **Impact RE-2:** The Project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. (Initial Study, p. 119)

- **Impact C-RE-1:** The Project, in combination with cumulative projects in the vicinity of the project site, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts related to recreation. (Initial Study, pp. 119-120)

Utilities and Service Systems

- **Impact UT-1:** The Project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities that could result in environmental effects beyond those evaluated throughout the initial study. (Initial Study, pp. 121-122)

- **Impact UT-2:** The Project would not exceed the capacity of the Southeast Treatment Plant and would not require the construction of new or expansion of existing wastewater and stormwater treatment facilities. (Initial Study, pp. 122-124)

- **Impact UT-3:** SFPUC has sufficient water supply available to serve the Project and future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. (Initial Study, pp. 124-137)

- **Impact UT-4:** The Project would not generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals, and would comply with applicable waste management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. (Initial Study, pp. 138-141)

- **Impact C-UT-1:** The Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts on utilities and service systems. (Initial Study, pp. 141-142)

Public Services

- **Impact PS-1:** The Project would not result in an increase in demand for police protection, fire protection, schools, or other services to an extent that would require new or physically altered fire, police, school, or other public facilities, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts. (Initial Study, pp. 143-147)

- **Impact C-PS-1:** The Project would have a less-than-significant cumulative impact on public services. (Initial Study, p. 147)

Biological Resources

- **Impact BI-1:** The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or indirectly through habitat modifications, on species or their habitat 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (Initial Study, pp. 149-150)

- **Impact BI-2:** The Project would not 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. (Initial Study, pp. 150-151)

- **Impact BI-3:** The Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. (Initial Study, pp. 151-152)

- **Impact C-BI-1:** The Project in combination with cumulative Projects would not result in cumulative impacts to biological resources. (Initial Study, pp. 152-153)

- **Impacts Determined in the Initial Study to Be Inapplicable to the Project:** The Project would not affect any riparian habitat or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. The Project would not conflict with any adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. (Initial Study, pp. 148-149)

Geology and Soils

- **Impact GE-1:** The Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential adverse effects related to the rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, and seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or landslides. (Initial Study, pp. 162-164)

- **Impact GE-2:** Construction and operation of the Project would not result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil. (Initial Study, pp. 164-165)

- **Impact GE-3:** The Project site is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that could become unstable as a result of the Project. (Initial Study, pp. 165-166)

- **Impact GE-4:** The Project would not create substantial direct or indirect risk to life or property as a result of being located on expansive soils. (Initial Study, pp. 166-167)

- **Impact C-GE-1:** The Project, in combination with cumulative projects in the project site vicinity, would have less-than-significant cumulative impacts related to geology, soils, and seismicity. (Initial Study, pp. 169-170)

- **Impacts Determined in the Initial Study to Be Inapplicable to the Project:** The Project would have no impacts related to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or

alternative wastewater disposal systems, and would not destroy a unique geologic feature. (Initial Study, pp. 154-155)

Hydrology and Water Quality

- **Impact HY-1:** The Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality, create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, or conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan. (Initial Study, pp. 172-176)

- **Impact HY-2:** The Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin or conflict with or obstruct implementation of a sustainable groundwater management plan. (Initial Study, pp. 176-177)

- **Impact HY-3:** The Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite; or impede or redirect flood flows. (Initial Study, pp. 177-178)

- **Impact C-HY-1:** The Project, in combination with cumulative Projects, would not result in cumulative impacts related to hydrology and water quality. (Initial Study, pp. 178-179)

- **Impacts Determined in the Initial Study to Be Inapplicable to the Project:** The Project would not result in a risk of release of pollutants due to Project inundation from flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche. (Initial Study, pp. 171-172)

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- **Impact HZ-1:** The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or 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. (Initial Study, pp. 188-192)

- **Impact HZ-2:** The Project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Initial Study, pp. 193-194)

- **Impact C-HZ-1:** The Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. (Initial Study, p. 194)

- **Impacts Determined in the Initial Study to Be Inapplicable to the Project:** The Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area due to the Project site's location within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport; or expose

people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. (Initial Study, p. 180)

Mineral Resources

- **Impacts Determined in the Initial Study to Be Inapplicable to the Project:** The project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and residents of the state and would not result in the loss of a locally important mineral resources recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan, either individually or cumulatively. (Initial Study, p. 195)

Energy Resources

- **Impact EN-1:** The Project would not result in a significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation; nor would it conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. (Initial Study, pp. 196-200)

- **Impact C-EN-1:** The Project, in combination with cumulative Projects, would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to energy resources. (Initial Study, pp. 200-201)

Agriculture and Forest Resources

- **Impacts Determined in the Initial Study to Be Inapplicable to the Project:** No land in San Francisco has been designated as agricultural land or forest land, and therefore there would be no impacts to agricultural or forest resources. (Initial Study, pp. 202-203)

Wildfire

- **Impacts Determined in the Initial Study to Be Inapplicable to the Project:** The city does not have any state responsibility areas for fire prevention or lands that have been classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. Therefore, this topic is not applicable to the Project . (Initial Study, p. 204)

III. FINDINGS OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS THAT CAN BE AVOIDED OR REDUCED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL THROUGH MITIGATION MEASURES

CEQA requires agencies to adopt mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen a Project's identified significant impacts or potential significant impacts if such measures are feasible (unless mitigation to such levels is achieved through adoption of a Project alternative). The findings in this Section III concern mitigation measures set forth in the Final EIR. These findings discuss mitigation measures as identified in the Final EIR for the Project. The full text of the mitigation measures is contained in the Final EIR and in **Attachment B**, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The impacts identified in this Section III would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR, included in the Project, or imposed as conditions of approval and set forth in **Attachment B.**

The project sponsor has agreed to implement the following mitigation measures to address potential

cultural resource impacts, tribal cultural resource impacts, operational noise impacts, conflicts with the Clean Air Plan, operational air quality impacts (NO_x), project-level and cumulative wind hazard impacts, and paleontological impacts identified in the EIR and the Initial Study. As authorized by CEQA section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines sections 15091, 15092, and 15093, based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Planning Commission finds that, unless otherwise stated, the Project will be required to incorporate mitigation measures identified in the EIR into the Project to mitigate or avoid significant or potentially significant environmental impacts. These mitigation measures will reduce or avoid the potentially significant impacts described in the EIR, and the Planning Commission finds that these mitigation measures are feasible to implement and are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the city to implement or enforce. In addition, the required mitigation measures are fully enforceable and will be included as conditions of approval for project approvals under the Project, as applicable, and also will be enforced through conditions of approval in building permits issued for the Project by the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, as applicable. With the required mitigation measures, these Project impacts would be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level.

The Commission recognizes that some of the mitigation measures are partially within the jurisdiction of other agencies. The Commission urges these agencies to assist in implementing these mitigation measures, and finds that these agencies can and should participate in implementing these mitigation measures.

Cultural Resources

Impact CR-2: The Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to section 15064.5. (Initial Study, pp. 66-75)

The Project site is highly sensitive for near-surface prehistoric resources (that is, on the land surface below any imported fill, as it existed prior to development); moderately sensitive for buried prehistoric resources; and, variably, of very high to very low sensitivity for submerged prehistoric resources. Based on the depth of artificial fill, which geotechnical coring suggests is 14 feet or deeper over most of the Project site, the potential for effects to prehistoric resources from Project grading and excavation may be low, but the potential for impacts to prehistoric resources from pile installation and soil improvements is high to very high. Although the closest known prehistoric resource is more than 600 feet distant from the Project site, the Project location is a former bank on an infilled portion of Islais Creek and its estuary; this area would have been highly attractive for prehistoric occupation, except where the main stem of Islais Creek ran across the Project site prior to infill. Archeological resources are not anticipated on the modern surface, because the Project site sits on land reclaimed from bay marshes with imported fill. However, prehistoric resources that lay at the historic surface and along the shores of the marsh lands could be encountered during Project excavations.

The Project's foundation design would involve concrete spread footings and/or grade beams set on improved and engineered soil, with excavation for the foundations likely to extend 10 feet below existing grade. Typical foundation excavation is expected to extend to 7 feet below grade, with elevator pits and utility trenching extending to 10 feet below existing grade. Although these disturbances are not deep enough to potentially impact deeply buried archeological deposits, they could affect resources buried at shallower depths, depending on the exact depth of twentieth century fill. In addition, it is anticipated that pile foundations would be necessary to support the buildings. Approximately 7,000 25-foot-deep stone columns and approximately 900 60-foot-deep auger-cast piles would be used for the entire site. Each of

these auger cast piles would be extended approximately 60 feet below ground surface, and they would be of sufficient depth to potentially impact deeply buried or submerged prehistoric archeological resources. These proposed ground-disturbing construction activities have the potential to alter in an adverse manner the physical characteristics of archeological resources. Therefore, Project implementation could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to CEQA guidelines section 15064.5, resulting in a significant impact unless mitigated.

Mitigation

Mitigation Measure M-CR-2: Archeological Testing

To reduce potentially significant impacts on prehistoric archaeological resources, Mitigation Measure M-CR-2 would require the project sponsor to retain the services of an archaeologist from the planning department's qualified archaeological consultants list to develop and implement an archaeological testing program.

The Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measure M-CR-2 would reduce Impact CR-2 to a less-than-significant level for the Project.

Impact CR-3: The Project could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. (Initial Study, pp. 75-76)

No known human burials have been identified in the study area. However, the possibility cannot be discounted that human remains could be inadvertently disturbed during Project excavations and pile extension activities in the Project site, given the elevated sensitivity for the area to contain near-surface and deeply buried and submerged prehistoric resources. Therefore, Project implementation could result in impacts on previously undiscovered human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, during ground-disturbing activities. If human remains are discovered during construction, this would be considered a significant impact without mitigation.

Mitigation

Mitigation Measure M-CR-2: Archeological Testing

To reduce potentially significant impacts on human remains, Mitigation Measure M-CR-2 would ensure that the treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soil-disturbing activity complies with applicable state and federal laws.

The Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measure M-CR-2 would reduce Impact CR-3 to a less-than-significant level for the Project .

Impact C-CR-1: The Project , in combination with cumulative Projects, could result in cumulative cultural resource impacts. (Initial Study, pp. 76-77)

Implementation of the Project has the potential to result in significant impacts to as-yet undiscovered buried archeological resources and to human remains, although no archeological resources or human remains are known to be present at the Project site. The immediate Project vicinity is similarly moderately to very highly sensitive for the presence of buried prehistoric archeological resources and

human remains: although there are no known resources in the immediate vicinity, there is a known prehistoric site approximately 600 feet away. If a resource were found to be present at the Project site, it is possible that its extent could include the adjacent Project site, which is where the SF Market Project is proposed. The SF Market Project involves excavation for all Project phases. In the event that both Projects impact an archaeological resource during construction, a significant cumulative impact to the resource could occur. Under these circumstances, the Project and the SF Market could result in significant cumulative impacts on archaeological resources or human remains, and the Project's impact could be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation

Mitigation Measure M-CR-2: Archeological Testing

Compliance with the procedures identified in Mitigation Measure M-CR-2 would ensure that in the event archaeological resources or human remains are discovered on the project site, the important information they represent would be preserved and interpreted to the public. This would ensure that the project's contribution to a significant cumulative archeological and human remains impact would not be cumulatively considerable.

The Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measure M-CR-2 would reduce Impact C-CR-1 to a less-than-significant level for the Project.

Tribal Cultural Resources

Impact TCR-1: The Project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code section 21074. (Initial Study, pp. 78-80)

Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 (Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1(d)), on October 17, 2019, the Planning Department contacted Native American individuals and organizations for the San Francisco area, providing a description of the Project and requesting comments on the identification, presence, and significance of tribal cultural resources in the Project vicinity. During the 30-day comment period, no Native American tribal representatives contacted the Planning Department to request consultation. There is a moderate to high potential that prehistoric archeological resources may be present, buried below the surface of the Project site. Based on prior Native American consultation under AB 52, all archeological sites of Native American origin in San Francisco, including all prehistoric archeological sites, are considered to be potential tribal cultural resources. If tribal cultural resources are disturbed during Project implementation (i.e., through Project excavations or pile extension), this would be considered a significant impact without mitigation.

Mitigation

Mitigation Measure M-CR-2: Archeological Testing

Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1: Tribal Cultural Resources Interpretive Program

Mitigation Measure M-CR-2 would ensure that archaeological resources that may be present in soils that would be disturbed by project construction would be identified and assessed. In the event that archaeological resources are found, they would be assessed to determine whether they constitute

significant tribal cultural resources, and preserved or recovered as appropriate, in accordance with Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1.

The Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measures M-CR-2 and M-TCR-1 would reduce Impact TCR-1 to a less-than-significant level for the Project.

Impact C-TCR-1: The Project , in combination with cumulative Projects, could result in cumulative cultural resource impacts. (Initial Study, pp. 80-81)

As presented under Impact TCR-1, implementation of the Project has the potential to result in significant impacts to buried archeological resources, because this area of San Francisco is considered moderately to highly sensitive for the presence of buried prehistoric archeological resources. Such prehistoric archeological resources could also be tribal cultural resources, as explained above. Although no such resources are known at the Project site and the closest known site is about 400 feet distant, construction activities at Project sites in the immediate vicinity, such as the SF Market project, would have a similar potential to that of the Project to result in significant impacts to buried prehistoric archeological resources that also may be tribal cultural resources. In this situation, a significant cumulative impact could occur. In the event of the discovery during construction of an archaeological resource that is determined to be a tribal cultural resource, the Project's contribution to the cumulative impact would be cumulatively considerable without mitigation.

Mitigation

Mitigation Measure M-CR-2: Archeological Testing

Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1: Tribal Cultural Resources Interpretive Program

Compliance with the procedures identified in Mitigation Measures M-CR-2 and M-TCR-1 would ensure that, if significant tribal cultural resources are discovered, the important values and information represented by these resources would be preserved and/or interpreted to the public in consultation with the affiliated Native American tribal representatives. This would ensure that the project's contribution to a significant cumulative impact on tribal cultural resources would not be cumulatively considerable.

The Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measures M-CR-2 and M-TCR-1 would reduce Impact C-TCR-1 to a less-than-significant level for the Project .

Noise

Impact NO-3: Operation of the Project would result in the generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project area in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.C-33 - 3.C-48)

The area surrounding the Project site to the southeast and east (made up of warehouse, storage, distribution, and SFPUC land uses), would experience the largest traffic noise increase from the Project of 2 dBA. Except in carefully controlled laboratory experiments, a change of only 1 dBA in sound level cannot generally be perceived by the human ear. Outside of the laboratory, a 3 dBA change is considered a barely perceptible difference. Therefore, traffic noise generated by the Project would not result in a substantial

permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Traffic noise impacts resulting from operation of the Project would be less than significant.

Fixed-source noise associated with typical Project operations would include the HVAC systems and testing of the emergency power generator systems. The Project would install two emergency generator units to prevent operational restrictions during periods of grid failure. Each building would be outfitted with a single 440 horsepower (hp) 400 kilovolt ampere (kVA) generator. The noise analysis assumed that these units would be at ground level along the northeastern perimeter of the Project site along Kirkwood Avenue, with an exhaust stack height of 12 feet. The reference noise source level input into the model for each unit was 70 dBA at 23 feet. This level is representative of the 75 percent load reference sound level of a slightly larger, 500 kVA emergency generator. Based on recommendations from the public health department, the analysis evaluates whether the Project's emergency generators would exceed 75 dBA at the property plane or the fixed residential interior noise limits provided in section 2909(d) of the noise ordinance (interior noise limits of 55 dBA between the hours of 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. and 45 dBA between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. at any receptor land use with a dwelling unit). Additionally, testing of emergency generators would occur between the hours of 7 a.m. and 8 p.m. The maximum predicted noise level generated from emergency generator testing and emergency operation at the northeastern property plane was 68 dBA. Therefore, the property plane noise levels from temporary emergency generator testing would be less than significant.

Because specific designs for the HVAC systems have not been prepared and a conservative assessment for CEQA review is appropriate to evaluate a worst-case operational scenario, the fixed-source operational noise analysis assumed an event during which carbon dioxide detection systems on all three Project logistics yard levels would reach ventilation system activation levels. This scenario would result in full-power, simultaneous operation of logistics yard ventilation units throughout both Project buildings. Considering rooftop ventilation unit operation, this worst-case scenario would generate a combined ventilation flow rate of more than 1 million cubic feet per minute.

Project predicted fixed-source noise levels would range from 30 to 37 dBA at the interior locations of the nearest residential structures. These values would not exceed the article 29 (Section 2909[d]) interior noise level limit of 55 dBA Leq during the daytime or 45 dBA Leq during the nighttime. However, predicted fixed-source noise levels due to Project operations would exceed the article 29 property plane noise limit (8 dBA above ambient) at all Project property boundaries by 2 to 16 dBA. Noise expected to be generated by the logistics yard ventilation system is the primary cause of predicted exceedance of the article 29 requirements at elevations below the Project buildings' rooftop heights because they exhaust outward from the building façades.

Without implementation of noise control measures, the Project's fixed-noise sources would result in exceedances of section 2909(b) requirements. Furthermore, as noted in the above description of the Project, the specific tenants that would occupy the building are unknown, and the building is designed to accommodate an assortment of PDR tenants that would change over time in response to economic and technological conditions. Individual tenants may have additional HVAC needs, which are currently unknown. Therefore, it is also possible for individual tenant HVAC systems to exceed the requirements in the noise ordinance. Exceedances of the limits in the noise ordinance would be a significant impact of the Project without mitigation.

Mitigation

Mitigation Measure M-NO-3a: Fixed-Mechanical Equipment Noise Attenuation for Buildings A and B

Mitigation Measure M-NO-3b: Fixed-Source Noise Attenuation for Building Tenants

To achieve compliance with the article 29 requirements and lessen noise from proposed project fixed-source mechanical equipment, Mitigation Measures M-NO-3a and M-NO-3b identify several feasible options to achieve the required noise reduction from the onsite mechanical equipment. The noise-reduction measures identified in Mitigation Measure M-NO-3a would reduce noise levels at the property plane by up to 18 dBA and therefore meet the property plane noise limits of article 29, section 2909(b). Additionally, Mitigation Measure M-NO-3b would ensure that all additional noise-generating equipment required by proposed project tenants would meet the requirements of article 29, sections 2909(b) and 2909(d).

The Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measures M-NO-3a and MM-NO-3b would reduce Impact NO-3 to a less-than-significant level for the Project .

Air Quality

Impact AQ-1: The Project could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2017 Clean Air Plan. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.D-34 – 3.D-37)

The Project is a clean construction Priority Project pursuant to Planning Director Bulletin No. 2, thereby incorporating, at a minimum, equipment that meets Tier 4 interim emissions standards for all equipment greater than 25 hp, which would minimize construction-related exhaust emissions. Furthermore, construction equipment with engines greater than 25 hp would be required to be rated Tier 4 Final, and construction equipment that is readily available as plug-in or battery-electric equipment shall be used instead of diesel-powered equipment during construction, in accordance with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3h. These measures would be consistent with the 2017 Clean Air Plan's MSM-C1, "Construction and Farming Equipment," which encourages the use of various strategies, such as the use of renewable electricity and fuels, to reduce emissions from construction and farming equipment.

The Project would align with the 2017 Clean Air Plan's Energy and Buildings Measures through implementation of existing city policies and additional design features aimed at improving energy efficiency and reducing reliance on nonrenewable energy resources, including elimination of onsite natural gas infrastructure and incorporation of onsite solar power generation. The Project would install a rooftop photovoltaic solar system for onsite electricity generation and would eliminate onsite natural gas infrastructure. The Project would be subject to the provisions of the San Francisco Green Building Code, and therefore would comply with some of the most stringent building energy-related requirements in the country.

The Project would be consistent with numerous control measures of the 2017 Bay Area Clean Air Plan, which demonstrates how the region will improve ambient air quality and achieve the state and federal ambient air quality standards. However, the Project would result in unmitigated operational NO_X emissions that would exceed the thresholds of significance that were established by the air district (discussed further under Impact AQ-3). Because NO_X (an ozone precursor) emissions thresholds would be exceeded on an ongoing basis during Project operations and because the region is in nonattainment for

ozone, the Project would not support one of the Clean Air Plan's primary goals—to reduce regional criteria air pollutant emissions. Therefore, the Project could conflict with the Clean Air Plan, and this impact would be significant without mitigation.

Mitigation

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3a: Electrification of Yard Equipment

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3b: Electrification of Transportation Refrigeration Units

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3c: Prohibition of Truck and Van Idling for More than Two Minutes

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3d: Limitation on Model Year of Visiting Trucks

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3e: Diesel Backup Generator Specifications

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3f: Limitation on Manufacturing and Maker Space Emissions

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3g: Compliance with CalGreen Tier 2 Green Building Standards

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3h: Requirements for Off-Road Construction Equipment

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3i: Development and Implementation of Operational Emission Management Plan

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3h entails implementing additional emissions reduction commitments for the proposed project to minimize construction-related emissions. In addition, as detailed in the discussion of Impact AQ-3, implementation of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3a through M-AQ-3g and M-AQ-3i would reduce operational NO_X emissions to a level that would not exceed the thresholds of significance for NO_X.

The Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3a through M-AQ-3i would reduce impact AQ-1 to a less-than-significant level for the Project .

Impact AQ-3: The Project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in a criteria air pollutant for which the Project region is in nonattainment status under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard. (Draft EIR, pp. 3.D-41 – 3.D-60)

For Project operational emissions at build out (assumed in the analysis to occur as early as 2025), the net increase in emissions of ROG, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10} would not exceed their respective daily or annual significance thresholds. However, the net increase in daily and annual operational emissions of NO_X would exceed the significance thresholds for this criteria air pollutant. Therefore, the Project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in NO_X, for which the Project region is in nonattainment status under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard. This impact would be significant without mitigation.

Over time, it is anticipated that certain emissions control technologies will advance, and air pollutant regulations will become more stringent, resulting in a reduction in long-term operational emissions with no change in operational activity with the Project. Without incorporation of mitigation measures, the Project's operational emissions would attenuate over time with fleet turnover and changes in regulations

and technology that would reduce emissions. Although the NO_X emissions would still exceed thresholds, the Project-generated daily emissions of NO_X would decline by approximately 27 percent and 38 percent by the years 2035 and 2050, respectively, relative to the initial operating year of 2025. In addition, other criteria air pollutants would be reduced as follows: ROG by approximately 8 percent (2035) and 11 percent (2050); PM_{10} by approximately 3 percent (2035) and 5 percent (2050); and $PM_{2.5}$ by approximately 7 percent (2035) and 10 percent (2050). Furthermore, improvements in emissions that may result from very recent or still-developing regulations, such as the November 2022 amendments to the in-use off-road diesel-fueled fleets regulation, the 2022 TRU airborne toxic control measure amendments, and the under-development advanced clean fleet regulations are not captured in these future emissions estimates. Additional emissions reductions would likely be achieved through technological advances that would further reduce area source emissions associated with consumer products, stationary source emissions associated with backup generators, and potentially further mobile source emissions reductions if fleet electrification or other emissions reductions occur at a faster rate than currently projected by the air board in the EMFAC database for the vehicle activity. However, at initial operation and until such time as these regulations effectively reduce NO_X emissions to below the threshold of significance identified in the EIR, the Project would result in significant NO_X emissions without mitigation.

Mitigation

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3a: Electrification of Yard Equipment

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3b: Electrification of Transportation Refrigeration Units

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3c: Prohibition of Truck and Van Idling for More than Two Minutes

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3d: Limitation on Model Year of Visiting Trucks

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3e: Diesel Backup Generator Specifications

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3f: Limitation on Manufacturing and Maker Space Emissions

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3g: Compliance with CalGreen Tier 2 Green Building Standards

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3h: Requirements for Off-Road Construction Equipment

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3i: Development and Implementation of Operational Emission Management Plan

Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3a through M-AQ-3g would reduce emissions associated with various operational sources from the Project. These measures would reduce the Project's operational emissions of NO_X, the criteria air pollutant for which the Project would exceed the relevant threshold. These measures would also reduce emissions associated with all criteria pollutants. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3h would further reduce the proposed project's NO_X emissions by reducing NO_X emissions during construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3i would further reduce operational emissions. The Operational Emission Management Plan in Mitigation Measure M-AQ-i requires that if the total net new emissions estimate for actual tenant and project operations are projected to exceed the NO_X performance standard, then additional feasible emissions reduction measures must be identified and implemented prior to occupancy (i.e., prior to the emissions occurring, to ensure that the project does not

exceed the NO_X performance standard).

The Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measures M-AQ-3a through M-AQ-3i would reduce Impact AQ-3 to a less-than-significant level for the Project.

Wind

Impact WI-1: The Project would create wind hazards in publicly accessible areas of substantial pedestrian use. (Initial Study, pp. 106-109)

Under existing plus Project conditions, the average wind speed would decrease from 11 miles per hour to 10.5 miles per hour, compared to existing conditions without the Project. However, with the Project, there would be a wind hazard criterion exceedance at two locations, and the number of hours that the wind hazard criterion would be exceeded would increase from zero hours per year to 13 hours per year. Fast upper-level prevailing westerly winds reaching the proposed development would be redirected toward the ground, creating downdraughts and funneling along Toland Street and accelerating around the corner of the Project at the junction with Kirkwood Avenue. The exceedances of the wind hazard criterion would occur around the northern corner of the Project on either side of Kirkwood Avenue.

Therefore, because the Project would result in an exceedance of the Planning Code wind hazard criterion, the Project would result in a significant wind impact.

A number of wind mitigation features were tested to reduce the Project's wind impact, including various combinations of canopies (both solid and porous) and deciduous trees along Toland Street. Although the canopies were shown to be partially effective in reducing certain wind conditions, they also increased the number of wind hazard hours away from the Project or at the northern corner of the Project at the intersection of Toland Street and Kirkwood Avenue. Given that deciduous trees lose their leaves in winter, trees without leaves were assessed in the wind tunnel to determine whether they could effectively reduce wind impacts. The wind tunnel tests demonstrated that exceedances of the city's wind criteria would still occur with the inclusion of deciduous trees. Based on the wind tunnel tests, the planting of nine evergreen street trees, which retain their foliage throughout the year, was evaluated. The trees would be placed along the eastern sidewalk of Toland Street; each tree would be approximately 25 feet tall, with a 15-foot-diameter canopy. This planting would eliminate the exceedance of the hazard criterion at all test points in the existing plus Project conditions.

On February 2, 2021, the San Francisco Bureau of Urban Forestry gave preliminary approval for the use of the proposed nine evergreen street trees on the eastern sidewalk of Toland Street. If the building design changes or the trees are not maintained to be at least 25 feet tall with a 15-foot-diameter canopy, the Project could result in an exceedance of the wind hazard criterion. This would be a significant Project impact without mitigation.

Mitigation

Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a: Wind Hazard Evaluation for Building Design and Streetscape Modifications

Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b: Maintenance of Landscaping Features that Reduce Wind Hazards

Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a would ensure that the Project does not exceed the wind hazard criterion in

the event of design changes. Additionally, Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b would entail the installation and maintenance, for the life of the Project buildings, of landscaping features required to ensure that the one-hour wind hazard is not exceeded.

The Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b would reduce Impact WI-1 to a less-than-significant level for the Project.

Impact C-W-1: The Project, in combination with cumulative Projects, could result in cumulative wind impacts. (Initial Study, pp. 109-113)

Under cumulative plus Project conditions, wind hazard exceedances are expected to occur at three test locations and would increase the total number of exceedance hours from zero hours per year to 18 hours per year. Because the exposure of the Project to prevailing westerly winds would be similar under existing and cumulative conditions, the resulting flow features and wind conditions around the Project site for cumulative plus Project conditions are similar to the existing plus Project conditions. The wind hazard criterion exceedances would occur around the northern corner of the Project on either side of Kirkwood Avenue and Toland Street. Therefore, the Project, in combination with cumulative Projects, would create wind hazards in publicly accessible areas of substantial pedestrian use, resulting in a significant cumulative impact. Given that the wind hazard impacts would only occur in the cumulative scenario with the Project, the Project's contribution to cumulative wind impacts would be cumulatively considerable without mitigation.

Mitigation

Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a: Wind Hazard Evaluation for Building Design and Streetscape Modifications

Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b: Maintenance of Landscaping Features that Reduce Wind Hazards

Mitigation Measure M-WI-1a would ensure that the Project does not result in a cumulatively considerable wind impact in the event of design changes. Additionally, Mitigation Measure M-WI-1b would entail the installation and maintenance, for the life of the Project buildings, of landscaping features required to ensure that the Project does not cumulatively contribute to a one-hour wind hazard exceedance.

The Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measures M-WI-1a and M-WI-1b would reduce Impact C-WI-1 to a less-than-significant level for the Project.

Geology and Soils

Impact GE-5: The Project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource. (Initial Study, pp. 167-169)

Rock formations at the Project site consist of artificial fill, Bay Mud, and the Colma Formation. Because the artificial fill and Young Bay Mud are too young to contain unique paleontological resources, these formations are considered to be of low paleontological sensitivity (Class 2). Because a limited amount of unique paleontological resources in the form of vertebrate fossils have been recovered from Old Bay Mud and Colma Formation in San Francisco and the greater Bay Area region, these formations are considered to be of moderate paleontological sensitivity (Class 3). The Project includes construction of 25-foot-deep stone columns and installation of 60-foot-deep auger-cast piles, which would exceed 2 feet in diameter.

Therefore, Project-related excavation would encounter Old Bay Mud and the Colma Formation. Damage to or destruction of unique paleontological resources, which may be present in these formations, would represent a potentially significant impact without mitigation.

Mitigation

Mitigation Measure M-GE-5: Inadvertent Discovery of Paleontological Resources Worker Environmental Awareness Training

Mitigation Measure M-GE-5 will ensure that unique paleontological resources that may be present in soils/sediments that would be disturbed by project construction would be identified and assessed, and preserved or recovered as appropriate.

The Commission finds that, for the reasons set forth in the Final EIR, implementing Mitigation Measure M-GE-5 would reduce Impact GE-5 to a less-than-significant level for the Project.

IV. SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED OR MITIGATED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

Based on substantial evidence in the whole record of these proceedings, the Planning Commission finds that, feasible changes or alterations have been required, or incorporated into, the Project to reduce the significant environmental impacts as identified in the Final EIR. The Commission finds that the Project will have no impacts that cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level through the incorporation of mitigation measures as described in the Final EIR. Accordingly, the Project will have no impacts that remain significant and unavoidable.

V. EVALUATION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

This section describes the EIR alternatives and the reasons for rejecting the alternatives as infeasible. CEQA mandates that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project or the project location that would feasibly attain most of the project's basic objectives, but that would avoid or substantially lessen any identified significant adverse environmental effects of the project. An EIR is not required to consider every conceivable alternative to a proposed project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. CEQA requires that every EIR also evaluate a "no project" alternative. Alternatives provide a basis of comparison to the proposed project in terms of their significant impacts and their ability to meet project objectives. This comparative analysis is used to consider reasonable, potentially feasible options for minimizing environmental consequences of the Project.

Alternatives Analyzed in the Final EIR

The Department considered a range of alternatives in draft EIR Chapter 6, Alternatives. The Final EIR analyzed the Project compared to four CEQA alternatives:

- No Project Alternative
- Code-Compliant Alternative

- Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative
- Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative

Evaluation of Project Alternatives

CEQA provides that alternatives analyzed in an EIR may be rejected if "specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible ... the project alternatives identified in the EIR" (CEQA Guidelines section 15091[a][3]). The Planning Commission has reviewed each of the alternatives to the Project as described in the Final EIR that would reduce or avoid the impacts of the Project and finds that there is substantial evidence of specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations that make these alternatives infeasible, for the reasons set forth below.

In making these determinations, the Planning Commission is aware that CEQA defines "feasibility" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors." The Planning Commission is also aware that under CEQA case law, the concept of "feasibility" encompasses (i) the question of whether a particular alternative promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project, and (ii) the question of whether an alternative is "desirable" from a policy standpoint to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.

The following Project alternatives and Project were fully considered and compared in the Final EIR.

A. No Project Alternative.

Under the No Project Alternative, the Project site would not be developed. Instead, the No Project Alternative assumes that approximately 75 percent of the existing building space on the site (336,000 gross square feet in three buildings) would be occupied by parcel and last-mile delivery uses. This is an increase over the existing conditions (i.e., no buildings were occupied by parcel delivery when the Project's environmental review started in 2017; however, parcel delivery services have been operating in two buildings since 2020). The remaining space (112,000 gross square feet in the fourth existing building) would be occupied by other types of PDR uses (e.g., wholesale and storage uses). These uses and the space occupied by them reflect what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future compared to the uses that existed onsite in 2017. The No Project Alternative would employ approximately 750 people—15 more employees than under baseline 2017 conditions, and 1,227 fewer employees than under the Project.

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing four single-story PDR buildings would not be demolished; other than tenant improvements (such as interior upgrades), no construction or site improvements—such as grading, excavation, or alterations to the height and massing of the buildings—would occur at the site. The No Project Alternative would not include sustainability features proposed under the Project, such as a rooftop solar array; water- and energy-efficient designs; and electric vehicle charging infrastructure for trucks, transportation refrigeration units, or passenger vehicles, except as may be required through the building permitting process for tenant improvement applications in the future. The No Project Alternative would not include street, sidewalk, or streetscape improvements; bicycle parking; or a TDM plan.

The No Project Alternative would reduce the impacts of the Project because the No Project Alternative would not involve construction of new buildings or street network changes, and only minimal tenant improvements are anticipated to occur. Due to the limited construction activities associated with the No Project Alternative, construction-related transportation, air quality, and noise impacts would be less than under the Project, and construction-related impacts to cultural resources and tribal cultural resources would not occur. Therefore, construction-related transportation impacts of the No Project Alternative would be less than the less-than-significant impacts identified for the Project. For operations, unlike the Project, the No Project Alternative would not introduce new fixed sources of noise; therefore, there would be no new noise effects at the property plane or noise-sensitive land uses. No impacts would occur from the No Project Alternative because no new fixed sources of noise would be needed as part of this alternative. Also, because the No Project Alternative would result in fewer vehicle trips, noise and air quality impacts from vehicle trips would be reduced. Regarding other operational air quality impacts and health risks, the No Project Alternative would not include manufacturing and maker use as a PDR use, would not require backup generators, and would require limited, if any, transportation refrigeration units, thereby eliminating or limiting operational emissions associated with these sources; therefore, impacts would be reduced.

The No Project Alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible because, although the severity of the less-than-significant impacts of the Project would be lessened, it would fail to meet the objectives of the Project. The No Project Alternative would not meet any of the Project objectives, except for Objective 5 (site PDR uses in a dense infill setting to create employment near housing and reduce vehicle miles traveled for potential distribution uses by locating such uses in San Francisco proximate to multiple freeways, rather than traditional suburban locations), which the No Project Alternative meets, but to a lesser degree than the Project. The existing PDR buildings would remain on site, and no new PDR space would be provided; therefore, the No Project Alternative would not meet the underlying objective to develop a modern, flexible, and durable PDR facility for a diverse and evolving range of uses in a central urban environment. The No Project Alternative would not advance progress toward the City's long-standing goals to upgrade and expand PDR space, replace functionally outdated PDR space with first- and best-in-class facilities, use innovative design at a size and scale that accommodates a range of large and small PDR uses, or boost resiliency in the local supply chain. The Project site would not be redeveloped to make efficient use of existing utilities, circulation, and complementary uses in the surrounding PDR-2 Zoning District.

The No Project Alternative would have a total building floor area of 448,000 square feet, which is approximately one-fifth of the total building area of the Project, and would result in a net gain of 15 employees compared to the 1,242 employees under the Project. The No Project Alternative has a considerably smaller overall footprint, and would not provide an appreciable positive fiscal impact as it would not substantially change the existing buildings nor the workforce size required for the site. This alternative would contribute, but not as much as the Project would, to new jobs at a variety of experience levels; enhanced property values; property taxes; workers who will support direct and indirect local business growth in the Bayview; and employment near housing that would reduce VMT for potential distribution uses by locating such uses in San Francisco. The No Project Alternative would not include sustainability features proposed under the Project, such as a rooftop solar array, water- and energy-efficient designs, and electrical docking stations. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not develop a Project with infrastructure that facilitates carbon-efficient vehicle fleets and operations as cost-effective technology becomes available. The No Project Alternative would not include street, sidewalk, or streetscape improvements; bicycle parking; or a TDM plan. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not meet the Project objective of creating a safe and compelling streetscape accessible by multiple

modes of transportation, including bicycles and pedestrians.

For these reasons, it is hereby found that the No Project Alternative is rejected because it would not meet the objectives of the Project and, therefore, is not a feasible alternative.

B. Code-Compliant Alternative.

The Code-Compliant Alternative would demolish the existing four single-story PDR buildings on site and construct two two-story buildings. Each of the buildings would have approximately the same ground floor shape as the Project and would have a similar orientation on the site. However, under the Code-Compliant Alternative, the buildings would not exceed the 65-J Height and Bulk District requirements (65 feet building height limit) and would only have two floors, plus active roof. As a result, there would be no Zoning Map Amendments for a height and bulk district reclassification, and there would be no Planning Code Text Amendments to adopt a Special Use District for the Project site. A shorter construction schedule of 26 months (compared to 31 months for the Project) is anticipated for this alternative, given the reduced building height and square footage.

The combined building square footage of the Code-Compliant Alternative (1,363,000 square feet) is less than that under the Project (2,160,000 square feet, including active roofs). Similar to the Project, the Code-Compliant Alternative would provide space for several main types of PDR uses. These uses could consist of principally permitted and conditionally permitted land uses in the PDR-2 Zoning District including manufacturing and maker space; parcel delivery service, including last-mile delivery; and wholesale and storage. Although the building's overall square footage would be less than that of the Project, the allocation of the PDR uses would be proportional to the Project, with 3 percent consisting of manufacturing and maker space, 65 percent consisting of parcel delivery, and 32 percent consisting of wholesale/storage. The proportion of ground-floor retail would be the same as under the Project (0.5 percent of the gross building area; i.e., 5,000 square feet). The Code-Compliant Alternative would include sustainability features similar to those of the Project, such as water- and energy-efficient designs and electrical docking stations. The Code-Compliant Alternative would include a reduced rooftop solar array. Similar to the Project, the Code-Compliant Alternative would include street, sidewalk, or streetscape improvements; bicycle parking; and a TDM plan.

Overall, the Code-Compliant Alternative would result in less impacts because it entails smaller structures (i.e., 1,363,000 square feet of new construction, compared to 2,160,000 square feet including active roofs) for the Project) and a shorter duration of construction (i.e., an estimated 26 months of construction duration, compared to 31 months for the Project). Therefore, for reasons similar to those described for the Project, construction-related transportation and air quality impacts for the Code-Compliant Alternative would be less than the less-than-significant impacts identified for the Project. Due to the reduced operational capacity of this Alternative, operational air quality and health risk impacts also would be reduced as compared to the Project. Further, because the building heights for this Alternative would be lower, wind-related impacts would also be reduced.

Under the Code-Compliant Alternative, noise- and vibration-generating construction activities and equipment are expected to be nearly identical to those analyzed for the Project due to the similar scope of construction work areas, grading and excavation, and activity types. Because the total duration of construction would be less than that of the Project, the amount of material required for delivery to the site under the Code-Compliant Alternative would be roughly 20 to 40 percent less than that under the

Project. The construction noise and vibration assumptions used for the Project (e.g., the types and quantities of construction equipment, their reference sound levels, and usage factors) would not change under the Code-Compliant Alternative. Therefore, similar to the Project, impacts generated by construction noise and vibration would be less than significant. Finally, because the Code-Compliant Alternative would not avoid the ground disturbing activity associated with the Project, the Alternative would not avoid the potentially significant impacts related to cultural resources and tribal cultural resources.

The Code-Compliant Alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible because it would fail to meet the objectives to the same extent as the Project or the Expanded Streetscape Alternative, including the underlying objective to develop a modern, flexible, and durable PDR facility for a diverse and evolving range of uses in a central urban environment. The Code-Compliant Alternative would replace the existing PDR buildings with modern facilities. The Project site would be redeveloped to make efficient use of existing utilities, circulation, and complementary uses in the surrounding PDR-2 Zoning District. Because the size and scale of the Code-Compliant Alternative would be reduced from the Project and the ground-floor manufacturing and maker space would be eliminated, this alternative would only partially meet the objective of using innovative design at a size and scale that accommodate an adaptable range of large and small PDR uses. The Code-Compliant Alternative would not replenish the supply of displaced PDR space, or boost resiliency in the local supply chain and disaster response capabilities by providing large-scale adaptable facilities that can be rapidly mobilized in a central location, to the same extent as the Project.

There would be a net increase of approximately 507 employees associated with the Code-Compliant Alternative, compared to 1,242 employees under the Project. Because fewer jobs would be created and the scale of development and operations would be smaller, the Code-Compliant Alternative would not meet, to the same extent as the Project, the objective of providing a positive fiscal impact by creating jobs at a variety of experience levels, enhancing property values, generating property taxes, introducing workers who will support direct and indirect local business growth in the Bayview, or creating employment near housing that would reduce VMT for potential distribution uses by locating such uses in San Francisco. Additionally, because the Project does not have any environmental impacts that remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation, there are no significant impacts that would be mitigated by the Code-Compliant Alternative but not the Project.

For these reasons, it is hereby found that the Code-Compliant Alternative is rejected because it would not meet the basic objectives to the same extent as the Project and, therefore, is not a feasible alternative.

C. Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative.

The Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative would demolish the existing four single-story PDR buildings on site and construct two new three-story buildings (plus active roof) in the same configuration used for the Project. The combined building square footage of the Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative (2,160,000 square feet, including active roofs) is the same as that of the Project. This alternative is different from the Project because it would include less space for parcel delivery (50 percent of the total PDR floor area) and eliminate the wholesale/storage space. The active PDR floor area would be divided equally between parcel delivery service, including last-mile delivery, and fleet management. The Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative would not include ground-floor manufacturing and maker or retail spaces. The areas of the buildings identified for these uses in the Project (35,000 square feet of manufacturing and maker

space and 8,400 square feet of retail) would instead be used for PDR support space to maximize the efficiency of each building's layout and internal circulation. The Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative would include sustainability features similar to those under the Project, such as water- and energy-efficient designs, electrical docking stations, and an active rooftop with a solar array, as well as the street, sidewalk, or streetscape improvements; bicycle parking; and a TDM plan.

The Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative includes the same amount of development area as the Project. However, all of it would be allocated to PDR uses: approximately half for private and/or public fleet storage and management uses, and half for parcel and last-mile delivery uses. Because the Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative would involve the same amount (i.e., 2,160,000 square feet, including active roofs) and duration (i.e., 31 months) of construction activities, and would include the same amount of development area as the Project, the Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative would have similar construction-related transportation, air quality, and noise impacts, and would not avoid the potentially significant cultural resources and tribal cultural resources impacts. Because the buildings under this Alternative would be the same height as the Project, wind impacts also would be similar.

Regarding operational impacts, the Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative would require HVAC systems to support the facility's enclosed and partially enclosed areas. Although shifts in square footage of uses may redistribute the HVAC systems, the overall HVAC needs of the facility would be similar to those required by the Project. The Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative would increase the area of logistics yard uses by 9.8 percent, and would therefore require a slight increase in ventilation system capacity while conversely slightly reducing the necessary capacities of rooftop HVAC equipment. Because the design and capacity of the system are similar to those of the Project, operational noise from fixed sources under the Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative would be similar. For noise from mobile sources, the Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative would reduce onsite and offsite traffic volumes by approximately 14 percent, with a 50 percent reduction in heavy truck trips during the nighttime (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) period compared to the Project ; but these reductions are partially offset by the Alternative's public fleet operations, which would increase nighttime medium truck (bus) trips from 31 to 130. Despite the large relative increase in nighttime period bus trips, the noise-reducing effects of halving the nighttime heavy trucks assumed in the proposed project would offset the potential increase in bus noise and result in a net nighttime traffic noise reduction of approximately 0.1 dBA compared to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts would be similar to the Project.

Regarding operational air quality and health risks, there would be an increase of approximately 20 percent in offsite emissions from worker and delivery trips to and from the site along the offsite traffic routes for the Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative, compared to the Project. This is attributed to an increase in vehicle trips, including worker commute trips, patrons and vendors/deliveries to the site, and bus trips. However, $PM_{2.5}$ exhaust is slightly lower, by 2 percent, under the Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative than under the Project, because the increase in vehicles under the Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative results from buses rather than higher polluting diesel trucks (i.e., single-unit and tractor trailer trucks), as under the Project. This shift in the vehicle types would lower the $PM_{2.5}$ exhaust emissions. There would also be a decrease of about 23 percent in $PM_{2.5}$ exhaust and total $PM_{2.5}$ emissions related to parcel delivery for this alternative compared to parcel delivery for the Project. Additionally, total $PM_{2.5}$ emissions and exhaust $PM_{2.5}$ emissions generated on site would decrease compared to the Project due in large part to the reduction in total onsite diesel trucks by 18 percent (for total $PM_{2.5}$) and 47 percent (for exhaust $PM_{2.5}$). Under this Alternative, the elimination of manufacturing and maker space and reduced transportation refrigeration units, and the shift in the vehicle fleet mix to reduce single-unit and tractor

trailer trucks, also would result in a decrease in operational mass emissions of NO_X as compared to the Project. The Fleet Management Use Mix alternative would result in a net increase in NO_X emissions, but these emissions would be below the thresholds of significance and thus, none of the air quality mitigation measures would be required if this alternative were implemented.

The Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it would fail to meet several Project objectives. It would not meet the underlying objective to develop a modern, flexible, and durable PDR facility for a diverse and evolving range of uses in a central urban environment, because eliminating wholesale and storage and manufacturing and maker uses would undermine the facility's flexibility. It would significantly limit the Project's ability to evolve to accommodate a range of PDR uses in response to industry and market needs, including anticipated demand for parcel delivery services, and its ability to accommodate a range of large and small PDR uses. Therefore, the Alternative would not meet the underlying objective or Objective 4. Additionally, because the Project does not have any environmental impacts that remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation, there are no significant impacts that would be mitigated by the Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative but not the Project.

For these reasons, it is hereby found that the Fleet Management Use Mix Alternative is rejected because it would not meet all of the basic objectives to the same extent as the Project and, therefore, is not a feasible alternative.

D. Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative.

The Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative would demolish the existing four single-story PDR buildings on site and construct two new three-story buildings (plus active roof) in the same configuration as the Project. The combined building square footage of the Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative (2,160,000 square feet, including active roofs) is the same as that of the Project. Unlike the Project, this alternative would provide space for only one PDR use, consisting of parcel delivery service, including last-mile delivery. The Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative would not include ground-floor manufacturing and maker or retail spaces. The areas of the buildings identified for these uses in the Project (35,000 square feet of manufacturing and maker space and 8,400 square feet of retail) would instead be used for PDR support space to maximize the efficiency of each building's layout and internal circulation. The Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative would include sustainability features similar to those used under the Project, such as water- and energy-efficient designs, electrical docking stations, and an active rooftop with a solar array, as well as street, sidewalk, or streetscape improvements; bicycle parking; and a TDM plan.

The Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative would involve the same amount (i.e., 2,160,000 square feet, including active roofs) and duration (31 months) of construction activities as the Project. Therefore, construction-related air quality, noise, and transportation impacts would be similar to the Project.

For operational impacts, the Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative would require HVAC systems to support the facility's enclosed and partially enclosed areas. Although shifts in square footage of uses may redistribute the HVAC systems, the overall HVAC needs of the parcel delivery use and building spaces would be nearly identical to those required by the Project. The Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative would increase the area of logistics yard uses by 9.8 percent, and would therefore require a slight increase in ventilation system capacity while conversely slightly reducing the necessary capacities of rooftop HVAC equipment. Because the design and capacity of the system would be similar to those under the Project ,

operational noise from fixed sources under the Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative would be similar. The Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative would result in an increase in onsite and offsite operational traffic volumes by approximately 4 percent when compared with the Project. Increased traffic volumes generally correspond with increased traffic noise. However, the Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative would only increase the number of cars and vans traveling to and from the site, while maintaining the same number of heavy truck trips and reducing the daily volumes of medium truck trips by approximately 21 percent. The notable reduction in medium truck trips would have a greater effect on overall traffic noise levels than the increase in cars and vans. As a result, the overall traffic noise levels generated by the Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative at noise-sensitive land uses would be less than those predicted for the Project.

For operational air quality impacts, total operational space would be the same as under the Project, but the PDR use mix would be allocated entirely to parcel delivery, including last-mile use, with no manufacturing and maker space, ground-floor retail, or wholesale and storage use. The number of transportation refrigeration units would increase slightly in comparison to the Project , because the parcel delivery use is anticipated to have a greater proportion of use requiring transportation refrigeration units than the warehousing/storage use that is included in the Project. In addition, the vehicle fleet mix for the Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative would shift slightly to include a greater proportion of vans and fewer single-unit and tractor trailer trucks. Overall, operational emissions under the Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative would be less than those under the Project. This alternative would result in a net increase in operational NO_X emissions that would be approximately 28 percent less than under the Project , but would still exceed the threshold of significance for NO_X. Further, due to the increase in last-mile vehicle travel under the Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative, there would be an increase of approximately 52 percent in offsite $PM_{2.5}$ exhaust and 53 percent in total $PM_{2.5}$ (inclusive of resuspended roadway dust) along the offsite circulation routes. $PM_{2.5}$ exhaust and total $PM_{2.5}$ from offsite worker and delivery trips for the Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative are lower than those under the Project by 8 percent and 18 percent, respectively. As a result of these changes in emissions for the Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative, the cancer risk at both the maximally exposed individual residential and worker receptors would increase approximately 2 to 3 percent in comparison to the Project .

The Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative is rejected as infeasible because the Alternative would fail to meet several of the Project objectives. The Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative would only provide PDR space for parcel delivery service, and therefore would not meet the underlying objective of developing a flexible PDR facility for a diverse and evolving range of uses. It would not accommodate a range of large and small PDR uses, including ground-floor manufacturing and maker or retail spaces, and also would not be able to adapt over time to different industries and market needs. Additionally, because the Project does not have any environmental impacts that remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation, there are no significant impacts that would be mitigated by the Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative but not the Project.

For these reasons, it is hereby found that the Expanded Parcel Delivery Use Alternative is rejected because it would not meet all of the basic objectives to the same extent as the Project or the Expanded Streetscape Alternative and, therefore, is not a feasible alternative.

E. Additional Alternatives Considered but Rejected

As stated in CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(f)(1), factors that may be considered when a lead agency is assessing the feasibility of alternatives include "site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries …, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site." Several alternatives were considered by the planning department but were ultimately rejected due to these factors or because the alternatives did not reduce the significant impacts identified for the proposed project. After further consideration of the five alternatives listed below, it was determined that they would not be feasible, would not substantially meet most of the project objectives, or would not avoid or lessen potentially significant adverse impacts that were identified for the Project.

1. Alternative Site in San Francisco

2. Alternative Site Outside of San Francisco, but Within the Bay Area

3. Expanded Maker Space Use Mix

4. Expanded Wholesale/Storage Use Mix

5. Phased Project Operations (restricting tenancy in second building to uses with lower emissions, particularly of NO_X, until a later time when emissions would be lower)

For these reasons, it is hereby found that these additional alternatives are infeasible and have been rejected.

VI. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to Public Resources Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the Commission hereby finds that, because the Project will have no impacts that remain significant and unavoidable with incorporation of mitigation measures, no statement of overriding considerations is warranted for the Project.