

File No. 131190

Committee Item No. 1
Board Item No. 16

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Budget & Finance Committee

Date January 22, 2014

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date February 4, 2014

Cmte Board

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

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

Completed by: Linda Wong Date January 17, 2014
Completed by: L.W. Date 1/22/14

1 [General Obligation Bond Election - Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response]

2
3 **Ordinance calling and providing for a special election to be held in the City and County**
4 **of San Francisco on Tuesday, June 3, 2014, for the purpose of submitting to**
5 **San Francisco voters a proposition to incur the following bonded debt of the City and**
6 **County: \$400,000,000 to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement, and**
7 **seismic retrofitting of Neighborhood Fire and Police Stations, the Emergency**
8 **Firefighting Water System, seismically secure facilities for the Medical Examiner, the**
9 **Police Department's Traffic Company, and the Police Department's Forensic Services**
10 **Division, and other critical infrastructure and facilities for earthquake safety and related**
11 **costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes; authorizing landlords to**
12 **pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax increase to residential tenants in**
13 **accordance with Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code; finding that the estimated cost**
14 **of such proposed project is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual**
15 **income and revenue of the City and County and will require expenditures greater than**
16 **the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy; reciting the estimated cost of such**
17 **proposed project; fixing the date of election and the manner of holding such election**
18 **and the procedure for voting for or against the proposition; fixing the maximum rate of**
19 **interest on such bonds and providing for the levy and collection of taxes to pay both**
20 **principal and interest; prescribing notice to be given of such election; finding that a**
21 **portion of the proposed bond is not a project under the California Environmental**
22 **Quality Act (CEQA) and adopting findings under CEQA for the remaining portion of the**
23 **proposed bond; finding that the proposed bond is in conformity with the eight priority**
24 **policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b), and is consistent with the General Plan;**
25

1 consolidating the special election with the general election; establishing the election
2 precincts, voting places and officers for the election; waiving the word limitation on
3 ballot propositions imposed by Municipal Elections Code, Section 510; complying with
4 the restrictions on the use of bond proceeds specified in Section 53410 of the
5 California Government Code; incorporating the provisions of the Administrative Code,
6 Section 5.30-5.36; and waiving the time requirements specified in Administrative Code,
7 Section 2.34.

8 Note: Additions are single-underline italics Times New Roman;
9 deletions are ~~strikethrough italics Times New Roman~~.
10 Board amendment additions are double underlined.
11 Board amendment deletions are ~~strikethrough normal~~.

12 Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

13 Section 1. Findings.

14 A. This Board of Supervisors (this "Board") recognizes the need to safeguard and
15 enhance the City's earthquake and emergency response and recovery by rehabilitating critical
16 facilities that support the City's first responders.

17 B. The Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond (the "Bond") will
18 provide funding to construct, improve and rehabilitate earthquake safety and emergency
19 responsiveness facilities and infrastructure (as described below in Section 3).

20 C. This Board now wishes to describe the terms of a ballot measure seeking
21 approval for the issuance of general obligation bonds to finance all or a portion of the City's
22 earthquake safety and response needs as described below.

23 Section 2. A special election is called and ordered to be held in the City on Tuesday,
24 the 3rd day of June, 2014, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City a
25 proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City for the project described in the amount
and for the purposes stated:

1 "SAN FRANCISCO EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE BOND,
2 2014. \$400,000,000 of bonded indebtedness to improve fire, earthquake and emergency
3 response by: improving and/or replacing deteriorating cisterns, pipes, and tunnels, and related
4 facilities to ensure firefighters a reliable water supply for fires and disasters; improving and/or
5 replacing neighborhood fire and police stations; replacing certain seismically-unsafe police
6 and medical examiner facilities with earthquake-safe buildings; and to pay related costs,
7 subject to independent citizen oversight and regular audits; and authorizing landlords to pass-
8 through to residential tenants in units subject to Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code (the
9 "Residential Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance") 50% of the increase in the real property
10 taxes attributable to the cost of the repayment of the bonds."

11 The special election called and ordered shall be referred to in this ordinance as the
12 "Bond Special Election."

13 Section 3. PROPOSED PROGRAM. All contracts that are funded with the proceeds of
14 bonds authorized hereby shall be subject to the provisions of Chapter 83 of the Administrative
15 Code (the "First Source Hiring Program"), which fosters construction and permanent
16 employment opportunities for qualified economically disadvantaged individuals. In addition,
17 all contracts that are funded with the proceeds of bonds authorized hereby also shall be
18 subject to the provisions of Chapter 14B of the Administrative Code (the "Local Business
19 Enterprise and Non-Discrimination in Contracting Ordinance"), which assists small and micro
20 local businesses to increase their ability to compete effectively for the award of City contracts.
21 The proposed program can be summarized as follows:

22 A. EMERGENCY FIREFIGHTING WATER SYSTEM. A portion of the Bond shall
23 be allocated to the renovation and seismic upgrading of the emergency firefighting water
24 system (the "EFWS") and related facilities, including but not limited to cisterns, pipes and
25 tunnels, and related facilities (collectively, the "EFWS Project").

1 B. **CRITICAL FIREFIGHTING FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE.** A portion of
2 the Bond shall be allocated to the construction, acquisition, improvement, retrofitting and
3 completion of critical firefighting facilities and infrastructure for earthquake safety and
4 emergency response not otherwise specifically enumerated in this ordinance, including
5 without limitation, neighborhood fire stations and related facilities (collectively, the "Critical
6 Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure").

7 C. **POLICE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE.** A portion of the Bond shall be
8 allocated to the construction, acquisition, improvement, retrofitting and completion of police
9 facilities and infrastructure for earthquake safety and emergency response not otherwise
10 specifically enumerated in this ordinance, including without limitation, neighborhood police
11 stations and related facilities (collectively, the "Police Facilities and Infrastructure").

12 D. **MEDICAL EXAMINER FACILITY.** A portion of the Bond shall be allocated to
13 design and construct a seismically secure structure for the Medical Examiner to enhance the
14 chief medical examiner's Citywide earthquake safety and emergency response capabilities
15 (the "Medical Examiner Facility").

16 E. **POLICE TRAFFIC COMPANY AND POLICE FORENSICS SERVICES**
17 **DIVISION FACILITIES.** A portion of the Bond shall be allocated to design and construct a
18 seismically secure structure to house both the Police Department's Traffic Company and the
19 Police Department's Forensic Services Division to enhance the police department's Citywide
20 earthquake safety and emergency response capabilities (the "Traffic Company and Forensic
21 Services Division Facility").

22 F. **CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE.** A portion of the Bond shall be used to
23 perform audits of the Bond, as further described in Section 15.

24 The proposed uses and amounts described in this Section 3 are estimates only and,
25 with the exception of Section 3F above, are subject, without limitation, to review and revision

1 by the Mayor and the Board.

2 Section 4. BOND ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES

3 The Bond shall include the following administrative rules and principles:

4 A. OVERSIGHT. The proposed bond funds shall be subjected to approval
5 processes and rules described in the Charter and Administrative Code. Pursuant to
6 Administrative Code Section 5.31, the Citizen's General Obligation Bond Oversight
7 Committee shall conduct an annual review of bond spending, and shall provide an annual
8 report of the bond program to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

9 B. TRANSPARENCY. The City shall create and maintain a Web page outlining and
10 describing the bond program, progress, and activity updates. The City shall also hold periodic
11 public hearings and reviews on the bond program and its implementation before the Capital
12 Planning Committee, the Police and Fire Commissions, and the Citizen's General Obligation
13 Bond Oversight Committee.

14 Section 5. The estimated cost of the bond financed portion of the project described in
15 Section 2 above was fixed by the Board by the following resolution and in the amount
16 specified below:

17 Resolution No. _____, \$400,000,000.

18 Such resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board and approved by the
19 Mayor of the City (the "Mayor"). In such resolution it was recited and found by the Board that
20 the sum of money specified is too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and
21 revenue of the City in addition to the other annual expenses or other funds derived from taxes
22 levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed by
23 the annual tax levy.

24 The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs described in this ordinance
25 are by the issuance of bonds of the City not exceeding the principal amount specified.

1 Such estimate of costs as set forth in such resolution is adopted and determined to be
2 the estimated cost of such bond financed improvements and financing, as designed to date.

3 Section 6. The Bond Special Election shall be held and conducted and the votes
4 received and canvassed, and the returns made and the results ascertained, determined and
5 declared as provided in this ordinance and in all particulars not recited in this ordinance such
6 election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California (the "State") and the
7 Charter of the City (the "Charter") and any regulations adopted under State law or the Charter,
8 providing for and governing elections in the City, and the polls for such election shall be and
9 remain open during the time required by such laws and regulations.

10 Section 7. The Bond Special Election is consolidated with the General Election
11 scheduled to be held in the City on Tuesday, June 3, 2014. The voting precincts, polling
12 places and officers of election for the June 3, 2014 General Election are hereby adopted,
13 established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and
14 officers of election for the Bond Special Election called, and reference is made to the notice of
15 election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for the June 3,
16 2014 General Election by the Director of Elections to be published in the official newspaper of
17 the City on the date required under the laws of the State of California.

18 Section 8. The ballots to be used at the Bond Special Election shall be the ballots to be used at the June
19 3, 2014 General Election. The word limit for ballot propositions imposed by Municipal Elections Code Section
20 510 is waived. On the ballots to be used at the Bond Special Election, in addition to any other matter required by
21 law to be printed thereon, shall appear the following as a separate proposition:

22 "SAN FRANCISCO EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE BOND,
23 2014. To improve fire, earthquake and emergency response by: improving and/or replacing
24 deteriorating cisterns, pipes, and tunnels, and related facilities to ensure firefighters a reliable
25 water supply for fires and disasters; improving and/or replacing neighborhood fire and police

1 stations; replacing certain seismically-unsafe police and medical examiner facilities with
2 earthquake-safe buildings and to pay related costs, shall the City and County of San
3 Francisco issue \$400,000,000 in general obligation bonds, subject to citizen oversight and
4 regular audits?"

5 Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the foregoing bond proposition shall mark
6 the ballot in the location corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition, and to vote against
7 the proposition shall mark the ballot in the location corresponding to a "NO" vote for the
8 proposition.

9 Section 9. If at the Bond Special Election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters
10 voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of bonded
11 indebtedness for the purposes set forth in such proposition, then such proposition shall have
12 been accepted by the electors, and bonds authorized shall be issued upon the order of the
13 Board. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not exceeding applicable legal limits.

14 The votes cast for and against the proposition shall be counted separately and when
15 two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on the proposition, vote in favor, the proposition
16 shall be deemed adopted.

17 Section 10. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on the bonds, the
18 Board shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax
19 levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a
20 sum in the Treasury of said City, or other account held on behalf of the Treasurer of said City,
21 set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on the
22 bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due
23 and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax
24 levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment
25 of such principal.

1 Section 11. This ordinance shall be published in accordance with any State law
2 requirements, and such publication shall constitute notice of the Bond Special Election and no
3 other notice of the Bond Special Election hereby called need be given.

4 Section 12. The Board, having reviewed the proposed legislation, makes the following
5 findings in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), California
6 Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., the CEQA Guidelines, 14 California Code of
7 Regulations Sections 15000 et seq., ("CEQA Guidelines"), and Administrative Code Chapter
8 31 ("Chapter 31"):

9 (i) Emergency Firefighting Water System (EFWS) Project. For the reasons set
10 forth in the letter from the Environmental Review Officer of the Planning Department, dated
11 November 25, 2013, a copy of which is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 131190
12 and incorporated by reference, the Board finds that the bond proposal as it relates to funds for
13 the EFWS Project is not subject to CEQA because as the establishment of a government
14 financing mechanism that does not involve any commitment to specific projects to be
15 constructed with the funds, it is not a project as defined by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.
16 The use of bond proceeds to finance any project or portion of any project with funds for the
17 EFWS Project portion of the Bond will be subject to approval of the Board upon completion of
18 planning and any further required environmental review under CEQA for the individual EFWS
19 projects.

20 (ii) Critical Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure. For the reasons set forth in the
21 letter from the Environmental Review Officer of the Planning Department, dated November
22 25, 2013, a copy of which is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 131190 and
23 incorporated by reference, the Board finds that the bond proposal as it relates to funds for
24 Critical Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure is not subject to CEQA because as the
25 establishment of a government financing mechanism that does not involve any commitment to

1 specific projects to be constructed with the funds, it is not a project as defined by CEQA and
2 the CEQA Guidelines. The use of bond proceeds to finance any project or portion of any
3 project with funds for the Critical Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure portion of the Bond
4 will be subject to approval of the Board upon completion of planning and any further required
5 environmental review under CEQA for the individual Critical Firefighting Facilities and
6 Infrastructure projects.

7 (iii) Police Facilities and Infrastructure. For the reasons set forth in the letter from
8 the Environmental Review Officer of the Planning Department, dated November 25, 2013, a
9 copy of which is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 131190 and incorporated by
10 reference, the Board finds that the bond proposal as it relates to funds for Police Facilities and
11 Infrastructure is not subject to CEQA because as the establishment of a government financing
12 mechanism that does not involve any commitment to specific projects to be constructed with
13 the funds, it is not a project as defined by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The use of bond
14 proceeds to finance any project or portion of any project with funds for the Police Facilities
15 and Infrastructure portion of the Bond will be subject to approval of the Board upon completion
16 of planning and any further required environmental review under CEQA for the individual
17 Police Facilities and Infrastructure projects.

18 (iv) Medical Examiner Facility. The Environmental Review Officer in the Planning
19 Department determined that the Medical Examiner Facility project is exempt from
20 environmental review as a Class 32 Categorical Exemption, infill development, in a written
21 determination dated May 30, 2013 and contained in Planning Department File No.
22 2012.1172E and this Board's File No. 131190.

23 (v) Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division Facility. On November 18,
24 2013, the Planning Department issued a Final Mitigated Negative Declaration ("FMND") for
25 the Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division Facility project, San Francisco Planning

1 Department Case No. 2013.0342E, which is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No.
2 131190 and which is incorporated into this ordinance by this reference. In issuing the FMND
3 the Planning Department determined that the Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division
4 Facility project could not have a significant effect on the environment.

5 (a) The Board hereby adopts as its own the CEQA findings for the Traffic Company
6 and Forensic Services Division Facility project made by the Planning Department in the
7 FMND.

8 (b) The Board has reviewed and considered the information contained in the FMND
9 and all other documents referenced in this Ordinance as being on file with the Clerk of the
10 Board in File No. 131190.

11 (c) The Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division Facility project as reflected
12 in this ordinance is consistent with the project described in the FMND and would not result in
13 any significant impacts not identified in the FMND nor cause significant effects identified in the
14 FMND to be substantially more severe.

15 (d) In accordance with CEQA, the Board has considered the mitigation measures
16 described in the FMND and hereby requires the mitigation measures and the mitigation
17 monitoring and reporting program ("MMRP") denoted as Exhibit A to this ordinance and on file
18 with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 131190 to be imposed as conditions on the
19 implementation of the Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division Facility project
20 approved by this ordinance.

21 (e) With the implementation of the mitigation measures required in Exhibit A to this
22 ordinance, the environmental impacts resulting from the Traffic Company and Forensic
23 Services Division Facility project on subsurface cultural resources, air quality emissions,
24 construction hours and operational traffic would be reduced to a less than significant level as
25 described in the FMND.

1 (f) Based upon the whole record for the FMND, including all written materials and
2 any oral testimony received by the Board, the Board hereby finds that the FMND reflects the
3 independent judgment and analysis of the Planning Department and the Board, is adequate
4 and complete and there is no substantial evidence that the proposed Traffic Company and
5 Forensic Services Division Facility project, given the implementation of the mitigation
6 measures as stated in the FMND and the adoption of the MMRP, could have a significant
7 effect on the environment as shown in the analysis of the FMND. The Board hereby adopts
8 the FMND and the MMRP on file with the Clerk of the Board as Exhibit A to this ordinance.

9 Section 13. The Board finds and declares that the proposed Bond is (i) in conformity
10 with the priority policies of Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code, (ii) in accordance with
11 Section 4.105 of the Charter and Section 2A.53(f) of the Administrative Code, and (iii)
12 consistent with the City's General Plan, and adopts the findings of the Planning Department,
13 as set forth in the General Plan Referral Report dated November 26, 2013, a copy of which is
14 on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 131190 and incorporates such findings by
15 reference.

16 Section 14. Under Section 53410 of the California Government Code, the bonds shall
17 be for the specific purpose authorized in this ordinance and the proceeds of such bonds will
18 be applied only for such specific purpose. The City will comply with the requirements of
19 Sections 53410(c) and 53410(d) of the California Government Code.

20 Section 15. The Bonds are subject to, and incorporate by reference, the applicable
21 provisions of Administrative Code Sections 5.30 – 5.36 (the "Citizens' General Obligation
22 Bond Oversight Committee"). Under Section 5.31 of the Citizens' General Obligation Bond
23 Oversight Committee, to the extent permitted by law, one-tenth of one percent (0.1%) of the
24
25

1 Oversight Committee, to the extent permitted by law, one-tenth of one percent (0.1%) of the
2 gross proceeds of the Bonds shall be deposited in a fund established by the Controller's
3 Office and appropriated by the Board of Supervisors at the direction of the Citizens' General
4 Obligation Bond Oversight Committee to cover the costs of such committee.

5 Section 16. The time requirements specified in Section 2.34 of the Administrative
6 Code are waived.

7 Section 17. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the
8 City are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to accomplish
9 the calling and holding of the Bond Special Election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions
10 of this ordinance.

11 Section 18. Documents referenced in this ordinance are on file with the Clerk of the
12 Board of Supervisors in File No. 131190, which is hereby declared to be a part of
13 this ordinance as if set forth fully herein.

14 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
15 DENNIS J. HERRERA,
16 City Attorney

17 By: Kenneth David Roux
18 Kenneth David Roux
19 Deputy City Attorney

20 n:\financ\as2013\1400173\00889002.doc

LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[General Obligation Bond Election - Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response] Ordinance calling and providing for a special election to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, June 3, 2014, for the purpose of submitting to San Francisco voters a proposition to incur the following bonded debt of the City and County: \$400,000,000 to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement, and seismic retrofitting of Neighborhood Fire and Police Stations, the Emergency Firefighting Water System, seismically secure facilities for the Medical Examiner, the Police Department's Traffic Company, and the Police Department's Forensic Services Division, and other critical infrastructure and facilities for earthquake safety and related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes; authorizing landlords to pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax increase to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code; finding that the estimated cost of such proposed project is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy; reciting the estimated cost of such proposed project; fixing the date of election and the manner of holding such election and the procedure for voting for or against the proposition; fixing the maximum rate of interest on such bonds and providing for the levy and collection of taxes to pay both principal and interest; prescribing notice to be given of such election; finding that a portion of the proposed bond is not a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopting findings under CEQA for the remaining portion of the proposed bond; finding that the proposed bond is in conformity with the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b), and is consistent with the General Plan; consolidating the special election with the general election; establishing the election precincts, voting places and officers for the election; waiving the word limitation on ballot propositions imposed by Municipal Elections Code, Section 510; complying with the restrictions on the use of bond proceeds specified in Section 53410 of the California Government Code; incorporating the provisions of the Administrative Code, Section 5.30-5.36; and waiving the time requirements specified in Administrative Code, Section 2.34.

Existing Law

General Obligation Bonds of the City and County of San Francisco may be issued only with the assent of two-thirds of the voters voting on the proposition.

Ballot Proposition

This ordinance authorizes the following ballot proposition to be placed on the June 3, 2014 ballot:

SAN FRANCISCO EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE BOND, 2014. To improve fire, earthquake and emergency response by: improving and/or replacing deteriorating cisterns, pipes, and tunnels, and related facilities to ensure firefighters a reliable water supply for fires and disasters; improving and/or replacing neighborhood fire and police stations; replacing certain seismically-unsafe police and medical examiner facilities with earthquake-safe buildings and to pay related costs, shall the City and County of San Francisco issue \$400,000,000 in general obligation bonds, subject to citizen oversight and regular audits?

The ordinance fixes the maximum rate of interest on the Bonds, and provides for a levy and a collection of taxes to repay both the principal and interest on the Bonds. The ordinance also describes the manner in which the Bond Special Election will be held, and the ordinance provides for compliance with applicable state and local laws.

Background Information

The Board of Supervisors found that the amount of specified for this project is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City, and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
BUDGET AND LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

1390 Market Street, Suite 1150, San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 552-9292
FAX (415) 252-0461

January 16, 2014

TO: Budget and Finance Committee *W*
FROM: Budget and Legislative Analyst
SUBJECT: January 22, 2014 Budget and Finance Committee Meeting

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Item	File	Page
1 & 2	13-1190	General Obligation Bond Election – Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response
	13-1189	General Obligation Bonds – Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response 1

<p>Items 1 and 2 Files 13-1190 and 13-1189</p>	<p>Departments: Department of Public Works (DPW) Public Utilities Commission (PUC) Controller's Office of Public Finance</p>
--	---

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Legislative Objectives

- File 13-1190: Ordinance calling and providing for a special election to be held on June 3, 2014 for in order to submit to San Francisco voters a proposition to incur \$400,000,000 of Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response (ESER) General Obligation bonded debt to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement and seismic retrofitting of Neighborhood Fire and Police Stations, the Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS), seismically secure facilities for the Medical Examiner, the Police Department's Traffic Company and the Police Department's Forensic Services Division and other critical infrastructure and facilities.
- File 13-1189: Resolution determining and declaring the public interest and necessity demand the construction, acquisition, improvement and retrofitting of Neighborhood Fire and Police Stations, the AWSS, seismically secure facilities for the Medical Examiner, the Police Department's Traffic Company, the Police Department's Forensic Services Division and other critical infrastructure and facilities for earthquake safety and the payment of costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Key Points

- On June 8, 2010, San Francisco voters approved Proposition B, a \$412,300,000. ESER General Obligation Bond to construct and improve Fire Stations, a new Public Safety Building, the AWSS, and other firefighting infrastructure and facilities related to earthquake safety.
- The proposed \$400 million GO bond includes (a) \$70 million for renovations to Fire Stations, (b) \$70 million for additional AWSS improvements, (c) \$30 million for renovations to nine of the ten Police Stations, (d) \$165 million for a new 110,000 square foot Police Department Forensic Services and Traffic Division facility, and (e) \$65 million for a new 43,000 square foot Medical Examiner facility. The 2014 ESER Bond does not specify which Fire Stations, Police Stations or AWSS projects which would be renovated or the scope or specific work that would be completed for each station or project.

Fiscal Impacts

- The \$165,000,000 cost for the Police Department's Traffic Company and Forensic Services Facility includes \$16,200,000 to purchase the site at 1995 Evans Avenue and includes potential expansion to accommodate growth of the Police Department's staff over the next 15-20 years. The Capital Planning Committee is working to identify such potential additional operating costs, which would be included in the City's Five Year Financial Plan.
- The \$165,000,000 cost for the Police Department's Traffic and Forensics facility does not include \$11.9 million and the \$65,000,000 cost for the Medical Examiner facility does not include \$10.7 million for the costs for furniture, fixtures or equipment, which cannot be paid from the proposed GO bond. The additional furniture, fixtures and equipment costs will likely need to be funded with General Fund monies, subject to future appropriation approval by the Board of Supervisors.

- The proposed \$400,000,000 in ESER GO Bonds will have a projected annual interest rate of 6.0 percent over approximately 20 years, with four issuances, resulting in estimated total debt service payments of \$688,978,400, including \$288,978,400 in interest and \$400,000,000 in principal, with estimated average annual debt service payments of \$26,499,169. Debt service would be paid from increased Property Taxes, such that an owner of a single family residence with an assessed value of \$500,000 would pay average annual additional Property Taxes to the City of \$48.06 per year.
- As of December 31, 2013, there was \$1,889,683,269 of General Obligation Bonds outstanding, or approximately 1.1% of the total assessed value of property in the City. If the \$400,000,000 of ESER General Obligation Bonds are issued, the total outstanding General Obligation Bonds would total \$2,289,683,269, or approximately 1.3% of the total assessed value of property.

Recommendations

- Approve the proposed ordinance (File 13-1190) and resolution (File 13-1189).
- Request that the City (Ballot Simplification Committee) include language in the subject bond measure to be placed before the San Francisco voters stating that there was an initial \$412,300,00 General Obligation bond authorization approved for public safety facilities in 2010, the subject \$400,000,000 General Obligation bond would be the second ESER General Obligation bond measure and that, in accordance with the City's Ten-Year Capital Plan, there is likely to be another ESER General Obligation bond measure submitted to the San Francisco voters.

MANDATE STATEMENT / BACKGROUND**Mandate Statement**

According to Article 16, Section 18(a) of the State of California Constitution, no county, city, town, township, board of education, or school district, shall incur any indebtedness or liability for any purpose exceeding in any year the income and revenue provided for such year, without the approval of two-thirds of the voters of the public entity voting at an election to be held for that purpose.

Section 9.105 of the City's Charter provides that the Board of Supervisors is authorized to approve the issuance and sale of General Obligation bonds in accordance with State law or local procedures adopted by ordinance.

Background

On June 8, 2010, the voters of San Francisco approved Proposition B, which authorized the issuance of \$412,300,000 of Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response (ESER) General Obligation Bonds to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement, and retrofitting of 19 Fire Stations, a new Public Safety Building, repair, replacement and expansion of the City's Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) and other firefighting infrastructure and facilities related to earthquake safety, as summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1: 2010 Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response General Obligation Bond Budget

Description	Total Budget
Neighborhood Fire Stations ¹	\$64,000,000
Public Safety Building	239,000,000
DPW Subtotal	\$303,000,000
Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) ²	\$34,400,000
Firefighting Cisterns	36,000,000
Firefighting Pipes and Tunnels	32,000,000
PUC Subtotal	102,400,000
Oversight and Cost of Bond Issuance	6,900,000
Total ESER Budget	\$412,300,000
Source: San Francisco Department of Public Works	

The Fire Stations and the new Public Safety Building projects totaling \$303,300,000 are being managed by the Department of Public Works (DPW). The City's AWSS, firefighting cisterns, and

¹ Renovations were planned for Fire Stations # 2, 5, 6, 13, 15, 17, 18, 22, 28, 31, 38, 40, 41, 42, 36, 43, 44, Fire Boat Headquarters #35 at the Port, and the Equipment Logistics Center #45.

² The Auxiliary Water Supply System is an independent fire protection system, also referred to as the Emergency Firefighting Water System which was designed as a secondary defense against fires in the event the domestic water system fails and includes a reservoir, two storage tanks, two pump stations, approximately 135 miles of pipes with approximately 1,600 hydrants and 52 connection along the waterfront to allow fire engines to pump water from the Bay. The AWSS also includes 153 underground cisterns throughout the City, which store water available for firefighting.

firefighting projects, pipes and tunnels totaling \$102,400,000 are being managed by the Public Utilities Commission (PUC). In addition, as shown in Table 1 above, an estimated \$6,900,000 is budgeted to provide bond oversight, including 0.1% allocation for the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee and 0.2% for the City Services Auditor and to fund the various costs to issue the General Obligation bonds.

As shown in Table 2 below, a total of \$332,135,000 ESER Bonds have been sold and appropriated to date, leaving a remaining balance of \$80,165,000 to be sold and appropriated of the total \$412,300,000 authorized. According to Mr. Charles Higuera, Program Manager for the ESER Bond Program, the remaining ESER Bonds are anticipated to be sold by the summer of 2014.

Table 2: Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response General Obligation Bond Total Budget, and Bond Sales and Appropriations to date

Project Description	Total Project Budget	First Bond Sale and Appropriation	Second Bond Sale and Appropriation	Third Bond Sale and Appropriation	Fourth Bond Sales and Appropriation	Total
Public Safety Building	\$239,000,000	\$63,096,285	\$164,120,973	0	0	\$227,217,258
Fire Stations	64,000,000	7,148,344	17,616,196	0	5,765,572	30,530,112
Auxiliary Water Supply System	102,400,000	8,396,928	0	37,999,848	25,000,000	71,396,776
Oversight/ Issuance	6,900,000	878,443	1,592,831	265,152	254,428	2,990,854
ESER Budget	\$412,300,000	\$79,520,000	\$183,330,000	\$38,265,000	\$31,020,000	\$332,135,000

Source: San Francisco Department of Public Works

The single largest project under the current ESER General Obligation Bonds is the construction of a new \$239,000,000 Public Safety Building, on City-owned land on Third Street between China Basin and Mission Rock in the Mission Bay Area, which will include (a) a new Police Headquarters and a new Southern District Police Station, which are both currently located in the Hall of Justice and (b) a new Mission Bay Fire Station. Construction began in January of 2012 and is anticipated to be completed during the summer of 2014, with a move-in date of November of 2014.

In addition, \$64 million of the current ESER Bonds are being used to complete improvements on 23 Fire Stations located throughout the City, including (a) replacement of two stations (Station 5 in Western Addition and Station 16 in Cow Hollow), (b) comprehensive renovations at two stations (Station 36 at 109 Oak Street and Station 44 at 129 Grand Street), seismic work at four stations, installation of emergency backup generators at five stations and more limited, focused scope replacement and reconstruction work at the remaining stations. All of these projects are anticipated to be completed by 2016.

The current 2010 ESER bonds are funding \$102.4 million of the AWSS project, including construction of 30 new cisterns, specific repairs to Pumping Stations 1 and 2, both AWSS water tanks (Ashbury and Jones) and the Twin Peaks Reservoir, and more limited repairs to the 135 miles of high-pressure underground connecting pipes. These projects are expected to be completed by 2018.

In addition to the above-described previously authorized 2010 \$412,300,000 ESER General Obligation Bond, the City's 2014-2023 Ten-Year Capital Plan, approved by the Board of Supervisors in April of 2013 (File 13-0228), identifies the need for a 2014 ESER \$428 million GO Bond. This \$428 million bond includes (a) \$70 million for additional Fire Stations, (b) \$70 million for additional AWSS improvements, (c) \$30 million for Police Stations, (d) \$165 million for a new Police Department Forensic Services and Traffic Division facility, (e) \$65 million for a new Medical Examiner facility, and (f) \$28 million to seismically improve or relocate the City's Animal Shelter. According to Mr. Brian Strong, Director of the Capital Planning Program, the \$28 million to seismically improve or relocate the City's Animal Shelter was removed from the \$428 million ESER Bond proposal, resulting in a need for \$400 million bond, because more time was needed to fully evaluate the needs for the facility, estimated detailed costs and to obtain CEQA certification and clearances.

DETAILS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

File 13-1190: The proposed ordinance would call and provide for a special election to be held in San Francisco on June 3, 2014 in order to submit to San Francisco voters a proposition to incur \$400,000,000 of General Obligation bonded indebtedness to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement and seismic retrofitting of Neighborhood Fire and Police Stations, the Emergency Firefighting Water System, seismically secure facilities for the Medical Examiner, the Police Department's Traffic Company and the Police Department's Forensic Services Division and other critical infrastructure and facilities.

File 13-1189: The proposed resolution would determine and declare that the public interest and necessity demand the construction, acquisition, improvement and retrofitting of Neighborhood Fire and Police Stations, the Emergency Firefighting Water System, seismically secure facilities for the Medical Examiner, the Police Department's Traffic Company, the Police Department's Forensic Services Division and other critical infrastructure and facilities for earthquake safety and the payment of costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

In addition, both the proposed ordinance (File 13-1190) and proposed resolution (File 13-1189):

- find that the estimated cost of the proposed capital improvement projects are too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County of San Francisco and will therefore require expenditures greater than the amount allowed in the existing annual tax levy;
- fix the maximum rate of interest on the bonds and provide for the levy and collection of property taxes to pay both the principal and interest on the bonds;

- authorize landlords to pass-through 50% of the property tax increases to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code;
- find that a portion of the proposed bond is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and adopt finding under CEQA for the remaining portion of the proposed bond;
- find that the proposed bond is in conformity with the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b) and consistent with the General Plan;
- fix the date of June 3, 2014 and the manner of the election, procedures for voting on the proposition, notice of such election and consolidate the special election with the general election;
- waive the ballot proposition word limit imposed by Municipal Elections Code Section 510;
- comply with Section 53410 of the California Government Code regarding restrictions on the use of bond proceeds;
- incorporate (a) Administrative Code Chapter 83, authorizing all contracts funded with the proceeds of these bonds be subject to the City's First Source Hiring Program, and (b) Chapter 14B, requiring the Local Business Enterprise and Non-Discrimination in Contracting Ordinance provisions;
- waive Administrative Code Section 2.34 time requirement provisions; and
- incorporate Administrative Code Section 5.30-5.36 provisions regarding the Citizen's General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee annual review and report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

Regarding CEQA, both the proposed ordinance and resolution include the following findings:

- Planning Department's November 25, 2013 letter determined that funds for the Emergency Firefighting Water System (EFWS) Project and Critical Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure are not subject to CEQA because the proposed legislation only establishes a proposed government financing mechanism which would enable potential projects to be constructed with these funds. However the proposed ordinance states that, upon completion of the necessary planning, any further required environmental review under CEQA for such individual projects would be required and subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors;
- Planning Department's determination on May 30, 2013 finds that the Medial Examiner Facility is categorically exempt, as an infill development project;
- Planning Department's November 18, 2013 Final Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division Facility finds that this project would not have a significant effect on the environment with the mitigation measures, monitoring and reporting program to be imposed as conditions on the implementation of this project approved by this ordinance.

Approval of the proposed \$400,000,000 of General Obligation Bond (GO Bond) would require approval by two-thirds of San Francisco voters. The use of GO Bond proceeds to finance any project or portion of any project would also be subject to future appropriation approval by the Board of Supervisors, subsequent to completion of planning and any further required environmental review under CEQA for individual projects.

If the proposed \$400,000,000 ESER 2014 General Obligation Bond is approved by at least two-thirds of the San Francisco voters, the funds would be used as shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Summary of Projects and Costs for the Proposed 2014 ESER Bond

Projects	2014 Bond	Explanation
Fire Stations	\$70,000,000	The ESER 2010 Bond Report identifies up to \$327 million of various renovations needed to correct all deficiencies and rehabilitate and upgrade all 42 Fire Stations and Bureau of Equipment at 2501 25 th Street and Emergency Medical Services at 1415 Evans Avenue ³ .
Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS)	70,000,000	PUC spent 1.5 years assessing and appraising the AWSS system and identified a \$294 million (2013 dollars) need to upgrade, replace, repair and improve the City's cisterns and water system pipe and tunnel network to withstand potential earthquake.
Police Stations and Infrastructure	30,000,000	A March 2013 comprehensive facility report identifies up to \$250 million of various mechanical, electrical and other renovation and seismic upgrades needed to correct all deficiencies at 9 of 10 police district stations ⁴ .
Police Department's Traffic Company ⁵ and Forensic Services Facility ⁶	165,000,000	-The Police Department's Traffic and Forensic services would be consolidated in a new 110,000 square foot (90,000 sf for Forensics + 20,000 sf for Traffic) building at 1995 Evans Avenue with separate 42,000 sf parking structure. City currently has lease with purchase option for the site, approved in November 2013.
Medical Examiner Facility ⁷	65,000,000	-The Medical Examiner would be relocated from 18,000 square feet in the Hall of Justice at 850 Bryant Street to an existing City-owned 29,000 square foot industrial warehouse at 1 Newhall Street currently used for City and County storage to add a second floor for a total 43,000 square foot Medical Examiner facility, including labs, medical/autopsy and office space.
Total	\$400,000,000	

³ Bureau of Equipment is the Department's Corporation Yard which repairs all Fire Department vehicles and equipment. Emergency Medical Services is where the Fire Department locates and manages all City ambulances.

⁴ The tenth Police District Station is currently being constructed under the 2010 ESER Bond in the Mission Bay Area, which will include a new Police Headquarters and a new Southern District Police Station.

⁵ SFPD's Traffic Company is located in the Hall of Justice at 850 Bryant Street and is primarily Police Officers on motorcycles providing traffic enforcement, accident investigations and traffic and pedestrian safety measures, including for parades and demonstrations.

⁶ SFPD's Forensic Services Facilities are also known as the crime labs that examine evidence, including DNA, photo lab and fingerprint records, with staff to provide expert testimony to support criminal cases, including crime scene investigators. Forensic Services are located in (a) the Hall of Justice, (b) vehicle impound lot at 450 7th Street, and (c) Hunters Point Shipyard.

⁷ The Medical Examiner is charged with coordinating investigations and certifications of deaths, determining the cause, circumstances and manner of fatalities in San Francisco.

FISCAL IMPACTS**Rationale for Proposed Costs**

According to Mr. Brian Strong, Director of the Capital Planning Program, the request for \$70 million for Fire Stations, \$70 million for AWSS and \$30 million for the Police Stations and Infrastructure under the proposed \$400 million 2014 ESER Bond, which were included in the 2014-2023 City 10-Year Capital Plan, is based on forecasting models of the amount of funds needed to improve and maintain these critical public safety facilities over the next six years, coupled with the restraint of not wanting to increase property taxes over existing levels, such that additional General Obligation Bonds would only be issued as existing debt is retired.

As noted in Table 3 above:

- the identified total Police Station needs are up to \$250 million, with the proposed 2014 Bond to fund \$30 million;
- the identified total Fire Station needs are up to \$327 million, the first ESER Bond funded \$64 million of improvements at 23 Fire Stations and the proposed 2014 ESER Bond would fund an additional \$70 million; and
- the identified total AWSS needs are up to \$294 million, the first ESER Bond funded \$102.4 million and the proposed 2014 ESER Bond would fund an additional \$70 million. In addition, the AWSS capital plan assumes leveraging of the City's potable water system to maximize the benefits of both PUC water systems.

The proposed 2014 ESER Bond does not specify which Fire Stations, Police Stations or AWSS projects which would be renovated or the scope or specific work that would be completed for each station or project. Both Mr. Higuera and Mr. David Myerson, Project Manager for the PUC note that if specific projects are detailed, each project would be subject to CEQA review and clearance, prior to approval by the voters. Therefore, Mr. Higuera and Mr. Myerson advise that, if the proposed \$400 million ESER Bond is approved by the voters, Police and Fire Department staff would work with DPW staff and PUC staff would work with Fire Department and DPW staff to prioritize the needs of each specific facility, station and project and then focus the scope of the individual projects. All issuances of the bonds and appropriations of the bond fund proceeds would be subject to Board of Supervisors approval, at which time CEQA review and approval of the specific projects would be detailed and the costs identified.

As shown in Attachment I provided by Mr. Higuera, the \$165,000,000 estimated cost for the Police Department's Traffic Company and Forensic Services Facility and the \$65,000,000 estimated cost for the Medical Examiner Facility are based on more detailed planning and initial design work conducted by consultant Harley Ellis Deveraux dba Crime Lab Design. This upfront work was funded with General Fund monies, including \$1,626,289 for the Medical Examiner facility and \$2,550,000 for the Traffic Company and Forensics Services facility, which would be reimbursed by the proposed 2014 ESER Bond funds, if approved by the voters. These upfront General Fund monies were previously appropriated in the FY 2011-12 and FY 2012-13 budgets.

As shown in Attachment I, the \$165,000,000 estimated cost for the Police Department's Traffic Company and Forensic Services Facility includes \$16,200,000 to purchase the site at 1995 Evans Avenue. In November, 2013, the Board of Supervisors approved a lease with an option to purchase this site (File 13-1038). In addition, the proposed size of the Traffic and Forensic Facility includes potential expansion to accommodate growth of the Police Department's staff over the next 15-20 years. For example, the Forensic Services Division currently has approximately 90 FTE staff and the proposed facility would accommodate approximately 130 FTE staff. Mr. Strong advises that the Capital Planning Committee is working with the Mayor and Controller's Office to identify such potential additional operating costs, which would be included in the City's Five Year Financial Plan.

In addition, the \$165,000,000 cost for the Police Department's Traffic and Forensics facility and the \$65,000,000 cost for the Medical Examiner facility do not include the costs for furniture, fixtures or equipment, which cannot be paid from the proposed GO bond. Such costs are estimated at \$11.9 million for the Police's Traffic and Forensics facilities and \$10.7 million for the Medical Examiner's facility. Mr. Strong advises that these additional furniture, fixtures and equipment costs are included in the City's 5-Year Financial Plan and would likely need to be funded with General Fund monies, subject to future appropriation approval by the Board of Supervisors.

Proposed Bond Financing Costs

If the proposed \$400,000,000 ESER General Obligation Bonds are approved by the San Francisco voters in June of 2014, Ms. Nadia Sesay, Director of the Office of Public Finance anticipates that these bonds would be sold in four issuances between 2015 and 2021, as shown in Attachment II. According to Ms. Sesay, the \$400,000,000 of ESER General Obligation Bonds are projected to have an annual interest rate of 6.0 percent over approximately 20 years, with annual debt service payments extending from 2015 through 2040, depending on the issuance. Overall, these bonds will result in estimated total debt service payments of \$688,978,400, including \$288,978,400 in interest and \$400,000,000 in principal, with estimated average annual debt service payments of \$26,499,169.

Repayment of such annual debt service will be recovered through increases to the annual Property Tax rate. As summarized in Attachment II, a single family residence with an assessed value of \$500,000, assuming a homeowners exemption of \$7,000, would pay average annual additional Property Taxes to the City of \$48.06 per year to cover the debt service on the proposed \$400,000,000 ESER General Obligation Bonds. As shown in Attachment II, the actual amount of additional Property Taxes for such a homeowner from the proposed \$400 million bond would range from \$3.28 to \$74.53 per year.

All of the oversight and bond issuance costs are included in the project estimated costs reflected in Table 3 above. Ms. Sesay estimates the total oversight and bond issuance cost would be approximately \$7,185,629 or 1.8%, which would be separately charged to each of the DPW and PUC projects, based on the actual cost of each project.

The City's Charter imposes a three percent limit on the amount of General Obligation Bonds that can be outstanding at any given time, relative to the total assessed value of property in the City. The FY 2013-14 total assessed value of property in the City is \$173,136,510,972, such that the three percent limit is currently \$5,194,095,329. According to Ms. Sesay, as of December 31, 2013, there was \$1,889,683,269 of General Obligation Bonds outstanding, or approximately 1.1% of the total assessed value of property in the City.

If the subject \$400,000,000 of ESER General Obligation Bonds are issued as proposed, the outstanding General Obligation Bonds would total \$2,289,683,269, or approximately 1.3% of the total assessed value of property. Ms. Sesay notes that the proposed issuances are consistent with the City's approved Ten-Year Capital Plan, which states that General Obligation bonds will be issued such that Property Tax rates will not increase above the FY 2006 Property Tax rates. Therefore, new General Fund bonds would only be issued as outstanding General Fund bonds are retired.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

It should be noted that the previously authorized 2010 ESER bond and the proposed 2014 ESER bond address the need to relocate City departments from the Hall of Justice, which has been determined to be seismically unsafe. A new Police Headquarters and a new Southern District Police Station, both currently located in the Hall of Justice, are being funded with the 2010 ESER bond, and will be completed in 2014. If the proposed \$400 million ESER bond is approved, the Police Department's Forensics Services and Traffic Company as well as the Medical Examiner would also be relocated into new facilities from the Hall of Justice. However, the District Attorney, Adult Probation, Police Investigations and Jail #3 and 4, as well as the Superior Court would still be located in the Hall of Justice. A proposed subsequent ESER General Obligation Bond would relocate the City's remaining functions. Mr. Higuera notes that the Superior Court are under the jurisdiction and responsibility of the State. Jails #3 and 4 will be a General Fund debt-financed project and is being addressed separately with the Sheriff's Department.

The proposed 2014 ESER General Obligation bond proposal references the previously authorized ESER 2010 General Obligation Bond indicating that the 2010 General Obligation bonds reflected the first phase of funding for improvements to essential public safety facilities. In addition, the City's 2014-2023 Capital Improvement Plan, as recently approved by the Board of Supervisors, addresses the need for multiple ESER General Obligation Bond measures to be approved by San Francisco voters to address the City's additional public safety facility needs. As noted in the City's Ten Year Capital Plan, a third ESER General Obligation Bond is anticipated to be submitted to the San Francisco voters for approximately \$290 million in 2021, to address additional Police, Fire, AWSS, Hall of Justice and other City needs.

However, a review of the 2010 ESER bond indicates that the Voter Information Pamphlet did not report to the voters that there were anticipated to be additional ESER General Obligation bond measures to further improve San Francisco's public safety facilities. While the City's Ten-Year Capital Plan are public documents, for full disclosure and transparency purposes, if the

proposed \$400 million bond is presented to the voters, the voters should be fully apprised of the previously authorized ESER GO bonds approved in 2010 and the likelihood of additional future subsequent ESER bonds.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve the proposed ordinance (File 13-1190) and resolution (File 13-1189).
2. Request that the City (Ballot Simplification Committee) include language in the subject bond measure to be placed before the San Francisco voters stating that there was an initial \$412,300,00 General Obligation bond authorization approved for public safety facilities in 2010, the subject \$400,000,000 General Obligation bond would be the second ESER General Obligation bond measure and that, in accordance with the City's Ten-Year Capital Plan, there is likely to be another ESER General Obligation bond measure submitted to the San Francisco voters.

TC&FSD

Based on the TBD Consultants Estimate dated 7/9/2013

11/2
100% Attachment I - Page 1 of 2

Div. #		%	TOTAL	GSF	
				Bldgs	Garage
				109,682	42,246
					\$/SF
01	FOUNDATIONS	4.63%	2,873,967		\$ 26.20
02	BASEMENT CONSTRUCTION	0.00%	0		\$ -
03	SUPERSTRUCTURE	12.70%	7,878,336		\$ 71.83
05	EXTERIOR CLOSURE	11.95%	7,417,683		\$ 67.63
06	ROOFING	1.61%	1,001,582		\$ 9.13
07	INTERIOR CONSTRUCTION	7.13%	4,426,425		\$ 40.36
08	STAIRS	0.61%	379,400		\$ 3.46
09	INTERIOR FINISHES	5.07%	3,148,645		\$ 28.71
10	CONVEYING	0.69%	430,000		\$ 3.92
11	PLUMBING	5.02%	3,116,465		\$ 28.41
12	HVAC	15.87%	9,851,555		\$ 89.82
13	FIRE PROTECTION	1.06%	658,410		\$ 6.00
14	ELECTRICAL	11.18%	6,939,812		\$ 63.27
15	EQUIPMENT	2.31%	1,433,650		\$ 13.07
16	FURNISHINGS	3.55%	2,205,632		\$ 20.11
17	SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION	0.64%	400,000		\$ 3.65
18	SELECTIVE BUILDING DEMOLITION	0.90%	560,000		\$ 5.11
19	SITE PREPARATION	0.35%	217,970		\$ 1.99
20	SITE IMPROVEMENTS	2.63%	1,630,379		\$ 14.86
21	SITE MECHANICAL UTILITIES	0.46%	287,600		\$ 2.62
22	SITE ELECTRICAL UTILITIES	0.27%	167,760		\$ 1.53
23	OTHER SITE CONSTRUCTION	0.96%	596,550		\$ 5.44
24	PARKING STRUCTURE	10.37%	6,435,657		\$ 58.68
	TOTAL DIRECT CONSTRUCTION COSTS	100.0%	62,057,479		\$ 565.79
	GC CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY	3.00%	1,861,724		
	DESIGN CONTINGENCY	15.00%	9,587,881		
	ESCALATION	20.00%	14,701,417	midpoint - June 18, 2018	
	Subtotal		26,151,022		
	DIRECT COSTS ESCALATED		88,208,501		
	JOBSITE MANAGEMENT	7.00%	6,174,595	\$246,984/month; 25 months	
	INSURANCE + BONDING	2.50%	2,359,577		
	FEE	3.00%	2,831,493	CM/GC	
	CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY	10.00%	6,205,748	% of construction direct cost	
	CM/GC CONTINGENCY	2.00%	1,241,150	% of construction direct cost	
	ART ENRICHMENT	2.00%	1,241,150	% of construction direct cost	
	Subtotal		20,053,712		
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS		108,262,213		
	PROJECT CONTROL				
	Client Department Services	0.50%	541,311		
	DPW Project Management	4.00%	4,330,489		
	City Administrative Services	0.75%	811,967		
	Regulatory Agency Approvals	2.25%	2,435,900		
	A/E Services	12.50%	13,532,777		
	Environmental Services	1.00%	1,082,622		
	CM Services	9.00%	9,743,599		
	Geotech, Surveys, & Data Collection	0.25%	270,656		
	Move Management	0.50%	541,311		
	Partnering Allowance	0.10%	108,262		
	Reserve	0.85%	920,229		
	Total Project Control	30.75%	34,319,122		
	Site Control				
	Site Purchase		16,200,000		
	Division of Real Estate Services		300,000		
	Total Site Control		16,500,000		
	Finance Costs				
	DPW Estimate of Cost of Issuance	1.50%	1,623,933		
	City Services Audits	0.20%	216,524		
	CGOBOC	0.10%	108,262		
	Total Finance Costs	1.80%	1,948,720		
	Other Misc. Indirect Costs				
1	Preliminary Project Planning - 1600 Owens		1,830,000		
2	Interior Signage		164,523		
3	Telecom/Data Wiring & Devices		658,092		
4	Security/Fire Alarm Wiring & Devices		643,181		
5	AV Wiring		284,523		
6	Escalation		369,317		
			3,949,636		
	Total Project Budget		164,979,690		

OCME @ 1 New All Street

Based on the TBD Consultants Estimate dated 1/30/2013.

100%

Div. #		%	TOTAL	GSF
				42,575
				\$/SF
01	GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	2.91%	814,241	\$ 19.12
02	SITE CONSTRUCTION	1.85%	516,606	\$ 12.13
03	CONCRETE	3.88%	1,084,059	\$ 25.46
05	METALS	11.53%	3,224,631	\$ 75.74
06	WOOD, PLASTIC + COMPOSITE	0.08%	23,416	\$ 0.55
07	THERMAL + MOISTURE PROTECTION	2.24%	627,419	\$ 14.74
08	OPENINGS	1.93%	540,116	\$ 12.69
09	FINISHES	9.38%	2,623,006	\$ 61.61
10	SPECIALITIES	0.89%	248,411	\$ 5.83
11	EQUIPMENT	9.76%	2,728,477	\$ 64.09
12	FURNISHINGS	3.71%	1,036,816	\$ 24.35
13	SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION	8.11%	2,267,476	\$ 53.26
14	CONVEYING EQUIPMENT	1.00%	280,000	\$ 6.58
21	FIRE SUPPRESSION	1.22%	342,307	\$ 8.04
22	PLUMBING	5.04%	1,409,931	\$ 33.12
23	HVAC	16.56%	4,629,715	\$ 108.74
26	ELECTRICAL	11.90%	3,326,031	\$ 78.12
27	COMMUNICATIONS	1.58%	442,026	\$ 10.38
28	ELECTRICAL SAFETY + SECURITY	0.08%	21,288	\$ 0.50
31	EARTHWORK	2.43%	678,739	\$ 15.94
32	EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS	2.85%	796,436	\$ 18.71
33	UTILITIES	1.05%	294,460	\$ 6.92
	TOTAL DIRECT CONSTRUCTION COSTS	100.0%	27,955,607	\$ 656.62

SUB BIDDING CONTINGENCY	3.50%	978,446
DESIGN CONTINGENCY	8.50%	2,459,395
ESCALATION	12.50%	3,924,181
Subtotal		7,362,022

midpoint - Jan. 16, '15

DIRECT COSTS ESCALATED		35,317,629
-------------------------------	--	-------------------

JOBSITE MANAGEMENT	5.50%	1,942,470
INSURANCE + BONDING	1.30%	484,381
FEE	3.00%	1,117,803
CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY	12.00%	3,354,673
CM/GC CONTINGENCY	2.00%	559,112
ART ENRICHMENT	2.00%	559,112
Subtotal		8,017,551

\$123,790/month - 14-month schedule

CM/GC

% of construction direct cost

% of construction direct cost

% of construction direct cost

TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS		43,335,180
---------------------------------	--	-------------------

PROJECT CONTROL

Client Department Services	1.00%	433,352
DPW Project Management	6.00%	2,600,111
City Administrative Services	1.00%	433,352
Regulatory Agency Approvals	2.50%	1,083,379
A/E Services	13.00%	5,633,573
Environmental Services	1.50%	650,028
CM Services	9.00%	3,900,166
Geotech, Surveys, & Data Collection	0.50%	216,676
Move Management	1.00%	433,352
Partnering Allowance	0.50%	216,676
Reserve	6.25%	2,708,449
Total Project Control	35.50%	18,309,113

Site Control

Site Purchase	-
Division of Real Estate Services	-
Total Site Control	-

Finance Costs

DPW Estimate of Cost of Issuance	1.50%	650,028
City Services Audits	0.20%	86,670
CGBOC	0.10%	43,335
Total Finance Costs	1.80%	780,033

Other Misc. Costs

1. Preliminary Planning - 1600 Owens	1,220,000
2. Interior Signage	63,863
3. Telecom/Data Wiring & Devices	255,450
4. Security/Fire Alarm Wiring & Devices	336,544
5. AV Wiring	103,863
6. Escalation	507,202
	2,486,922

allowance

Total Project Budget	64,911,248
-----------------------------	-------------------

2406

City and County of San Francisco
 Earthquake Safety & Emergency Response 2 (ESER-2)
 Proposed General Obligation Bonds
 Summary of Tax Levy

Fiscal Year	Assessed Valuation	Aggregate Debt Service	Tax Per \$500K A.Y.		Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response 2, Election 2014					Existing + ESER 2			
			Total Levy Amount	Levy Rate	2015	2017	2019	2021	2024	Agg.D/S	Levy Rate	Total Levy Amount	Levy Rate
2015	180,235,107,922	209,416,918	0.1162%	572.82	\$ 3,625,000						0.1201%	9.92	562.74
2016	188,706,157,994	165,988,868	0.0880%	433.65	12,995,000						0.1201%	33.95	467.60
2017	197,197,935,104	157,567,352	0.0799%	393.92	12,997,300	5,245,750					0.1201%	45.61	439.53
2018	205,085,852,508	153,728,995	0.0750%	369.54	12,994,000	12,597,400					0.1201%	61.52	431.06
2019	212,263,857,346	147,803,645	0.0696%	343.29	12,994,500	12,597,500	2,948,000				0.1201%	66.29	409.57
2020	219,693,092,353	140,723,495	0.0641%	315.79	12,992,600	12,597,600	7,078,200				0.1201%	73.31	369.10
2021	227,382,350,385	134,843,407	0.0593%	292.36	12,997,400	12,596,800	7,077,800	1,211,250			0.1201%	73.46	365.83
2022	235,340,732,856	132,977,070	0.0565%	276.57	12,997,400	12,594,200	7,079,000	2,907,600			0.1201%	74.53	353.10
2023	243,577,658,506	131,004,908	0.0538%	265.15	12,996,700	12,593,900	7,076,200	2,910,000			0.1201%	72.01	337.16
2024	252,102,816,553	127,627,014	0.0506%	249.58	12,994,100	12,594,700	7,079,100	2,908,800			0.1201%	69.57	319.15
2025	260,926,477,233	122,284,417	0.0469%	231.05	12,993,100	12,594,800	7,076,800	2,909,000			0.1201%	67.22	298.26
2026	270,058,903,936	111,639,737	0.0413%	203.80	12,993,100	12,594,800	7,079,000	2,910,300			0.1201%	64.95	268.75
2027	279,510,965,574	111,468,734	0.0399%	196.61	12,996,700	12,596,700	7,074,800	2,907,400			0.1201%	62.75	239.36
2028	289,293,849,369	110,812,037	0.0383%	188.84	12,992,400	12,594,600	7,078,900	2,910,300			0.1201%	60.63	249.47
2029	299,419,134,097	105,058,902	0.0351%	172.98	12,994,000	12,592,300	7,075,100	2,908,400			0.1201%	58.57	231.55
2030	309,898,803,790	95,309,402	0.0308%	151.62	12,994,400	12,593,300	7,078,100	2,911,700			0.1201%	56.60	208.22
2031	320,745,261,923	70,528,304	0.0220%	108.41	12,996,800	12,595,800	7,076,700	2,909,600			0.1201%	54.69	163.09
2032	331,971,346,090	70,714,275	0.0213%	105.02	12,994,100	12,593,000	7,075,300	2,907,100			0.1201%	52.82	157.84
2033	343,590,345,203	32,475,800	0.0093%	46.60	12,994,500	12,594,900	7,078,000	2,908,900			0.1201%	51.04	97.64
2034	355,616,006,215	5,595,250	0.0016%	7.76	12,995,600	12,594,900	7,078,600	2,909,400			0.1201%	49.32	57.08
2035	368,062,565,398	5,596,500	0.0015%	7.50	12,995,600	12,595,400	7,076,200	2,908,300			0.1201%	30.24	37.74
2036	380,944,755,187	-	-	-	12,592,800	7,074,900	2,910,300	2,909,800			0.1201%	29.22	29.22
2037	394,277,824,618	-	-	-	7,078,500	2,909,800	2,906,500	2,906,500			0.1201%	12.49	12.49
2038	408,077,545,375	-	-	-	7,075,500	2,910,100	2,906,500	2,906,500			0.1201%	12.06	12.06
2039	422,360,259,463	-	-	-	2,909,700	2,909,700	2,909,700	2,909,700			0.1201%	3.40	3.40
2040	437,142,868,544	-	-	-	2,909,700	2,909,700	2,909,700	2,909,700			0.1201%	3.28	3.28
Total Debt Service					\$250,329,000	\$244,550,250	\$137,414,700	\$56,484,450	\$688,978,400				
Total Principal					145,000,000	142,230,000	79,920,000	32,850,000	400,000,000				
Annual Levy Per \$500K A.Y.													
2014 A.Y.		173,136,510,972	Average	\$234.99			Average Annual DS	\$26,499,169			Average	\$48.06	\$237.86
2014 Debt Capacity		5,194,095,329	Maximum	\$72.82			Highest Annual Levy Rate	0.0097%			Maximum	\$74.53	\$582.74
			Minimum	\$7.50			Lowest Annual Levy Rate	0.0151%			Minimum	\$3.28	\$3.28


** SFGH Series 2014A Expected to be issued January 2014



2014 Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond: Safeguarding San Francisco

Not a project per CEQA
Guidelines Section
15378(b)(4) - the
creation of government
funding mechanisms
which do not involve
any commitment to any
specific project which
may result in a significant
physical impact on the
environment.

Jeanie Poling
Nov. 25, 2013
2013.1597R



City and County of San Francisco

What will this voter-backed bond do?

The ESER 2014 bond addresses San Francisco's emergency response capital shortcomings. The proposed projects and programs are the result of a citywide assessment of essential infrastructure improvement needs.

ESER 2014 will:

Seismically upgrade neighborhood fire stations

- rehabilitate and seismically upgrade selected neighborhood fire stations throughout the City

Seismically upgrade the emergency firefighting water system (also referred to as the Auxiliary Water Supply System or AWSS)

- construct additional cisterns that provide an emergency source of water for firefighting
- repair, replace and improve the most vulnerable components of the emergency firefighting water system pipe and tunnel network to withstand a major earthquake
- address safety and seismic reliability concerns at the core facilities

Seismically upgrade district police stations

- rehabilitate and seismically upgrade selected police district stations throughout the City
- address a broad range of deficiencies, beginning the renovation and/or the replacement of up to nine of the ten district stations

Relocate and seismically upgrade the traffic company and forensic services facilities

- design and construct seismically safe structures, professional work environments, and the facilities necessary for the San Francisco Police Department to function effectively during and after natural disasters and other calamities when emergency response capabilities will be critical

Relocate and seismically upgrade the medical examiner's facility

- provide a seismically safe structure, professional work environments, and morgue necessary for citywide emergency response capabilities by the medical examiner

Projects & programs	Cost (millions)
Neighborhood Fire Stations	\$70
Emergency Firefighting Water System	\$70
District Police Stations	\$30
Traffic Company and Forensic Services Facilities	\$165
Office of Chief Medical Examiner	\$65
Total	\$400



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Certificate of Determination Exemption from Environmental Review

Case No.: 2012.1172E
 Project Title: 1 Newhall Street
 Zoning: PDR-2 (Core Production, Distribution, and Repair) Use District
 65-J Height and Bulk District
 Block/Lot: 4570/030
 Lot Size: 46,980 square feet
 Project Sponsor: John Matthies, SFDPW
 (415) 557-4659
 Staff Contact: Christopher Espiritu - (415) 575-9022
 christopher.espiritu@sfgov.org

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

Reception:
 415.558.6378

Fax:
 415.558.6409

Planning
 Information:
 415.558.6377

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project would include the interior expansion and re-use of an existing industrial warehouse building to accommodate the new Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (OCME) facility. The existing building, constructed in 1986, is an approximately 28,875-square-foot (sq ft), two-story structure that has been primarily used for office/warehouse and is currently vacant. The proposed project would include an interior expansion of the second floor from 5,854 sq ft to 21,012 sq ft, seismic upgrades to existing foundations, and a rooftop replacement, resulting in a 5-foot increase in building height from 25 feet to approximately 30 feet (not including an additional 13 feet for a rooftop mechanical screen wall). The first floor would remain at a total of 23,021 square feet. The proposal would expand the total building square footage by 15,158 sq ft to a total of 40,033 sq ft. No expansion of the existing building footprint would occur.

EXEMPT STATUS:

Categorical Exemption, Class 32 (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15332)

REMARKS:

See next page.

DETERMINATION:

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

Victoria Wise for
 Sarah B. Jones
 Acting Environmental Review Officer

May 30th, 2013
 Date

cc: John Matthies, SFDPW, Project Sponsor
 Distribution List

Supervisor Malia Cohen, District 10
 Virna Byrd, M.D.F

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (continued):

As part of the programmatic changes to the building, the OCME facility would introduce new uses such as a medical complex (autopsy), a forensics laboratory, field investigation facilities, minor administration, and other building support functions. The existing 44-space parking lot would be reconfigured to provide 23 secured parking spaces for staff use and seven (7) public parking spaces located at the western and southern portions of the lot, respectively. The project site is located within the block surrounded by Cargo Way to the north, Newhall Street to the south, Jennings Street to the east, and Mendell Street to the west, in the Bayview neighborhood.

REMARKS:

In-Fill Development. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) State Guidelines Section 15332, or Class 32, provides an exemption from environmental review for in-fill development projects which meet the following conditions:

- a) *The project is consistent with applicable general plan designations and policies as well as with applicable zoning designations.*

The *San Francisco General Plan*, which provides general policies and objectives to guide land use decisions, contains some policies that relate to physical environmental issues. The proposed project would not conflict with any such policy. The project site is located within the Core Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR-2) zoning district and a 65-J Height and Bulk district in the Bayview neighborhood. The proposed use is permitted with a Conditional Use authorization from the Planning Commission per Section 227(d) of the *San Francisco Planning Code (Planning Code)* which would authorize establishment of a nonindustrial Public Use within the district. At approximately 30 feet in height, the proposed building would comply with the 65-J height and bulk district.

- b) *The development occurs within city limits on a site of less than five acres surrounded by urban uses.*

The approximately 1.1-acre (46,980 sf) project site is located within a fully developed area of San Francisco. The surrounding uses include warehouses, light industrial, parking, offices, and residential uses. The proposed project, therefore, would be properly characterized as in-fill development of less than five (5) acres, completely surrounded by urban uses.

- c) *The project site has no habitat for endangered, rare, or threatened species.*

The project site is within a developed urban area and occupied by existing development, with minimal landscaping, including hedges, ground cover, and street trees. Thus, the project site has no value as habitat for rare, threatened, or endangered species.

- d) *Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.*

Traffic. The project site is located within the block surrounded by Cargo Way to the north, Newhall Street to the south, Jennings Street to the east, and Mendell Street to the west, in the Bayview neighborhood.

Based on the trip rate for office use in the Planning Department's Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review (Guidelines) (October 2002), the proposed project would generate an estimated 725 average daily person-trips, of which there would be about 62 p.m. peak hour person-trips (generally between 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.). These peak hour person-trips would be distributed among various modes of transportation, including 42 automobile person-trips, 12 transit trips, five (5) walking trips, and two (2) trips by other means, which include bicycles and motorcycles. This would result in about 32 p.m. peak hour vehicle trips. This change in traffic in the project area as a result of the proposed project would be undetectable to most drivers, although it could be noticeable to those immediately adjacent to the project site. The proposed project would add a small increment to the cumulative long-term traffic increase on the local roadway network in the neighborhood and to other land use and development changes in the region. However, the volume of additional trips would not result in considerable contributions to any intersection cumulative impacts.

Vehicular access would be provided through two curb cuts on Newhall Street at the secured parking lot on the northwest side and at the visitor parking lot on the southwest side at Newhall Street. There would be adequate on-site queuing space on the ramp which would prevent queuing of the vehicles accessing the project on Newhall Street. The effect on traffic flow on Newhall Street from project vehicles entering and exiting both secured and visitor parking lots would therefore, not be substantial.

Parking. In addition to the existing parking lots located on the project site, street parking is also available on all adjacent streets with weekly parking restrictions for street cleaning. The proposed project would provide approximately 30 parking spaces on an existing at-grade parking lot. Approximately 23 parking spaces would be provided in a secure lot located at the northwest side of the project site. Seven (7) visitor parking spaces would be provided for visitors and would be located at the south side of the site. Access to the secured parking lot would be provided through a new curb cut on the northwest side of Newhall Street, while access to the visitor parking lot would be provided through an existing curb cut located at the southwest side of the lot at Newhall Street. In addition, eight (8) bicycle parking spaces would be provided at the visitor lot through four (4) secured bicycle lockers and four (4) unsecured bicycle spaces (bike rack).

The parking demand for the new uses associated with the proposed project was determined based on the methodology presented in the Transportation Guidelines. Based on the methodology, on an average weekday, the demand for parking would be about 94 spaces. The proposed project would include 30 off-street parking spaces (23 secured parking and 7 public parking spaces). Thus, the project would have an estimated unmet parking demand of 64 spaces. While the proposed off-street parking spaces would be less than the anticipated parking demand, the resulting parking deficit would not be considered a

significant impact. An unmet demand of 64 parking spaces associated with the project would not have a substantial adverse impact on overall parking conditions in the vicinity. Parking conditions are not static, as parking supply and demand varies from day to day, from day to night, from month to month, etc. Hence, the availability of parking spaces (or lack thereof) is not a permanent physical condition, but changes over time as people change their modes and patterns of travel.

Further, to the extent that lack of parking encourages people to switch mode, the resulting shifts to transit service would be in keeping with the City's "Transit First" policy and numerous San Francisco General Plan Policies. The City's Transit First Policy, established in the City's Charter Article 8A, Section 8A.115, provides that "parking policies for areas well served by public transit shall be designed to encourage travel by public transportation and alternative transportation." As discussed below, the project area is well-served by local public transit (Muni lines 19 Polk and 44 O'Shaughnessy) and bike routes (5, 7, 68, and 70), which provide alternatives to auto travel.

There may be secondary physical environmental impacts, such as increased traffic congestion at intersections, air quality impacts, safety impacts, or noise impacts caused by congestion. The transportation analysis accounts for potential secondary effects, such as cars circling and looking for a parking space in areas of limited parking supply, by assuming that all drivers would attempt to find parking at or near the project site and then seek parking farther away if convenient parking is unavailable. The secondary effects of drivers searching for parking is typically offset by a reduction in vehicle trips due to others who are aware of constrained parking conditions in a given area and thus, choose to reach their destination by other modes (i.e., walking, biking, transit, taxi). If this occurs, any secondary environmental impacts which may result from a shortfall in parking in the vicinity of the proposed project would be minor, and the traffic assignments used in the transportation analysis as well as in the associated air quality, pedestrian safety, and noise analyses, reasonably addresses potential secondary effects.

Transit, Bicycles, and Pedestrians. The 19 Polk and 44 O'Shaughnessy Muni lines run on Evans Avenue approximately 800 feet south of the project site. No other transit lines are located near the project site. A dedicated bicycle lane runs along Evans Avenue which connects to a shared bicycle route (Route 5) running along 3rd Street to the east of the project site. In addition, bicycle routes 7, 68, and 70 are also located near the project site. Pedestrian circulation is served by built sidewalks and painted crosswalks in the surrounding area. The proposed change of use from office/warehouse to public use for the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner would not generate substantial additional trips and thus, would not substantially change transit, bicycle, or pedestrian conditions in the project vicinity. During project construction, truck traffic and any construction activities may be noticeable to transit users, bicycle riders, and pedestrians in the project vicinity; however, construction-related impacts of a project are generally considered less-than-significant due to their temporary nature and limited duration.

The proposed project would generate a total of approximately 19 p.m. peak hour bicycle trips and pedestrian trips (5 pedestrian walking trips and 12 pedestrian transit trips). The proposed project would

therefore not cause a substantial increase in the amount of pedestrian and vehicle conflicts. Sidewalk widths are sufficient to allow for the free flow of pedestrian traffic. Pedestrian activity may marginally increase as a result of the proposed project, but not to a degree that could not be accommodated on local sidewalks or would result in safety concerns. Although the proposed project would result in an increase in the number of vehicles in the project vicinity, this increase would not substantially affect bicycle travel and safety in the area.

Loading. The existing building provides three (3) loading docks with overhead doors at the north end of the lot. The proposed project would continue to use the approximately 12-foot wide x 32-foot long loading spaces and provide a new canopy above the overhead doors. The loading area would require the installation of a new curb cut located on the northwest side of the parking lot at Newhall Street to access to the secured parking lot and loading bays/docks. The loading dock would accommodate loading demand and would have no significant impacts.

Construction. During the project construction period, construction-related trucks would travel in and out of the site. It is not anticipated that any construction-related lane closure would be required; however, if required, a lane closure permit would be secured to accommodate this work. Lane and sidewalk closures are subject to review and approval by the Department of Public Works (DPW) and the Transportation Advisory Staff Committee (TASC), which consists of representatives from the Fire Department, Police Department, MTA Traffic Engineering Division, and Department of Public Works. TASC provides recommendations to minimize the effects of construction projects on the public right-of-way. TASC review and subsequent compliance of the proposed project with its recommendations would therefore help minimize traffic effects due to any temporary lane closures during project construction. The project construction truck traffic would result in a temporary decrease in the capacities of local streets in the project area due to the slower movement and larger turning radii of project-related construction trucks. Due to its temporary nature and limited duration, project-related construction impacts on traffic would not be considered significant.

Noise. An approximate doubling of traffic volumes in the project area would be necessary to produce an increase in ambient noise levels noticeable to most people. As described above, the proposed project would not cause a doubling in traffic volumes. The project's marginal increase to the existing traffic volumes (see Traffic, p.4), would not cause a noticeable increase in the ambient noise level in the project vicinity. The noise generated by the proposed new use would be considered common and generally acceptable in an urban area, and would not be considered a significant impact.

During project construction, all diesel and gasoline-powered engines would be equipped with noise-arresting mufflers. Delivery truck trips and construction equipment would generate noise that that may be considered an annoyance by occupants of nearby properties. Construction noise is regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the City Police Code). Section 2907 of the Police Code requires that noise levels from individual pieces of construction equipment, other than impact tools, not

exceed 80 A-weighted decibels (dBA) at a distance of 100 feet from the source. Impact tools (such as jackhammers and impact wrenches) must have both intake and exhaust muffled to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works. Section 2908 of the Police Code prohibits construction work between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., if noise would exceed the ambient noise level by 5 dBA at the project property line, unless a special permit is authorized by the Director of Public Works. Construction noise impacts would be temporary and intermittent in nature. Considering the above, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact with respect to noise.

Air Quality. In accordance with the state and federal Clean Air Acts, air pollutant standards are identified for the following six criteria air pollutants: ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter (PM), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and lead. These air pollutants are termed criteria air pollutants because they are regulated by developing specific public health- and welfare-based criteria as the basis for setting permissible levels. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has established thresholds of significance to determine if projects would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. To assist lead agencies, the BAAQMD, in their CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (May 2011), has developed screening criteria. If a proposed project meets the screening criteria, then the project would result in less-than-significant criteria air pollutant impacts. A project that exceeds the screening criteria may require a detailed air quality assessment to determine whether criteria air pollutant emissions would exceed significance thresholds. The proposed project would not exceed criteria air pollutant screening levels for operation or construction.¹

In addition to criteria air pollutants, individual projects may emit toxic air contaminants (TACs). TACs collectively refer to a diverse group of air pollutants that are capable of causing chronic (i.e., of long-duration) and acute (i.e., severe but of short-term) adverse effects to human health, including carcinogenic effects. In an effort to identify areas of San Francisco most adversely affected by sources of TACs, San Francisco partnered with the BAAQMD to inventory and assess air pollution and exposures from mobile, stationary, and area sources within San Francisco. Areas with poor air quality, termed "air pollution hot spots," were identified based on two health-protective criteria: (1) excess cancer risk from the contribution of emissions from all modeled sources greater than 100 per one million population, and/or (2) cumulative PM_{2.5} concentrations greater than 10 micrograms per cubic meter. Land use projects within these air pollution hot spots require special consideration to determine whether the project's activities would expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations.

The proposed project is not within an air pollution hot spot. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with respect to exposing sensitive receptors to substantial levels of air pollution. The proposed project would include construction activities for the approximately 18-month construction phase. However, construction emissions would be temporary and variable in nature and

¹ Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, Updated May 2011. Table 3-1.

would not be expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutants. Furthermore, the proposed project would be subject to, and comply with, California regulations limiting idling to no more than five minutes,² which would further reduce nearby sensitive receptors exposure to temporary and variable TAC emissions. Therefore, construction period TAC emissions would result in a less than significant impact with respect to exposing sensitive receptors to substantial levels of air pollution.

In conclusion, the proposed project would not result in significant air quality impacts.

Water Quality. The proposed project involves interior renovations and would involve 5,000 square feet or more of ground surface disturbance; thus the project would require a Stormwater Control Plan. The project would not generate wastewater or result in discharges that would have the potential to degrade water quality or contaminate a public water supply. Project-related wastewater and stormwater would flow to the City's combined sewer system and would be treated to standards contained in the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant prior to discharge. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant water quality impacts.

e) *The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.*

The project site is located in a dense urban area where all public services and utilities are available. The proposed project would be connected with the City's water, electric, and wastewater services. Prior to receiving a building permit, the project would be reviewed by the City to ensure compliance with City and State fire and building code regulations concerning building standards and fire protection. The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in intensity of use or demand for utilities or public services that would necessitate any expansion of public utilities or public service facilities.

Other Environmental Concerns

Historic Architectural Resources. The existing building was constructed in 1986 and is not considered as a historic resource. In addition, the project site is not located within a historic or potentially historic district, or adjacent to a historic resource. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact to historic resources.

Archeological Resources. The proposed project would include excavation activities of up to 10 feet in depth for seismic retrofit and upgrades for the existing building, as well as the installation of a new elevator located on the north side of the building. A Preliminary Archeological Review³ was conducted by the Planning Department and concluded that the proposed project is not expected to cause effects to

² California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Division 3, § 2485.

³ *Environmental Planning Preliminary Archeological Review: Checklist*, May 1, 2013. This document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103 as part of Case File No. 2012.1172E.

archeological resources. Thus, no environmental concerns involving cultural resources would be associated with the proposed project.

Geologic and Seismic Hazards. Project construction would include excavation and the use of precast concrete piles for the seismic retrofit of the existing building. The proposed project would be required to conform to the San Francisco Building Code, which ensures the safety of all new construction in the City. Geologic and seismic hazards are considered as part of the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) review process. Background information provided to DBI would provide for the security and stability of the subject building and adjoining properties during construction. Potential damage to structures from geologic hazards on the project site would be addressed through the DBI requirement for a geotechnical report and review of the building permit application pursuant to DBI implementation of the Building Code. In light of the above, no environmental concerns involving geologic and seismic hazards would be associated with the proposed project.

Hazardous Materials. The proposed project would involve subsurface soils work for seismic upgrades and the placement of a new elevator. A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment⁴ was conducted and concluded that there was no evidence found during the site reconnaissance to indicate that current or historical activities conducted on the property have contributed to contamination of subsurface soil or groundwater in the area of the property. In addition, any interior work involving the handling and removal of hazardous building materials, such as asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint, would comply with federal, state, and local regulations. Therefore, no environmental concerns involving hazardous materials would be associated with the proposed project.

Neighborhood Concerns. A "Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review" was mailed on March 29, 2013, to community organizations, tenants of the affected property, and properties adjacent to the project site, and those persons who own property within 300 feet of the project site. No members of the public commented on the proposed project.

SUMMARY:

CEQA State Guidelines Section 15300.2 states that a categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances. There are no unusual circumstances surrounding the current proposal that would suggest a reasonable possibility of a significant effect. The proposed project would have no significant environmental effects. The project would be exempt under the above-cited classification. For the above reasons, the proposed project is appropriately exempt from environmental review.

⁴ *Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment of One Newhall Street, San Francisco, California* by PIERS Environmental Services, Inc., May 1999. This document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103 as part of Case File No. 2012.1172E.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Final Mitigated Negative Declaration

<i>PMND Date:</i>	October 2, 2013; Amended on November 15, 2013 (amendments to the PMND are shown in deletions as strikethrough ; additions in <u>double underline</u>)	1650 Mission St. Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103-2479
<i>Case No.:</i>	2013.0342E	Reception: 415.558.6378
<i>Project Title:</i>	1995 Evans Avenue / San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) Forensic Service Division (FSD) & Traffic Company (TC)	Fax: 415.558.6409
<i>Zoning:</i>	Industrial Use District PDR-2: Core Production, Distribution, and Repair – Bayview 80-E Height and Bulk District	Planning Information: 415.558.6377
<i>Block/Lot:</i>	Block 5231 / Lots 002B, 004, 005 and 006	
<i>Lot Size:</i>	96,000 square feet	
<i>Project Sponsor:</i>	San Francisco Police Department	
<i>Contact:</i>	Magdalena Ryor, San Francisco Department of Public Works	
<i>Lead Agency:</i>	San Francisco Planning Department	
<i>Staff Contact:</i>	Elizabeth Purl– (415) 575-9028 elizabeth.purl@sfgov.org	


PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The site of the proposed project is 1995 Evans Avenue, at the southeastern corner of the intersection of Evans Avenue and Toland Street in the northern part of the Bayview neighborhood of San Francisco. The site comprises Lots 002B, 004, 005, and 006 of Assessor's Block 5231. Four buildings, totaling approximately 40,500 square feet (sf) in floor area, occupy the site. Between 1954 and 2005 the site was used by the Parisian Baking Company. Recent use includes newspaper printing and warehousing. Currently, the buildings and site parking lot are vacant, with the exception of occasional unauthorized parking. The proposed project entails demolition of the existing buildings and construction of a new 128,000-sf building with a separate 47,000-sf parking garage to house the San Francisco Police Department's (SFPD) Forensic Services Division (FSD) and Traffic Company (TC). The FSD is a division of the SFPD's Investigation Bureau with a forensic testing laboratory that examines evidence and provides expert testimony to support criminal cases. The TC includes a fleet of motorcycle police officers who provide traffic enforcement, accident investigations and education. The project would accommodate approximately 285 full time equivalent employees.

FINDING

This project could not have a significant effect on the environment. This finding is based upon the criteria of the Guidelines of the State Secretary for Resources, Sections 15064 (Determining Significant Effect), 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance), and 15070 (Decision to Prepare a Negative Declaration), and the following reasons as documented in the Initial Evaluation (Initial Study) for the project, which is attached. Mitigation Measures are included in this project to avoid potentially significant effects (see page 127).

In the independent judgment of the Planning Department, there is no substantial evidence that the project could have a significant effect on the environment.


SARAH B. JONES
Environmental Review Officer

November 13, 2013
Date of Issuance of Final Mitigated
Negative Declaration

cc: Magdalena Ryor, Project Sponsor
Malia Cohen, Supervisor, District 10
Julian Bañales, Neighborhood Planner
Distribution List, Bulletin Board, Master Decision File



**SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

RECEIVED
MAYOR'S OFFICE

13 DEC 13 PM 3: 37

Final Mitigated Negative Declaration

PMND Date: October 2, 2013; Amended on November 15, 2013 (amendments to the PMND are shown in deletions as ~~strike~~through; additions in double underline)

Case No.: 2013.0342E

Project Title: 1995 Evans Avenue / San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) Forensic Service Division (FSD) & Traffic Company (TC)

Zoning: Industrial Use District PDR-2: Core Production, Distribution, and Repair – Bayview
80-E Height and Bulk District

Block/Lot: Block 5231 / Lots 002B, 004, 005 and 006

Lot Size: 96,000 square feet

Project Sponsor: San Francisco Police Department

Contact: Magdalena Ryor, San Francisco Department of Public Works

Lead Agency: San Francisco Planning Department

Staff Contact: Elizabeth Purl- (415) 575-9028
elizabeth.purl@sfgov.org

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377


PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The site of the proposed project is 1995 Evans Avenue, at the southeastern corner of the intersection of Evans Avenue and Toland Street in the northern part of the Bayview neighborhood of San Francisco. The site comprises Lots 002B, 004, 005, and 006 of Assessor's Block 5231. Four buildings, totaling approximately 40,500 square feet (sf) in floor area, occupy the site. Between 1954 and 2005 the site was used by the Parisian Baking Company. Recent use includes newspaper printing and warehousing. Currently, the buildings and site parking lot are vacant, with the exception of occasional unauthorized parking. The proposed project entails demolition of the existing buildings and construction of a new 128,000-sf building with a separate 47,000-sf parking garage to house the San Francisco Police Department's (SFPD) Forensic Services Division (FSD) and Traffic Company (TC). The FSD is a division of the SFPD's Investigation Bureau with a forensic testing laboratory that examines evidence and provides expert testimony to support criminal cases. The TC includes a fleet of motorcycle police officers who provide traffic enforcement, accident investigations and education. The project would accommodate approximately 285 full time equivalent employees.

FINDING

This project could not have a significant effect on the environment. This finding is based upon the criteria of the Guidelines of the State Secretary for Resources, Sections 15064 (Determining Significant Effect), 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance), and 15070 (Decision to Prepare a Negative Declaration), and the following reasons as documented in the Initial Evaluation (Initial Study) for the project, which is attached. Mitigation Measures are included in this project to avoid potentially significant effects (see page 127).

In the independent judgment of the Planning Department, there is no substantial evidence that the project could have a significant effect on the environment.


SARAH B. JONES
Environmental Review Officer

November 18, 2013
Date of Issuance of Final Mitigated
Negative Declaration

cc: Magdalena Ryor, Project Sponsor
Malia Cohen, Supervisor, District 10
Julian Bañales, Neighborhood Planner
Distribution List, Bulletin Board, Master Decision File

INITIAL STUDY
1995 EVANS AVENUE / SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT
FORENSIC SERVICES DIVISION AND TRAFFIC COMPANY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT CASE NUMBER 2013.0342E

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION	1
B. PROJECT SETTING	20
C. COMPATIBILITY WITH ZONING, PLANS, AND POLICIES	22
D. SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS	26
E. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS	28
E.1 Land Use and Land Use Planning	28
E.2 Aesthetics	30
E.3 Population and Housing	34
E.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources	36
E.5 Transportation and Circulation	44
E.6 Noise	56
E.7 Air Quality	61
E.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	76
E.9 Wind and Shadow	90
E.10 Recreation	92
E.11 Utilities and Public Services	94
E.12 Public Services	99
E.13 Biological Resources	101
E.14 Geology and Soils	104
E.15 Hydrology and Water Quality	109
E.16 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	114
E.17 Mineral and Energy Resources	121
E.18 Agriculture and Forest Resources	123
E.19 Mandatory Findings of Significance	125
F. MITIGATION MEASURES AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES	127
G. PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT	134
H. DETERMINATION	135
L. LIST OF PREPARERS	136

List of Figures

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
Figure 1. Project Location	2
Figure 2. Existing Site Plan	3
Figure 3. Photographs of Current Uses	4
Figure 4. Photographs of Current Uses	5
Figure 5. Proposed Site Plan	7
Figure 6. Proposed Building Elevations	8
Figure 7. Proposed Building Section	9
Figure 8. Proposed FSD/TC Building Ground-Floor Plan	10
Figure 9. Proposed FSD/TC Building Second-Floor Plan	11
Figure 10. Proposed FSD/TC Building Third-Floor Plan	12

Figure 11. Proposed FSD/TC Building Fourth-Floor Plan	13
Figure 12. Proposed FSD/TC Building Roof Plan	14
Figure 13. Proposed Parking Garage Floor Plans	15
Figure 14. Proposed Site Plan - Subsurface Structures	19

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table 1. Project Characteristics for the New Forensic Services Division and Traffic Company Building and Parking Garage	16
Table 2. Proposed Project Employee and Travel Characteristics	46
Table 3. Proposed Project Vehicle Trip Generation - Weekday PM Hour	46
Table 4. PM Peak-Hour Intersection Levels of Service (LOS) and Average Stopped Delay in Seconds per	48
Table 5. Nearby Street Noise	57
Table 6. Criteria Air Pollutant Significance Thresholds	62
Table 7. Off-Road Equipment Compliance Step-Down Schedule	70
Table 8. San Francisco Forensic Services Division Project Estimated Daily Regional Emissions (2016)	72
Table 9. Greenhouse Gas Reductions by Sector from the AB32 Scoping Plan	78
Table 10. Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies Applicable to the Proposed Project	83

INITIAL STUDY
1995 EVANS AVENUE / SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT
FORENSIC SERVICES DIVISION AND TRAFFIC COMPANY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT CASE NUMBER 2013.0342E

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location

The site of the proposed project is 1995 Evans Avenue, at the southeastern corner of the intersection of Evans Avenue and Toland Street in the northern part of the Bayview neighborhood of San Francisco. The site lies between U.S. Highway 101 (U.S. 101) and Interstate 280 (I-280), approximately 1,200 feet south of Cesar Chavez Street. The site comprises Lots 002B, 004, 005, and 006 of Assessor's Block 5231 (Figure 1), which form a 96,000-square-foot (sf) rectangle along 400 feet of Evans Avenue and 240 feet of Toland Street (Figure 2). The site is located in industrial use district PDR-2 (Core Production, Distribution, and Repair – Bayview) and an 80-E height and bulk district; the allowable basic floor area ratio limit is 5:1.

Four vacant buildings, totaling approximately 40,500 sf in floor area, occupy the project site (Figure 3). The main building was constructed in 1954 on previously undeveloped land in the northwest corner of the site. The building is a single-story, 24-foot-high structure, with the exception of a two-story portion along the northeast façade. It is approximately 30,000 sf in area. A retail storefront is located at the northwest corner of the building, facing the intersection of Evans Avenue and Toland Street (Figure 3). A 15-foot-tall covered loading area (approximately 8,000 sf) was added to the building's east side in 1956. An ancillary single-story parking garage building, of approximately 1,500 sf, and a one-story, 2,200-sf storage shed occupy the southeastern corner of the site. The parking garage is rectangular in plan with a shallow gable roof, metal cladding, three metal roll-up doors, and two flush metal man doors at the northeast elevation. The shed also has a gable roof, a flush metal door at the southeast elevation, and a window and roll-up metal door at the northeast elevation. A fourth ancillary single-story building of 640 sf is located at the northeastern corner of the site. The four buildings occupy approximately 45 percent of the lot.

All of the buildings are currently vacant. Recent use of the main building includes a hydroponics supply operation, newspaper printing, and warehousing. The most recent business, Hydroponic Connection, vacated the site in 2013. The San Francisco Examiner's newspaper printing operation, which used the site prior to Hydroponic Connection, also ceased operation in 2013 and the printing equipment was relocated to the Examiner's East Bay facility. In 1940, the West Oregon Lumber Company erected and used the ancillary building at the northeastern corner as an office (Figure 4). It is not known if the subsequent owners or tenants used this building. The shed at the southeastern corner of the site was constructed in 1960 and is believed to have been used for storage. The site parking lot was recently used for bus storage and is now vacant. Unauthorized cars are occasionally parked in the lot.

The area not occupied by the buildings is entirely paved with no vegetation. Eight trees are present along the sidewalk on Evans Avenue (see photograph in Figure 3). About 20 percent of the property contains marked parking areas, with 10 standard spaces for cars or small trucks and 14 long spaces for buses or large trucks. The loading area has approximately 14 bays. Parking in unmarked areas can accommodate approximately 30 additional cars or small trucks. An abandoned rail spur at the south side of the site (on Lot 002B) has been paved over on the western portion of the site but is visible on the eastern portion. The site is accessible to pedestrians and automobiles via one entrance on Toland Street and two entrances on Evans Avenue, which allow trucks to drive to the covered loading area on the southeast side of the main building. Pedestrian access is via the retail storefront of the main building.







Figure 1. Project Location



Site Plan – Existing Structures
NOT TO SCALE

07-29-13



crime
lab
design

Figure 2. Existing Site Plan





Figure 3. Photographs of Current Uses

Clockwise from top left: Storefront façade of the main building at the corner of Evans Avenue and Toland Street looking southwest. View of main building looking along Toland Street to the east. West corner of the storefront façade of the main building at the corner of Evans Avenue and Toland Street looking east. Eastern side of main building looking southeast along Evans Avenue.





Figure 4. Photographs of Current Uses

Clockwise from top left: Back of main building with covered loading dock looking northwest. Entrance from Evans Avenue with view of loading dock on right. Ancillary structure at southeastern corner with Interstate Highway 280 in background. Former office of lumber company at eastern corner of the site.

The closest San Francisco Municipal Transit Agency (SFMTA) Bus Route is No. 19 from Hunters Point to Fisherman's Wharf, which stops on Evans Street at Napoleon Street to the north of the site. The Evans Street stop for the T-Third Street rail line is approximately one-half mile from the site.

Project Characteristics


The proposed project entails demolition of the existing buildings, removal of pavement, and construction of a new building with a separate parking garage to house the San Francisco Police Department's (SFPD) Forensic Services Division (FSD) and Traffic Company (TC) (Figure 5). The FSD, a division of the SFPD's Investigation Bureau, is a forensic testing laboratory that examines evidence and provides expert testimony to support cases involving firearms, forensic biology (DNA), narcotics, arson debris, gunshot residue from the hands of shooters, and forensic documents. The TC, an independent command within the SFPD's Field Operations Bureau, operates a fleet of solo motorcycle officers who provide traffic enforcement, accident investigations, and education. The TC is presently housed at the Hall of Justice building at 850 Bryant Street in San Francisco, and the FSD function is presently located at the Hunters Point Shipyard.

Demolition of existing structures and removal of pavement from the site would be completed prior to the construction of a new 128,000-sf building and associated parking garage.¹ The proposed FSD/TC building would be four stories, approximately 64 feet in height inclusive of a 1-foot parapet, with a mechanical penthouse extending approximately 15 feet above the roofline, for a total building height of 80 feet. Elevations of the proposed building façades are shown on Figure 6 and a site section with heights is shown on Figure 7. Two elevators would provide access to the upper floors. The FSD would occupy 110,000 sf and the TC would occupy 18,000 sf of the FSD/TC building. The TC would be located on the first two floors of the southwestern section of the FSD/TC building, and FSD facilities would be housed in the remaining space not utilized for common areas or facility infrastructure. Floor plans of the FSD/TC building are shown on Figure 8 through Figure 12. FSD facilities would include forensics laboratories, laboratory support space, and offices. The TC would use the building for offices and storage.

Table 1 provides project characteristics for each building and the functions of each division.

A 47,000-sf, two-level parking garage would be constructed with 82 spaces for TC sworn-officer personal vehicles, 110 spaces for TC motorcycles, and storage space for 25 impounded vehicles. The parking garage would include four handicap spaces and two car share spaces. Parking garage floor plans are shown on Figure 13. Three parking spaces for visitors would be located along Evans Avenue (Figure 5). In addition, 16 Class 1 and eight Class 2 bicycle parking spaces would be located to the northwest of the parking garage near the main employee entry of the FSD/TC building. Receiving and one off-street loading space would be situated between the parking garage and the FSD/TC building as shown on Figure 5. Employee access to the facility would be via secure entrances to the parking garage structure from Toland Street and Evans Avenue and a walkway from the parking garage to the FSD/TC building. Employees and visitors arriving on foot or via public transit would enter the FSD/TC building lobby located on Evans Avenue. A vehicle access bay would also be constructed at the northeastern side of the site.

¹ Approximately 23,000 sf of the total may be constructed as a potential future building expansion. This Initial Study analyzes impacts associated with full build-out at the site. For the 23,000-sf future building expansion, approximately 16,100 sf will be utilized for additional forensic testing laboratory space and 6,900 sf will be utilized for additional office space.




Site Plan

07-29-13




Figure 5. Proposed Site Plan



07-29-13



Figure 6. Proposed Building Elevations



NOT TO SCALE


Site Section
(Looking Southwest)









07-29-13



crime lab design

Figure 7. Proposed Building Section




- 
1st Floor
 NOT TO SCALE
-  LAB & LAB SUPPORT
 -  OFFICE
 -  TRAFFIC
 -  BUILDING SUPPORT
 -  FUTURE EXPANSION
 -  CIRCULATION
 -  VERTICAL CIRCULATION









07-29-13



**crime
lab
design**

Figure 8. Proposed FSD/TC Building Ground-Floor Plan











-  **2nd Floor**
 NOT TO SCALE
-  LAB & LAB SUPPORT
 -  OFFICE
 -  TRAFFIC
 -  BUILDING SUPPORT
 -  FUTURE EXPANSION
 -  CIRCULATION
 -  VERTICAL CIRCULATION

07-29-13

Figure 9. Proposed FSD/TC Building Second-Floor Plan






-  **3rd Floor**
 NOT TO SCALE
-  LAB & LAB SUPPORT OFFICE
 -  TRAFFIC
 -  BUILDING SUPPORT
 -  FUTURE EXPANSION
 -  CIRCULATION
 -  VERTICAL CIRCULATION







07-29-13



crime
lab
design

Figure 10. Proposed FSD/TC Building Third-Floor Plan




- 4th Floor**
 NOT TO SCALE
-  LAB & LAB SUPPORT OFFICE
 -  TRAFFIC
 -  BUILDING SUPPORT
 -  FUTURE EXPANSION
 -  CIRCULATION
 -  VERTICAL CIRCULATION








07-29-13



crime
lab
design

Figure 11. Proposed FSD/TC Building Fourth-Floor Plan





-  **Penthouse**
 NOT TO SCALE
-  LAB & LAB SUPPORT OFFICE
 -  TRAFFIC
 -  BUILDING SUPPORT
 -  FUTURE EXPANSION
 -  CIRCULATION
 -  VERTICAL CIRCULATION

07-29-13



crime
lab
design

Figure 12. Proposed FSD/TC Building Roof Plan



Parking Garage Floor Plans

07-29-13



Figure 13. Proposed Parking Garage Floor Plans

TABLE 1. PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS FOR THE NEW FORENSIC SERVICES DIVISION AND TRAFFIC COMPANY BUILDING AND PARKING GARAGE

Uses	FSD/TC Building		Parking Garage
	FSD Operation	TC Operation	
Public Services Uses			
Forensic testing laboratories and laboratory support	63,000 sf	-	-
Forensic Services Division administrative offices and support areas	27,000 sf	-	-
Traffic Company administrative offices and support areas	-	18,000 sf	-
Common areas and building support (stairs, toilets, conference rooms, mechanical and electrical facilities, housekeeping, etc.)	20,000 sf		-
Traffic Company vehicle operations (police motorcycle fleet, sworn office vehicles, and impounded cars)	-	-	47,000 sf
<i>Total</i>	128,000 sf		47,000 sf
Number of Employees	178	120	-
Building Characteristics			
Height	80 feet		34 feet
Number of stories	4		2
Number of showers	11		
Number of lockers	130		
Number of loading areas	1		
Parking spaces			
Sworn-officer personal vehicles	-	-	82
TC motorcycles	-	-	110
Impound vehicles	-	-	25
Bicycles	16 Class 1 and eight Class 2		
Car share	-	-	2

Source: Information provided by project sponsor.

The new FSD/TC building would be of steel frame construction with a foundation supported by 275 to 400 14-inch-square pre-cast and pre-stressed concrete piles approximately 90 feet deep. The parking garage would be supported by 100 to 200 piles of the same dimensions and depth. The FSD/TC building would be set back from the property line 15 feet along Toland Street, 24 feet along Evans Avenue, and 26 feet along the southern property boundary. The parking garage would be set back 46 feet from the property boundary at Evans Avenue. A low perimeter concrete site wall along the street edges would protect the FSD/TC building from vehicular crashes. The FSD/TC building façade with "street-level" presence would be screened with obscuring and resistive construction. FSD/TC building delivery and secure intake functions would be shielded from public view. Exterior building materials would consist of masonry, glass, and metal panels chosen for durability, long-term performance, and appropriateness for a modern forensic testing laboratory and office structure.

The entire site would be raised approximately three feet in elevation for flood protection and would be paved, with the exception of areas that would be landscaped as shown on Figure 5. Under the proposed project, the sidewalk along Evans Avenue adjacent to the project site would be maintained at 10 feet in width, and a 6-foot planter strip would replace the parking lane in front of the project site (with the exception of the three guest parking spaces). On Toland Street, the project would construct an 8-foot wide sidewalk (with adjacent 8-foot planter strip) where no sidewalk currently exists. Trees would be planted along the perimeter of the site and along the sidewalks of Toland Street and Evans Avenue. Permeable pavers, rain gardens, a bio-swale and a roof garden (Figure 5) would be installed to reduce storm water flow from the site in compliance with the San Francisco Public Utility Commission's (SFPUC's) *Storm Water Design Guideline*. Storm water would discharge to the SFPUC's combined sewer system.

The project would include provision for drinking and fire suppression water, power, and sanitary sewerage. The buildings would be designed in accordance with the Essential Services Buildings Seismic Safety Act to minimize fire hazards and to resist the forces of earthquakes, gravity, and wind.² The TC space would be designed for immediate occupancy and normal operational use, with specialty water, sanitary, fire protection, and emergency power systems for 96-hour self-sufficient operation. FSD components would include controlled shutdown and emergency systems adequate for preservation of evidence but not on-going operations. Two emergency power generators fueled by an underground diesel storage system would provide backup power in the event of an outage. Storage tanks for fire suppression and emergency potable water would be installed at the northwestern perimeter of the site). An 8,000-gallon sanitary storage tank (see Figure 14) would be installed below grade, external to the FSD/TC building and connected via gravity source along the FSD/TC building main sanitary discharge, with access for mechanical pumping, if needed, to satisfy essential facilities use demands during emergency conditions. The facility would be secured by fencing and monitored via closed-circuit television. Outdoor lighting would be provided for the FSD/TC building entryways and parking structure.

Operating hours for the FSD would be 6:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. The TC would operate three daily shifts: a day shift from 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.; swing shift from 2:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.; and a night shift from 9:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. Approximately 298 employees would work at the facility (staffing level reflects post-expansion workforce), with 120 working at the TC and 178 at the FSD. About nine of the FSD employees would be working during the evening and nighttime hours of 6:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. At the TC, 48 employees would work during the day shift, 36 on the swing shift, and 36 on the night shift. Three to six of these employees would be civilian staff, with the remainder being law enforcement officers.

² California Health and Safety Code (HSC), Chapter 2, Section 16000 through Section 16023.


Construction of the facility is anticipated to take 30 months. Demolition of existing structures would occur during 2016 and is anticipated to require three months to complete. Limited excavation would be required for installation of subsurface structures, such as the elevator shafts, diesel fuel tanks, and a water storage tank. Excavation of 1,100 cubic yards (cy) of soil is anticipated to a depth ranging from approximately 5 to over 24 feet. The site grade would be raised by about three feet with approximately 10,000 cy of fill. Pile driving for support of the FSD/TC building and parking garage foundations would be conducted for a period of four months. The total duration of construction is estimated to be 30 months, beginning in 2016 and ending in 2018. Hours of construction are expected to be from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The estimated cost of the project is \$55,500,000.

Required Approvals

William Spencer Company of Brisbane, California, owns the property on which the project would be constructed. The City and County of San Francisco plans to purchase the property from the current owner. Funding for the purchase would be obtained via the Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond Program.

The project would require the following approvals from the City and County of San Francisco:

- Approval for bond funding by Board of Supervisors (Approval Action);
- Approval of a Planned Unit Development by the San Francisco Planning Department (SF Planning Department);
- Approval of a Subdivision Map and Issuance of a Street Tree Permit, Grading Permit and Right-of-Way (ROW) Permits from the San Francisco Department of Public Works (SFPD);
- Issuance of a Building Permit by the Department of Building Inspection;
- Approval of a Site Mitigation Plan (SMP) by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFPDH); and,
- Approval of a Storm Water Control Plan (SWCP) by the SFPUC.



Site Plan – Subsurface Structures
NOT TO SCALE

07-29-13



Figure 14. Proposed Site Plan - Subsurface Structures

B. PROJECT SETTING

The site of the proposed project is an approximately 2.2-acre parcel in the northern part of the Bayview neighborhood of San Francisco at 1995 Evans Avenue, on the southern corner of the intersection of Evans Avenue and Toland Street. The property is bordered by public roadways, with Toland Street on the western edge and Evans Avenue on the northern edge. The eastern property edge abuts a parcel owned and used by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for vehicle storage. A 17-foot wide inactive railway spur runs along the southern site boundary. Beyond the railway spur, to the southwest, is a warehouse occupied by Ceiling Systems Supply, Inc. Evans Avenue and Toland Street are both two-way streets, with two traffic lanes in each direction on Evans Avenue and a single lane in each direction on Toland Street. Toland Street terminates at the five-way intersection of Evans Avenue and Napoleon Street, a two-way, two-lane street running approximately east-west (see Figure 1).

The topography of the vicinity of the project site is either flat or gently sloping eastward towards the Bay, and has a mix of commercial and light industrial uses dominated by one- and two-story warehouses. The nearest residences are at the Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex public housing units 0.3 mile north of the project site. The nearest parks to the project site include Islais Creek Park and Tulare Park, which are about 0.4 mile east of the project site, and Selby & Palou Mini Park, which is approximately 0.6 mile south of the project site. Although no building in the vicinity exceeds two stories in height, many buildings include features such as high ceilings, large loading docks, and ground floor access generally not present in most offices and commercial buildings. A range of industrial construction styles typical of the latter half of the twentieth century is present, and includes reinforced concrete, steel, and wood-framed buildings clad in corrugated sheet metal, masonry, or stucco. The tallest nearby structure is the I-280 elevated freeway, located approximately 200 feet southeast, paralleling the southeastern boundary of the site. Its height at this location is approximately 60 feet above street level and well above the height of buildings in the area.

Evans Avenue is a major artery serving the area; it intersects Cesar Chavez Street approximately 1,000 feet north-northeast of the site. Exits and entrances to the U.S. 101 and I-280 freeways are about one-half mile from this junction.

New housing, large office developments, large-scale retail, and the heaviest of industrial uses, such as incinerators, are not permitted in the PDR-2 district in which the site is located. Generally, all other uses are permitted. Activities in these areas may emit noises, vibrations, odors, and other emissions. Chemical, biological, and other hazardous, explosive, or flammable materials may be stored and used in buildings in the PDR-2 use district.

The site is located in an Industrial Protection Zone (IPZ) special use district, which is intended to protect light and heavy industrial uses, and within one-quarter mile of an Existing Fringe Financial Service restricted use district, which prohibits new fringe financial services, including check cashing and payday lending. Residential, live/work, and office uses are not permitted in the IPZ. Office space accessory to an industrial use is allowed.

The area immediately outside of the PDR-2 use district in which the proposed project would be located is primarily residential to the north, west, and south. Commercial and industrial uses are to the east toward the inlet for Islais Creek and San Francisco Bay.

The project site lies within an 80-E height and bulk district that comprises several city blocks in the core of the PDR-2 district. This core is surrounded on all sides by a 65-J height and bulk district. Most (90 percent) of the residential areas beyond are in a 40-X height and bulk district, with some in 45-X, 48-X, 55-X, 65-X, 68-X, and OS (open space) height and bulk districts. Notable exceptions to this pattern are San Francisco General Hospital, located three quarters of a mile northwest of the site in a 105-E height and bulk district, and the area north of Islais Creek, about one-half mile northeast of the site, which includes some 68-X, 80-E, and 85-X height and bulk districts centered on the Third Street corridor and its intersections with 25th Street and Cesar Chavez Street.

C. COMPATIBILITY WITH ZONING, PLANS, AND POLICIES

	<i>Applicable</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
Discuss any variances, special authorizations, or changes proposed to the Planning Code or Zoning Map, if applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discuss any conflicts with any adopted plans and goals of the City or Region, if applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discuss any approvals and/or permits from City departments other than the Planning Department or the Department of Building Inspection, or from Regional, State, or Federal Agencies.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

San Francisco Planning Code

The San Francisco Planning Code (Planning Code), which incorporates the San Francisco Zoning Maps, governs permitted uses, densities, and configuration of buildings within San Francisco. Permits to construct new buildings (or to alter or demolish existing ones) may not be issued unless the proposed project either conforms to the Planning Code or is granted an exception pursuant to provisions of the Planning Code. Because the project site is greater than one-half acre in size, a PUD would be required for any exceptions to the Planning Code. The proposed project approvals would include a PUD to address the project's provision of a smaller number of off-street parking spaces than is required by the Planning Code.

Use District

The project site is in the PDR-2 use district. Planning Code Section 210.11 provides that the intent of the PDR-2 zoning district is, "... to encourage the introduction, intensification, and protection of a wide range of light and contemporary industrial activities. Thus, this zoning district prohibits new housing, large office developments, large-scale retail, and the heaviest of industrial uses, such as incinerators. Generally, all other uses are permitted." According to Planning Code Section 210.11, a wide range of light and contemporary industrial activities are permitted in the PDR-2 use district. In addition, certain non-industrial and non-residential uses can be permitted, including small-scale retail and office, entertainment, certain institutions, and similar uses that would not conflict with primary industrial uses or are compatible with the operational characteristics of businesses in the area.

The proposed use includes:

- Forensic testing laboratories and laboratory support areas for the FSD (63,000 sf in size);
- Administrative offices and support areas for the FSD (27,000 sf in size);
- Common and building support areas (e.g., stairs, toilets, conference rooms, mechanical and electrical facilities) (20,000 sf in size);
- TC operations, including accident investigations and education (18,000 sf in size); and
- Two-level parking garage for the TC police motorcycle fleet, sworn office vehicles, and impounded cars (47,000 sf).

PDR districts are intended to preserve and expand the City's existing stock of light industrial activities, which are important to the health and function of the City's economy, but cannot adequately compete against residential and office land uses in the real estate market. The San Francisco Planning Department's (SF Planning Department) Zoning Administrator determined that the FSD and TC are a "public service facility, excluding service yard" and that "operating requirements necessitate [their] location within the [PDR-2] district" as defined in Planning Code Section 227(e). A public service facility is permitted as a principle use in a PDR-2 use district.

Height and Bulk District

The project site is located in an 80-E height and bulk district, with maximum allowed building height of 80 feet (Planning Code Section 250). The proposed FSD/TC building would be 64 feet in height including a 1-foot parapet with a mechanical penthouse extending it approximately 15 feet above the roofline to a total height of 80 feet. The mechanical penthouse above 64 feet would be approximately 110 feet in length and 120 feet on the diagonal and would not exceed the maximum length (110 feet) and/or diagonal (140 feet) dimensions for the 80-E bulk district. Thus, the proposed project complies with both the height and bulk limits.

Special Use District

The project site is situated in the IPZ Special Use District, which prohibits residential and office uses, except office space accessory to an industrial use (Planning Code Section 249.22(b)). The project is also subject to Planning Code Section 230, which requires replacement of PDR space if an industrial building is demolished. Since the Zoning Administrator determined that project is a public service facility whose operating requirements necessitate location within PDR, the proposed FSD/TC building would meet Planning Code Section 230 industrial building replacement requirement.

Parking

Planning Code Section 151 provides requirements for off-street parking based on proposed uses. Per Table 151 of the Planning Code, for manufacturing and industrial uses, one off-street parking space is required for each 1,500 sf of occupied floor area; for office space accessory to the industrial space, one off-street parking space is required for each 500 sf of occupied floor area. Under a full build-out scenario, 45 off-street parking spaces are required for the laboratory functions and 96 off-street parking spaces are required for office functions. The parking garage would provide 82 spaces for employee vehicles, 20 spaces fewer than the 102 required by Planning Code Section 151. The SF Planning Department would review the proposed number and dimensions of parking spaces for conformance with the off-street parking requirements of the Planning Code through the building permit review process. A variance would be required for approval of fewer parking spaces than are required by the Planning Code. The project would provide two car-share spaces, which would meet the Planning Code requirement in Section 166. The proposed project would provide 16 Class 1 and eight Class 2 bicycle parking spaces, for a total of 24 at-grade spaces. This would exceed the Planning Code requirements for bicycle parking (Sections 155.2 and 155.3) of 15 Class 1 and eight Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. In addition to the bicycle parking spaces, the proposed project would provide 130 lockers and 11 showers. This would exceed the Planning Code requirements in Section 155.4 of 24 lockers and four showers.

Loading

Planning Code Section 152 provides loading space requirements based on proposed uses. For buildings with a gross floor area of 100,001 to 200,000 sf that are not a retail store, a wholesale use, a manufacturing use, or a use primarily engaged in the handling of goods, Planning Code Section 152 states that one off-street freight loading space is required. The proposed project would include ~~an~~ no official off-street loading space that ~~meets~~ would meet the requirements of the Planning Code ~~Section 155~~ for size and location. However, the ~~area between the parking garage and FSD/TC building would be used for loading and would meet the demand for loading space on the project site and the Planning Code requirements for the length and width of the loading space.~~ The SF Planning Department would review the proposed uses for conformance with the Planning Code through the building permit review process.

Plans and Policies

San Francisco Plans and Policies

San Francisco General Plan

The *San Francisco General Plan* (General Plan) provides general policies and objectives to guide land use decisions. The General Plan contains 10 elements (Commerce and Industry, Recreation and Open Space, Housing, Community Facilities, Urban Design, Environmental Protection, Transportation, Air Quality, Community Safety, and Arts) that set forth goals, policies, and objectives for the physical development of the City. The proposed project would not obviously or substantially conflict with any General Plan goals, policies, or objectives. The compatibility of the proposed project with the General Plan goals, policies, and objectives that do not relate to physical and environmental issues will be considered by decision-makers as part of their assessment whether to approve or disapprove the proposed project. Any potential conflicts identified as part of the process would not alter the physical environmental effects of the project.

Bayview Hunters Point Area Plan

The project is located in the Bayview Hunters Point Area Plan (Area Plan) and in the Oakinba Activity Node. Activity nodes are "community-identified catalyst areas in which to focus public investment."³ The Area Plan calls for maintaining industrial zones for production, distribution, and repair activities in the Oakinba subdistrict to strengthen the role of the Bayview's industrial sector in the economy of the district, the City, and the region. The industrial nature of the proposed project is consistent with the objectives of the Area Plan.

The Accountable Planning Initiative

In November 1986, the voters of San Francisco approved Proposition M, the *Accountable Planning Initiative*, which added Section 101.1 to the Planning Code to establish the following eight priority policies:

1. Preservation and enhancement of neighborhood-serving retail uses;
2. Protection of neighborhood character (see Section E.1, Land Use and Land Use Planning, Question 1c);
3. Preservation and enhancement of affordable housing (see Section E.3, Population and Housing, Question 3b, with regard to housing supply and displacement issues);
4. Discouragement of commuter automobiles (see Section E.5, Transportation and Circulation, Questions 5a, 5b, and 5f);
5. Protection of industrial and service land uses from commercial office development and enhancement of resident employment and business ownership (see Section E.1, Land Use and Land Use Planning, Question 1c);
6. Maximization of earthquake preparedness (see Section E.14, Geology and Soils, Questions 14a through 14d);
7. Landmark and historic building preservation (see Section E.4, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Question 4a); and,
8. Protection of open space (see Section E.9, Wind and Shadow, Questions 9a and 9b; and Question 10, Recreation, Questions 10a and 10c).

³ SF Planning Department, Environmental Planning Division, *Bayview Hunters Point Area Plan* Available online at: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/Bayview_Hunters_Point.htm. Accessed on May 23, 2013.

Prior to issuing a permit for any project that requires an Initial Study under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), or issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion, or change of use, and prior to taking any action that requires a finding of consistency with the General Plan, the City is required to find that the proposed project would be consistent with these priority policies. Consistency with policies applicable to the proposed project is discussed in Section E (specific subsections are noted in parentheses in the priority policies listed above).

Regional Plans and Policies

The five principal regional planning agencies and their policy documents that guide planning in the nine-county Bay Area are:

- Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) 2009 Projections;
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) 2010 *Clean Air Plan* (2010 CAP);
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) *Regional Transportation Plan – Transportation 2035*;
- San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) *San Francisco Basin Plan*; and,
- San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) *San Francisco Bay Plan*.

The project would not obviously or substantially conflict with any adopted environmental plan or policy.

D. SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The proposed project could potentially affect the environmental factor(s) checked below. The following pages present a more detailed checklist and discussion of each environmental factor.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Wind and Shadow | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural and Paleo. Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation and Circulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral/Energy Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural and Forest Resources |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

All items on the Initial Study Checklist that have been checked "Less Than Significant Impact," "No Impact," or "Not Applicable" indicate that, upon evaluation, staff has determined that the proposed project could not have a significant adverse environmental effect relating to that issue. For items that have been checked "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," staff has determined that the proposed project would not have a significant adverse environmental effect provided that the project sponsor implements mitigation measures presented in Section F of this document. A discussion is included for most issues checked "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," "Less Than Significant Impact," "No Impact," or "Not Applicable." For all of the items without discussion, the conclusions regarding potential significant adverse environmental effects are based upon field observation, staff experience and expertise on similar projects, and/or standard reference material available within the SF Planning Department, such as the *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review*, or the California Natural Diversity Data Base and maps, published by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). For each checklist item, the evaluation has considered the impacts of the project both individually and cumulatively.

Two approaches to a cumulative impact analysis are provided in CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b)(1). The analysis can be based on: (a) a list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related impacts that could combine with those of a proposed project; or (b) a summary of projections contained in a general plan or related planning document. The analysis in this Initial Study employs both list-based and projections approaches, depending on which approach best suits the individual resource topic being analyzed. For instance, the aesthetics analysis considers individual projects that are anticipated in the project area that may alter the visual character and views in and surrounding the project area, while the transportation and circulation analysis relies on a citywide growth projection model that encompasses the proposed project and other nearby projects, which is the typical methodology that the SF Planning Department applies to analysis of transportation impacts.

The reasonably foreseeable probable future projects within one-quarter mile of the project site considered in the cumulative analysis, as applicable, include the following:

- Recently completed expansion of the Restaurant Depot store at 2045 and 2121 Evans Avenue, located just north of the project site on Evans Avenue;⁴

⁴ SF Planning Department, Environmental Planning Division, Case No. 2009.0651. Available for public review at the SF Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, 94103.

- Proposed Home Depot store at 2000 Marin Street, located just north of the project site on Evans Avenue;⁵
- Approved expansion of the San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market (901 Rankin Street and 2101 Jerrold Avenue);⁶
- Proposed construction of a 25,000-sf commercial building at 928 Toland Street, one-half mile southwest of the project site;⁷ and
- Planned redevelopment (replacement of existing units and expansion) of the Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex public housing units on the opposite side of Cesar Chavez Street to the north (700, 871, 901, and 915 Missouri Street; 1 and 65 Turner Terrace; 1, 83, and 97 Watchman Way; 1001-1029 and 1201-1275 Wisconsin Street; 901-995, 900-788, 1000-1090, 1001-1079, and 1100-1148 Connecticut Street; 1-81, 2-88, 100-174, and 101-173 Dakota Street; 900 Texas Street; 1801-1849 23rd Street; 1620-1720 and 1800-1892, 1801-1855, and 1901-1951 25th Street; and 1720-1828 26th Street).⁸

In addition to the above projects, the cumulative analysis of transportation and other quantified impacts incorporates growth forecasts that are the basis for the San Francisco County Transportation Authority citywide transportation model. These growth projections include the effects of major long-term projects such as the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project, located one mile southeast of the project site.

⁵ SF Planning Department, Environmental Planning Division, Case No. 2009.0362. Available for public review at the SF Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, 94103.

⁶ SF Planning Department, Environmental Planning Division, Case No. 2009.1153. Available for public review at the SF Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, 94103.

⁷ SF Planning Department, Environmental Planning Division, Case No. 2011.0859. Available for public review at the SF Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, 94103.

⁸ SF Planning Department, Environmental Planning Division, Case No. 2010.0515. Available for public review at the SF Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, 94103.

E. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

E.1 LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING

<u>Topics:</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	<u>Not Applicable</u>
1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING— Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact LU-1: The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. (Less than Significant)

Land uses in the vicinity of the project site are dominated by light industrial and manufacturing, warehouse, and distribution uses. These surrounding uses would be expected to continue to operate and relate to each other as they do presently, without disruption from the proposed project. Because the proposed FSD/TC building and associated parking structure would be constructed within the existing lot configuration, the project would not physically divide or interfere with the arrangement of existing uses and activities that surround it or alter the existing street plan. The proposed project would not impede the passage of persons or vehicles. The surrounding uses and activities would remain and would interrelate with each other as they do at the present time. Therefore, impacts related to the division of an established community would be *less than significant*.

Impact LU-2: The proposed project would be consistent with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. (Less than Significant)

Environmental plans and policies are those that directly address environmental issues and/or contain targets or standards for environmental quality, such as the BAAQMD's 2010 CAP. As documented throughout this Initial Study, the proposed project would not conflict with applicable plans, policies, and regulations such that an adverse physical change would occur. The proposed project would conform to air quality, storm water, construction, and planning requirements discussed herein.

In addition, the proposed project would not obviously or substantially conflict with any such adopted environmental plan or policy. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less-than-significant* impact with regard to conflicts with existing plans and zoning.

Impact LU-3: The proposed project would not have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the project vicinity. (Less than Significant)

The character of the vicinity is dominated by one- to two-story manufacturing, warehouse, and distribution buildings reaching approximately 15 to 25 feet in height. The project would introduce new uses, a forensic testing laboratory, motorcycle fleet operations, and the equivalent of office space for police officers, different from bakery and printing operations that previously occupied the site, but generally compatible with the existing land uses in the area.

The proposed four-story, 64-foot tall FSD/TC building with two additional 16-foot tall mechanical penthouses would be taller than the other buildings in the area. However, the FSD/TC building would be set back from the property line by a minimum of 15 feet and the mechanical penthouses would be set back from the building façades to visually minimize the bulk and massing of the building. Many existing buildings have a footprint as large as, or larger than, the proposed FSD/TC building, and the proposed FSD/TC building would be similar in style to buildings in the vicinity. Neither the character of the FSD/TC building nor the proposed use would have a substantial effect on the character of the area.

As the project site currently contains a defunct bakery building, the project would introduce new uses, including forensic testing laboratory space, a command and dispatch center for the TC motorcycle fleet for the SFPD. As noted in Section C, Compatibility with Zoning, Plans, and Policies, the Zoning Administrator has determined that the FSD and TC are a “public service facility, excluding service yard” and that “operating requirements necessitate [their] location within the [PDR-2] district” as defined in Planning Code Section 227(e). These uses would generally be compatible with the existing land uses in the area, which include light industrial, office, and manufacturing and warehouse space. Therefore, the change in land use at the project site would not be considered a significant impact. The impact of the proposed project on the existing character of the vicinity would be *less than significant*.

Impact C-LU-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development in the site vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant land use impact. (Less than Significant)

Together with the other nearby commercial projects, the proposed project would result in an intensification of activity in the vicinity. The overall character of the vicinity would remain primarily commercial and industrial with low-rise industrial and distribution buildings and substantial truck activity. There would be no substantial change in the character of the vicinity, nor would any planned or foreseeable projects combine to physically divide the community; therefore, cumulative land use effects would be *less than significant*. The rehabilitation and expansion of public housing on Potrero Hill (the Potrero Hill and Potrero Annex units), while a major project in its own right, would occur in a different neighborhood, on the opposite side of a major thoroughfare, and would not combine with the proposed project in any substantial way to alter neighborhood character.

For the reasons discussed above, the proposed project’s impacts related to land use, both individually and cumulatively, would be *less than significant*.

E.2 AESTHETICS

<u>Topics:</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	<u>Not Applicable</u>
2. AESTHETICS—Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and other features of the built or natural environment which contribute to a scenic public setting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or which would substantially impact other people or properties?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Analysis of impacts on visual quality or aesthetic resources is somewhat subjective. The project design is considered in relation to the surrounding visual character, heights and building types of surrounding uses, the potential for proposed structures to obstruct scenic views or vistas, and potential to create light and glare. The proposed FSD/TC building design would be considered to have significant adverse environmental effects on visual quality only if it would cause a substantial and demonstrable negative change.

Impact AE-1: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. (Less than Significant)

A project would have a significant effect on scenic vistas if it would substantially degrade important public view corridors and obstruct scenic vistas from public areas viewable by a substantial number of people. View corridors are defined by physical elements such as buildings and structures that direct lines of sight and control view directions available to the public.

Scenic views and vistas are limited in the project vicinity due to surrounding urban development and intervening buildings. One- to two-story warehouse, manufacturing, and distribution buildings, with heights ranging from approximately 15 to 25 feet, largely define the scale and character of the project area. Views from public streets and sidewalks consist primarily of the surrounding warehouse and distribution buildings and wooden poles and suspended wiring for the overhead power lines. The elevated I-280 freeway features prominently in near-range views down Evans Avenue to the north and east. Distant views accessible from the surrounding streets include Potrero Hill to the north; partial views of Bernal Heights to the southwest; and San Bruno Mountain from Toland Street looking south. The I-280 freeway obstructs distant views to the east.

The proposed FSD/TC building would be positioned at the corner of Toland Street and Evans Avenue with a 15-foot setback from the property line along Toland Street and a 24-foot setback from the property line along Evans Avenue. It would be 64 feet tall and shaped, in plan view, like an inverted "U" (Figure 5).

The FSD/TC building would have two 16-foot tall mechanical penthouses set back from the building façades, one atop each leg of the “U.” The bottom of the inverted “U” would front Evans Avenue along a 212-foot façade that would be articulated with an approximately 12-foot-deep recess to accommodate the visitor entrance near the western corner (Toland Street), which would lead to a three-story lobby at the corner of Evans Avenue and Toland Street. The eastern end of this façade would step back approximately 20 feet to accommodate an employee entrance. The Toland Street façade would be 190 feet in length, and would appear as a single plane without entrances or other recesses. Per the preliminary design, the majority of the façades on Evans Avenue and Toland Street would be glazed (Figure 6).

The two-level parking structure would be located in the eastern portion of the project site. This structure would be approximately 17.5 feet in height, including a 3.5-foot screening wall around the second (top) parking level, which would not be covered. A stair and elevator tower would extend an additional 20 feet in height along approximately one-fourth of the Evans Avenue façade. The entire parking garage, except for the stair/elevator tower, would be set back about 45 feet from Evans Avenue (Figure 5).

While the height of the main FSD/TC building would be taller than other buildings in the project vicinity and the proposed project would result in a noticeable change on the project site, the project would not substantially affect views along Toland Street or Evans Avenue due to the proposed setback of the building from these streets. Views of features such as Bernal Heights and Potrero Hill looking west and northwest, respectively, from the I-280 freeway could be affected by the four-story FSD/TC building. However, given the height of the freeway—approximately 50 feet above the street grade—and the speed at which vehicles are traveling on the freeway, the proposed project would not substantially obstruct existing views of these features. Therefore, the project would not adversely affect the distant scenic views that are available from the surrounding public streets.

Because there are no existing residences in the project vicinity, there are no views from residences that would be substantially and adversely affected by the project. While the proposed FSD/TC building could be visible in longer-range views from some private residences, such as those on Potrero Hill, it would generally blend into the existing densely built urban fabric of the area, due to the distance of the site from these residences as well as other intervening features (i.e., other buildings and trees).

Views from some nearby non-residential buildings could be altered or diminished by the project. Any such change would not exceed that commonly accepted in an urban setting. While this loss or change of views might be of concern to the property owners or tenants in the nearby buildings, it would not affect a substantial number of people and would result in a *less-than-significant* impact.

Impact AE-2: The proposed project would not substantially damage any scenic resources. (No Impact)

Scenic resources are visible physical features of a landscape (i.e., land, water, vegetation, animals, structures, or other features). Scenic resources of the built environment may include City landmarks that would be identified along a tour route, including, but not limited to, Coit Tower or the Golden Gate Bridge.

No scenic resources or landmarks exist on the site. The buildings presently occupying the site do not contribute to a scenic public setting. Therefore, the project would not damage any scenic resource, and there would be *no impact*.

Impact AE-3: The proposed project would result in a change to the existing character of the project site, but this change would not degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. (Less than Significant)

The visual character of the project site and vicinity is urban, with a diversity of building sizes, styles, and ages. The dominant scale and character of development within the project vicinity are one- to two-story warehouse, manufacturing, and distribution buildings that range between approximately 15 to 25 feet in height. While the proposed FSD/TC building would be taller than other structures in the vicinity, this would not result in a substantial degradation of existing visual character or quality of the project site or vicinity, because the existing visual character is not cohesive or particularly notable (in the way that, for example, a grouping of similarly designed buildings in a historic district might be). There are currently four structures on the project site, including a two-story former bakery building with a connecting loading dock (the main building), a one-story former lumber yard office building, a one-story storage shed, and a one-story garage. The main building occupies the portion of the project site at the corner of Toland Street and Evans Avenue and is developed up to the property line. The lumber yard office building is located along the Evans Street frontage approximately 158 feet behind the main building. The storage shed and garage are adjacent to each other along the southern property boundary, which abuts a service way, and are approximately 120 feet behind the main building. Due to their positioning on the site and their scale, the three smaller buildings are not visually prominent features. All four buildings would be demolished as part of the proposed project.

Design and aesthetics are, by definition, subjective and open to interpretation by decision-makers and members of the public. A proposed project would, therefore, normally be considered to have a significant adverse impact on visual quality under CEQA only if it would cause a substantial and demonstrable negative change. The proposed project would not cause such a change. The proposed project would change the visual character of the project site by developing it with a new FSD/TC building that would most closely resemble an office building. The height would be taller than other buildings in the area and the massing would include setbacks at the ground level and at some of the upper stories. The proposed two-story parking structure would be of similar height and massing to the other buildings in the project vicinity. Although the project would replace existing buildings with new buildings, it would not represent an incompatible or intrusive visual feature relative to the existing visual context.

The proposed project's final architectural design and articulation would be subject to review by the SF Planning Department and/or Planning Commission via the building permit review process, a process separate from the environmental review. The project's final design would be available at that time.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not be expected to result in a substantial and demonstrable negative change to the existing visual character of the project site vicinity, and the effect would be *less than significant*.

Impact AE-4: The proposed project would create a new source of light and glare, but not to an extent that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or substantially impact other people or properties. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would likely introduce new sources of outdoor lighting to the site, including lighting for the FSD/TC building entryways and the parking structure. This lighting would not exceed what is typical for existing buildings in the area. The proposed project would comply with Planning Commission Resolution 9212, which prohibits the use of mirrored or reflective glass. For these reasons, the proposed project would not generate obtrusive light or glare that would substantially affect other properties. As a result, light and glare impacts associated with the proposed project would be *less than significant*.

Impact C-AE-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development in the site vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant aesthetics impact. (Less than Significant)

Although the proposed project would change the visual character of the project site, the new buildings would not be of such a height and scale that they would be visible for long distances. Therefore, any cumulative effects would be limited to those that would include other projects relatively close to the project site, such as the recently completed expansion of the Restaurant Depot store and the proposed Home Depot store, both located just north of the project site on Evans Avenue.⁹ Although the project, together with these nearby projects, would result in a visual change, the overall character of the project site vicinity would remain primarily that of low-rise industrial and distribution buildings with large floor plates. There would be no substantial change in visual character, or in views or scenic resources, and therefore the proposed project would not contribute considerably to any cumulative adverse impact relative to aesthetics; therefore, cumulative effects would be *less than significant*.

⁹ SF Planning Department. Environmental Planning Department, Case No. 2009.0651 and Case No. 2009-0362.

E.3 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
3. POPULATION AND HOUSING—					
Would the project:					
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact PH-1: The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in San Francisco, either directly or indirectly. (Less than Significant)

In general, a project would be considered growth inducing if its implementation would result in substantial population increases and/or new development through the extension of roads or other infrastructure that might not occur if the project were not implemented. No residential units are present on the project site and none are proposed. The current zoning does not allow residential use of the site. Furthermore, the project site is currently unoccupied, with the last business having relocated in early 2013.

The project sponsor estimates that approximately 298 full-time equivalent staff would be employed at the project site. Since the project site is currently unoccupied, all of these employees would be considered new to the site; however, most of these employees would be relocating from other police department locations in San Francisco, which would result in a reduction of employees at these other police department facilities. It is likely that construction of the project would increase forensic capability of the SFPD and would lead to some increase in employment. Therefore, the proposed project's potential to induce population growth would be *less than significant*.

Impact PH-2: The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing, nor would it displace a substantial number of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. (Less than Significant)

As noted above, most project employees would relocate from elsewhere in San Francisco. Therefore, most of the jobs at the site would be filled by existing residents of San Francisco or the San Francisco Bay Area. Even if some new employees would need to relocate to the City or the Bay Area, the number of new employees would be very small compared to the total regional population and would not necessitate the construction of new housing in San Francisco or the general region. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a substantial demand for new housing, and the project would have a *less-than-significant impact* with respect to housing demand.

No residential units are present on the site and the site is not zoned for residential use. Consequently, the proposed project would not displace housing units or a substantial number of people and would result in *no impact* related to displacement of housing or people.

Impact C-PH-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development in the site vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant population and housing impact. (Less than Significant)

The project would not result in any significant impact with respect to population and housing since the proposed project does not include any residential uses and would not result in demolition of existing housing or necessitate the construction of relocation housing. Planned and foreseeable future projects are industrial or commercial in nature and are not anticipated to impact population or housing in the area. Therefore these projects would not interact with the proposed project to result in cumulative adverse impacts with respect to population and housing. For these reasons, the proposed project's impacts related to population and housing, both individually and cumulatively, would be *less than significant*.

E.4 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
4. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5, including those resources listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact CP-1: The proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of historic architectural resources. (No Impact)

Historical resources are those that meet the terms of the definitions in Section 21084.1 of the CEQA Statute and Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Historical resources include properties listed in, or formally determined eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or listed in an adopted local historic register. The term "local historic register" or "local register of historical resources" refers to a list of resources that are officially designated or recognized as historically significant by a local government pursuant to resolution or ordinance. Historical resources also include resources identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting certain criteria. Additionally, properties not listed but otherwise determined to be historically significant, based on substantial evidence, would also be considered historical resources.

A historic resource evaluation (HRE) was prepared for the proposed project by Carey & Company to evaluate whether the proposed project would have any adverse effect on historic resources at the project site or in the project vicinity.¹⁰ The following discussion summarizes the HRE. The proposed project includes the demolition of four buildings totaling approximately 40,500 sf, including a two-room office building constructed by the West Oregon Lumber Company in 1940; a main building constructed for a commercial bakery in 1954 and attached loading dock added in 1956; a storage building constructed in 1960; and a second storage building with loading dock constructed in 1980.

No listings for 1995 Evans Avenue were identified in the CRHR, the National Register of Historical Places (NRHP), or the San Francisco City Landmark register. The property is not within a designated historic district and was not included in past surveys, such as the 1960s Junior League Survey, SF Planning Department's 1976 Architectural Survey, or San Francisco Architectural Heritage surveys. The Historic Status Code assigned to the property by the SF Planning Department is B-Potential Historic Resource.

¹⁰ Cary & Company, *Historic Resource Evaluation, 1995 Evans Avenue*, August 30, 2013. This document is available for public review as part of Case No. 2013.0342E at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103.

None of the buildings at 1995 Evans Avenue appears to be eligible for listing in the CRHR, either individually or as a group. The main building, although associated with Parisian Bakeries Inc. (Parisian), one of San Francisco's earliest and most prominent sourdough bakeries, is not associated with the bakery's formative years. Parisian's tenure in the main building at 1995 Evans Avenue occurred late in the bakery's history, when it was owned by a large corporation, rather than by individuals. During the first few years after moving to the subject building, the bakery does not appear to have been operating under its own name. The building also lacks distinguishing architectural character. Of the other buildings on the project site, only one is more than 50 years old. That building, dating to 1940 and constructed as the office of a lumber company, similarly lacks historic and architectural significance. No records were discovered that would indicate that the founder of Parisian had been associated with the buildings or the site, although various bakers have been linked to the bakery's history, including French immigrants Emile Pierron, John Pale, and Leon J. Hillou. These bakers do not appear to have been of renown in the city and they have no association with the buildings at 1995 Evans Avenue, as their involvement in the bakery had ended long before the bakery's move to Evans Avenue. Therefore, the property does not appear to be eligible for listing in the CRHR based on an association with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history. No buildings on the property appear to meet any of the criteria for listing in the CRHR. As there appear to be no historic resources on the proposed project site, it has been assigned a CRHR Status Code of 6 – not eligible for listing or designation.

The property is not within a designated historic district. The demolition and construction activities would be contained to the project site and adjacent sidewalks and would not disturb any buildings or structures adjacent to or in the vicinity of the project site; consequently, no direct impact to any potentially historic resources in the vicinity would occur. Similarly, the proposed project would not alter any historic character of the immediate vicinity after project completion since this area does not include any designated historic resources. The proposed project would therefore not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, and would have *no impact* to on-site historic architectural resources or any potentially historic resources in the vicinity.

Impact CP-2: The proposed project would result in damage to, or destruction of, as-yet-unknown archeological remains, should such remains exist beneath the project site. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

When determining the potential for encountering archeological resources, relevant factors include the location, depth, and areal extent of excavation proposed, as well as any recorded information on known resources in the area. A Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) has been prepared by the SF Planning Department's archeologist for the project and is summarized below.¹¹ The project sponsor supplied boring logs from a geotechnical investigation conducted around the project site.¹²

Excavation for the following structures to be installed beneath the site would be required: two elevator pits, each approximately 6 feet deep and 9 by 9 feet wide; a single 8,000-gallon sanitary storage tank, 24 feet deep and 8 feet in diameter; and one belowground fuel tank, 8 feet in diameter and 26 feet long.

¹¹ Allison Vanderslice, SF Planning Department, Environmental Planning Division, Preliminary Archeological Review: Checklist, dated June 7, 2013. This document is available for public review as part of Case No. 2013.0342E at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103.

¹² Geotechnical Investigation for the City & County of San Francisco Clean Water Program, Islais Creek Transport/Storage Project, San Francisco, California. October 1990. This document is available for public review as part of Case No. 2013.0342E at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103.

The FSD/TC building foundation would include between 275 and 400 14-inch, pre-cast and pre-stressed concrete piles to a depth of 90 feet below ground surface (bgs). The parking garage would include between 100 and 200 14-inch, pre-cast and pre-stressed concrete piles, also to a depth of 90 feet. With the exception of the concrete piles and the sanitary storage tank, no proposed subsurface structures would extend more than 10 feet below final grade. This final grade would be approximately three feet higher than the existing grade.

Prior to the mid-1920s, historical maps (1859, 1869, and 1905 U.S. Coast Surveys) show the project site as undeveloped marshland along the southern shoreline of the main Islais Creek channel and the northern edge of the Islais Creek Marsh. The project site was filled during the first half of the 20th century, likely between the mid-1920s to mid-1930s in association with the Islais Creek Reclamation District Project.¹³ The 2006 U.S. Geologic Survey (USGS) Geologic Map of the San Francisco Bay Area shows the project site less than 500 feet from the southern edge of a serpentine outcrop.

Based on a review of boring logs outside the project site, primarily to the north, artificial fill beneath the site reaches a depth of around 17 feet bgs. Below the fill, recent bay mud extends to approximately 35 to 50 feet bgs, and in some locations to 90 feet bgs. Sandstone is located beneath the bay mud in most of the nearby borings. The bay mud identified at the nearby project sites was characterized as Late Holocene marsh deposits in which prehistoric deposits, if present, would be located. Anthropogenic midden deposits have been found along the Islais Creek estuary. Prehistoric deposits are thought to have greater probability of occurrence along shorelines (or paleo-shorelines). The site is historically mapped near the shoreline of the former estuary; however, it is located in a marshland and at the mouth of the Islais Creek. There is low to moderate potential that prehistoric archeological deposits are present in the bay mud deposits beneath the site.

There are several prehistoric sites documented/recorded along the former Islais Creek estuary. All of these sites were shell middens or shellmounds. One of two locations where CA-SFR-15 has been identified is less than a quarter-mile to the southeast of the project site. More distant to the southwest of the project site along the southern edge of the former extent of the Islais Creek marsh is CA-SFR-17 (formerly, also recorded as CA-SFR-3, -SFR-16, -SFR-18), which is a large, only partially excavated, prehistoric midden village site in which numerous human remains have been found over the years. CA-SFR-17 is located on an upstream terrace overlooking Islais Creek and CA-SFR-15 is located along the historical southern shoreline of the marshland.

Installation of piles and excavation for installation of the sanitary storage tank would reach the area above the late bay mud deposits that may contain prehistoric deposits, and could potentially disturb cultural resources if such resources were present. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-2 below would reduce the magnitude of this impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

Mitigation Measure M-CP-2: Archeology Resources (Testing)

Based on a reasonable presumption that archeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of an archaeological consultant from the rotational Department Qualified Archaeological Consultants List (QACL) maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist.

¹³ Gerald Robert Dow, Bay Fill in San Francisco: A History of Change. Unpublished Master's Thesis, California State University, San Francisco, 1973: 162-168.

The project sponsor shall contact the Department archeologist to obtain the names and contact information for the next three archeological consultants on the QACL. The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this measure. The archeological consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Sect. 15064.5 (a)(c).

Consultation with Descendant Communities: On discovery of an archeological site¹⁴ associated with descendant Native Americans, the Overseas Chinese, or other descendant group an appropriate representative¹⁵ of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to consult with ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated archeological site. A copy of the Final Archaeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group.

Archeological Testing Program. The archeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archeological testing plan (ATP). The archeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA.

At the completion of the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archeological testing program the archeological consultant finds that significant archeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archeological testing, archeological monitoring, and/or an archeological data recovery program. No archeological data recovery shall be undertaken without the prior approval of the ERO or the Planning Department archeologist.

¹⁴ The term "archeological site" is intended here to minimally included any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

¹⁵ An "appropriate representative" of the descendant group is here defined to mean, in the case of Native Americans, any individual listed in the current Native American Contact List for the City and County of San Francisco maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission and in the case of the Overseas Chinese, the Chinese Historical Society of America. An appropriate representative of other descendant groups should be determined in consultation with the Department archeologist.

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

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

Archeological Monitoring Program. If the ERO, in consultation with the archeological consultant, determines that an archeological monitoring program (AMP) shall be implemented, this AMP shall minimally include the following provisions:

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

Whether or not significant archeological resources are encountered, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.

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

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

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

Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects. The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines. Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement shall take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

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

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

Impact CP-3: The proposed project would not indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. (Less than Significant)

Paleontological resources include fossilized remains or traces of animals, plants, and invertebrates, including their imprints, from a previous geological period. Collecting localities and the geologic formations containing those localities are also considered paleontological resources as they represent a limited, non-renewable resource and once destroyed, cannot be replaced.

Paleontological resources are lithologically dependent; that is, deposition and preservation of paleontological resources are related to the lithologic unit in which they occur. If the rock types representing a deposition environment conducive to deposition and preservation of fossils are not favorable, fossils will not be present. Lithological units that may be fossiliferous include sedimentary formations.

The Late Bay Mud deposits beneath the proposed site could support paleontological resources; however, it is unlikely for clayey sand and sandy clay fill materials due to their age. No unique geologic features are present on the project site.

Bay Mud deposits would be reached only during pile driving to a depth of up to 90 feet and during excavation to install the 8,000-gallon sanitary storage tank at a depth of 24 feet below final grade (21 feet below existing grade). Due to the small footprint of these features, minimal excavation would occur to a depth at which fossil-containing beds may be encountered. Therefore, any impacts on paleontological resources would be *less than significant*.

Impact CP-4: The proposed project would not disturb human remains. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Impacts on Native American burials are considered under Northwest Information Center (PRC) Section 15064.5(d)(1). When an Initial Study identifies the existence of, or the probable likelihood of the existence of, Native American human remains at a project site, the lead agency is required to work with the appropriate tribal entity identified by the NAHC. The CEQA lead agency may develop an agreement with the appropriate tribal entity for testing or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any items associated with Native American burials.

By implementing such an agreement, the project becomes exempt from the general prohibition on disinterring, disturbing, or removing human remains from any location other than a dedicated cemetery (HSC Section 7050.5) and the requirements of CEQA pertaining to Native American human remains.

The treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils-disturbing activity would comply with applicable state laws, including immediate notification of the coroner for the City and County of San Francisco upon discovery of human remains. If the coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the NAHC would be notified and would appoint a most likely descendant (PRC Section 5097.98).

To the southwest of the project site is a partially excavated prehistoric midden village (CA-SFR-17) in which numerous human remains have been found over the years. No such remains have been found in prehistoric sites closer to the site of the proposed project and there is no indication that human remains are present beneath the site; however, without additional evidence indicating the absence of remains, implementation of the proposed project would result in a significant impact related to the disturbance of human remains. The SF Planning Department Environmental Planning Division's archeologist determined that implementation of M-CP-2: Archeology Resources (Accidental Discovery), discussed above, would reduce the proposed project's impact on archeological resources, including buried human remains, to a *less-than-significant* level.¹⁶

Impact C-CP-1: The proposed project in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity would not result in cumulative impacts to cultural resources. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

No historic resources would be affected by the proposed project, nor would the project be constructed within a historic district. Cumulative impacts occur when impacts that are significant or less than significant from a proposed project combine with similar impacts from other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects in a similar geographic area.

Archaeological resources are non-renewable members of a finite class. All adverse effects to archaeological resources erode a dwindling cultural/scientific resource base. Federal and state laws protect archeological resources in most cases, either through project redesign or by requiring that the scientific data present within an archeological resource be archeologically recovered. Excavation for installation of subsurface utilities would occur in terrain underlain primarily by fill materials that are not anticipated to contain cultural resources. Pile driving and excavation in a small area would reach into the late bay mud deposits that may contain prehistoric resources. As discussed above, the proposed project would have a significant impact related to archeological resources and disturbance of human remains. The project's impact, in combination with other projects in the area that would also involve ground disturbance and which could also encounter previously recorded or unrecorded archeological resources or human remains, could result in a significant cumulative impact to archeological resources. However, implementation of mitigation measure M-CP-2 would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative impacts to a *less-than-significant* level.

¹⁶ SF Planning Department, Environmental Planning Division, Preliminary Archeological Review, June 7, 2013, Case No. 2013.0342E. This document is available for public review as part of Case No. 2013.0342E at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103.

E.5 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

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

The project site is not located near a public or private airport or within an airport land use plan area. Therefore, Question 5c is not applicable to the proposed project. Due to the scope and location of the proposed project, the SF Planning Department determined that a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) was required for this project. The following summarizes the findings of the TIS.¹⁷

Setting

The project site is located at the southeastern corner of Evans Avenue and Toland Street. Evans Avenue is an east-west arterial, with two travel lanes each way, extending between Cesar Chavez Street and Jennings Street. The General Plan identifies Evans Avenue as a major arterial in the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) Network from Cesar Chavez to Third Street, as a secondary arterial east of

¹⁷ LCW Consulting, 1995 Evans Avenue / San Francisco Police Department Forensic Service Division (FSD) & Traffic Company (TC) Transportation Impact Study, September 18, 2013. Available at the SF Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2013.0342E

Third Street, and as part of the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) Network. Toland Street runs north-south with one lane in each direction, extending between Evans and Oakdale Avenues. Toland Street is not listed in the General Plan as a major arterial or part of the CMP Network, or a Transit Preferential Street, a part of the Citywide Pedestrian Network, or an MTS Network Street. Toland Street is designated as a "Significant Traffic Truck Route" in the General Plan.¹⁸

The site is currently accessible to pedestrians and automobiles via one entrance on Toland Street and two entrances on Evans Avenue, which allowed trucks to drive to the covered loading area on the southeast side of the main building when the building was in use. Pedestrian access is via the retail storefront of the main building.

Public transit stops within one-half mile of the project site include the following:

- 19 Polk motor coach route at the intersection of Evans Avenue and Napoleon Street;
- KT Ingleside-Third Street light rail vehicle line located at Third Street and Evans Avenue;
- 23 Monterey motor coach route at Jerrold Avenue and Toland Street; and
- 10 Townsend and 48 Quintara/24th Street motor coach lines at 25th and Connecticut Streets.

On-street parking on Evans Avenue and on Napoleon, Toland, and Marin Streets was surveyed to evaluate current weekday occupancy. Of approximately 450 on-street parking spaces, about 240, or 53 percent, were occupied. Higher occupancies were observed in the vicinity of the light industrial and manufacturing uses, and specifically on both sides of Napoleon Street between Jerrold and Evans Avenues, and on the west side of Toland Street between Jerrold and Evans Avenues.

Impact TR-1: The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, nor would the proposed project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures. (Less than Significant)

Policy 10.4 of the Transportation Element of the General Plan states that the City will "consider the transportation system performance measures in all decisions for projects that affect the transportation system." To determine whether the proposed project would conflict with a transportation- or circulation-related plan, ordinance, or policy, this section analyzes the proposed project's effects on intersection operations, transit demand, impacts on pedestrian and bicycle circulation, parking, and freight loading, as well as construction impacts.

Trip Generation

Travel demand estimates were based on methodology contained in the SF Planning Department's *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review* (SF Guidelines); however, because the SF Guidelines do not provide trip generation rates for non-standard uses with unique trip generation and travel behavior, the trip generation for the proposed project was based on the number of employees projected to be on-site at full build out and full occupancy of the proposed project. In addition, the SFPD provided information related to projected employees and visitors based on the characteristics of the existing FSD and TC facilities. According to the SFPD, based on existing travel patterns at the existing FSD facilities, employees and visitors would be expected to drive to and from the project site,

¹⁸ San Francisco General Plan Transportation Element, Maps 6 through 9, 11, and 15. Available online at: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/14_Transportation.htm. Accessed July 23, 2013.

and therefore, as a conservative assumption, the transportation analysis assumed that all person-trips would occur by automobile, with an average vehicle occupancy rate of one person per vehicle.¹⁹

Table 2 gives the project characteristics, provided by the Police Department, that were used in determining travel demand, and Table 3 provides the estimated weekday p.m. peak hour trip generation for the proposed project.

TABLE 2. PROPOSED PROJECT EMPLOYEE AND TRAVEL CHARACTERISTICS

Project Component/Shift	Shift Hours	Number of Employees	PM Peak Hour Activity (4:00 to 5:00 PM)
Traffic Company			
Day	7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.	48	Leaving for the day
Swing	2:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.	36	No overlap
Night	9:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.	36	No overlap
Subtotal		120	
Forensic Services Division			
Shift 1	6 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.	33	No overlap
Shift 2	7 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.	92	No overlap
Shift 3	7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.	33	Leaving for the day
Shift 4	8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.	7	Leaving for the day
Shift 5	8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.	7	No overlap
Shift 6	9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.	7	No overlap
Subtotal		179	

Source: LCW Consulting, 2013; data from SFPD.

TABLE 3. PROPOSED PROJECT VEHICLE TRIP GENERATION - WEEKDAY PM HOUR

Project Component	Inbound	Outbound	Total
Traffic Company	0	48	48
Forensic Services Division Employees	0	40	40
Forensic Services Division Visitors	1	1	2
TOTAL NEW TRIPS	1	89	90

Source: LCW Consulting, 2013.

¹⁹ If the project were a typical office building, mode split would be based on SF Guidelines and would consist of approximately 71 percent driving trips, 20 percent transit trips, and 9 percent other modes (walking, biking, etc.). However, since the proposed use is specialized, mode split data was obtained from the project sponsor.

In general, the addition of project-generated traffic would result in a small increase in the average delay per vehicle at the study intersections during the p.m. peak hour (Table 4). The westbound approach at the unsignalized intersection of the I-280 southbound off-ramp/Pennsylvania Street would continue to operate at level-of-service (LOS) E conditions and the proposed project would not contribute any vehicles to this approach during the p.m. peak hour. As with existing conditions, peak-hour signal warrants would not be met at this intersection for Existing plus Project conditions. All other study intersections would continue to operate at acceptable levels (LOS D or better).

Overall, under Existing plus Project conditions, the proposed project would not contribute to existing LOS E conditions at the worst approach to the intersection of the I-280 southbound off-ramp/Pennsylvania Street, and the remaining study intersections would continue to operate at acceptable levels of LOS D or better. Therefore, the proposed project impacts on traffic operations would be *less than significant*.

Parking

Parking conditions are not static, as parking supply and demand varies from day to day, from day to night, from month to month, etc. Hence, the availability of parking spaces (or lack thereof) is not a permanent physical condition, but changes over time as people change their modes and patterns of travel. While parking conditions change over time, a substantial deficit in parking caused by a project that creates hazardous conditions or significant delays to traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians could adversely affect the physical environment. Whether a deficit in parking creates such conditions will depend on the magnitude of the shortfall and the ability of drivers to change travel patterns or switch to other travel modes. If a substantial deficit in parking caused by a project creates hazardous conditions or significant delays in travel, such a condition could also result in secondary physical environmental impacts (e.g., air quality or noise impacts caused by congestion), depending on the project and its setting.

The absence of a ready supply of parking spaces, combined with available alternatives to auto travel (e.g., transit service, taxis, bicycles, or travel by foot) and a relatively dense pattern of urban development, induces many drivers to seek and find alternative parking facilities, shift to other modes of travel, or change their overall travel habits. Any such resulting shifts to transit service or other modes (walking and biking), would be in keeping with the City's "Transit First" policy and numerous San Francisco General Plan policies, including those in the Transportation Element. The City's Transit First Policy, established in the City's Charter Article 8A, Section 8A.115, provide that "parking policies for areas well served by public transit shall be designed to encourage travel by public transportation and alternative transportation."

The transportation analysis accounts for potential secondary effects, such as cars circling and looking for a parking space in areas of limited parking supply, by assuming that all drivers would attempt to find parking at or near the project site and then seek parking farther away if convenient parking is unavailable. The secondary effects of drivers searching for parking is typically offset by a reduction in vehicle trips due to others who are aware of constrained parking conditions in a given area, and thus choose to reach their destination by other modes (i.e., walking, biking, transit, taxi). If this occurs, any secondary environmental impacts that may result from a shortfall in parking in the vicinity of the proposed project would be minor, and the traffic assignments used in the transportation analysis, as well as in the associated air quality, noise, and pedestrian safety analyses, would reasonably address potential secondary effects.

TABLE 4. PM PEAK-HOUR INTERSECTION LEVELS OF SERVICE (LOS) AND AVERAGE STOPPED DELAY IN SECONDS PER VEHICLE^a

Intersection	Existing (2013)		Existing + Project		Cumulative ^b (2035)		Project Contrib ^d
	LOS ^c	Delay ^c	LOS ^c	Delay ^c	LOS ^c	Delay ^c	
1. I-280 SB off-ramp/Pennsylvania Street (AWS) ^e	E	41.5 (wb)	E	41.5 (wb)	F	>50 (sb,wb)	0.0%
2. 25 th Street/Indiana Street/I-280 NB Off-ramp (AWS) ^e	B	12.0 (eb)	B	11.9 (eb)	E F	37.0 (nb) >50 (eb,wb)	0.7% 0.0%
3. Cesar Chavez Street/Kansas Street	B	18.4	B	18.4	E	62.3	1.1%
4. Cesar Chavez Street/Evans Avenue	C	28.0	C	28.7	F	>80	1.8%
5. Cesar Chavez Street/Pennsylvania Street/I-280 NB Off-ramp	D	52.4	D	52.8	F	>80	1.0%
6. Cesar Chavez Street/Indiana Street	C	27.6	C	27.6	F	>80	1.0%
7. Cesar Chavez Street/Third Street	D	38.6	D	39.3	F	>80	1.9%
8. Evans Avenue/Third Street	C	34.2	C	34.3	F	>80	0.0%
9. Evans Ave./Toland St./Napoleon St.	D	40.7	D	41.0	F	>80	0.3%
10. Jerrold Ave./Toland St./Napoleon St. (SSSC) ^e	B	14.0 (wb)	B	14.4 (wb)	C	18.2 (wb)	-
11. Jerrold Avenue/Bayshore Blvd./US 101 NB Off-ramp	D	43.9	D	46.6	F	>80	2.5%

^a Levels of service (LOS) were determined using the analysis methodologies presented in the 2000 *Highway Capacity Manual*.

^b Cumulative volumes were derived on the basis of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority countywide travel demand forecasting model.

^c Delay presented in seconds per vehicle. LOS and delay for signalized intersections represent conditions for the overall intersection. LOS and delay for stop-controlled unsignalized intersections represent conditions for the worst (most congested) approach, indicated in parentheses: nb = northbound, sb = southbound, eb = eastbound, wb = westbound

^d Project's percent contribution to the growth in cumulative traffic volumes at intersections projected to operate at LOS E or F. **Bold** typeface signifies a cumulatively considerable contribution to LOS F conditions (a significant impact), based on the project's contribution to the intersection's critical turning movements; that is, whether the project would add a substantial number of vehicles to these movements.

^e All intersections are signalized except those indicated AWS, which have stop signs on all approaches, and those indicated SSSC, which have a stop sign only on the minor street approach(es).

Bold typeface indicates a significant project or cumulatively impact.

Source: LCW Consulting, 2013.

The proposed project would include construction of a two-level parking garage that would contain 82 parking spaces for TC sworn-officer personal vehicles and two car-share parking spaces. In addition, the parking garage would include four ADA-accessible parking spaces and three on-street visitor parking spaces would be provided along Evans Avenue. The proposed project would not provide on-site parking for FSD personal vehicles. Vehicle access to the parking garage would be provided via a secure entrance from Evans Avenue; a walkway would connect the garage to the FSD/TC building itself. Three on-street parking spaces within a recessed bay would be provided for visitors along Evans Avenue. (The second secure access gate, from Toland Street, would be for vehicles towed into the facility's impound area, and for freight loading and FSD investigation vehicles.)

The peak employee parking demand would occur between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., when two of the TC shifts and all six of the FSD shifts overlap, which would create a demand for a range between 206 and 263 parking spaces.²⁰ This would result in a parking shortfall of approximately 181 parking spaces. Of the peak demand for 263 spaces, the FSD would generate a peak demand for 179 spaces and the TC would generate a peak demand for 84 spaces; 99 percent of the parking shortfall of 181 spaces would be attributable to the FSD, for which no on-site parking is proposed. Additionally, the project sponsor proposes to remove 13 on-street parking spaces along the Evans Street site frontage and replace them with a planting strip adjacent to the sidewalk. The parking shortfall would need to be accommodated on-street, and as a result, the mid-day parking occupancy in the study area would increase. Based on the existing weekday on-street parking occupancy in the project vicinity of just over 50 percent, there is adequate on-street parking within a two-block walk of the project site to accommodate the unmet on-site parking demand, even under the assumption that all employees would drive to work. Based on the calculation of unmet demand, on-street occupancy in the vicinity would increase from about 53 percent to about 94 percent, which could result in some employees having to park farther from the project site and could also result in some drivers switching to transit, car-sharing, carpooling, walking, or bicycling.

In terms of the Planning Code parking requirement (Section 151), based on preliminary estimates of occupied floor area, 45 off-street parking spaces would be required for the laboratory functions and 96 off-street parking spaces would be required for office functions, for a total requirement of 141 parking spaces, or 59 more spaces than are proposed. A variance would be required to allow for less than the Code-required amount of parking. The project would provide two car-share spaces, which would meet the Planning Code requirement in Section 166.

The proposed project parking shortfall would be a less-than-significant impact as the parking shortfall would be accommodated on-street. In addition, the proposed project parking shortfall would not create hazardous conditions or significant delays affecting traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians, and therefore, parking impacts would be *less than significant*. Although the project's impacts would be *less than significant*, Improvement Measure I-TR-1 below is recommended to reduce the parking shortfall and encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation.

Improvement Measure

I-TR-1: Transportation Demand Management

As an improvement measure to reduce the parking shortfall and encourage use of alternate modes, the project sponsor should develop and implement a Transportation Demand Management ("TDM") Plan designed to reduce use of single-occupant vehicles and to increase

²⁰ The calculated parking demand is based on the information provided by the project sponsor with respect to projected employee travel patterns; as noted above in the discussion of Trip Generation, this analysis assumes that all employees would drive.

the use of rideshare, transit, bicycle, and walk modes for trips to and from the Proposed Project. The TDM plan should include such measures as the following to reduce single occupancy vehicles and encourage alternate modes of travel:

- Ensure that bicycle safety strategies are developed along the Evans Avenue side of the property (e.g., avoiding conflicts with private cars accessing the parking garage on the east side of the property);
- Facilitate access to the Evans Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street bike routes through on-site signage;
- Require that the points of access to bicycle parking include signage indicating the location of these facilities;
- Facilitate access to carshare spaces (first level of the parking deck) through on-site signage;
- Require a TDM contact person who would be responsible for conducting employee surveys, coordinating carpool/ridematch services, and conducting annual TDM events;
- Provide information to employees and visitors on transit options and locations where transit passes can be purchased; and
- Require a transit pass subsidy for FSD and TC employees purchasing transit passes.

These measures would be in addition to those set of citywide commuter benefits provided to all City employees that allow them to reduce their monthly commuting expenses for transit, bicycling, vanpooling and parking.

Loading

The proposed project would generate seven delivery and service vehicle trips to the project site per day, which corresponds to a demand of less than one loading space during the peak and average hour of loading activities. The proposed project would not include one off-street loading ~~spaces~~ that would meet the requirements of the Planning Code for size and location. ~~Building~~ However, building deliveries would occur on-site between the FSD/TC building and the parking garage. Secure intake functions for FSD operations would occur at two vehicle bays that would be provided within the FSD/TC building. The proposed delivery and intake operations would be obscured from public view and access and would not interfere with traffic on surrounding streets. Access to the on-site loading area would be via Toland Street and would be gated and secured at all times. Trash and recycling would be stored on-site within the service area between the FSD/TC building and parking garage. Access for trash and recycling pickup would be controlled and coordinated by both the FSD and TC. Because the proposed project's loading demand would be minimal and would be accommodated within the proposed on-site loading area, the project's impacts related to loading would be *less than significant*.

Construction Activities

The total duration of construction of the proposed project is estimated to be 30 months, beginning in 2016 and ending in 2018. Construction-related activities would typically occur Monday through Friday, between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. During the project's construction period, temporary and intermittent traffic and transit impacts may result from truck movements to and from the construction site. It is anticipated that a majority of the construction-related truck traffic would use Evans Avenue, Cesar Chavez Street, Third Street, and Bayshore Boulevard with I-280 and U.S. 101 for the South Bay and East Bay destinations. Overall, because construction activities would be temporary and limited in duration and activities are required to be conducted in accordance with City requirements, construction-related transportation of the proposed project would be *less than significant*. Implementation of Improvement Measure I-TR-2: Construction Measures, would reduce the *less-than-significant* impacts related to construction activities.

Improvement Measure

I-TR-2: Construction Measures

The Department of Public Works (SFDPW) should require the following of the construction contractor:

- 1) Construction contractors should be prohibited from scheduling any truck trips, such as concrete mixers, heavy construction equipment, and materials delivery, etc., to the construction sites during the a.m. (7:00 to 9:00 a.m.) and p.m. (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.) peak commute periods.
- 2) All construction activities should adhere to the provisions in the City's Blue Book, including those addressing sidewalk and lane closures. To minimize construction impacts on nearby businesses and residents, the SFMTA should alert motorists, bicyclists, and nearby property owners of upcoming construction through its existing website and other available means, such as distribution of flyers, emails, and portable message or informational signs. Information provided should include contact name(s) for the SFMTA project manager, public information officer, and/or the SFMTA General Enforcement Division contact number (311).
- 3) Construction contractors should encourage construction workers to use carpooling and public transit to the construction site in order to minimize parking demand.

Overall, impacts of the proposed project related to an applicable transportation or circulation system plan or policy would be less than significant.

Impact TR-2: The proposed project would not result in substantially increased hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would not include any design features that would substantially increase traffic hazards (e.g., new sharp curves or dangerous intersections), and would not include any incompatible uses, as discussed above in Topic 1, Land Use and Land Use Planning. Therefore, the project would not have adverse impacts associated with traffic hazards. On Evans Avenue, the access gate for the parking garage would be recessed about 75 feet from the curb, which would allow for off-street queuing of two vehicles while waiting for the gate to open. Therefore, it is not anticipated that there would be any queue spillback from the parking garage onto Evans Avenue, and the proposed project would not result in substantial conflicts between project-generated vehicles destined to the parking garage and traffic on Evans Avenue. On Toland Avenue, the security gate for the loading dock would be recessed about 53 feet from the curb, which would likewise be anticipated to prevent queues extending onto the street. Based on the above, transportation hazards would be *less than significant*. Implementation of Improvement Measure I-TR-3: Queue Abatement, as detailed below, would reduce the less-than-significant impact related to queuing.

Improvement Measure

I-TR-3: Queue Abatement

As an improvement measure to reduce the potential for queuing of vehicles accessing the project site, the SFPD should ensure that recurring vehicle queues do not occur on Evans Avenue or Toland Street adjacent to the site. A vehicle queue is defined as one or more vehicles (destined to the parking facility) blocking any portion of the Evans Avenue or Toland Street sidewalk or travel lanes on Evans Avenue or Toland Street travel lane for a consecutive period of three minutes or longer on a daily and/or weekly basis.

If the Planning Director, or his or her designee, suspects that a recurring queue is present, the Planning Department should notify the SFPD in writing. Upon request, the SFPD should hire a qualified transportation consultant to evaluate the conditions at the site for no less than seven days. The consultant should prepare a monitoring report to be submitted to the Planning Department for review. If the Planning Department determines that a recurring queue does exist, the SFPD should abate the queue within 90 days from the date of the written determination.

This improvement measure would further reduce the severity of the proposed project's less-than-significant impacts related to vehicular access to the project site. Implementation of this improvement measure would not result in any secondary transportation-related or other significant impacts.

Impact TR-3: The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access. (Less than Significant)

Emergency vehicle access to the project site would remain substantially unchanged from existing conditions, and the proposed project would not change the adjacent travel lanes. Emergency service providers would be able to pull up to the project site from Evans Avenue or Toland Street, and would be able to enter the site via the two proposed project driveways, on Evans Avenue and on Toland Street (Figure 5). In particular, the Toland Street driveway would allow for fire apparatus to reach the rear of both the FSD/TC building and the parking garage. Therefore, the proposed project's impacts on emergency vehicle access would be *less than significant*.

Impact TR-4: The proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such features. (Less than Significant)

Transit Conditions

It is anticipated that the majority of trips to and from the proposed project during the p.m. peak hour would be made by automobile, and therefore the number of transit trips generated by the proposed project would be minimal. As noted above for parking, the project would result in an on-site parking shortfall and it is assumed that some employees may switch to public transit as a result. However, even with some employees switching to transit, the increased ridership would constitute a minimal change in usage and existing transit would be able to accommodate this increase. Any transit trips to and from the project site would utilize the nearby San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) lines and transfer to other Muni bus and light rail lines, or to regional transit providers including Caltrain, SamTrans, AC Transit, Golden Gate Transit, and Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART). The nearby T-Third Street light rail line and the current bus routes (10 Townsend, 19 Polk, 23 Monterey, and 48 Quintara/24th Street) currently operate below Muni's 85 percent capacity utilization standard in the project vicinity and could accommodate additional passengers.²¹ In addition, because of recessed access to the proposed parking garage, it is not anticipated that there would be queuing from the parking garage onto Evans Avenue, and the proposed project would not result in conflicts between transit routes on Evans Avenue and project-generated vehicles entering the parking garage.

Because the proposed project would not substantially affect the capacity utilization of the local and regional transit lines, and would not affect the operations of the adjacent and nearby Muni bus routes, the impacts of the proposed project on transit would be *less than significant*.

²¹ Of nearby Muni lines, only the 10 Townsend currently operates in excess of Muni's 85 percent capacity utilization standard in the p.m. peak hour, but not in the project area. Moreover, this line does not directly serve the project site.

Bicycle Conditions

The proposed project would provide 16 Class 1 and eight Class 2 bicycle parking spaces at-grade, for a total of 24 at-grade spaces, between the FSD/TC building and the parking garage near the main employee entry. This would exceed the Planning Code requirements for bicycle parking (Sections 155.2 and 155.3) of 15 Class 1 and eight Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. In addition to the bicycle parking spaces, the proposed project would provide 100 lockers and six showers for the TC, and 30 lockers and five showers for the FSD. The lockers and showers would exceed the relevant Planning Code requirements in Section 155.4 of 24 lockers and four showers. The project site is within convenient bicycling distance of the Potrero Hill, Mission, Mission Bay, and South of Market areas. There are a number of designated City bicycle routes in the vicinity of the proposed project, including Route 5 on Illinois and Third Streets, Route 7 on Indiana Street, Route 25 on Bayshore Boulevard, Route 60 on Cesar Chavez Street, Route 68 on Evans Avenue, Route 170 on Oakdale Avenue, and Route 525 on Vermont, Kansas, and 23rd Streets north of Cesar Chavez Street. As indicated above, it is anticipated that the majority of the trips to and from the proposed project during the p.m. peak hour would be made by automobile, and therefore, the number of trips generated by the proposed project by bicycle would be minimal. In addition, as discussed under Transit Conditions, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would result in any queuing on Evans Avenue by vehicles waiting to enter the parking garage. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate conflicts between project-generated vehicles destined to the parking garage and bicycle travel on Evans Avenue. Based on the above, impacts related to bicyclists would be *less than significant*.

Pedestrian Conditions

The primary pedestrian entrance to the proposed project would be via a building lobby located along Evans Avenue, with pedestrian access from the parking garage via a walkway. Under the proposed project, the sidewalk along Evans Avenue adjacent to the project site would be maintained at 10 feet in width, and a 6-foot planter strip would replace the parking lane in front of the project site (with the exception of the three guest parking spaces). On Toland Street, the project would construct an 8-foot-wide sidewalk (with adjacent 8-foot planter strip) where no sidewalk currently exists. Thus, the project would meet the requirements of the *Better Streets Plan*, which specifies a minimum sidewalk width of 8 feet and a recommended width of 10 feet for industrial streets such as Evans Avenue and Toland Street.²² As discussed above, it is anticipated that the majority of trips to and from the project site during the p.m. peak hour would be made by automobile; however, there would be some pedestrian trips, including walking to and from the bus stops. These new pedestrian trips could be accommodated on the existing sidewalks and crosswalks adjacent to the project site and the new sidewalk along Toland Street, and would not substantially affect the current pedestrian conditions along Evans Avenue. As pedestrian activity on these streets adjacent to the project site is generally very low throughout the day, pedestrian conditions would continue to remain acceptable. Based on the above, project-related impacts to pedestrians would be *less than significant*.

²² San Francisco *Better Streets Plan*, online at: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/BetterStreets/proposals.htm#Final_Plan. Accessed on August 7, 2013.

Impact C-TR-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant transportation impacts. (Less than Significant)

Traffic

The cumulative analysis is based upon output from the San Francisco County Transportation Authority citywide travel demand model, and encompasses reasonably foreseeable growth in housing and employment, as forecast by the SF Planning Department, based on regional growth projections and citywide plans and policies. Table 4 presents the 2035 Cumulative intersection operating conditions for the weekday p.m. peak hour. Under 2035 Cumulative conditions, 10 of the 11 study intersections would operate poorly (i.e., at LOS E or LOS F) during the p.m. peak hour. Overall, the poor operating conditions at the 10 study intersections would be due to traffic volume increases associated with other developments in the project vicinity and, as shown in Table 4, traffic from the proposed project would contribute less than 5 percent (2.5 percent maximum) to any critical turning movement that affects intersection level of service, which would not be a considerable contribution. Because the project would not result in considerable contribution to the poor operating conditions, the project's cumulative traffic impacts at these intersections would be considered *less than significant*.

The construction of the proposed project may overlap with the construction of other projects listed in Section D, above, including the proposed Home Depot project at 2000 Marin Street. Construction activities associated with these projects would affect access, traffic, and pedestrians on streets used as access routes to and from the project sites (e.g., Evans Avenue, Cesar Chavez Street). Localized cumulative construction-related transportation impacts could occur as a result of cumulative projects that generate increased traffic at the same time and on the same roads as the proposed project. However, the impacts of the project and nearby construction projects would not be cumulatively considerable, as the construction would be of temporary duration, and the project sponsor and other project sponsors would coordinate with various City departments such as SFMTA and DPW through the TASC to develop coordinated plans that would address construction-related vehicle routing and pedestrian movements adjacent to the construction area for the duration of construction overlap. In addition, the construction schedules for the proposed project and the nearby Home Depot project would not likely overlap to a substantial degree shall both projects be approved, as the Home Depot project's entitlement process is expected to take substantially longer than that of the proposed project. Therefore, for the above reasons, the project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in less-than-significant cumulative construction-related transportation impacts. Therefore, cumulative traffic impacts would be *less than significant*.

Transit, Pedestrians, and Bicycles

The transit analysis contained within the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) Draft EIR (July 2013) was used for analysis of 2035 cumulative transit impacts. The cumulative conditions "without TEP" analysis included the planned transit changes proposed as part of the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II project, as well as additional service, corridor and capital improvement projects, as described in Section 2.3 of the TIS for the project area.²³ The SFPD FSD/TC project, however, would not contribute project-generated transit trips to the Mission corridor within the Southeast screenline (instead it would

²³ "Without TEP" represents 2035 cumulative transit conditions with the planned transit changes proposed as part of the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II project. "With TEP" represents 2035 cumulative transit conditions with the planned transit changes proposed as part of the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II project, as well as the proposed service improvements proposed under the TEP and the upper range of the TEP Transit Travel Time Reduction Proposals for selected Muni Rapid Network Corridors.

contribute to the Third Street corridor, which is projected to operate at less than 85 percent capacity utilization standard under 2035 cumulative conditions with or without the TEP), and therefore the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact on the Southeast screenline and a less-than-significant contribution to cumulative transit impacts on the Mission corridor within the Southeast screenline under cumulative conditions with the TEP. The transit analysis for the TEP also included development of regional screenlines for 2035 cumulative conditions without and with the TEP.

During the p.m. peak hour, all regional transit service providers are projected to operate under the capacity utilization standard of 100 percent. As indicated above, the project would generate limited transit trips, and therefore, would not substantially affect cumulative ridership on regional transit service; therefore, the project's cumulative impact on regional transit capacity utilization would be *less than significant*.

The project would not make cumulatively considerable contributions to pedestrian or bicycle impacts. The project would improve pedestrian circulation adjacent to the project site by constructing sidewalks where none currently exist on Toland Street, and widening sidewalks on Evans Avenue, consistent with the *Better Streets Plan*. Even with the anticipated increase in background vehicular traffic, which could increase pedestrian-vehicle conflicts, the widened sidewalks would improve pedestrian conditions by facilitating safe pedestrian circulation and crossings, by providing safe spaces for pedestrians, and by slowing traffic, and by increasing pedestrian visibility to drivers. Furthermore, the project would not significantly contribute to cumulative bicycle circulation or conditions in the area given that the majority of trips to the project site were assumed to be made by automobile.

For the above reasons, the proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, would result in *less-than-significant* cumulative transit, pedestrian, and bicycle impacts.

Parking

As noted above, the project would not provide on-site parking spaces for FSD personal vehicles, and nearly the entire on-site parking shortfall would, therefore, be attributed to demand from FSD employees. The parking shortfall associated with FSD parking demand would need to be accommodated on-street, and, as a result, the midday parking occupancy in the study area would increase, and some employees may need to park further from the project site. Due to the potential increased difficulty in finding on-street parking in the study area, some drivers may park outside of the study area, switch to transit, car-sharing, carpooling, walking, or bicycling. Furthermore, the project would encourage transit use through implementation of Improvement Measure TR-1: Transportation Demand Management, which may lead to a shift from private passenger vehicles to transit or other modes of travel. The proposed project parking shortfall would not be considered substantial and no nearby projects would be anticipated to substantially increase on-street parking demand. Therefore, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco, the project would result in *less-than-significant* cumulative parking impacts.

E.6 NOISE

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

The project site is not within an airport land use plan area, nor is it in the vicinity of a private air strip. Therefore, Topics 6e and 6f are not applicable.

Impact NO-1: The proposed project would not result in exposure to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance. (Less than Significant)

The Environmental Protection Element of the General Plan includes Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise. These guidelines, which are similar to state guidelines promulgated by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR), indicate maximum acceptable noise levels for various newly developed land uses. The proposed uses for the proposed project most closely correspond to the “Office Building – Personal, Business, and Professional Services” land use category within the Land Use Compatibility Guidelines.²⁴

²⁴ San Francisco General Plan, Environmental Protection Element, Land Use Compatibility Chart for Community Noise. Available online at: http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/general_plan/16_Environmental_Protection.htm. Accessed on May 1, 2013.

For this land use category, the maximum "satisfactory, with no special insulation requirements" exterior noise levels are approximately 70 dBA (Ldn).^{25,26} Where exterior noise levels exceed 65 dBA (Ldn) for a new commercial building, it is generally recommended that a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements be conducted prior to final review and approval of the project, and that the needed noise insulation features be include in the project design.

Existing Noise in Project Site Vicinity. Land uses in the project site vicinity generate a substantial amount of noise, as is typical in PDR districts. In addition, high traffic volumes along I-280 and heavy volumes of truck traffic on nearby streets contribute to a relatively noisy environment, according to citywide modeling of traffic noise volumes conducted by the SFDPH. Based on this model, ambient noise levels exceed 70 dBA on Evans Avenue and range from 60 to 70 dBA on Toland Street. Ambient noise levels along the I-280 segment are above 75 dBA, as shown in Table 5.

Passing trains on the elevated Caltrain tracks, approximately 350 feet east of the project site, generate additional noise. The Caltrain tracks cross beneath the I-280 freeway near the location where both pass closest to the project site.

TABLE 5. NEARBY STREET NOISE LEVELS

Street Name	Noise Levels [dBA (Ldn)]
Evans Avenue	>70
Toland Street	65 – 70
Selby Street / I-280 Freeway	>70

Source: Citywide modeling of traffic noise volumes conducted by the SFDPH.

Project Noise Exposure. Although the exterior noise levels in the project vicinity exceed levels that are considered satisfactory for office buildings, noise-insulating features would be incorporated into the proposed project in compliance with the San Francisco Building Code. Because the project site is within 1,000 feet of the I-280 freeway and is within an area where exterior noise exceeds 65 dB, the project would be subject to Building Code Section 13C.5.507. This section requires that, for non-residential buildings within 1,000 feet of freeways or where exterior noise levels at the property line exceed 65 dB, exterior walls and roof-ceiling assemblies must have a Sound Transmission Class (STC) of at least 50, while exterior windows must have a minimum STC of 30.²⁷ Therefore, indoor noise levels would be reduced by at least 30 decibels, to approximately 45 dBA (assuming an exterior noise level of 75 dBA) which would be suitable for office use. To the extent that areas of the proposed FSD/TC building require particular controls on propagation of exterior noise to further reduce noise levels, it can reasonably be assumed that design features necessary to minimize interior noise would be incorporated into the design.

²⁵ The dBA, or A-weighted decibel, refers to a scale of noise measurement that approximates the range of sensitivity of the human ear to sounds of different frequencies. On this scale, the normal range of human hearing extends from about 0 dBA to about 140 dBA. A 10-dBA increase in the level of a continuous noise represents a perceived doubling of loudness.

²⁶ The Ldn is the Leq, or Energy Equivalent Level, of the A-weighted noise level over a 24-hour period with a 10-decibel penalty applied to noise levels between 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. Leq is the level of a steady noise which would have the same energy as the fluctuating noise level integrated over the time period of interest.

²⁷ Sound Transmission Class is a rating for building materials (door, windows, wall assemblies, etc.) that characterizes the material's ability to block the transmission of noise. In general, a higher STC rating indicates greater noise-blocking ability. STC ratings are primarily focused on noise frequencies associated with speech; they do not necessarily account for very low frequencies.

Consequently, with Building Code compliance and implementation of any special design features are needed, potential environmental impacts associated with locating the testing laboratory, motorcycle fleet, and accessory office uses (and parking facilities) in an area that currently exceeds acceptable ambient noise levels for such uses would be *less than significant*.

Impact NO-2: Operation of the proposed project would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. (Less than Significant)

Employees and laboratory equipment within the FSD/TC building could be affected by vibration from truck traffic on local streets, including Evans Avenue and Toland Street, and from Caltrain rail operations approximately 500 feet east of the proposed FSD/TC building. The parking garage, which would be as close as about 350 feet from the railroad tracks, would not be adversely affected by roadway or rail vibration. At 500 feet from the proposed FSD/TC building, the Caltrain tracks are near the distance (600 feet) at which heavy rail operations would not be expected to have an adverse effect, even on the most sensitive land uses, and distance between the Caltrain tracks and the project FSD/TC building means that train vibration would likely be no more noticeable than that from truck traffic on Evans Avenue.²⁸ Moreover, building occupants would not be considered sensitive to vibration in the way that residents would be. Some forensic testing laboratory equipment is sensitive to vibration and would require vibration dampening design features; according to the project sponsor, such features are included in the proposed project, thereby precluding any adverse impact. Consequently, effects related to vibration would be *less than significant*.

Impact NO-3: The project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would involve construction of an approximately 128,000-sf FSD/TC building that would house the SFPD's FSD and TC motorcycle fleet operations. Vehicular traffic makes the greatest contribution to ambient noise levels throughout most of San Francisco. Generally, traffic must double in volume to produce a noticeable increase in the ambient noise level in the project vicinity. According to the project TIS, the proposed project would generate approximately 1,045 daily vehicle trips, with 90 of those trips occurring in the p.m. peak hour, mostly on Evans Avenue, which has substantial traffic volumes under existing condition. The increase in vehicle trips would not cause traffic volumes to double on nearby streets, and therefore would not have a noticeable effect on ambient noise levels in the project site vicinity.

The proposed small-scale laboratory and office uses would not include features (such as large air compressors, etc.) that would generate substantial noise. Additionally, noise-insulating features that would be incorporated into the proposed project through standard construction practices and that would meet the San Francisco Building Code requirements would act to diminish noise emanating from the FSD/TC building to the outside. Mechanical equipment, such as rooftop heating and ventilation units, would be a source of operational noise; however, such equipment would be subject to and comply with Section 2909 of the Noise Ordinance, which establishes a noise limit from mechanical sources. Measured at the property line, noise generated by commercial and industrial uses must be 8 dBA or less in excess of ambient noise levels; for noise on public property, including streets, the limit is 10 dBA in excess of ambient noise levels. Surrounding land uses are all commercial or light industrial, and include

²⁸ Federal Transit Administration, (FTA), Office of Planning and Environment, *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, May 2006. Available on the internet at: http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf
Reviewed May 20, 2013.

a restaurant, valet parking service, restaurant supply company, storage facility, parcel distribution facility, building materials supplier, towing company, and the I-280 freeway and Caltrain tracks; these uses are not considered sensitive to noise and would not be adversely affected by project noise.

Therefore, operational noise from the proposed project and traffic-related noise associated with operations would not adversely affect ambient noise levels in the project vicinity and this impact would be *less than significant*.

Impact NO-3: During construction, the proposed project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels and vibration in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. (Less than Significant)

Demolition, excavation, and building construction would temporarily increase noise in the project vicinity. Construction equipment would generate noise and possibly vibration, notably from pile driving that could be considered an annoyance by occupants of nearby properties. According to the project sponsor, the construction period would last approximately 30 months. Construction noise levels would fluctuate depending on construction phase, equipment type and duration of use, distance between noise source and listener, and presence or absence of barriers. Impacts would generally be limited to demolition and the periods during which new foundations and exterior structural and façade elements would be constructed; this phase would include pile driving. Interior construction noise would be substantially reduced by exterior walls.

The project would be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance, which regulates construction noise.²⁹ This Ordinance requires that noise levels from individual construction equipment, other than impact tools, not exceed 80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the source. Impact tools (pile drivers, jackhammers, impact wrenches, etc.) must have both intake and exhaust muffled to the satisfaction of the SFDPW Director. Section 2908 of the Noise Ordinance prohibits construction work between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. if noise would exceed the ambient noise level by 5 dBA at the project property line, unless the SFDPW Director or the Director of Building Inspection grants a special permit. The project would be required to comply with regulations set forth in the Noise Ordinance.

Sensitive receptors nearest to the project site are the residences along 26th Street (including the Potrero Terrace housing complex), approximately one-third mile north of the project site. These residences are located far enough away that it is unlikely they will be adversely affected by construction noise. Construction activities typically generate noise levels no greater than 90 dBA (i.e., excavation) at 50 feet from the activity, while other activities, such as concrete work, generate much less noise. Demolition and pile driving activities would result in impact-related noise that would result in short-term noise levels as high as 105 dBA. These noise levels would be reduced to 74 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptor (one-third mile), which, while noticeable, would be similar to existing traffic noise levels along this portion of the City, as indicated in Table 5.

Therefore, for nearby sensitive receptors, although construction noise could be perceptible at times, it would not be expected to exceed noise levels commonly experienced in an urban environment. The increase in noise and vibration in the project area during project construction would be considered less than significant because it would be temporary, intermittent, and restricted in occurrence and level as the contractor would be required to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance. In light of the above, the project's construction noise impacts would be considered *less than significant*.

²⁹ Article 29 of the *Police Code*, §2901 to §2926.

Impact C-NO-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant noise impact. (Less than Significant)

Construction activities in the vicinity of the project site, such as excavation, grading, or construction of other buildings in the area, would occur on a temporary and intermittent basis. Project construction-related noise would not substantially increase ambient noise levels at locations greater than a few hundred feet from the project site. The nearest other project to the site, the expansion of the Restaurant Depot store, has been completed. The only other nearby project with which construction of the proposed project could overlap is the proposed Home Depot store at 2000 Marin Street.³⁰ The two project sites are located approximately 500 feet or more from each other and both are in an area surrounded by high-volume roadways and freeways whose traffic tends to dominate the local noise environment. Moreover, the project schedules would not likely overlap to a substantial degree shall both projects be approved, as the FSD/TC project is considerably farther along in its entitlement process than is the Home Depot project. Construction noise effects associated with the proposed project thus are not anticipated to combine with those associated with other proposed and ongoing projects located in the vicinity such that a substantial temporary or periodic noise increase would be experienced by local workers. The nearest residential uses are too distant to be adversely affected by construction noise. Therefore, cumulative construction-related noise impacts would be *less than significant*.

Localized traffic noise would increase in conjunction with foreseeable residential and commercial growth in the project vicinity. However, because neither the proposed project nor the other projects in the vicinity are anticipated to result in a doubling of traffic volumes along any of the nearby major streets, the project would not contribute considerably to any cumulative traffic-related increases in ambient noise. Moreover, operations would comply with the Noise Ordinance and would therefore not be expected to substantially contribute to any cumulative increases in ambient noise levels. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less-than-significant* cumulative noise impacts.

³⁰ Case No. 2009.0651; EIR in preparation. Project file available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400.

E.7 AIR QUALITY

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
7. AIR QUALITY—Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The BAAQMD is the regional agency with jurisdiction over the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB), which includes nine counties: San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Napa Counties and portions of Sonoma and Solano Counties. The BAAQMD is responsible for attaining and maintaining air quality in the SFBAAB in conformance with federal and state air quality standards, established by the federal Clean Air Act (CAA) and the California Clean Air Act (CCAA), respectively. Specifically, the BAAQMD has the responsibility to monitor ambient air pollutant levels throughout the SFBAAB and to develop and implement strategies to attain the applicable federal and state standards. The CAA and the CCAA require plans to be developed for areas that do not meet air quality standards, generally. The most recent air quality plan, the 2010 CAP, was adopted by the BAAQMD on September 15, 2010. The 2010 CAP updates the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy in accordance with the requirements of the CCAA to implement all feasible measures to reduce ozone; provide a control strategy to reduce ozone, particulate matter (PM), air toxics, and greenhouse gases in a single, integrated plan; and establish emission control measures to be adopted or implemented. The 2010 CAP contains the following primary goals:

- Attain air quality standards;
- Reduce population exposure and protect public health in the San Francisco Bay Area; and
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and protect the climate.

The 2010 CAP represents the most current applicable air quality plan for the SFBAAB. Consistency with this plan is the basis for determining whether the proposed project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan.

Criteria Air Pollutants

In accordance with state and federal CAAs, air pollutant standards are identified for the following six criteria air pollutants: ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), PM, nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and lead. These air pollutants are termed criteria air pollutants because they are regulated by developing specific public health- and welfare-based criteria as the basis for setting permissible levels. In general, the SFBAAB experiences low concentrations of most pollutants when compared to federal or state standards. The SFBAAB is designated as either in attainment or unclassified for most criteria pollutants with the exception of ozone, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀, for which it is designated as in non-attainment for either the state or federal standards.³¹ By its very nature, regional air pollution is largely a cumulative impact in that no single project is sufficient in size to, by itself, to result in non-attainment of air quality standards. Instead, a project's individual emissions contribute to existing cumulative air quality impacts. If a project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is considerable, the project's impact on air quality would be considered significant.³²

Land use projects may contribute to regional criteria air pollutants during construction and operational phases.

Table 6 provides significance thresholds for determining air quality impacts. Projects that would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants below these significance thresholds would not violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants within the SFBAAB.

TABLE 6. CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANT SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

Pollutant	Construction Thresholds	Operational Thresholds	
	Average Daily Emissions (lbs./day)	Average Daily Emissions (lbs./day)	Annual Average Emissions (tons/year)
ROG	54	54	10
NO _x	54	54	10
PM ₁₀	82 (exhaust)	82	15
PM _{2.5}	54 (exhaust)	54	10
Fugitive Dust	Construction Dust Ordinance or other Best Management Practices (BMPs)	Not Applicable	

Note: PM₁₀ is often termed "coarse" particulate matter and is made of particulates that are 10 microns in diameter or smaller. PM_{2.5}, termed "fine" particulate matter, is composed of particles that are 2.5 microns or less in diameter.

Ozone Precursors. The SFBAAB is currently in non-attainment for ozone and PM (specifically, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). Ozone is a secondary air pollutant produced in the atmosphere through a complex series of photochemical reactions involving reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x). State and federal clean air acts contain limits on emissions of these criteria pollutants from stationary sources. By meeting these limits, it is anticipated that emissions from new stationary sources do not contribute to an air quality violation or result in a considerable net increase of criteria air pollutants in the air basin.

³¹"Attainment" status refers to those regions that are meeting federal and/or state standards for a specified criteria pollutant. "Non-attainment" refers to regions that do not meet federal and/or state standards for a specified criteria pollutant. "Unclassified" refers to regions where there is not enough data to determine the region's attainment status.

³² BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, page 2-1.

Stationary sources of air pollution are subject to a New Source Review (NSR) under the federal CAA and BAAQMD, Regulation 2, Rule 2, which requires any new source that emits criteria air pollutants above a specified emissions limit to offset those emissions. For ozone precursors ROG and NO_x, the offset emissions level is an annual average of 10 tons per year (or 54 pounds [lbs.] per day).³³ Although the offset requirements apply to new or modified stationary sources, the above thresholds can be applied to construction and operational phases of land use projects since the increases in vehicle trips, architectural coating, and construction activities associated with these projects result in ROG and NO_x emissions. Projects that result in emissions below these thresholds would not be considered to contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation or result in a considerable net increase in ROG and NO_x emissions. Due to the temporary nature of construction activities, only the average daily thresholds are applicable to construction phase emissions.

Particulate Matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). The BAAQMD has not established an offset limit for PM_{2.5}. However, the federal emissions limit for new stationary sources in nonattainment areas is an appropriate significance threshold since these limits represent levels at which a source is not expected to have an impact on air quality.³⁴ For PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀, the emissions limit under the NSR is 15 tons per year (82 lbs. per day) and 10 tons per year (54 lbs. per day), respectively. Land development projects typically result in PM emissions as a result of increases in vehicle trips, space heating and natural gas combustion, landscape maintenance, and construction activities. Therefore, the above thresholds can be applied to the construction and operational phases of a land use project. Again, because construction activities are temporary in nature, only the average daily thresholds are applicable to construction-phase emissions.

Fugitive Dust. Fugitive dust emissions are typically generated during construction phases. Studies have shown that the application of best management practices (BMPs) at construction sites significantly control fugitive dust.³⁵ Individual measures have been shown to reduce fugitive dust by anywhere from 30 to 90 percent.³⁶ The BAAQMD has identified a number of BMPs to control fugitive dust emissions from construction activities.³⁷ The City's Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008) requires a number of measures to control fugitive dust to ensure that construction projects do not result in visible dust. Employing BMPs in compliance with Ordinance 176-08 is an effective strategy for controlling construction-related fugitive dust.

Local Risks and Hazards

In addition to criteria air pollutants, individual projects may emit toxic air contaminants (TACs), a diverse group of air pollutants that are capable of causing chronic (i.e., of long-term duration) and acute (i.e., severe but short-term) adverse effects to human health, including carcinogenic effects. A TAC is defined in California HSC Section 39655 as an air pollutant which may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or serious illness, or which may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. Human health effects of TACs include birth defects, neurological damage, cancer, and death. There are hundreds of different types of TACs with varying degrees of toxicity. Individual TACs vary greatly in the health risk they present; at a given level of exposure, one TAC may pose a hazard that is many times greater than another.

³³ BAAQMD, Revised Draft Options and Justification Report, CEQA Thresholds of Significance, October 2009, page 17.

³⁴ BAAQMD, Revised Draft Options and Justification Report, CEQA Thresholds of Significance, October 2009, page 16.

³⁵ Western Regional Air Partnership. 2006. WRAP Fugitive Dust Handbook. September 7, 2006. This document is available online at http://www.wrapair.org/forums/dej/fdh/content/FDHandbook_Rev_06.pdf, accessed February 16, 2012.

³⁶ BAAQMD, Revised Draft Options and Justification Report, CEQA, Thresholds of Significance, October 2009, page 27.

³⁷ BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011.

Unlike criteria air pollutants, ambient air quality standards have not been developed for TACs; however, these pollutants are regulated by the BAAQMD using a risk-based approach. This approach uses a health risk assessment to determine which sources and pollutants to control as well as the degree of control. A health risk assessment (HRA) is an analysis in which human health exposure to toxic substances is estimated, and considered together with information regarding the toxic potency of the substances, to provide quantitative estimates of health risks.³⁸

Vehicle tailpipe emissions contain numerous TACs, including benzene, 1,3-butadiene, formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, acrolein, naphthalene, and diesel exhaust in a complex mixture of particles and gases, with collective and individual toxicological characteristics.³⁹ While each constituent pollutant in engine exhaust may have a unique toxicological profile, health effects have been associated with proximity, or exposure, to vehicle-related pollutants collectively as a mixture.⁴⁰ Exposures to PM_{2.5} are strongly associated with mortality, respiratory diseases, and lung development in children, and other endpoints such as hospitalization for cardiopulmonary disease.⁴¹ In addition to PM_{2.5}, diesel particulate matter (DPM) is also of concern. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) identified DPM as a TAC in 1998, primarily based on evidence demonstrating cancer effects in humans.⁴² Mobile sources such as trucks and buses are among the primary sources of diesel emissions, and concentrations of DPM are higher near heavily traveled roadways. The estimated cancer risk from exposure to diesel exhaust is much higher than the risk associated with any other TAC routinely measured in the region.

Air pollution does not affect every individual in the population in the same way, and some groups are more sensitive to adverse health effects than others. Land uses such as residences, schools, children's day care centers, hospitals, and nursing and convalescent homes are considered to be the most sensitive to poor air quality as the population groups associated with these uses have increased susceptibility to respiratory distress or, as in the case of residential receptors, their exposure time is greater than for other land uses. Exposure assessment guidance typically assumes that residences would be exposed to air pollution 24 hours per day, 350 days per year, for 70 years. Therefore, assessments of air pollutant exposure to residents typically result in the greatest adverse health outcomes of all population.

In an effort to identify areas of San Francisco most adversely affected by sources of TACs, the City partnered with BAAQMD to inventory and assess air pollution and exposures from mobile, stationary, and area sources within San Francisco. Areas with poor air quality, termed "air pollution hot spots," were identified based on two health-protective criteria: (1) excess cancer risk from the contribution of emissions from all modeled sources greater than 100 per one million population, and/or (2) cumulative PM_{2.5} concentrations greater than 10 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$).

³⁸ In general, a HRA is required if the BAAQMD concludes that projected emissions of a specific air toxic compound from a proposed new or modified source suggest a potential public health risk. The applicant is then subject to a HRA for the source in question. Such an assessment generally evaluates chronic, long-term effects, estimating the increased risk of cancer as a result of exposure to one or more TACs.

³⁹ SFDPH, *Assessment and Mitigation of Air Pollutant Health Effects from Intra-Urban Roadways: Guidance for Land Use Planning and Environmental Review*, May 2008.

⁴⁰ Delfino RJ, 2002, "Epidemiologic evidence for asthma and exposure to air toxics: linkages between occupational, indoor, and community air pollution research," *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 110(S4):573-589.

⁴¹ SFDPH, *Assessment and Mitigation of Air Pollutant Health Effects from Intra-Urban Roadways: Guidance for Land Use Planning and Environmental Review*, May 2008.

⁴² CARB, Fact Sheet, "The Toxic Air Contaminant Identification Process: Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions from Diesel-fueled Engines," October 1998.

Excess Cancer Risk. The above 100 per one million persons (100 excess cancer risk) criteria is based on United State Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) guidance for conducting air toxic analyses and making risk management decisions at the facility and community-scale level.⁴³ As described by the BAAQMD, the USEPA considers a cancer risk of 100 per million to be within the "acceptable" range of cancer risk. Furthermore, in the 1989 preamble to the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) rulemaking for benzene, the USEPA states that it "...strives to provide maximum feasible protection against risks to health from hazardous air pollutants by (1) protecting the greatest number of persons possible to an individual lifetime risk level no higher than approximately one in one million and (2) limiting to no higher than approximately one in ten thousand [100 in one million] the estimated risk that a person living near a plant would have if he or she were exposed to the maximum pollutant concentrations for 70 years."⁴⁴ The 100 per one million excess cancer case is also consistent with the ambient cancer risk in the most pristine portions of the Bay Area based on BAAQMD regional modeling.⁴⁵

Fine Particulate Matter. In April 2011, the USEPA published *Policy Assessment for the Particulate Matter Review of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards* (Particulate Matter Policy Assessment). In this document, USEPA staff concludes that the current federal annual PM_{2.5} standard of 15 µg/m³ shall be revised to a level within the range of 13 to 11 µg/m³, with evidence strongly supporting a standard within the range of 12 to 11 µg/m³. Air pollution "hot spots" for San Francisco are based on the health protective PM_{2.5} standard of 11 µg/m³, as supported by the USEPA's Particulate Matter Policy Assessment, although lowered to 10 µg/m³ to account for error bounds in emissions modeling programs.

A portion of the proposed project (Block 5231/Block 4) is located in an air pollution hot spot. Land use projects within these air pollution hot spots require special consideration to determine whether the project's activities would expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations or add emissions to areas already adversely affected by poor air quality.

Construction Impacts

Project-related air quality impacts fall into two categories: (1) short-term impacts due to construction and (2) long-term impacts due to project operations.

Impact AQ-1: The proposed project's construction activities would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, but would not violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant)

Construction activities (short-term) typically result in emissions of fugitive dust, criteria air pollutants, and DPM. Emissions of criteria pollutants and DPM are primarily a result of the combustion of fuel from on-road and off-road vehicles and equipment. However, ROG_s are also emitted from activities that involve painting or other types of architectural coatings or asphalt paving activities. The proposed project includes demolition of the existing four buildings totaling approximately 40,500 sf in floor area and construction of an approximately 128,000 sf building, four stories and approximately 64 feet in height, which would house the FSD and TC. During the project's approximately 30-month construction period, construction activities would have the potential to result in fugitive dust emissions, criteria air pollutants, and DPM.

⁴³ BAAQMD, *Revised Draft Options and Justification Report*, of Significance, October 2009, page 67.

⁴⁴ 54 Federal Register 38044, September 14, 1989.

⁴⁵ BAAQMD, *Revised Draft Options and Justification Report*, CEQA Thresholds of Significance, October 2009, page 67.

Fugitive Dust: Project-related demolition, excavation, grading, and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. Although there are federal standards for air pollutants and implementation of state and regional air quality control plans, air pollutants continue to have impacts on human health throughout the country. California has found that PM exposure can cause health effects at lower levels than national standards. The current health burden of PM demands that, where possible, public agencies take feasible and available actions to reduce sources of PM exposure. According to CARB, reducing ambient PM from 1998-2000 levels to natural background concentrations in San Francisco would prevent over 200 premature deaths.

Dust can be an irritant causing watering eyes or irritation to the lungs, nose, and throat. Demolition, excavation, grading, and other construction activities can cause wind-blown dust to add to PM in the local atmosphere. Depending on exposure, adverse health effects can occur due to this PM in general and also due to specific contaminants such as lead or asbestos that may be constituents of soil.

In response, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes (referred hereto as Ordinance 176-08).⁴⁶ This Ordinance is an effective strategy for controlling and reducing the quantity of dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and onsite workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI).

Ordinance 176-08 requires that all site preparation work, demolition, or other construction activities within San Francisco that has the potential to create dust or to expose or disturb more than 10 cy or 500 sf of soil comply with specified dust control measures, whether or not the activity requires a permit from the DBI. The DBI Director may waive this requirement for activities on sites less than one half-acre in size that are unlikely to result in any visible wind-blown dust.

In compliance with Ordinance 176-08, the project sponsor and the contractor responsible for construction activities at the project site would be required to use the following practices to control construction dust on the site or other practices that result in equivalent dust control which are acceptable to the Director. Dust suppression activities may include:

- Water all active construction areas sufficiently to prevent dust from becoming airborne; increased water frequency may be necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour (mph);
- Reclaimed water must be used if required by Article 21, Section 1100 *et seq.* of the SFDPW; if not required, reclaimed water shall be used whenever possible;
- Contractors shall provide as much water as necessary to control dust without creating run-off in any area of land clearing, and/or earth movement;
- During excavation and dirt-moving activities, contractors shall wet sweep or vacuum streets, sidewalks, paths, and intersections where work is in progress at the end of the workday;
- Inactive stockpiles (where no disturbance occurs for more than seven days) greater than 10 cy or 500 sf of excavated materials backfill material, import material, gravel, sand, road base, and soil shall be covered with a 10 mil (0.01 inch) polyethylene plastic (or equivalent) tarp, braced down, or other equivalent soil stabilization techniques used.

⁴⁶ San Francisco's Construction Dust Control Ordinance effective July 30, 2008.

For projects over one half-acre in size, such as the proposed project, Ordinance 176-08 requires that the project sponsor submit a Dust Control Plan (DCP) for approval by the SFDPH. The DBI will not issue a building permit without written notification from the SFDPH that the applicant has a site-specific DCP, unless the Director waives the requirement. Interior-only tenant improvement projects that are over one-half acre in size that will not produce exterior visible dust are exempt from the site-specific DCP requirement.

The site-specific DCP would require the project sponsor to:

- Submit a map to the SFDPH Director showing all sensitive receptors within 1,000 feet of the site;
- Wet down areas of soil at least three times per day;
- Provide an analysis of wind direction and install upwind and downwind particulate dust monitors;
- Record particulate monitoring results;
- Hire an independent, third-party to conduct inspections and keep a record of inspections;
- Establish shut-down conditions based on wind, soil migration, etc.;
- Establish a hotline for surrounding community members who may be potentially affected by project-related dust;
- Limit the area subject to construction activities at any one time;
- Install dust curtains and windbreaks on the property lines, as necessary;
- Limit the amount of soil in hauling trucks to the size of the truck bed and securing with a tarpaulin;
- Enforce a 15 mph speed limit for vehicles entering and exiting construction areas at the site;
- Sweep affected streets with water sweepers at the end of each day;
- Install and utilize wheel washers to clean truck tires;
- Terminate construction activities when winds exceed 25 mph;
- Apply soil stabilizers to inactive areas; and
- Sweep off adjacent streets to reduce particulate emissions.

The project sponsor would be required to designate an individual to monitor compliance with the dust control requirements of the DCP. Compliance with these regulations and procedures set forth by the San Francisco Building Code (SFBC) would ensure that potential dust-related air quality impacts would be reduced to a level of insignificance.

Criteria Air Pollutants

As discussed above, construction activities would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants from the use of off- and on-road vehicles and equipment. To assist lead agencies in determining whether short-term construction-related air pollutant emissions require further analysis as to whether a project may exceed the criteria air pollutant significance thresholds shown in Table 5, the BAAQMD developed screening guidelines.⁴⁷ If a proposed project meets the screening criteria, then construction of the proposed project would result in less-than-significant criteria air pollutant impacts. A project that exceeds the screening criteria may require a detailed air quality assessment to determine if criteria air pollutant emissions would exceed significance thresholds. The BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines note that screening

⁴⁷ BAAQMD, *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* (CEQA Guidelines), May 2011.

levels are generally representative of new development on greenfield sites without any form of mitigation measures taken into consideration.⁴⁸ In addition, the screening criteria do not account for project design features, attributes, or local development requirements that could also result in lower emissions. For projects that are mixed-use, infill, and/or near transit service and local services, emissions would be expected to be less than the greenfield-type project that the screening criteria are based upon.

The proposed project includes demolition of the existing four buildings totaling approximately 40,500 sf in floor area and construction of an approximately 128,000-sf building, four stories and approximately 64 feet in height, which would house the FSD and TC. The proposed project would be below the criteria air pollutant screening sizes for government office buildings, which is 277,000 sf, as identified in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines. Thus, quantification of construction-related criteria air pollutant emissions is not required, and the proposed project's construction activities would not exceed any of the significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants, and would result in a *less-than-significant* construction criteria air pollutant impact.

Impact AQ-2: The proposed project's construction activities would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, but would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Off-road equipment (which includes construction-related equipment) is a large contributor to DPM emissions in California and was once estimated to be the second largest source of ambient DPM emissions in California. However, since 2007, CARB has found emissions to be substantially lower than previously expected.⁴⁹ Newer and more refined emission inventories have substantially lowered the DPM emission estimates from off-road equipment such that this equipment is now considered the sixth largest source of DPM emissions in California.⁵⁰ This reduction in emissions is due, in part, to effects of the economic recession and refined emissions estimation methodologies. For example, revised PM emission estimates for the year 2010, in which DPM is a major component of total PM, have decreased by 83 percent from previous estimates for the SFBAAB.⁵¹ Approximately half of the reduction can be attributed to the economic recession and half can be attributed to updated assumptions independent of the economic recession (e.g., updated methodologies used to better assess construction emissions).⁵²

Additionally, a number of federal and state regulations are requiring cleaner off-road equipment. Specifically, both California and the USEPA have set emissions standards for new off-road equipment engines, ranging from Tier 1 to Tier 4 levels. Tier 1 emission standards were phased in between 1996 and 2000 and Tier 4 Interim and Final emission standards for all new engines are being phased in between 2008 and 2015. To meet the Tier 4 emission standards, engine manufacturers will be required to produce new engines with advanced emission-control technologies. Although the full benefits of these regulations will not be realized for several years, the USEPA estimates that by implementing the federal Tier 4

⁴⁸ A greenfield site refers to agricultural, forest land, or an undeveloped site earmarked for commercial, residential, or industrial projects.

⁴⁹ CARB, *Staff Report: Initial Statement of Reasons for Proposed Rulemaking, Proposed Amendments to the Regulation for In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets and the Off-Road Large Spark-Ignition Fleet Requirements*, p.1 and p. 13 (Figure 4), October 2010.

⁵⁰ CARB, *Ibid.*

⁵¹ CARB, "In-Use Off-Road Equipment, 2011 Inventory Model," Query accessed online, April 2, 2012, http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/categories.htm#inuse_or_category.

⁵² CARB, *Staff Report: Initial Statement of Reasons for Proposed Rulemaking, Proposed Amendments to the Regulation for In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets and the Off-Road Large Spark-Ignition Fleet Requirements*, October 2010.

standards, NO_x and PM emissions will be reduced by more than 90 percent.⁵³ Furthermore, California regulations limit maximum idling times to five minutes, which further reduces public exposure to DPM emissions.⁵⁴

In addition, construction activities do not lend themselves to analysis of long-term health risks because of their temporary and variable nature. As explained in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines:

Due to the variable nature of construction activity, the generation of TAC emissions in most cases would be temporary, especially considering the short amount of time such equipment is typically within an influential distance that would result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations. Concentrations of mobile-source diesel PM emissions are typically reduced by 70 percent at a distance of approximately 500 feet. In addition, current models and methodologies for conducting health risk assessments are associated with longer-term exposure periods of 9, 40, and 70 years, which do not correlate well with the temporary and highly variable nature of construction activities. This results in difficulties with producing accurate estimates of health risk.⁵⁵

Therefore, project-level analyses of construction activities have a tendency to produce over-estimated assessments of long-term health risks. However, within air pollution hot spots, as discussed above, additional construction activity may adversely affect populations that are already at a higher risk for adverse long-term health risks from existing sources of air pollution.

The proposed project would require construction activities for the approximate 30-month construction phase. Project construction activities would result in short-term emissions of DPM and other toxic air contaminants that would add emissions to areas already adversely affected by poor air quality. This would result in a *significant* air quality impact to sensitive land uses. Implementation of the following emissions-reducing mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2: Construction Emissions Minimization

Construction Emissions Minimization Plan. Prior to issuance of a construction permit, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (EMP) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The EMP shall detail project compliance with the following requirements:

1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall meet the following requirements:
 - a) Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited;
 - b) All off-road equipment shall have:
 - Engines that meet or exceed either United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 2 off-road emissions standards; and

⁵³ USEPA, *Clean Air Nonroad Diesel Rule: Fact Sheet*, May 2004.

⁵⁴ California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 13, Division 3, § 2485.

⁵⁵ BAAQMD, *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, May 2012, page 8-6.

- Engines that are retrofitted with a CARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS).⁵⁶
- c) Exceptions:
- Exceptions to A(1)(a) *may* be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site and that the requirements of this exception provision apply. Under this circumstance, the project sponsor shall submit documentation of compliance with A(1)(b) for onsite power generation.
 - Exceptions to A(1)(b)(ii) *may* be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is: (1) technically not feasible; (2) would not produce desired emissions reductions due to expected operating modes; (3) installing the control device would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator; or (4) there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that are not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS and the sponsor has submitted documentation to the ERO that requirements of this exception provision apply. If granted an exception to A(1)(b)(ii), the project sponsor must comply with the requirements of A(1)(c)(iii).
 - If an exception is granted pursuant to A(1)(c)(ii), the project sponsor shall provide the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment as provided by the step down schedules in Table 7.

TABLE 7. OFF-ROAD EQUIPMENT COMPLIANCE STEP-DOWN SCHEDULE

Compliance Alternative	Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control
1	Tier 2	ARB Level 2 VDECS
2	Tier 2	ARB Level 1 VDECS
3	Tier 2	Alternative Fuel *

*Alternative fuels are not VDECS

HOW TO USE THIS TABLE:

If the requirements of (A)(1)(b) cannot be met, then the project sponsor would need to meet Compliance Alternative 1. Shall the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then Compliance Alternative 2 would need to be met. Shall the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 2, then Compliance Alternative 3 would need to be met.

2. The project sponsor shall require the idling time for off-road and on-road equipment be limited to no more than *two minutes*, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment. Legible and visible signs shall be posted in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Chinese) in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the *two minute* idling limit.
3. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications.

⁵⁶ Equipment with engines meeting Tier 4 Interim or Tier 4 Final emission standards automatically meet this requirement, therefore a VDECS would not be required.

4. The EMP shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation.

For VDECS installed: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, CARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used

5. The EMP shall be kept on-site and available for review by any persons requesting it and a legible sign shall be posted at the perimeter of the construction site indicating to the public the basic requirements of the EMP and a way to request a copy of the Plan. The project sponsor shall provide copies of the EMP to members of the public as requested.

Reporting. Monthly reports shall be submitted to the ERO indicating the construction phase and off-road equipment used during each phase including information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include actual amounts of alternative fuel used.

Within six months of completion of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit a final report summarizing construction activities to the ERO. The final report shall indicate the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase. For each phase, the report shall include detailed information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used.

Certification Statement and On-site Requirements. Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project sponsor must certify: (1) compliance with the EMP, and (2) that all applicable requirements of the EMP have been incorporated into contract specifications.

While the emissions reductions from limiting idling, educating workers and the public, and properly maintaining equipment is difficult to quantify, other measures, specifically the requirement for equipment with Tier 2 engines and Level 3 VDECSs, can reduce construction emissions by 89 to 94 percent as compared to equipment with engines meeting no emission standards and without VDECS. Emissions reductions from the combination of Tier 2 equipment with Level 3 VDECS is almost equivalent to requiring only equipment with Tier 4 Final engines, which is not yet available for engine sizes subject to the mitigation. Therefore, compliance with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2 would result in construction emission impacts to nearby sensitive receptors at a *less-than-significant* level.

Impact AQ-3: During project operations, the proposed project would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants, but not at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant)

As discussed in Impact AQ-1, the BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines developed screening criteria to determine whether a project requires an analysis of project-generated criteria air pollutants. If all the screening criteria are met by a proposed project, the lead agency or applicant does not need to perform a detailed air quality assessment.

Operational emissions from project traffic and from operation of the proposed building were calculated using the CalEEMod model, and are presented in Table 8. As shown in this table, emission increases attributable to the proposed project would be substantially below the applicable significance thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project's effects of regional criteria pollutant emissions would be *less than significant*.

TABLE 8. SAN FRANCISCO FORENSIC SERVICES DIVISION PROJECT ESTIMATED DAILY REGIONAL EMISSIONS (2016)

	Daily Projected Emissions (Pounds per Day) ^{a,b}			
	ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Area-Source Emissions	3.78	<1	<1	<1
Mobile-Source (Vehicle) Emissions	10.27	8.75	6.18	<1
TOTAL	14.05	9.45	6.23	0.51
<i>Significance Threshold</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>82</i>	<i>54</i>
Significant?	No	No	No	No
	Annual Projected Emissions (Tons per Year) ^{a,b}			
	ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Area-Source Emissions	0.69	0.13	<0.1	<0.1
Mobile-Source (Vehicle) Emissions	1.69	1.51	0.91	<0.1
TOTAL	2.38	1.64	0.92	0.09
<i>Significance Threshold</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>10</i>
Significant?	No	No	No	No

NOTES:

^a Emission factors were generated by the CalEEMod (v. 2011.1.1) model for San Francisco County, and assume a default vehicle mix. All daily estimates are for worst case winter conditions. Traffic generated emissions based on trip generation from the project transportation study.

^b Columns may not total due to rounding.

SOURCE: Environmental Science Associates, 2013.

Operational point source emissions from the forensic testing laboratory would be subject to BAAQMD permit regulations. The existing Forensic Services Division laboratory does not handle a sufficient volume of materials such that it requires a BAAQMD permit. If the new facility were to emit toxic air contaminants in volumes that exceed any of the "trigger levels" in Regulation 2, Rule 5, New Source Review of Toxic Air Contaminants, of BAAQMD's Rules and Regulations, then BAAQMD would conduct a site-specific health risk assessment (HRA) prior to granting a permit. Assuming that none of the trigger levels is exceeded, emissions of toxic air contaminants would not pose a significant risk to the public. It is anticipated that the facility would be exempt from permitting requirements due to the bench scale intensity of operations which result in low emission levels. If one or more trigger levels were exceeded, BAAQMD would perform a HRA and, if warranted, would require installation of appropriate control technology on laboratory exhaust to ensure that no significant health risk is posed to the public. Through compliance with BAAQMD rules and regulations, the impact of operational emission form the testing laboratory would be *less than significant*.

Impact AQ-4: During project operations, the proposed project would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, but would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Vehicle Trips. Individual projects result in emissions of toxic air contaminants primarily as a result of an increase in vehicle trips. The BAAQMD considers roads with less than 10,000 vehicles per day “*minor, low-impact*” sources that do not pose a significant health impact even in combination with other nearby sources and recommends that these sources be excluded from the environmental analysis. The proposed project’s 1,027 daily vehicle trips would be well below this level; therefore, an assessment of project-generated TACs resulting from vehicle trips is not required. Thus, the proposed project would not generate a substantial amount of TAC emissions that could affect nearby sensitive receptors.

On-Site Diesel Generators. The proposed project would include two backup emergency generators. Emergency generators are regulated by the BAAQMD through its NSR (Regulation 2, Rule 5) permitting process. The project applicant would be required to obtain applicable permits to operate an emergency generator from the BAAQMD. Although emergency generators are intended only to be used in periods of power outages, monthly testing of the generator would be required. The BAAQMD typically limits testing to no more than 50 hours per year. Additionally, as part of the permitting process, the BAAQMD limits the excess cancer risk from any facility to no more than 10 per one million population and requires any source that would result in an excess cancer risk greater than one per one million population to install Best Available Control Technology for Toxics (TBACT). However, because the project site is located in an area that already experiences poor air quality, the proposed emergency back-up generator has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of diesel emissions, a known TAC, resulting in a *significant* air quality impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

Mitigation Measure

M-AQ-4: Best Available Control Technology (BACT) for Diesel Generators

All diesel generators shall have engines that: (1) meet Tier 4 Final or Tier 4 Interim emission standards, or (2) meet Tier 2 emission standards and are equipped with CARB Level 3 VDECS.

Implementation of M-AQ-4 would reduce emissions by 89 to 94 percent compared to equipment with engines that do not meet any emission standards and without VDECS. Therefore, although the proposed project would add a new source of TACs within an area that already experiences poor air quality, implementation of M-AQ-4 would reduce this impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

The proposed project would not include the development of any sensitive land uses for purposes of air quality evaluation (i.e., residential, daycare, hospital, etc.). BAAQMD has modeled and assessed air pollutant impacts from mobile, stationary, and area sources within the City. This assessment has resulted in the identification of air pollutant “hot spots”. The proposed project does not propose any sensitive land uses and would result in a *less-than-significant* impact with respect to exposing sensitive receptors to substantial levels of air pollution.

Impact AQ-5 : The proposed project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the 2010 Clean Air Plan. (Less than Significant)

The most recently adopted air quality plan for the SFBAAB is the *2010 Clean Air Plan*. The *2010 Clean Air Plan* is a road map that demonstrates how the San Francisco Bay Area will achieve compliance with the state ozone standards as expeditiously as practicable and how the region will reduce the transport of ozone and ozone precursors to neighboring air basins. In determining consistency with the *2010 Clean Air Plan* (CAP), this analysis considers whether the project would: (1) support the primary goals of the CAP, (2) include applicable control measures from the CAP, and (3) avoid disrupting or hindering implementation of control measures identified in the CAP.

To meet the primary goals, the CAP recommends specific control measures and actions. These control measures are grouped into various categories and include stationary and area source measures, mobile source measures, transportation control measures, land use measures, and energy and climate measures. The CAP recognizes that to a great extent, community design dictates individual travel mode, and that a key long-term control strategy to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants, air toxics, and greenhouse gases from motor vehicles is to channel future Bay Area growth into vibrant urban communities where goods and services are close at hand, and people have a range of viable transportation options. To this end, the *2010 Clean Air Plan* includes 55 control measures aimed at reducing air pollution in the SFBAAB.

The measures most applicable to the proposed project are transportation control measures and energy and climate control measures. The proposed project would be consistent with energy and climate control measures as discussed in Section E.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, which demonstrates that the proposed project would comply with the applicable provisions of the City's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

The compact development of the proposed project and availability of transportation options ensure that employees could bicycle, walk, and ride transit to and from the project site instead of taking trips via private automobile; the lack of on-site parking could provide further incentives for FSD employees to use commute alternatives. Combined with the fact that the project is primarily a relocation within San Francisco of existing activities, these features ensure that the project would avoid substantial growth in automobile trips and vehicle miles traveled. The proposed project would be generally consistent with the *San Francisco General Plan*, as discussed in Section C, Compatibility with Zoning, Plans, and Policies. Transportation control measures that are identified in the *2010 Clean Air Plan* are implemented by the *San Francisco General Plan* and the Planning Code, through the City's Transit First Policy, bicycle parking requirements, and transit impact development fees applicable to the proposed project. By complying with these applicable requirements, the project would include relevant transportation control measures specified by the *2010 Clean Air Plan*.

Examples of a project that could cause the disruption or delay of *Clean Air Plan* control measures are projects that would preclude the extension of a transit line or bike path, or projects that propose excessive parking beyond parking requirements. The proposed project would not preclude the extension of a transit line or a bike path or any other transit improvement, and thus would avoid disrupting or hindering implementation of control measures identified in the CAP.

For the reasons described above, the proposed project would not interfere with implementation of the *2010 Clean Air Plan*, and because the proposed project would be consistent with the applicable air quality plan that demonstrates how the region will improve ambient air quality and achieve the state and federal ambient air quality standards, this impact would be *less than significant*.

Impact AQ-6: The proposed project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (Less than Significant)

Typical odor sources of concern include wastewater treatment plants, sanitary landfills, transfer stations, composting facilities, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing facilities, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, auto body shops, rendering plants, and coffee roasting facilities. During construction, diesel exhaust from construction equipment would generate some odors. However, construction-related odors would be temporary and would not persist upon project completion. Additionally, the proposed project would develop a forensic laboratory and support space, with rooftop ventilation equipment of any laboratory exhaust, and would therefore not create a significant source of new odors. Therefore, odor impacts would be *less than significant*.

Impact C-AQ-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development in the project area would contribute to cumulative air quality impacts. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

As discussed above, regional air pollution is by its very nature largely a cumulative impact. Emissions from past, present, and future projects contribute to the region's adverse air quality on a cumulative basis. No single project by itself would be sufficient in size to result in regional nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Instead, a project's individual emissions contribute to existing cumulative adverse air quality impacts.⁵⁷ The project-level thresholds for criteria air pollutants are based on levels by which new sources are not anticipated to contribute to an air quality violation or result in a considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. Therefore, because the proposed project's construction (Impact AQ-1) and operational (Impact AQ-3) emissions would not exceed the project-level thresholds for criteria air pollutants, the proposed project would not be considered to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional air quality impacts.

As discussed above, the project site is located in an area that already experiences poor air quality. The project would add new sources of TACs (e.g., new vehicle trips and/or stationary sources) within an area already adversely affected by air quality, resulting in a considerable contribution to cumulative health risk impacts on sensitive receptors. This would be a significant cumulative impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2: Construction Emissions Minimization, which could reduce construction period emissions by as much as 94 percent, and Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4a: Best Available Control Technology (BACT) for Diesel Generators, which requires best available control technology to limit emissions from the project's emergency back-up generator, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

⁵⁷ BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, page 2-1.

E.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS— Would the project:					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are referred to as greenhouse gases (GHGs) because they capture heat radiated from the sun as it is reflected back into the atmosphere, much like a greenhouse does. The accumulation of GHGs has been implicated as the driving force for global climate change. The primary GHGs are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), ozone, and water vapor.

Individual projects emit GHGs during demolition, construction, and operational phases. While the presence of the primary GHGs in the atmosphere is naturally occurring, CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O are largely emitted from human activities, accelerating the rate at which these compounds occur within earth's atmosphere. Emissions of CO₂ are largely byproducts of fossil fuel combustion, whereas methane results from off-gassing associated with agricultural activities and landfills. Black carbon has recently emerged as a major contributor to global climate change, possibly second only to CO₂. Black carbon results from incomplete combustion of fossil fuels, biofuels, and biomass.⁵⁸ N₂O is emitted from agricultural activities, fossil fuel combustion, wastewater management, and industrial processes, such as the production of nitric acid, which is used to make synthetic commercial fertilizer.⁵⁹ Other GHGs generated in industrial processes include hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. Greenhouse gases are typically reported in "carbon dioxide-equivalent" measures (CO₂E).⁶⁰

There is international scientific consensus that human-caused increases in GHGs have contributed and will continue to contribute to global warming. Many impacts resulting from climate change, including increased fires, floods, severe storms and heat waves, occur already and will only become more frequent and more costly.⁶¹ Secondary effects of climate change are likely to include a global rise in sea levels; impacts to agriculture, the state's electricity system, and native freshwater fish ecosystems; an increase in the vulnerability of levees in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta; changes in disease vectors; and changes in habitat and biodiversity.^{62,63}

⁵⁸ Center for Climate and Energy Solutions. *What is Black Carbon?*, April 2010. Available online at: <http://www.c2es.org/docUploads/what-is-black-carbon.pdf>. Accessed May 16, 2013.

⁵⁹ *Overview of Greenhouse Gases, Climate Change*. Online at: <http://epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/gases/n2o.html>. Accessed May 21, 2013.

⁶⁰ Because of the differential heat absorption potential of various GHGs, GHG emissions are frequently measured in "carbon dioxide-equivalents," a weighted average based on each gas's heat absorption (or "global warming") potential.

⁶¹ California Climate Change Portal. Available online at: <http://www.climatechange.ca.gov>. Accessed May 16, 2013.

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ California Energy Commission. California Climate Change Center. *Our Changing Climate 2012*. Available online at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2012publications/CEC-500-2012-007/CEC-500-2012-007.pdf>. Accessed August 2, 2013.

CARB estimated that in 2010, California produced approximately 451 million gross metric tons of CO₂E (MMTCo₂E) emissions.⁶⁴ CARB determined that transportation is the source of 38 percent of the State's GHG emissions, followed by electricity generation (both in-state and out-of-state) at 21 percent and industrial sources at 19 percent. Commercial and residential fuel use (primarily for heating) accounted for approximately 10 percent of CO₂E emissions.⁶⁵ In the Bay Area, the transportation (on-road motor vehicles, off-highway mobile sources, and aircraft) and the industrial and commercial sector were the two largest sources of GHG emissions, each accounting for approximately 36 percent of the Bay Area's 95.8 MMTCo₂E emitted in 2007.⁶⁶ Electricity generation accounts for approximately 16 percent of the Bay Area's GHG emissions, followed by residential fuel usage (e.g., home water heaters, furnaces, etc.) at 7 percent, off-road equipment at 3 percent, and agriculture at 1 percent.⁶⁷

Regulatory Setting

In 2005, in recognition of California's vulnerability to the effects of climate change, former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger established Executive Order S-3-05, which set forth a series of target dates by which statewide emissions of GHGs would be progressively reduced:

- By 2010: reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels (approximately 457 MMTCo₂E);
- By 2020: reduce emissions to 1990 levels (estimated at 427 MMTCo₂E); and
- By 2050: reduce state-wide GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels (about 85 MMTCo₂E).

In response, in 2006, the California legislature passed Assembly Bill No. 32 (AB 32; California HSC Division 25.5, Section 38500, et seq.) also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act. AB 32 requires CARB to design and implement emission limits, regulations, and other measures to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020.⁶⁸

Pursuant to AB 32, CARB adopted the Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan) in December 2008, as the state's overarching plan for addressing climate change. The Scoping Plan outlines measures to meet the required GHG reductions by 2020 and sets out an implementation timeline for GHG reduction strategies. In order to meet the goals of AB 32, California must reduce its GHG emissions by 30 percent below projected 2020 business as usual emissions levels, or about 15 percent from 2008 levels.⁶⁹ The Scoping Plan estimates a reduction of 174 million MMTCo₂E (about 191 million U.S. tons) from the transportation, energy, agriculture, forestry, and high global warming potential sectors, as summarized in Table 9.⁷⁰

⁶⁴ CARB. *California Greenhouse Gas Inventory for 2000-2010— by Category as Defined in the Scoping Plan*. Available online at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/tables/ghg_inventory_scopingplan_00-10_2013-02-19.pdf. Accessed May 16, 2013.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ BAAQMD, *Source Inventory of Bay Area Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Base Year 2007*, updated February 2010. Available online at: http://www.baaqmd.gov/-/media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/Emission%20Inventory/regionalinventory2007_2_10.ashx. Accessed August 2, 2013.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Governor's Office of Planning and Research. *Technical Advisory- CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review*, June 19, 2008. Available online at: <http://opr.ca.gov/docs/june08-ceqa.pdf>. Accessed August 2, 2013.

⁶⁹ CARB. *California's Climate Plan: Fact Sheet*. Available online at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/cleanenergy/clean_fs2.pdf. Accessed May 16, 2013.

⁷⁰ CARB. *Assembly Bill 32: Global Warming Solutions Act*. Available online at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/ab32/ab32.html>. Accessed May 16, 2013.

TABLE 9. GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTIONS BY SECTOR FROM THE AB32 SCOPING PLAN

Sector	GHG Reductions (MMTCO ₂ E)
Transportation Sector	62.3
Electricity and Natural Gas	49.7
Industry	1.4
Landfill Methane Control Measure (Discrete Early Action)	1
Forestry	5
High Global Warming Potential GHGs	20.2
Additional Reductions Needed to Achieve the GHG Cap	34.4
Total	174
Other Sectors/Recommended Measures	
Government Operations	1-2
Agriculture - Methane Capture at Large Dairies	1
Water	4.8
Green Buildings	26
High Recycling/ Zero Waste	
• Commercial Recycling	
• Composting	
• Anaerobic Digestion	9
• Extended Producer Responsibility	
• Environmentally Preferable Purchasing	
Total	41.8 - 42.8

The AB 32 Scoping Plan recommendations are intended to curb projected business-as-usual growth in GHG emissions and reduce those emissions to 1990 levels. Meeting the reduction goals of the Scoping Plan would result in an overall annual net decrease in GHGs relative to current levels, accounting for projected increases in emissions resulting from anticipated growth.

The Scoping Plan also incorporates requirements of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) to implement carbon emission reductions by aligning local land use and transportation planning to further achieve the state's GHG reduction goals. SB 375 requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations to incorporate a "sustainable communities strategy" in regional transportation plans (RTPs) to achieve GHG emission reduction targets set by CARB. The Bay Area MTC's 2013 RTP, *Draft Plan Bay Area, Strategy for a Sustainable Region*, will be the first plan subject to SB 375.⁷¹

In conformance with AB 32, CARB has identified a GHG reduction target of 15 percent from current levels for local governments, noting that successful implementation of the Scoping Plan relies on local governments' land use planning and urban growth decisions because local governments have the primary authority to plan, zone, approve, and permit land development to accommodate population growth and the changing needs of their jurisdictions.⁷² The BAAQMD conducted an analysis of the actions outlined in the Scoping Plan and determined that in order for the Bay Area to meet the GHG reduction goals, the region would need to achieve an additional 2.3 percent reduction in GHG emissions from the land use sector.⁷³

⁷¹ ABAG and MTC, *Draft Bay Area Plan, Strategy for a Sustainable Region*. March 2013. Available online at: <http://onebayarea.org/regional-initiatives/plan-bay-area/draft-plan-bay-area.html>. Accessed May 16, 2013.

⁷² CARB. *Climate Change Scoping Plan*, December 2008.

⁷³ BAAQMD. California Environmental Quality Act, *Proposed Thresholds of Significance*, December 7, 2009. Available online at: <http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA/Proposed%20Thresholds%20ofSignificance%20%207%202009.ashx>. Accessed May 16, 2013

Senate Bill 97 (SB 97) required the OPR to amend the state CEQA guidelines to address the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions or the effects of GHGs. In response, OPR amended the CEQA Guidelines to provide guidance for analyzing GHG emissions. Among other changes to the CEQA Guidelines, the amendments added a new section to the CEQA Checklist (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G) to address questions regarding the project's potential to emit GHGs.

The BAAQMD is the primary agency responsible for air quality in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area air basin. The BAAQMD recommends that local agencies adopt a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy consistent with the goals of AB 32 and that significance of GHG emissions from a project be based on the degree to which that project complies with a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.⁷⁴ As described below, this recommendation is consistent with the approach to analyzing GHG emissions outlined in the CEQA Guidelines.

At a local level, the City of San Francisco has developed a number of plans and programs to reduce the City's contribution to global climate change. San Francisco's 2008 Greenhouse Gas Reduction ordinance requires that by 2008, the city determine its GHG emissions for the year 1990, the baseline level with reference to which target reductions are set; by 2017, reduce GHG emissions by 25 percent below 1990 levels; by 2025, reduce GHG emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels; and finally by 2050, reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels. San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* (Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy) documents the city's actions to pursue cleaner energy, energy conservation, alternative transportation, and solid waste reduction.⁷⁵ As identified in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, the City has implemented a number of mandatory requirements and incentives that have measurably reduced GHG emissions including, but not limited to, increasing the energy efficiency of new and existing buildings, installation of solar panels on building roofs, implementation of a green building strategy, adoption of a zero waste strategy, a construction and demolition debris recovery ordinance, a solar energy generation subsidy, incorporation of alternative fuel vehicles in the city's transportation fleet (including buses), and a mandatory recycling and composting ordinance. The strategy also identifies 42 specific regulations for new development that would reduce a project's GHG emissions.

San Francisco's policies and programs have resulted in a reduction in GHG emissions below 1990 levels of approximately 6.15 MMTCO₂E.⁷⁶ A recent third-party verification of the city's 2010 community-wide and municipal emissions inventory confirmed that San Francisco reduced its GHG emissions to 5.26 MMTCO₂E, representing a 14.5 percent reduction in GHG emissions below 1990 levels, which exceeds the statewide AB 32 GHG reduction goals.^{77,78}

⁷⁴ BAAQMD. *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines*, May 2012. Available online at: http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA/BAAQMD%20CEQA%20Guidelines_Final_May%202012.ashx?la=en. Accessed May 16, 2013.

⁷⁴ BAAQMD. *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines*, May 2012. Available online at: http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA/BAAQMD%20CEQA%20Guidelines_Final_May%202012.ashx?la=en. Accessed May 16, 2013.

⁷⁵ SF Planning Department. *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions in San Francisco*, November 2010. Available online at: http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/GHG_Reduction_Strategy.pdf. Accessed May 21, 2013.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ ICF International. "Technical Review of the 2010 Community-wide GHG Inventory for City and County of San Francisco." Memorandum from ICF International to San Francisco Department of the Environment, April 10, 2012.; and "Technical Review of San Francisco's 2010 Municipal GHG Inventory." Memorandum from ICF International to San Francisco Department of the Environment, May 8, 2012.

⁷⁸ ICF International. "Technical Review of San Francisco's 2010 Municipal GHG Inventory." Memorandum from ICF International to San Francisco Department of the Environment, May 8, 2012.

Approach to Analysis

In compliance with SB 97, OPR amended the CEQA Guidelines to address the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions or the effects of GHGs. Among other changes to the CEQA Guidelines to comply with SB 97, OPR added a new section to the CEQA Checklist (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G) to address questions regarding the project's potential to emit GHGs. The potential for a project to result in significant GHG emissions that contribute to the cumulative effects of global climate change is determined by an assessment of the project's compliance with local and state plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the cumulative effects of climate change. GHG emissions are analyzed in the context of their contribution to the cumulative effects of climate change because a single land use project could not generate enough GHG emissions to noticeably change the global average temperature. Sections 15064.4 and 15183.5 of the CEQA Guidelines address the analysis and determination of significant impacts from a proposed project's GHG emissions.

Section 15183.5 of the CEQA Guidelines allows public agencies to analyze and mitigate GHG emissions as part of a larger plan for the reduction of greenhouse gases and describes the required contents of such a plan. As discussed above, San Francisco has prepared its own Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy and reduced community-wide GHG emissions to below 1990 levels, meeting GHG reduction goals outlined in AB 32. The city is also well on its way to meeting the long-term GHG reduction goal of reducing emissions 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Chapter 1 of the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy describes how the strategy meets the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5.⁷⁹ The BAAQMD has reviewed San Francisco's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, concluding that "[a]ggressive GHG reduction targets and comprehensive strategies like San Francisco's help the Bay Area move toward reaching the state's AB 32 goals, and also serve as a model from which other communities can learn."⁸⁰

Factors to be considered in making a significance determination in accordance with Section 15064.4(b), include: 1) the extent to which GHG emissions would increase or decrease as a result of the proposed project; 2) whether or not a proposed project exceeds a threshold that the lead agency determines applies to the project; and finally 3) demonstrating compliance with plans and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing or mitigating GHG emissions.

The GHG analysis provided below includes a qualitative assessment of GHG emissions that would result from a proposed project, including emissions from an increase in vehicle trips, natural gas combustion, and/or electricity use among other things. Consistent with the CEQA Guidelines and BAAQMD recommendations for analyzing GHG emissions, the significance of GHG emissions generated during project construction and operation is based on whether the project complies with the city's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, and associated policies, programs and regulations, including the 42 specific regulations that address the reduction of GHG emissions. Projects that comply with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy would not result in a substantial increase in GHGs, since the city has shown that overall community-wide GHGs have decreased and the city has met AB 32 GHG reduction targets. Consequently, such projects would not be considered to result in a significant cumulative impact due to GHG emissions. Individual project compliance with the city's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy is demonstrated by completion of the Compliance Checklist for Greenhouse Gas Analysis.

⁷⁹ SF Planning Department, *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions in San Francisco*, November 2010. Available online at: http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/GHG_Reduction_Strategy.pdf. Accessed May 21, 2013.

⁸⁰ BAAQMD. *Letter from J. Roggenkamp, BAAQMD, to B. Wycko*, San Francisco Planning Department, October 28, 2010.

In summary, the two applicable greenhouse gas reduction plans, the AB 32 Scoping Plan and the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, are intended to reduce GHG emissions below current levels. Given that the city's local greenhouse gas reduction targets are more aggressive than the state's 2020 GHG reduction targets and consistent with the long-term 2050 reduction targets, the city's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy is consistent with the goals of AB 32. Therefore, proposed projects that are consistent with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy would be consistent with the goals of AB 32, would not conflict with either plan, and would therefore not exceed San Francisco's applicable GHG threshold of significance. Furthermore, a locally compliant project would not result in a substantial increase in GHGs.

The following analysis of the proposed project's impact on climate change focuses on the project's contribution to cumulatively significant GHG emissions. Given the analysis in a cumulative context, project-specific impact statements are not included.

Impact C-GG-1: The proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, but not at levels that would result in a significant impact on the environment. (Less than Significant)

The most common GHGs resulting from human activity associated with land use decisions are CO₂, black carbon, CH₄, and N₂O. Individual projects contribute to the cumulative effects of climate change by directly or indirectly emitting GHGs during construction and operational phases. Direct operational emissions include GHG emissions from new vehicle trips and area sources (natural gas combustion). Indirect emissions include emissions from electricity providers, energy required to pump, treat, and convey water, and emissions associated with landfill operations.

The proposed project would increase the activity onsite by constructing and operating a laboratory and motorcycle police facility, with associated increases in employment on and visitors to the site. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to annual long-term increases in GHGs as a result of increased vehicle trips (mobile sources) and commercial operations that result in an increase in energy use, water use, wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal. Construction activities would also result in temporary increases in GHG emissions.

As discussed above, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy would result in a less-than-significant GHG impact. As shown in Table 10, the proposed project would comply with applicable policies, programs, and ordinances implementing the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

In addition to complying with the city's regulations, the 2008 Green Building Ordinance requires that all city departments prepare an annual department-specific climate action plan. The SF Police Department's plan focuses on energy efficiency and conservation, 100 percent waste recycling and composting, green building, water use reduction, and commuter programs such as the Commuter Benefits Program, the City Bicycle Fleet, Ridesharing Matching Assistance, and the Emergency Ride Home Program.⁸¹ Depending on a proposed project's size, use, and location, a variety of controls are in place to ensure that a proposed project would not impair the state's ability to meet statewide GHG reduction targets outlined in AB 32, or impact the city's ability to meet San Francisco's local GHG reduction targets. Given that: (1) San Francisco has implemented regulations to reduce GHG emissions specific to new construction and renovations of private developments and municipal projects; (2) San Francisco's sustainable policies have resulted in the measured reduction of annual GHG emissions; (3) San Francisco has met and exceeds AB 32 GHG reduction goals for the year 2020 and is on track towards meeting long-term GHG reduction goals;

⁸¹ San Francisco Police Department. *Climate Action Plan*, March 2012.

(4) current and probable future state and local GHG reduction measures will continue to reduce a project's contribution to climate change; and (5) San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions meet the CEQA and BAAQMD requirements for a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's regulations would not contribute significantly to global climate change. The proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements listed above, and was determined to be consistent with San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* impact with respect to GHG emissions. No mitigation measures are necessary.

Impact C-G-G-2: The proposed project would not conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. (Less than Significant)

San Francisco's *Compliance Checklist for Greenhouse Analysis* (Compliance Checklist; see Table 10) is used to demonstrate compliance of the proposed project with San Francisco's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.⁸² Direct operational GHG emissions associated with the project would include new vehicle trips and area sources (natural gas combustion). Indirect emissions include emissions from electricity providers, energy required to pump, treat, and convey water, and emissions associated with landfill operations. Analysis provided in Table 10 includes a qualitative assessment of GHG emissions that would result from the proposed project, including emissions from an increase in vehicle trips, natural gas combustion, and/or electricity use among other activities.

The proposed project would contribute to annual long-term increases in GHGs as a result of increased vehicle trips (mobile sources) and energy use, water use, wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal associated with building operations. Construction and demolition activities would also result in temporary increases in GHG emissions. However, as shown in Table 10, the proposed project would comply with applicable policies, programs, and ordinances implementing the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, and therefore would result in a *less-than-significant* impact with respect to GHG emissions.

⁸² SF Planning Department. *Compliance Checklist for Greenhouse Gas Analysis: Table 2. Municipal Projects*, 1995 Evans Avenue, March 19, 2013. This document is available for review as part of Case File No. 2013.0342E at the SF Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California, 94103. Information from this document is provided in Table 10.

TABLE 10. GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION STRATEGIES APPLICABLE TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
Transportation Sector			
Commuter Benefits Ordinance (San Francisco Environment Code, Section 421)	All employers of 20 or more employees must provide at least one of the following benefit programs: (1) A Pre-Tax Election consistent with 26 U.S.C. §132(f), allowing employees to elect to exclude from taxable wages and compensation, employee commuting costs incurred for transit passes or vanpool charges; or (2) Employer Paid Benefit whereby the employer supplies a transit pass for the public transit system requested by each Covered Employee or reimbursement for equivalent vanpool charges at least equal in value to the purchase price of the appropriate benefit; or (3) Employer Provided Transit furnished by the employer at no cost to the employee in a vanpool or bus, or similar multi-passenger vehicle operated by or for the employer.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance. Item to be further addressed within the design documents.
Emergency Ride Home Program	All City employees are automatically eligible for the emergency ride home program.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance. The occupants of this facility will all be city employees therefore are automatically eligible for this program.
Healthy Air and Clean Transportation Ordinance, Section 403 (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 4, Section 403)	Requires all City officers, boards, commissions and department heads responsible for departments that require transportation to fulfill their official duties to reduce the Municipal Fleet by implementing Transit First policies by: (A) maximizing the use of public transit, including taxis, vanpools, and car-sharing; (B) facilitating travel by bicycle, or on foot; and (C) minimizing use of single-occupancy motor vehicles, for travel required in the performance of public duties.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance. Item to be further addressed within the design documents.
Healthy Air and Clean Transportation Ordinance (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 4)	Requires the reduction of the number of passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks in the Municipal Fleet. In addition, requires new purchases or leases of passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks to be the cleanest and most efficient vehicles available on the market. There are also requirements for medium and heavy duty vehicles and for phasing out highly polluting vehicles (diesel MUNI buses).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance. SFPD submitted plan for compliance with the Healthy Air and Clean Transportation Ordinance for 2013. Police department emergency vehicles are exempt. By 2017, the SFPD fleet will be in compliance.
Biodiesel for Municipal Fleets (Executive Directive 06-02)	Requires all diesel using City Departments to begin using biodiesel (B20). Sets goals for all diesel equipment to be run on biodiesel by 2007 and goals for increasing biodiesel blends to B100).	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	No diesel fleet equipment used.
Clean Construction Ordinance (San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 6.25)	Effective March 2009, all contracts for large (20+ day) City projects are required to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Fuel diesel vehicles with B20 biodiesel, andUse construction equipment that meets USEPA Tier 2 standards or best available control technologies for equipment over 25 hp.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance. Construction will last 720 + days.

Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
<p>Bicycle Parking in City-Owned and Leased Buildings (SF Planning Code, Section 155.1)</p>	<p><u>Class 1 and 2 Bicycle Parking Spaces</u></p> <p><i>Class 1 Requirements:</i></p> <p>(A) Provide two spaces in buildings with 1 to 20 employees.</p> <p>(B) Provide four spaces in buildings with 21 to 50 employees.</p> <p>(C) In buildings with 51 to 300 employees, provide bicycle parking equal to at least 5% of employees at that building, but no fewer than 5 bicycle spaces.</p> <p>(D) In buildings with more than 300 employees, provide bicycle parking equal to at least 3% of employees at that building, but no fewer than 16 bicycle spaces.</p> <p>In addition to the Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, provide Class 2 bicycle parking.</p> <p><i>Class 2 Requirements:</i></p> <p>(A) Provide at least 2 bicycle parking spaces in buildings with 1 to 40 employees.</p> <p>(B) Provide at least 4 bicycle parking spaces in buildings with 41 to 50 employees.</p> <p>(C) Provide at least 6 bicycle parking spaces in buildings with 51 to 100 employees.</p> <p>(D) In buildings with more than 100 employees, at least 8 bicycle parking spaces shall be provided. Wherever a responsible City official is required to provide 8 or more Class 2 bicycle parking spaces, at least 50% of those spaces shall be covered.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply</p>	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p> <p>Item to be further addressed within the design documents.</p>
<p>Bicycle Parking in Parking Garages (SF Planning Code, Section 155.2)</p>	<p>(A) Every garage will supply a minimum of 6 bicycle parking spaces.</p> <p>(B) Garages with between 120 and 500 automobile spaces shall provide 1 bicycle space for every 20 automobile spaces.</p> <p>(C) Garages with more than 500 automobile spaces shall provide 25 spaces plus 1 additional space for every 40 automobile spaces over 500 spaces, up to a maximum of 50 bicycle parking spaces.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply</p>	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p> <p>Item to be further addressed within the design documents.</p>
<p>Transportation Management Programs (SF Planning Code, Section 163)</p>	<p>Requires new buildings or additions over a specified size (buildings >25,000 square feet or 100,000 square feet depending on the use and zoning district) within certain zoning districts (including downtown and mixed-use districts in the City's Eastern Neighborhoods and South of Market) to implement a Transportation Management Program and provide on-site transportation management brokerage services for the life of the building.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply</p>	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p>

Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
Energy Efficiency Sector			
Green Building Requirements for City Buildings: Indoor Water Use Reduction (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 7)	The LEED Project Administrator shall submit documentation verifying a minimum 30% reduction in the use of indoor potable water, as calculated to meet and achieve LEED credit WE3.2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this City ordinance. Item to be further addressed within the design documents.
Resource Efficiency and Green Building Ordinance (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 7)	<p>All new construction must achieve at a minimum the LEED® Gold standard. City leaseholds are subject to all of the requirements of the Commercial Water Conservation Ordinance of Chapter 13A of the SFBC, including provisions requiring the replacement of non-compliant water closets and urinals on or before January 1, 2017.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All water closets (toilets) with a rated flush volume exceeding 1.6 gallons per flush and urinals with a rated flush volume exceeding 1.0 gallon per flush must be replaced with high-efficiency water closets that use no more than 1.28 gallons per flush and high efficiency urinals that use no more than 0.5 gallons per flush, respectively. 2. Showerheads must use no more than 1.5 gallons per minute. In addition, all showerheads in the facility having a maximum flow rate exceeding 2.5 gallons per minute must be replaced with showerheads that use no more than 1.5 gallons per minute. 3. All faucets and faucet aerators in the facility with a maximum flow rate exceeding 2.2 gallons per minute are replaced with fixtures having a maximum flow rate not to exceed 0.5 gallons per minute per appropriate site conditions. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance. Item to be further addressed within the design documents.
Green Building Requirements for City Buildings: Energy Efficient Lighting Retrofit Requirements (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 7)	<p>These requirements (or those in the CCR Title 24, Part 6, or subsequent State standards, whichever are more stringent) shall apply in all cases except those in which a City department is not responsible for maintenance of light fixtures or exit signs.</p> <p><u>Exit Signs</u> – At the time of installation or replacement of broken or non-functional exit signs, all exit signs shall be replaced with light-emitting diode (LED)-type signs. Edge-lit compact fluorescent signs may be used as replacements for existing edge-lit incandescent exit signs.</p> <p><u>Fluorescent Fixtures -Mercury Content</u> – The mercury content of each 4-foot or 8-foot fluorescent lamp ("tube" or "bulb") installed in a luminaire shall not exceed 5 mg for each 4-foot fluorescent lamp, or 10 mg for each 8-foot fluorescent lamp.</p> <p><u>Fluorescent Fixtures–Energy Efficiency</u> – The lamp and ballast system in each luminaire that utilizes one or more 4-foot or 8-foot linear fluorescent lamps to provide illumination in a City-Owned Facility must meet the specified requirements.</p> <p><u>Exterior Light Fixtures</u> – At the time of installation or replacement of broken or non-functional exterior light fixtures, a photocell or automatic timer shall be installed to prevent lights from operating during daylight hours.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance. Item to be further addressed within the design documents.

Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
<p>Green Building Requirements for City Buildings: Energy Performance (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 7)</p>	<p>Using an Alternative Calculation Method (ACM) approved by the California Energy Commission, the LEED Project Administrator shall calculate the project's energy use, and compare it to the standard or "budget" building to achieve LEED credit EA 1 by either:</p> <p>(A) A 15% compliance margin over Title 24, Part 6, 2008 California Energy Standards; or,</p> <p>(B) Document compliance with Title 24, Part 6, 2008 California Energy Standards, including submittal of all standard documentation, and additionally demonstrate that the project achieves a 15% or greater compliance margin over the ASHRAE 90.1 2007 energy cost baseline using the published LEED 2009 rules.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply</p>	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p> <p>Item to be further addressed within the design documents.</p>
<p>Green Building Requirements for City Buildings: Renewable Energy (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 7)</p>	<p>The LEED Project Administrator shall confer with SFPUC on renewable energy opportunities for municipal construction projects.</p> <p>The LEED Project Administrator shall submit documentation verifying that either:</p> <p>(A) At least 1% of the building's energy costs are offset by on-site renewable energy generation, achieving LEED credit A 2, including any combination of: photovoltaic, solar thermal, wind, biofuel-based electrical systems, geothermal heating, geothermal electric, wave, tidal, or low impact hydroelectric systems, or as specified in Section 25741 of the California Public Resources Code; or,</p> <p>(B) In addition to meeting LEED prerequisite EA 1 Energy performance requirement, achieve an additional 10 percent compliance margin over Title 24, Part 6, 2008 California Energy Standards, for a total compliance margin of at least 25%.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply</p>	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p> <p>Item to be further addressed within the design documents.</p>
<p>Green Building Requirements for City Buildings: Commissioning (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 7)</p>	<p>The LEED Project Administrator shall submit documentation verifying that the facility has been or will meet the criteria necessary to achieve LEED credit EA 3.0 (Enhanced Commissioning) in addition to LEED prerequisite EA1 (Fundamental Commissioning of Building Energy Systems.)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply</p>	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p> <p>Item to be further addressed within the design documents.</p>
Waste Reduction Sector			
<p>Resource Efficiency and Green Building Ordinance (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 7)</p>	<p>The ordinance requires all demolition (and new construction) projects to prepare a Construction and Demolition Debris Management Plan designed to recycle construction and demolition materials to the maximum extent feasible, with a goal of 75% diversion.</p> <p>The ordinance specifies requires for all city buildings to provide adequate recycling space.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply</p>	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p> <p>Item to be further addressed within the design documents.</p>
<p>Resource Conservation Ordinance (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 5)</p>	<p>This ordinance establishes a goal for each City department to:</p> <p>(i) maximize purchases of recycled products, and</p> <p>(ii) divert from disposal as much solid waste as possible so that the City can meet the state-mandated 50% diversion requirement. Each City department shall prepare a Waste Assessment.</p> <p>The ordinance also requires the Department of the Environment to prepare a Resource Conservation Plan that facilitates waste reduction and recycling. The ordinance requires janitorial contracts to consolidate recyclable materials for pick up. Lastly, the ordinance specifies purchasing requirements for paper products.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply</p>	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p> <p>Item to be further addressed within the design documents.</p>

Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
Green Building Requirements for City Buildings: Recycling (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 7)	All City departments are required to recycle used fluorescent and other mercury containing lamps, batteries, and universal waste as defined by CCR Section 66261.9.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p> <p>Item to be further addressed within the design documents.</p>
Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 19)	The mandatory recycling and composting ordinance requires all persons in San Francisco to separate their refuse into recyclables, compostables, and trash, and place each type of refuse in a separate container designated for disposal of that type of refuse.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p> <p>Item to be further addressed within the design documents.</p>
Construction Recycled Content Ordinance (San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 6.4)	Ordinance requires the use of recycled content material in public works projects to the maximum extent feasible and gives preference to local manufacturers and industry.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p> <p>Item to be further addressed within the design documents.</p>
Environment/Conservation Sector			
Street Tree Planting Requirements for New Construction (SF Planning Code Section 138.1)	SF Planning Code Section 138.1 requires new construction, significant alterations or relocation of buildings within many of San Francisco's zoning districts to plant one 24-inch box tree for every 20 feet along the property street frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p> <p>Item to be further addressed within the design documents.</p>
Green Building Requirements for City Buildings: Enhanced Refrigerant Management (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 7)	The LEED Project Administrator shall submit documentation verifying that the project will reduce ozone depletion, while minimizing direct contribution to climate change, achieving LEED credit EA 4.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p> <p>Item to be further addressed within the design documents.</p>
Green Building Requirements for City Buildings: Low Emitting Materials (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 7)	<p>The LEED Project Administrator shall submit documentation verifying that the project is using low-emitting materials, subject to onsite verification, achieving LEED credits EQ 4.1, EQ 4.2, EQ 4.3, and EQ 4.4 wherever applicable:</p> <p>(A) Adhesives, sealants and sealant primers shall achieve LEED credit EQ 4.1. including compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1168.</p> <p>(B) Interior paints and coatings applied on-site shall achieve LEED credit EQ 4.2. including:</p> <p>(i) Architectural paints and coatings shall meet the VOC content limits of Green Seal Standard GS-11.</p> <p>(ii) Anti-corrosive and anti-rust paints applied to interior ferrous metal substrates shall not exceed the VOC content limit of Green Seal Standard GC-03 of 250 g/L.</p> <p>(iii) Clear wood finishes, floor coatings, stains, primers, and shellacs applied to interior elements shall not exceed SCAQMD Rule 1113 VOC content limits.</p> <p>(C) Flooring systems shall achieve LEED credit EQ 4.3 Option 1, including:</p> <p>(i) Interior carpet shall meet the testing and product requirements of the Carpet and Rug Institute Green Label Plus program.</p> <p>(ii) Interior carpet cushioning shall meet the requirements of the carpet and Rug Institute Green Label Program.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p> <p>Item to be further addressed within the design documents.</p>

Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
	<p>(iii) Hard surface flooring, including linoleum, laminate flooring, wood flooring, ceramic flooring, rubber flooring, and wall base shall be certified as compliant with the Floor Score standard, provided; however, that 100% reused or 100% post-consumer recycled hard surface flooring may be exempted from this LEED credit EQ 4.3 requirement. Projects exercising this exemption for hard surface flooring shall otherwise be eligible for LEED credit EQ 4.3.</p> <p>(D) Interior composite wood and agrifiber products shall achieve LEED credit EQ.4.4 by containing no added urea formaldehyde resins. Interior and exterior hardwood plywood, particleboard, and medium density fiberboard composite wood products shall additionally meet CARB's Air Toxics Control Measure for Composite Wood (17 CCR 93120 et seq.), by or before the dates specified in those sections.</p> <p>(E) Project sponsors are encouraged to achieve LEED Pilot Credit 2: Persistent Bioaccumulative Toxic Chemicals Source Reduction: Dioxins and Halogenated Organic Compounds. This standard is consistent with Environment Code Chapter 5: Non-PVC Plastics.</p>		
<p>Stormwater Management Ordinance and Construction Pollution Prevention (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 7)</p>	<p>For City sponsored projects, the LEED Project Administrator shall submit documentation verifying that a construction project that is located outside the City and County of San Francisco achieves the LEEDSS6.2 credit.</p> <p>Construction projects located within the City and County of San Francisco shall implement the applicable storm water management controls adopted by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC).</p> <p>All construction projects shall develop and implement construction activity pollution prevention and stormwater management controls adopted by the SFPUC, and achieve LEED prerequisite SSP1 or similar criteria adopted by the SFPUC, as applicable.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply</p>	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p> <p>Item to be further addressed within the design documents.</p>
<p>Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Ordinance (Formerly Precautionary Purchasing Ordinance)</p>	<p>Requires City Departments to purchase products on the Approved Green Products List, maintained by the Department of the Environment. The items in the Approved Green Products List has been tested by San Francisco City Depts. and meet standards that are more rigorous than ecolabels in protecting our health and environment.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply</p>	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p> <p>Item to be addressed within the design documents where possible and still meet the requirements of this project type.</p>
<p>Tropical Hardwood and Virgin Redwood Ban (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 8)</p>	<p>The ordinance prohibits City departments from procuring, or engaging in contracts that would use the ordinance-listed tropical hardwoods and virgin redwood.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply</p>	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p> <p>Item to be further addressed within the design documents.</p>
<p>Wood Burning Fireplace Ordinance (SFBC, Chapter 31, Section 3102.8)</p>	<p>Bans the installation of wood burning fire places except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pellet-fueled wood heater • EPA approved wood heater • Wood heater approved by the Northern Sonoma Air Pollution Control District 	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply</p>	<p>No wood burning fire places included in design.</p>

Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
Regulation of Diesel Backup Generators (San Francisco Health Code, Article 30)	<p>Requires:</p> <p>All diesel generators to be registered with the Department of Public Health.</p> <p>All new diesel generators must be equipped with the best available air emissions control technology.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	<p>The proposed project is a municipal project that will be required to comply with this city ordinance.</p> <p>Item to be further addressed within the design documents.</p>

E.9 WIND AND SHADOW

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
9. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:					
a) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact WS-1: The proposed project would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas. (Less than Significant)

This discussion summarizes the result of the *Wind Technical Memorandum* prepared for the proposed project by ESA.⁸³ Wind impacts are generally caused by large building masses extending substantially above their surroundings, and by buildings oriented such that a large wall catches a prevailing wind, particularly if such a wall includes little or no articulation. Average wind speeds in San Francisco are the highest in the summer and lowest in winter; however, the strongest peak winds occur in winter. Throughout the year, the highest wind speeds occur in mid-afternoon and the lowest in the early morning. Westerly to northwesterly winds are the most frequent and strongest winds regardless of season. Of the primary wind directions, four have the greatest frequency of occurrence and also make up the majority of the strong winds that occur; these include the northwest, west-northwest, west, and west-southwest.

Per Section 148 of the Planning Code, the proposed project would have a significant wind impact if it would cause the 36 mph wind hazard criterion to be exceeded for more than one hour per year. Also, per Section 148, a project that would cause exceedances of the pedestrian comfort criterion, of 11 mph, but not the wind hazard criterion, would not be considered to have a significant impact under CEQA.⁸⁴

Most buildings in the project vicinity are two stories or less in height. The elevated segment of the I-280 freeway that runs along the eastern side of the project block is approximately 50 feet in height. The project site currently contains four buildings ranging from 15 to 24 feet in height, surrounded by paved areas. These would be replaced with two new structures: an approximately 64-foot-tall FSD/TC building with two 16-foot mechanical penthouses totaling 128,000 sf, and a 47,000-sf two-level parking garage adjacent to the building (Figure 5).

The proposed FSD/TC building would be one of the tallest structures in the project area at four stories and 80 feet in height. However, the proposed structures would not be tall and wide enough to intercept and redirect downward to the ground level the volume of wind that would be necessary to substantially increase ground-level wind speeds. Although project design is yet to be finalized, the proposed fenestration and setbacks of the mechanical penthouses would reduce winds redirected toward the ground level, as would other FSD/TC building features that would break up solid façades. The proposed landscaping and trees on the street (Figure 5), once mature, would also reduce ground-level wind speeds on adjacent sidewalks. Based on these combined effects, any change in wind speeds that would result from the proposed project is not anticipated to cause a wind hazard at any location.

⁸³ ESA, *Wind Technical Memorandum*, 1995 Evans Street, September 30, 2013.

⁸⁴ The hazard and comfort criteria are derived from SF Planning Code §148, which applies to the City's downtown area, and are used by extension in CEQA analysis citywide.

Because the proposed project would be less than 60 feet taller than nearby buildings and the taller of the two proposed buildings would be no more than approximately 80 feet above grade, the project would not be expected to create ground-level winds that could be hazardous to pedestrians. For this reason, any changes in wind speeds due to the project would be considered to be *less than significant*.

Impact WS-2: The proposed project would not create new shadows in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas. (Less than Significant)

Planning Code Section 295, which was adopted in response to Proposition K (passed November 1984), mandates that new structures above 40 feet in height that would cast additional shadows on properties under the jurisdiction of, or designated to be acquired by, the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department (SFRPD) can only be approved by the SF Planning Commission (based on recommendation from the Recreation and Parks Commission) if the shadow is determined to be insignificant or not adverse to the use of the park. The height of the proposed FSD/TC building would be 64 feet, with an additional 16 feet to the top of the two mechanical penthouses, for a total height of about 80 feet. To assess the extent of new shadow, a shadow fan analysis⁸⁵ was performed by SF Planning Department staff that indicates the proposed project could not affect any parks subject to Section 295 of the Planning Code.

The nearest parks to the project site include Islais Creek Park and Tulare Park, which are about 0.4 mile east of the project site, and Selby & Palou Mini Park, which is approximately 0.6 mile south of the project site. In addition, an open space has recently been constructed by Muni at the west end of the Islais Creek basin (just across the Caltrain tracks and freeway from the project site) as part of its new Islais Creek Motor Coach Facility, some 850 feet northeast of the project site. The maximum extent of shadow that would be cast by the proposed project during the hours subject to Planning Code Section 295 is approximately 520 feet.⁸⁶ Islais Creek Park, Tulare Park, Selby & Palou Mini Park, and the new Muni-built open space along Islais Creek are all located sufficiently far enough from the project site that any new shadow resulting from the proposed project would not reach those open spaces. Therefore, the project would result in *less-than-significant* shadow impacts.

Impact C-WS-1: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in significant wind and shadow impacts. (Less than Significant)

Based on the discussion above, the proposed project, along with other potential and future development in the vicinity, would not result in a significant wind or shadow impact in the project vicinity. Thus, the proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects considered in this analysis, would not be expected to contribute considerably to adverse wind or shadow effects under cumulative conditions, and cumulative wind or shadow impacts would be *less than significant*.

⁸⁵ SF Planning Department, Shadow Fan Analysis, April 8, 2013. Available at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2013.0342E.

⁸⁶ Planning Code Section 295 governs shadow during the period between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset. At other hours, shadows are very long and move very quickly; the length of shadow from even a relatively short building closer to a park will often obscure shadow from a much taller building that is more distant. The length of maximum shadow is based on the angle of the sun at one hour after sunrise and before sunset on the winter solstice, when shadows are longest.

E.10 RECREATION

<u>Topics:</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	<u>Not Applicable</u>
10. RECREATION—Would the project:					
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Physically degrade existing recreational resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would have significant impacts under CEQA if it were to increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated; if it were to include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment; or if it were to physically degrade existing recreational resources.

The proposed 128,000-sf FSD/TC building would accommodate a total of approximately 298 employees across varying shifts. As noted in Section E.3, Population and Housing, most of the staff would relocate from other existing police department locations to the project site, minimizing the number of new employees hired by the SFPD. Moreover, new employees who may be hired to work at the new facility would not necessarily be new residents of San Francisco.

The employees of the proposed project would be served by the SFRPD, which administers more than 220 parks, playgrounds, and open spaces throughout the city, as well as recreational facilities including recreation centers, swimming pools, golf courses, athletic fields, tennis courts, and basketball courts. The project site is in a primarily industrial area containing few public parks. The 2009 Draft Recreation and Open Space Element Update of the General Plan identified high-need areas, which are given highest priority for the construction of new parks and recreation improvements. The project site is in an area that has been identified as a lesser need area. It is noted that there are no residential uses near the project site.

Impact RE-1: The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in the use of existing neighborhood parks or other recreational facilities, or physically degrade existing recreational resources. (Less than Significant)

The nearest open spaces to the project site include Islais Creek Park and Tulare Park, on either side of Third Street at Islais Creek (about 0.4 miles east of the project site), and Selby & Palou Mini Park, which is about 0.6 miles south of the project site. The nearest larger parks are James Rolph Playground and Potrero del Sol Park, at Potrero Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street. The proposed project would include public service uses and would result in an increase in the number of employees in the area. As opposed to residential populations, which rely heavily on nearby recreational facilities, employee populations tend to make substantially less use of nearby park and recreational facilities, because most employees arrive at work from their homes and leave the area immediately after work. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would result in a substantial increase in the use of the nearby parks such that substantial deterioration could occur. Consequently, impacts on recreational facilities related to the proposed project would be *less than significant*.

Impact RE-2: The proposed project would not require the construction of recreational facilities that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would result in a negligible increase in the demand for existing recreational facilities and parks in the project vicinity as a result of the increased number of employees working at the project site. The proposed project would not necessitate the construction of new recreational facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. No recreational facilities are proposed as part of the project. Therefore, implementation of the project would have a *less-than-significant* impact related to construction of new recreational resources.

Impact C-RE-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future project, would not considerably contribute to recreational impacts in the project site vicinity. (Less than Significant)

The use of recreational facilities in the vicinity of the project site is not expected to noticeably increase as a result of the proposed project. As discussed above, the proposed project includes public service uses only and would negligibly increase the demand for recreational resources. The area surrounding the project site is almost entirely warehouse, manufacturing, and distribution uses and most other projects that have been proposed in the area are consistent with these types of uses. Like the proposed project, other future development would involve new employee, but not residential, populations and would have a negligible effect on the area's recreational resources. Therefore, the cumulative impact of the proposed project on recreational resources would be *less than significant*.

E.11 UTILITIES AND PUBLIC SERVICES

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

The project site is within an urban area that is served by existing utility service systems, including water, wastewater and storm water collection and treatment, and solid waste collection and disposal. A new daytime and some nighttime employee population would be added to the proposed site that would increase the demand for utilities and service systems on site, but not in excess of amounts expected and provided for in the project area.

Impact UT-1: The proposed project would not significantly exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB or affect wastewater collection and treatment facilities and would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. (Less than Significant)

The project site is served by San Francisco's combined sewer system, which handles both sewage and storm water runoff. The Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant (SE Plant) provides wastewater and storm water treatment and management for the east side of the City, including the project site. No new sewer or storm water facilities or construction would be needed to serve the proposed project.

The proposed project includes the construction of a below grade sanitary waste storage tank with an approximate 8,000-gallon capacity that would be used for storage of sanitary waste during emergency conditions. This tank would only be used in case of a power failure, and would have access for mechanical pumping, if needed, to satisfy essential facilities use demands during emergency conditions.

Because its use would be limited to emergency conditions, and because it could be pumped out manually if necessary, the sanitary waste storage tank would not adversely affect the combined sewer system.

Discharges from the proposed project would meet the wastewater pre-treatment requirements of the SFPUC, as required by the San Francisco Industrial Waste Ordinance in order to meet RWQCB requirements.⁸⁷ This would include any necessary pre-treatment of hazardous materials disposed at the laboratory. The proposed project would incrementally increase the demand for wastewater and storm water treatment services, but not in excess of amounts expected and provided for in the project area.

The project site is currently covered with impervious surfaces and the proposed project would not create any additional impervious surfaces, resulting in little effect on the total storm water volume discharged through the combined sewer system. The additional landscaping proposed would, in fact, reduce the amount of impervious area at the project site. While the proposed project would result in an incremental increase of sewage flows, collection and treatment capacity of the sewer system in the City would not be exceeded. In light of the above, construction of new wastewater or storm water treatment facilities, or the expansion of existing facilities, would not result from the proposed project. The project design would meet the San Francisco 2010 Stormwater Design Guidelines which would reduce the total storm water runoff volume and peak storm water runoff rate through the use of low impact design approaches and BMPs including landscape planters and green roofs.

The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in the demand for wastewater treatment and would result in a *less-than-significant* impact on wastewater collection and treatment facilities.

Impact UT-2: The proposed project would not require expansion or construction of new water supply or treatment facilities. (Less than Significant)

The added public service uses resulting from the proposed project would increase the demand for water on the site, but not in excess of amounts expected and provided for in the project area. Although it is likely that the demand for water in San Francisco would incrementally increase with the proposed project, the estimated increase in demand could be accommodated within anticipated water use and supply for San Francisco pursuant to the SFPUC's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (2010 UWMP) and the update to the 2010 UWMP, the 2013 Water Availability Study.⁸⁸

The project site is located within a designated recycled water use area, as defined in Sections 390-91 and 393-94 of the Recycled Water Ordinance, and the proposed project would involve the construction of new building area totaling more than 40,000 sf; thus, the project would be required to install a recycled water system. Water-conserving measures, such as low-flush toilets and urinals, required by the San Francisco Green Building Ordinance, would be incorporated into the design of the proposed project.

⁸⁷ City and County of San Francisco. Ordinance No. 19-92, San Francisco Municipal Code (Public Works), Part II, Chapter X, Article 4.1 (amended), January 13, 1992. Planning Code Section 295 governs shadow during the period between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset. At other hours, shadows are very long and move very quickly; the length of shadow from even a relatively short building closer to a park will often obscure shadow from a much taller building that is more distant. The length of maximum shadow is based on the angle of the sun at one hour after sunrise and before sunset on the winter solstice, when shadows are longest.

⁸⁸ SFPUC, 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, which includes county-wide demand projections through the year 2035, and compares water supply and demand; accessed May 7, 2013; and 2013 Water Availability Study, which updates the 2010 UWMP based on the latest regional growth projections included in Plan Bay Area. Available online at: <http://www.sfwater.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentID=1055> and <http://www.sfsewers.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=3589>, respectively.

Since the water demand of the proposed project could be accommodated by the existing and planned supply anticipated under the SFPUC's 2010 UWMP and the 2013 update thereto, the proposed project would result in *less-than-significant* impacts to the water service.

Impact UT-3: The proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. (Less than Significant)

Recology (formerly Norcal Waste Systems, Inc.) provides solid waste collection, recycling, and disposal services for residential and commercial garbage and recycling in San Francisco through its subsidiaries San Francisco Recycling and Disposal, Inc. (SF Recycling), Golden Gate Disposal and Recycling, and Sunset Scavenger.

San Francisco uses a three-cart collection program: residents and businesses sort solid waste into recyclables, compostable items such as food scraps and yard trimmings, and garbage. All materials are taken to the San Francisco Solid Waste Transfer and Recycling Center, located at 501 Tunnel Avenue in southeast San Francisco. There, the three waste streams are sorted and bundled for transport to the composting and recycling facilities and landfill. San Francisco has created a large-scale urban program for collection of compostable materials. Food scraps and other compostable material collected from residences, restaurants, and other businesses are sent to Recology's Jepson-Prairie composting facility located in Solano County. Food scraps, plant trimmings, soiled paper, and other compostables are turned into a nutrient-rich soil amendment, or compost. Recyclable materials are sent to Recycle Central, located at Pier 96 on San Francisco's southern waterfront, where they are separated into commodities and sold to manufacturers that turn the materials into new products. Waste that is not composted or recycled is taken to the Altamont Landfill, which is located east of Livermore in Alameda County.

The Altamont Landfill is a regional landfill that handles residential, commercial, and construction waste. It has a permitted maximum disposal of about 11,500 tons per day and received about 1.29 million tons of waste in 2007 (the most recent year reported by the State). In 2007, the waste contributed by San Francisco (approximately 628,914 tons) represented approximately 49 percent of the total volume of waste received at this facility. The remaining permitted capacity of the landfill is about 45.7 million cubic yards. With this capacity, the landfill can operate until 2025.⁸⁹

In 1988, San Francisco contracted for the disposal of 15 million tons of solid waste at the Altamont Landfill. Through August 1, 2009, the City has used approximately 12.5 million tons of this contract capacity. The City projects that the remaining contract capacity will be reached no sooner than August 2014. On September 10, 2009, the City and County of San Francisco announced it could award its landfill disposal contract to SF Recycling, a subsidiary of Recology. Under this contract, SF Recycling would ship solid waste from San Francisco by truck and rail to Recology's Ostrom Road Landfill in Yuba County. The landfill is open to commercial waste haulers and can accept up to 3,000 tons of municipal solid waste per day. The site has an expected closure date of 2066 with a total design capacity of over 41 million cy.⁹⁰

⁸⁹ California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), *Facility/Site Summary Details: Altamont Landfill & Resource Recovery (01-AA-0009)*. Available online at <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/01-AA-0009/Detail/>. Accessed August 2, 2013.

⁹⁰ Recology web site at <http://www.recologyostromroad.com/>, accessed August 2, 2013.

The Board of Supervisors could ratify a new agreement prior to entitlement of the proposed project that could provide approximately 5 million tons of capacity, which would represent 20 or more years of use beginning in 2014. The City's contract with the Altamont Landfill expires in 2015.⁹¹

As discussed in Section E.16, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the proposed project would involve the use of small quantities of hazardous materials such as chemical sterilents, acids and bases, solvent preservatives and cleaners, compressed gases, and blood and bodily fluids from crime scene investigations. Proper facilities are provided for the safe disposal of biological and chemical hazardous wastes. These provisions include collection containers in individual laboratories and centralized collection locations in the FSD/TC building where materials can be containerized and prepared for transportation for off-site treatment and disposal (see Section E.16, Hazards and Hazardous Materials). Hazardous waste, including hospital, commercial, and household hazardous waste, is handled separately from other solid waste. Recology operates a facility at the San Francisco Dump (Transfer Station) for people to safely dispose of the hazardous waste generated from their homes or businesses.⁹²

Given this and the long-term capacity available at the applicable landfills, the solid waste generated by project construction and operation would not result in a landfill exceeding its permitted capacity, and the project would result in *less-than-significant* impacts with respect to solid waste.

Impact UT-4: The construction and operation of the proposed project would follow all applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste. (Less than Significant)

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) requires municipalities to adopt an Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) to establish objectives, policies, and programs relative to waste disposal, management, source reduction, and recycling. Reports filed by the San Francisco Department of the Environment show that the City generated approximately 870,000 tons of waste material in 2000. By 2010, that figured decreased to approximately 455,000 tons. Waste diverted from landfills is defined as recycled or composted. San Francisco has a goal of 75 percent landfill diversion by 2010, and 100 percent by 2020.⁹³ As of 2012, 80 percent of San Francisco's solid waste was being diverted from landfills, having met the 2010 diversion target.⁹⁴

Ordinance No. 27-06, San Francisco's Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Program, requires a minimum of 65 percent of all construction and demolition debris to be recycled and diverted from landfills. Additionally, Ordinance 100-09, which requires everyone in San Francisco to separate their refuse into recyclables, compostables, and trash would apply to the project. With waste diversion and expansions that have occurred at the Altamont Landfill, there is adequate capacity to accommodate San Francisco's solid waste. Waste disposal for the proposed project would comply with both the construction and demolition debris diversion rate and the requirements of Ordinance 100-09

⁹¹ San Francisco is currently participating as a responsible agency in the environmental review process that Yuba County has begun for the Recology Ostrom Road Green Rail and Permit Amendment Project (Project) and to conduct CEQA review of San Francisco's proposal to enter into one or more new agreements with Recology for disposal and transportation of San Francisco's solid waste. On March 28, 2013, Yuba County and San Francisco entered into a Cooperative Agreement to designate Yuba County as the lead agency for the proposed project and to outline their cooperative efforts concerning environmental review of the proposed project.

⁹² Recology, web page, "The San Francisco Dump (Transfer Station)," available at <http://sunsetsavenger.com/sfDump.htm>, Accessed August 2, 2013.

⁹³ City and County of SFPD, Environmental Health Section. Available on the internet at www.sustainablef.org/indicators/view/4. Accessed on May 7, 2013.

⁹⁴ <http://www.sfenvironment.org/news/press-release/mayor-lee-announces-san-francisco-reaches-80-percent-landfill-waste-diversion-leads-all-cities-in-north-america>.

(San Francisco's Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance), which require all persons in San Francisco to separate recyclables, compostables, and landfilled trash and participate in recycling and composting programs.

The examination of evidence requires handling of biological and chemical hazardous materials. Accordingly, the proposed project would include appropriate facilities for the safe disposal of biological and chemical hazardous materials. These provisions include collection containers in individual laboratories and centralized collection locations in the FSD/TC building where materials can be containerized and prepared for transportation for off-site treatment and disposal.

Therefore, solid waste generated from the project's construction and operation would not substantially affect the projected life of the landfill, and *less-than-significant* impacts related to solid waste would occur.

Impact C-UT-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development in the site vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant utilities or service systems impact. (Less than Significant)

Cumulative development in the project site vicinity would incrementally increase demand on citywide utilities and service systems, but not beyond levels anticipated and planned for by public service providers. Given that the City's existing service management plans address anticipated growth in the region, the proposed project would not be expected to have a considerable effect on utility service provision or facilities under cumulative conditions, and cumulative effects would be *less than significant*.

E.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

<u>Topics:</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	<u>Not Applicable</u>
12. PUBLIC SERVICES—Would the project:					
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services such as fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The buildings would be designated as Essential Facilities,⁹⁵ which are required to be designed and constructed to minimize fire hazards and to resist the forces of earthquakes, gravity, and winds. TC components would meet requirements for immediate occupancy and normal operational use in an emergency scenario and would incrementally improve emergency service in the project vicinity during or immediately follow an earthquake or large fire.

Impact PS-1: The proposed project would not increase the demand for police service, and would not result in substantial adverse impacts associated with the provision of such services. (Less than Significant)

The project site currently receives police protection services from the SFPD Bayview Station at 201 Williams Street, approximately 1.2 miles southeast of the project site. The proposed project would involve construction of a facility to house special units of the SFPD. The proposed project is being constructed in order to allow the police department to maintain adequate service standards and would not increase demand for police protection services. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less-than-significant* impacts related to police protection services.

Impact PS-2: The proposed project would incrementally increase demand for fire protection services, but would not result in substantial adverse impacts associated with the provision of such service. (Less than Significant)

The nearest fire station, San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) Station Number 9, is located at 2245 Jerrold Avenue, approximately 0.3 miles from the project site. Station Number 25 is also located near the site at 3305 Third Street, approximately one-half mile from the project site. The proposed project includes provision of back-up power, fire suppression, and sanitary sewerage for emergency operations. By increasing occupancy on site, the proposed project could increase the number of calls for fire protection services; however, the increase would be incremental and not likely be substantial in light of the existing demand and capacity for fire suppression and emergency medical services in the City. While the proposed project would include small quantities of flammable materials (i.e., diesel fuel and some laboratory chemicals), the proposed project would include fire suppression features and would comply with California HSC Chapter 6.95 to ensure proper installation and maintenance of the diesel storage tank (see Section E.16, Hazards and Hazardous Materials). Thus, fire hazards related to these flammable materials would not be substantial. Therefore, this impact would be *less than significant*.

⁹⁵ Essential Services Buildings Seismic Safety Act of 1986, California HSC, Chapter 2, Section 16000 through Section 16022.

Impact PS-3: The proposed project would not result in an impact on existing school facilities. (No impact)

The proposed project would involve the construction of a building for the SFPD FSD and TC, which would include no residential dwelling units. A large percentage of staff that would be employed at the proposed site would be relocating from other SFPD locations. A small fraction of the workforce would be newly hired to work at the proposed site, and a small fraction of this workforce could be new residents of San Francisco with school age children. As a result, it is anticipated that the number of new students resulting from the proposed project would be minimal. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *no impact* related to the construction of new school facilities.

Impact PS-4: The proposed project would not increase demand for government services, and there would be no impact on government facilities. (No impact)

Because the proposed project does not involve residential uses, and would result in few, if any, new employees not currently residing in San Francisco, it would not result in substantial increased demand for other governmental facilities such as libraries, community centers, or other public facilities (parks are discussed in Section E.10, Recreation). Overall, the proposed project would have *no impact* on governmental services.

Impact C-PS-1: The proposed project, combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not have a substantial cumulative impact to public services. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project is not expected to significantly increase demand for public services, beyond levels anticipated and planned for by public service providers. Cumulative development in the project area would incrementally increase demand for public services, but not beyond levels anticipated and planned for by public service providers. Thus, project-related impacts to public services would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts would be *less-than-significant*.

E.13 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

The proposed project is located in a developed area that is completely covered by impervious surfaces; the only vegetation near the property boundaries consists of a few street trees along Evans Avenue. The project area does not include riparian or wetland habitat or other sensitive natural communities as defined by the CDFG and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); therefore, Question 13.b is not applicable to the proposed project. In addition, the project area does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the CWA; therefore Question 13.c is not applicable to the proposed project. Moreover, the proposed project does not fall within any local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans; therefore, Question 13.f is not applicable to the proposed project.

Impact BI-1: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse impact on special status species, would not interfere substantially with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife, and would not conflict with policies or ordinances regarding biological resources. (Less than Significant)

The project site is entirely covered with impervious surfaces and does not provide habitat for any rare or endangered plant or animal species. Thus, the proposed project would not affect or substantially diminish plant or animal habitats. The proposed project would not interfere with any resident or migratory species, nor affect any rare, threatened, or endangered species. The proposed project would not interfere with species movement or migratory corridors because it would replace existing development with new buildings on a site that does not provide wildlife habitat, wildlife movement corridors, or nursery sites, and therefore would not meaningfully affect species movement.

Nesting birds, their nests and eggs are fully protected by CDFG Code Sections 3503 and 3503.5, and the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Migrating birds pass through San Francisco and may nest in the trees adjacent to the project site. Nesting birds and their nests and eggs are fully protected by the California Fish and Game Code (Sections 3503, 3503.5) and the MBTA. The MBTA protects over 800 species, including geese, ducks, shorebirds, raptors, songbirds, and many relatively common species. Destruction or disturbance of a nest would be a violation of these regulations and is considered a potentially significant impact, in that the potential exists that special-status bird species (although not observed at the site) could be affected. Compliance with the MBTA would ensure that impacts to resident and migratory birds would be *less than significant*. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less-than-significant* impact on nesting birds.

Planning Code Section 139, Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings, focuses on buildings, both public and private, that create location-related hazards and building feature-related hazards. Location-related hazards apply to buildings in or within 300 feet of and having a direct line of sight to, an Urban Bird Refuge, such as "open spaces two acres and larger dominated by vegetation, including vegetated landscaping, forest, meadows, grassland, or wetlands, or open water." Because the project site is more than 600 feet from the nearest Urban Bird Refuge (Islais Creek), location-related hazards would not apply. Section 139 applies similar standards to certain building features citywide, including "free-standing glass walls, wind barriers, skywalks, balconies, and greenhouses on rooftops that have unbroken glazed segments 24 sf and larger in size." The proposed project would not include these features, and therefore would not conflict with Section 139.

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted legislation that amended the City's Urban Forestry Ordinance to require a permit from the SFPDW to remove any protected trees.⁹⁶ Protected trees include landmark, significant, or street trees located on private or public property anywhere within the territorial limits of the City and County of San Francisco. There are currently eight trees located on sidewalks adjacent to the project site, all along the Evans Avenue frontage.⁹⁷ These trees, which are not considered protected trees according to SFPDW Code Section 801 et. seq., would be preserved as part of the proposed project. In addition, the project sponsor would plant 24 new street trees along the Evans Avenue and Toland Street façades to comply with Planning Code Section 143, which requires that one 24-inch box tree be planted every 20 feet of property frontage along each street, with any remaining fraction of 10 feet or more of frontage requiring an additional tree. The new trees would be planted in

⁹⁶ SFPDW Code, Article 16, §800 to §814.

⁹⁷ John Matthies, SFPDW, *Required Checklist for Tree Planting and Protection, 1995 Evans Avenue*, March 20, 2013. This document is available for public review as part of Case No. 2013.0342E at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103.

conformance with the City's recently adopted *Better Streets Plan*, including conformance with the street tree goals for a particular street type.⁹⁸

Because the proposed project would have no adverse impact on special status species or interfere with fish or wildlife movement, and because the project would be consistent with relevant biological resources policies and ordinances, its impact would be *less than significant*.

Impact C-BI-1: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in impacts to biological resources. (Less than Significant)

As discussed above, the project site does not contain biological resources, and the project vicinity has few street trees which do not provide a habitat for endangered or threatened plant or animal species. Therefore, the project would not impact such species. As a result, the proposed project would not have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts on biological resources and would have a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact on biological resources.

⁹⁸ Planning Code, Article 1.2, Section 138.1.

E.14 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

The proposed project would be connected to the existing sewer system and would not require use of septic systems. Therefore, Question 14e is not applicable to the proposed project.

Existing Site Conditions. Based on a review of historical bay shoreline maps, the project site is located on former tideland that was filled sometime between 1915 and 1950. Directly beneath the fill is a portion of the former tidal portion of the Islais Creek channel and adjacent tidal marshes.⁹⁹

The subsurface at the site consists of artificial fill material underlain by Young Bay Mud. The fill material consists of sandy silt and silty sand, sand, and fine- to medium-size gravel to a depth of about 8 feet bgs. The Young Bay Mud consists of silty clay with organic material (peat) present beneath the fill material.

⁹⁹ Ramirez-Herrera, M.T., Sowers, J.M., and Richard, C.M., 2006, *Creek & Watershed Map of San Francisco*: Oakland Museum of California, Oakland, CA 1:25,800 scale.

Based on groundwater monitoring activities conducted at the site, depth to groundwater ranges between approximately 4.5 to 9 feet bgs. Groundwater flow direction is predominantly toward the east. Islais Creek, which extends toward the San Francisco Bay, is located approximately 500 feet to the northeast of the site.¹⁰⁰

Impact GE-1: The proposed project would not result in exposure of people and structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, expansive soils, seismic ground-shaking, liquefaction, lateral spreading, or landslides. (Less than Significant)

The project site is not in an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone, and no known or potentially active fault exists on the site.¹⁰¹ The project site is not located in the immediate vicinity of any active earthquake fault based on MAP 01 in the Community Safety Element of the General Plan, which shows the location of earthquake faults in the Bay Area.¹⁰² The project site is located approximately 6.5 miles northeast of the San Andreas Fault and 12.5 miles southwest of the Hayward Fault.

The project site is located in a seismic category "C" area; hence, it is expected that the site will be subjected to at least one moderate to severe earthquake.¹⁰³ Maps 02 and 03 in the Community Safety Element of the General Plan show the intensity of ground-shaking in San Francisco from two of the most probable earthquakes, one of magnitude 7.2 on the San Andreas Fault and one of magnitude 6.5 on the northern segment of the Hayward Fault. Based on the Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI) scale, these maps show that the subject property is located in an area subject to "Violent" ground shaking from a 7.2 magnitude earthquake along the San Andreas Fault and "Very Strong" ground shaking from a 6.5 magnitude earthquake along the Hayward Fault.

The project site is located in a Seismic Hazards Zone, which is historically or potentially subject to liquefaction, as delineated by the California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG).¹⁰⁴ Based upon the USGS Seismic Map and relatively shallow water table, liquefaction of the foundation soils could occur during major seismic events.¹⁰⁵

The project site is situated on flat terrain and not in an area considered susceptible to landslides according to Map 04 in the Community Safety Element of the General Plan. In addition, the site is not in an area subject to tsunami or potential inundation due to reservoir failure based on Maps 05 and 06 in the Community Safety Element of the General Plan.

¹⁰⁰ AEW Engineering, Inc., 2013, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report*, 1995 Evans Avenue, San Francisco, California, Prepared for ARUP and SFPDW, June 2013. This document is available for public review as part of Case No. 2013.0342E at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103.

¹⁰¹ California Department of Conservation. *Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Maps*. Available online at: http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/aplap_maps.htm. Accessed April 19, 2013.

¹⁰² SF Planning Department. *San Francisco General Plan, Community Safety Element*, October 2012. Available online at: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/Community_Safety_Element_2012.pdf. Accessed April 19, 2013.

¹⁰³ Borchardt, Gibbs, and Lajois 1975. *Maps showing maximum earthquake intensity predicted in the southern San Francisco Bay region, California, for large earthquakes on the San Andreas and Hayward Faults*. 1975.

¹⁰⁴ California Department of Conservation. *Seismic Hazard Zones, City and County of San Francisco*, November 17, 2000. Available online at: http://gmsw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/download/pdfozn_sf.pdf. Accessed April 19, 2013.

¹⁰⁵ P. Whitehead and Associates Consulting Engineers. *Geotechnical Report, 928 Toland Street, Block 5597A Lot 001, San Francisco, CA., P. Whitehead & Associates Report 2012 - 31*, October 15, 2012. This document is available for public review as part of Case No. 2011.0859E at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103.

Construction of the proposed project would include excavation for some elements of the proposed 83-foot tall, four-story, 128,000-sf FSD/TC building. The FSD/TC building foundation would be supported on 14-inch square pre-cast and pre-stressed concrete piles up to 90 feet deep. The FSD/TC building would require 275 to 400 piles; the parking garage would require 100 to 200 piles.

For any development proposal in an area with liquefaction potential, the DBI will require the project sponsor to prepare a geotechnical report pursuant to the State Seismic Hazards Mapping Act in support of the building permit application. The report would assess the nature and severity of the hazard(s) on the site and recommend project design and construction features to reduce the hazards(s). To ensure compliance with all San Francisco Building Code provisions regarding structural safety, when DBI reviews the geotechnical report and building plans for a proposed project, it will determine engineering and design features necessary to reduce potential damage to structures from ground-shaking and liquefaction. Consequently, potential damage to structures from geologic hazards on the project site would be mitigated through the DBI requirement that appropriate engineering and design features be incorporated into the project that are consistent with the findings from the geotechnical report pursuant to DBI's implementation of the Building Code. Any changes incorporated into the foundation design required to meet the Building Code standards that are identified as a result of the DBI review process would constitute minor modification of the project and would not require additional environmental analysis. In light of the above, impacts related to seismic or geologic hazards would be *less than significant*.

**Impact GE-2: The proposed project would not result in substantial loss of topsoil or erosion.
(Less than Significant)**

In general, project-related construction activities could create conditions where soils are more susceptible to erosion. Without proper soil stabilization controls, construction activities such as excavation, backfilling, and grading could increase the potential for exposed soils to be eroded by wind or storm water runoff, resulting in long-term soil loss. Project construction activities could also result in the loss of topsoil—a fertile soil horizon that typically contains a seed base if there is a well-developed topsoil horizon and it is mixed with other soil horizons or otherwise lost during excavation and backfilling.

The project site is paved and soils beneath the pavement are composed of varied compacted filled material; hence, no loss of topsoil would result from the proposed project. Soil erosion could occur during construction when subsurface material would be removed to install subsurface utilities and the site grade would be raised by 3 feet with approximately 10,000 cy of fill. As the acreage of disturbed area (2.2 acres) would exceed the one-acre threshold for a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit, the project sponsor and its contractor would be required to implement BMPs to prevent soil erosion. With implementation of BMPs during construction, potential impacts related to soil erosion would be *less than significant*.

Impact GE-3: The proposed project would be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, but would not result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. (Less than Significant)

As stated above, the project site is situated on flat terrain and not in an area considered susceptible to landslides according to Map 04 in the Community Safety Element of the General Plan. The project site is located in a Seismic Hazards Zone, which is historically or potentially subject to liquefaction. Based upon the USGS Seismic Map and relatively shallow water table, liquefaction of the foundation soils could occur

during major seismic events.¹⁰⁶ Liquefaction-related phenomena can include lateral spreading, ground oscillation, loss of bearing strength, vertical settlement from densification (subsidence), buoyancy effects, sand boils, and flow failures, all of which could cause damage to the proposed structures. Design and construction of the structures would incorporate appropriate engineering practices to ensure seismic stability, as required by the SFBC, Chapter 16, Structural Design, and Chapter 18, Soils and Foundations. Sections 1607 through 1614 contain the formulae, tables, and graphs by which the project engineer would develop the structural specifications for building design and which would be used by DBI to verify the applicability of SFBC's specifications. Sections 1804 through 1812 contain similar information for the design and verification of adequate soils and foundation support for individual elements of the project. Section 1802 requires the use of this information in the seismic analyses prepared for the site-specific investigations that must be prepared in connection with the permits for individual elements of the project.

Compliance with site-specific requirements established by state and local codes and enforced by DBI would serve to avoid significant liquefaction hazards. Structural design would incorporate recommendations of the site-specific geotechnical investigations and include measures such as construction of deep foundations, which transfer loads to competent strata beneath the zone susceptible to liquefaction, for critical utilities and shallow foundations or structural mat foundations to distribute concentrated load to prevent damage to structures. If appropriate, unstable soil would be replaced with engineering-compacted fill. All plans would be prepared in compliance with the requirements of the SFBC, the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, and requirements contained in California Geological Survey (CGS) Special Publication 117A—Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California and approved by DBI. DBI would review and approve a site-specific, design-level geotechnical investigation prepared by a California Certified Engineering Geologist or California Registered Geotechnical Engineer. Although the proposed project would be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, it would be constructed in such a manner as to result in a *less-than-significant* impact.

Impact GE-4: The proposed project is potentially located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, but would not create substantial risks to life or property. (Less than Significant)

Soils at the project site are predominantly Urban Land and Urban Land Orthents, reclaimed complex, 0 to 2 percent slopes.¹⁰⁷ These soils are highly variable, and could contain clays with various levels of risk for expansion.¹⁰⁸ Significant impacts related to expansive soils would be avoided through implementation of standard engineering and geotechnical practices for the identification and remediation of expansive soils, as required by SFBC, Chapter 18, Soils and Foundations. Soil-stability specifications, including the appropriate foundation designs for structures on expansive soils, would conform to the requirements of SFBC Section 1803 through 1812, which contain applicable formulae, tables, and graphs. Appropriate support and protection procedures would be designed and implemented to maintain the stability of soils adjacent to newly graded or re-graded access roads, work areas, and structures during and after construction, and to minimize potential for damage to structures and facilities at the site.

¹⁰⁶ Whitehead and Associates Consulting Engineers. *Geotechnical Report, 928 Toland Street, Block 5597A Lot 001, San Francisco, CA, P. Whitehead & Associates Report 2012 - 31*, October 15, 2012. This document is available for public review as part of Case No. 2011.0859E at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103.

¹⁰⁷ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey, <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/HHomePage.htm>, Accessed May 18, 2013.

¹⁰⁸ USDA Soil Conservation Service (renamed Natural Resources Conservation Service), 1991, Soil Survey of San Mateo County, Eastern Part, and San Francisco County, California.

Recommendations of a site-specific geotechnical investigation would be incorporated in the structural designs and approved by DBI. All engineering practices and analyses of structural design would be consistent with the SFBC to ensure soils stability, including reduction of potential soil expansion hazards. With implementation of the engineering and geotechnical requirements, impacts related to expansive soils would be reduced to *less than significant*.

Impact GE-5: The proposed project would not substantially change the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site. (Less than Significant)

The site is flat with no unique geologic or physical features. To reduce flood hazards, the elevation of the project site would be increased by approximately three feet. The change in elevation of the project site is not substantial when compared to the overall site acreage. Consequently, impacts from changes in topography would be *less than significant*.

Impact C-G E: The proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to any cumulative significant effects related to geology or soils. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would not result in a large amount of excavation, and there are no other foreseeable projects in the project vicinity that would combine with the proposed project's impacts in a considerable manner so as to result in a significant adverse effect. Thus, the proposed project's impacts related to geology and soils, both individually and cumulatively, would be *less than significant*.

E.15 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
15. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY—					
Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion of siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact HY-1: The proposed project would not violate water quality standards or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would not substantially degrade water quality or contaminate a public water supply. As discussed in Section F.11, Utilities and Service Systems, all wastewater from the proposed project and storm water runoff from the project site would flow into the City's combined sewer system to be treated by the standards contained in the NPDES permit for the SFPUC's SE Plant prior to discharge into San Francisco Bay. Additionally, during wet weather events, combined sanitary and storm water flows from the project area would be treated at the North Point Wet Weather Facility. Treatment would be provided pursuant to the effluent discharge standards in the NPDES Permit for the facility. The proposed project includes the construction of a below grade sanitary waste storage tank with an approximate 8,000-gallon capacity level that will be used for storage of sanitary waste during emergency conditions which may potentially affect the combined sewer system (see Impacts UT-1 and C-UT-1 under Section E.11 Utilities and Public Services).

The proposed project would be required to meet the standards for storm water management identified in the San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance (SFSMO) and the SFPUC storm water management requirements per the San Francisco 2010 Stormwater Design Guidelines (SDGs). The project sponsor would be required to submit for SFPUC's approval a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) that complies with the SDGs using a variety of BMPs. Because the project would disturb over 5,000 sf of ground surface that would discharge to the combined sewer system, the BMPs must meet SFPUC performance requirements and reduce the total storm water runoff volume and peak runoff rate from the project site. Implementation of the SCP would ensure that the project meets performance measures set by the SFPUC related to storm water runoff rate and volume. The proposed project includes a combination of BMPs, including permeable pavers, rain gardens, a bio swale, and a roof garden.

During site preparation, excavation, and construction of the foundation and building shell, the potential exists for erosion and transportation of soil particles, sediment, and other pollutants in surface run-off into San Francisco Bay. As discussed above, storm water runoff from project construction would drain to the combined sewer and storm water system and be treated at the SE Plant. Pursuant to Chapter 13C (Green Building) and Chapter 33 (Excavation and Grading) of the SFBC, the project sponsor would be required to implement BMPs that include erosion and sediment control measures to reduce potential erosion impacts.

About 10,000 cy of fill would be imported to the project site to elevate the existing grade by about 3 feet. To avoid the possibility that fill could contain contaminants that would be leached by infiltrating surface water, all imported fill would be tested prior to transport to the project site to ensure it is clean.

Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially degrade water quality nor would water quality standards and waste discharge requirements be violated. Thus, the project would have a *less-than-significant* impact on water quality resources.

Impact HY-2: The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. (Less than Significant)

Groundwater is not currently used as a drinking water supply in the City and County of San Francisco. The project site is entirely covered with impervious surfaces and thus does not allow groundwater infiltration under existing conditions. As discussed in Section E.14, Geology and Soils, groundwater was observed in borings drilled near the project site at depths ranging from 4.5 to 9 feet bgs.

Groundwater levels vary with time and rainfall conditions; however, based on these observations, dewatering may be required during project construction. Any groundwater pumped and discharged during construction of the proposed project is subject to the requirements of the City's Sewer Use Ordinance (Ordinance Number 19-92, amended 116-97), supplemented by the SFPDW's Order No. 158170, requiring a permit from the SFPUC's Wastewater Enterprise Collection System Division. A permit may be issued only if an effective pre-treatment system is maintained and operated. Each permit for such discharge shall contain specified water quality standards and may require the project sponsor to install and maintain meters to measure the discharge volume to the combined sewer system. These measures would ensure protection of water quality during construction of the proposed project. The project would convert the site's impervious surface area into a partially pervious surface, which would result in a small increase in the area available for potential groundwater recharge. Therefore, groundwater resources would not be substantially affected, and the proposed project would not substantially interfere with groundwater flow. Thus, the proposed project would have a *less-than-significant* impact on groundwater.

Impact HY-3: The proposed project would not result in altered drainage patterns that would cause substantial erosion or flooding or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. (Less than Significant)

The project site is currently covered with impervious surfaces. Construction of the proposed project would decrease impervious surface coverage on the site, increasing infiltration and groundwater recharge. In addition, the proposed storm water drainage system involves vegetated swales, a roof garden, and landscaping designed to comply with the SFSMO requirement that existing volume and rate of storm water runoff at the project site be maintained or reduced by retaining runoff on-site, promoting storm water reuse, and limiting site discharges that enter the combined sewer collection system. Because storm water flows from the proposed project could be accommodated by the existing combined sewer system, and there would be no expected increase in storm water flows, impacts from surface water runoff would be *less than significant*.

Impact HY-4: The proposed project would not expose people, housing, or structures to substantial risk of loss due to flooding. (Less than Significant)

Development in the City and County of San Francisco must account for flooding potential. Flood risk assessment and some flood protection projects are conducted by federal agencies including the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). Flood management agencies and cities implement the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) under the jurisdiction of FEMA and its Flood Insurance Administration. FEMA is preparing Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) for San Francisco for the first time. FIRMs identify areas that are subject to inundation during a flood having a one-percent chance of occurrence in a given year (also known as a "base flood" or "100-year flood"). FEMA refers to the flood plain that is at risk from a flood of this magnitude as a special flood hazard area (SFHA).

In 2007, FEMA issued preliminary FIRMs for review and comment by the City, and anticipates publishing revised preliminary FIRMs after completing a more detailed analysis of flood hazards associated with San Francisco Bay as requested by the Port of San Francisco and City staff. As proposed, the FIRMs would designate portions of waterfront piers, Mission Bay, Bayview Hunters Point, Hunters Point Shipyard, Candlestick Point, and Treasure Island as Zone A (areas subject to inundation by tidal surge) or Zone V (areas of coastal flooding subject to wave hazards).¹⁰⁹ The project site is not located within Zone A, Zone V, or a SFHA identified on the Interim Floodplain Map.¹¹⁰

The project site is located within an area identified by the SFPUC as prone to flooding due to combined sewer backups or flooding, which can affect locations, such as certain areas south of Market Street, developed at elevations below the water level in the combined sewer lines.¹¹¹ Through the building permit review process for the proposed project, the SFPUC would require that the ground level of the proposed FSD/TC building be located at or above the official grade of the street to minimize the potential of a sewer backup during storm events, as well as to minimize the potential for street storm flow to enter the property. In addition, if plumbing fixtures below the elevation of the side sewer vent cover are to be utilized for this project, a backflow device would be required to be installed on such plumbing fixtures in accordance with the San Francisco Plumbing Code. To reduce flood hazards, the elevation of the proposed project site would be increased by approximately three feet to elevate the FSD/TC building above the observed level of ponds that currently form at and near the project site during storm events that combine heavy rain and high tide.

In light of the above, the proposed project would result in *less-than-significant* impacts related to exposing people, housing, or structures to a substantial risk of loss due to flooding.

Impact HY-5: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (No Impact)

The project site is not located within a tsunami hazard zone; therefore, no significant tsunami hazards exist at the site.^{112,113} A seiche is an oscillation of a water body, such as a bay, that may cause local flooding. A seiche could occur on the San Francisco Bay due to seismic or atmospheric activity. However, based on historical record, seiches are rare and there is no significant seiche hazard expected at the project site. There is no mudslide hazard at the project site as the site and local vicinity are generally flat and fully developed with no erosion-prone slopes. Thus, the proposed project would result in *no impact* due to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow hazards.

¹⁰⁹ City and County of San Francisco, Office of the City Administrator, San Francisco Floodplain Management Program Fact Sheet, January 25, 2001 (revised January 5, 2011), Available online at: <http://sfgsa.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=7520>. Accessed May 17, 2013.

¹¹⁰ FEMA, Preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Map, City and County of San Francisco, California, Panel 235 of 260, Map Number 06075C0235A, September 21, 2007, Available online at: <http://sfgsa.org/Modules/ShowImage.aspx?imageid=2680>. Accessed May 17, 2013.

¹¹¹ SF Planning Department, Review of Projects in Identified Areas Prone to Flooding, April 1, 2007 (Updated October 2009). Available online at: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/DB_04_Flood_Zones.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2013.

¹¹² SF Planning Department. Tsunami Hazard Zones. 2002. Available online at: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/Community_Safety_Element_2012.pdf (Map 5). Accessed May 17, 2013.

¹¹³ California Department of Conservation. Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning, San Francisco, June 15, 2009. Available online at: http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geologic_hazards/Tsunami/Inundation_Maps/SanFrancisco/Documents/Tsunami_Inundation/SouthSFNorthSF_SFBay_SanFrancisco.pdf. Accessed May 17, 2013.

Impact C-HY-1: The proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to any cumulative significant effects related to hydrology or water quality. (Less than Significant)

Flood and inundation hazards are site-specific. However, other proposed developments in the project area, in combination with the proposed project, could result in intensified uses and a cumulative increase in wastewater generation. The SFPUC, which provides wastewater treatment in the city, has accounted for such growth in its service projections. The proposed project would result in a reduction of impervious surface at the project site. Given the proposed project's landscaping and its required compliance with the SFPUC-required SCP, the proposed project would not combine with other projects in a manner that could result in significant cumulative impacts related to hydrology or water quality. Thus, the project's contribution to any cumulative impacts on hydrology or water quality would be *less than significant*.

E.16 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
16. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS— Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project site is not located near a public or private airport or within an airport land use plan area. Therefore, Questions 16e and 16f would not apply to the proposed project.

Impact HZ-1: The proposed project would not create a significant hazard through routine transport, use, disposal, handling, or emission of hazardous materials. (Less than Significant)

Small quantities of hazardous materials, such as chemical sterilents, acids and bases, solvent preservatives and cleaners, and compressed gases, would be used at the forensics laboratories of the FSD. Blood and bodily fluids from crime scene investigations would also be handled. Proper facilities would be provided for the safe disposal of biological and chemical hazardous wastes. These provisions include collection containers in individual laboratories and centralized collection locations in the FSD/TC building where materials can be containerized and prepared for transportation for off-site treatment and disposal. Laboratory facilities would be constructed in accordance with current laws and regulations including the 2010 SFBC and Fire Code and operated in conformance with the U.S. Department of Transportation hazardous material transport regulations and California Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA) regulations to minimize exposure of people or the environment to hazardous materials and the potential for inadvertent releases. The use of hazardous materials and generation of

wastes would be regulated by the San Francisco Hazardous Material Unified Program Agency (SFHMUPA), within the SFDPH, under a compliance certificate. The SFPD would develop a hazardous waste and hazardous materials business plan (HMBP) to reflect storage locations, management, and emergency procedures for hazardous materials and waste. The SFHMUPA would conduct periodic inspections to ensure that hazardous materials and wastes are being used and stored properly. The SFPD is required by law to ensure employee safety by properly identifying hazardous materials and adequately training workers. Hazardous material containers would be labeled to inform users of potential risks and to instruct them in appropriate storage, handling, and disposal procedures.

Operation of the proposed facility would involve the occasional delivery, storage, handling, and use of diesel fuel, a flammable hazardous material. The diesel fuel would be stored in an 8,000-gallon underground storage tank (UST) located near the west corner of the parking garage, and would supply two emergency generators. The delivery of diesel fuel for the proposed project could create chemical exposure and fire hazards in the event of a spill and release of diesel fumes to the atmosphere. However, sufficient access would be provided at the project site for ingress and egress allowing tanker trucks and other vehicles transporting diesel fuel to safely turn in and out of the UST filling area. Based on the depth to groundwater, it is possible that the UST system could be submerged in groundwater, which could result in buoyancy, or erosion and scour. Compliance with California regulations for the design and installation of USTs, including corrosion control for submerged metallic piping and UST systems, would reduce this potential hazard.¹¹⁴ The SFPD would be required by California HSC Chapter 6.95 to obtain an operating permit for the UST, which includes a review of the system and its installation by a registered engineer. Tank operating permits are incorporated into the HMBP and issued as part of the Hazardous Materials Certificate of Registration, obtained from the SFHMUPA.

With adherence to applicable state and federal regulations and local code requirements, the proposed impacts from routine transport, use, disposal, handling, or emission of hazardous materials would be *less than significant*.

Impact HZ-2: The proposed project is on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and would 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. (Less than Significant)

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA) was performed for the project site.¹¹⁵ The Phase I ESA report describes current and prior uses on the project site and, summarizes records obtained from environmental agency databases, site reconnaissance observations, and potential soil and groundwater contamination concerns. Per the Phase I ESA, and according to a representative of HC&M Commercial Properties (the current property manager), past uses of the project site included a lumberyard from 1940 to around 1954, a French bread bakery from 1954 to 2005 (see discussion in Section E.4, Cultural Resources), followed by production and distribution of newspapers by the San Francisco Newspaper Company, publisher for the San Francisco Examiner, from approximately 2006 to 2013, and warehousing and retail (Hydroponic Connection) and bus parking until 2013. Recognized environmental conditions noted in the site reconnaissance include outdoor storage of potentially hazardous materials (used antifreeze and motor oil); surface asphalt staining, and distressed vegetation around the material storage; and evidence of vehicle maintenance and wash-down areas.

¹¹⁴ CCR, Title 23. Waters, Division 3. SWRCB and RWQCB, Chapter 16. Underground Tank Regulations.

¹¹⁵ AEW Engineering, Inc., 2013, DRAFT Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, 1995 Evans Avenue, San Francisco, California, Prepared for ARUP and SFDPW, May 2013.

From the review of environmental agency databases, the Phase I ESA noted that the project site was listed on numerous current and inactive databases associated with USTs under various names of the Parisian Bakery, the former occupant. The project site is also listed on the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Geotracker database, which indicates that a UST gasoline leak was reported on May 1, 1987. Geotracker indicates that cleanup was completed and the case closed on May 29, 1998.¹¹⁶

The Phase I ESA includes references to several reports documenting removal of USTs, soil and groundwater sampling, groundwater monitoring, and excavation of contaminated soil at the project site. Reportedly, four USTs were removed from the site between 1987 and 1997:

- Two 8,000-gallon gasoline USTs located east of the primary FSD/TC building and loading docks;
- One 1,000-gallon UST located along the western perimeter of the site beneath Toland Street sidewalk; and
- One 3,000-gallon diesel UST located along the northern perimeter of the site beneath the Evans Street sidewalk.

Soil and groundwater sampling indicated the presence of residual hydrocarbons and lead. Three groundwater monitoring wells were installed: two near the former 8,000-gallon UST location and one near the 1,000-gallon UST location. Quarterly groundwater sampling was initiated in 1995 and terminated in 1997. Soil sampling during well installation indicated the presence of lead in soil above California hazardous waste thresholds. Quarterly sampling detected the presence of total petroleum hydrocarbons in the gasoline range (TPH-G) and benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene and xylene (BTEX) in the three groundwater monitoring wells. The three wells were decommissioned in 1998. In May 1998, the SFDPH issued a Remedial Action Completion Certification for the 8,000-gallon UST removed in 1997. No formal letter from SFDPH was identified for the first 8,000-gallon UST, the 1,000-gallon UST, and/or the 3,000-gallon UST. It is likely that subsurface contamination remains and could be encountered during excavation for the proposed project.

To evaluate off-site environmental concerns, the Phase I ESA included a review of agency lists and databases for recorded sites in the project vicinity. Neighboring sites that may present a potential impact to subsurface soil and groundwater and were identified on the databases within the American Standard for Testing and Materials (ASTM) search radii include the following:

- Federated Fry Metals at 1901 Cesar Chavez Street;
- Polita Hawley Forge at 2350 Jerrold Avenue;
- Applied Dielectronic at 1750 Army Street (Cesar Chavez Street);
- 3950 Third Street property at 3950 3rd Street;
- Infoimage, Inc. at 890 Pennsylvania Avenue; and,
- Caltrans ROW at Evans Avenue and Rankin Street.

The Phase I ESA report included recommendations that the project sponsor perform a Phase II ESA to establish current soil and groundwater conditions underneath the site, particularly around the former UST locations, in areas of recognized environmental conditions, and at site boundary. A survey of hazardous materials (such as but not limited to lead, asbestos, and polychlorinated biphenyls [PCBs]) at the existing building structures was also recommended based on the age of the buildings.

¹¹⁶ http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0607500199, Accessed May 18, 2013.

Hazardous Soil and Groundwater

Industrial printing operations and industrial-scale bakery operations occurred on the project site. Additionally, the site is within the former Islais Creek Estuary, which was filled during the first half of the 20th century, likely between the mid-1920s to mid-1930s in association with the Islais Creek Reclamation District project.¹¹⁷ As described in Topic 14, Geology and Soils, the project site is underlain by relatively shallow fill materials and late bay mud, below which bedrock is present. The shallow fill may contain hazardous material, which could be encountered during construction. Compliance with the Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance is required when a project disturbs more than 50 cy of soil; the proposed project involves the excavation of approximately 1,100 cy of soil; therefore, the project is subject to the Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the SFDPH. The Maher Ordinance requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I ESA that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. The Phase I ESA would determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project. Based on that information, the project sponsor may be required to conduct soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis. Where such analysis reveals the presence of hazardous substances in excess of state or federal standards, the project sponsor is required to submit a SMP to DPH or other appropriate state or federal agency(ies), and to remediate any site contamination in accordance with an approved SMP prior to the issuance of any building permit. The project sponsor has already satisfied the Maher Ordinance requirement to submit a Phase I ESA to SFDPH. The project sponsor will perform a Phase II ESA/Soil Characterization Study and submit a Maher Application to SFDPH to assess the potential for site contamination.

The proposed project would be required to remediate potential soil (and/or) groundwater contamination described above in accordance with Article 22A of the Health Code. Thus, the proposed project would not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment from contaminated soil (and/or) groundwater and would result in a *less-than-significant* impact.

Hazardous Building Materials

As discussed above, a Phase I ESA was conducted for the proposed project. Although asbestos or lead-based paint surveys were not conducted as part of the ESA, the report notes a potential for these materials to exist on the project site.

Asbestos. Due to the age of the structures proposed for demolition, it is likely that asbestos containing material (ACMs) may be present. Section 19827.5 of the California HSC requires that local agencies not issue demolition or alteration permits until an applicant has demonstrated compliance with the notification requirements under applicable federal regulations regarding hazardous air pollutants, including asbestos. The BAAQMD is vested by the California legislature with authority to regulate airborne pollutants, including asbestos, through both inspection and law enforcement, and is to be notified ten days in advance of any proposed demolition or abatement work.

¹¹⁷ Gerald Robert Dow, Bay Fill in San Francisco: A History of Change. Unpublished Master's Thesis, California State University, San Francisco, 1973: 162-168.

Notification includes the following:

- Names and addresses of operations and persons responsible;
- A description and location of the structure to be demolished/altered including size, age and prior use, and the approximate amount of friable asbestos;
- Scheduled starting and completion dates of demolition or abatement;
- Nature of the planned work and methods to be employed;
- Procedures to be employed to meet BAAQMD requirements; and
- The name and location of the waste disposal site to be used.

The BAAQMD randomly inspects asbestos removal operations. In addition, the BAAQMD will inspect any removal operation when a complaint has been received.

The local California OSHA office must be notified of asbestos abatement to be performed. Asbestos abatement contractors must follow state regulations contained in 8 CCR 1529 and 8 CCR Section 341.6 through Section 341.14 where there is asbestos-related work involving 100 sf, or more of ACMs. Asbestos removal contractors must be certified as such by the State of California Contractors Licensing Board. The owner of the property where abatement is to occur must have a Hazardous Waste Generator Number assigned by and registered with the California Department of Health Services in Sacramento. The contractor and hauler of the material are required to file a hazardous waste manifest, which details the hauling of the material from the site and appropriate disposal. Pursuant to California law, the DBI would not issue a required permit until an applicant has complied with the notice and abatement requirements described above. These regulations and procedures, already established as part of the permit review process, would ensure that ACM impacts would be *less than significant*.

Lead-Based Paint. Based on the construction dates of the existing buildings, before the use of lead-based paint was banned, there is the potential to encounter lead within the existing structures. In the event that lead-based paint is found on the project site, the project sponsor would be required to comply with Section 3435 of the SFBC which requires specific notification and work standards and identifies prohibited work methods and penalties.

SFBC Section 3425 typically applies to the exterior of all buildings or steel structures on which original construction was completed prior to 1979 (which are assumed to have lead-based paint on their surfaces, unless demonstrated otherwise through laboratory analysis), and to the interior of residential buildings, hotels, and child care centers. Performance standards, including establishment of containment barriers and identification of prohibited practices that may not be used in disturbances or removal of lead-based paint, are provided in SFBC Section 3425. Any person performing work subject to SFBC Section 3425 shall, to the maximum extent possible, protect the ground from contamination during exterior work; protect floors and other horizontal surfaces from work debris during interior work; and make all reasonable efforts to prevent migration of lead paint contaminants beyond containment barriers during the course of the work. Clean-up standards require the removal of visible work debris, including the use of a high efficiency particulate air filter (HEPA) vacuum following interior work.

SFBC Section 3425 also includes notification and requirements for signage. Prior to the commencement of work, the responsible party must provide written notice to the DBI Director, including:

- Address and location of the project;
- Scope of work, including specific location;
- Methods and tools to be used;
- Approximate age of the structure;
- Anticipated job start and completion dates for the work;
- Indication if the building is residential or nonresidential, owner-occupied or rental property;
- Dates by which the responsible party has fulfilled or will fulfill any tenant or adjacent property notification requirements; and
- Name, address, telephone and pager numbers of the party who will perform the work.

Further notice includes signs and requirements for signage when containment of lead paint contaminants is required; notice to occupants; availability of pamphlets related to protection from lead in the home; and notice of Early Commencement of Work (Requested by Tenant). SFBC Section 3425 contains provisions regarding inspection and sampling for compliance and enforcement by DBI. In addition, the ordinance describes penalties for non-compliance with the requirements of the ordinance. Compliance with these regulations and procedures in the SFBC would ensure that impacts of lead-based paint due to demolition would be *less than significant*.

Other Hazardous Building Materials

Other potential hazardous building materials such as PCB-containing electrical equipment or fluorescent lights could pose health threats for construction workers if not properly disposed of and create a significant impact in case of worker exposure or a release to the environment. These materials are regulated and would be managed, handled, transported, and disposed of according to federal, state, and local laws and regulations. Consequently, potential impacts of the proposed project related to exposure to hazardous materials would be *less than significant*.

Impact HZ-3: The proposed 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. (Less than Significant)

RISE Institute (1760 Cesar Chavez Street), located approximately 1,200 feet to the north-northeast, is the only school within one-quarter mile of the project site.¹¹⁸ As previously discussed, the project would involve the use of small quantities of hazardous materials in forensic laboratory operations, as well as storing diesel fuel in an 8,000-gallon UST. No storage, handling, or disposal of significant quantities of any other hazardous materials would occur. Emissions of hazardous substances would be in amounts exempt from permitting and would not be considered significant. Therefore, with adherence to applicable state and federal regulations and local code requirements, the proposed project would have a *less-than-significant* impact related to hazardous emissions or materials within a quarter of a mile of a school location.

¹¹⁸ SF Planning Department Website, Home / Resource Center / Map Library / Areas Within 1000 feet of a School - <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2337>. February 2010.

Impact HZ-4: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, nor interfere with the implementation of an emergency response plan. (Less than Significant)

San Francisco ensures fire safety primarily through provisions of the SFBC and Fire Code. Final building plans are reviewed by the SFFD, as well as DBI, in order to ensure conformance with these provisions. Potential fire hazards, including those associated with underground storage of diesel fuel and laboratory operations would be addressed during the permit review process to ensure adequacy of emergency equipment (e.g. hydrant water pressure) and emergency access. The use of hazardous materials is regulated by the SFHMUPA, within the SFDPH. To comply with hazardous materials regulations, the SFPD would develop an HMBP which would include site-specific emergency response procedures for hazardous materials. Consequently, impacts of fires and interference with emergency response plan implementation would be *less than significant*.

Impact C-HZ-1: The proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to any cumulative significant effects related to hazardous materials. (Less than Significant)

Impacts from hazardous materials are generally site-specific and typically do not result in cumulative impacts provided applicable safety and remediation requirements are followed at each site. The proposed project could contribute to cumulative impacts if workers or the public were exposed to legacy contaminants from the site or these contaminants were accidentally released to the environment during construction and impacted surrounding properties. Compliance with laws and regulations relating to soil and groundwater contaminants would preclude the project's interaction with other projects in a manner that could result in significant cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials. For the reasons discussed above, the proposed project's impacts related to hazardous materials, both individually and cumulatively, would be *less than significant*.

E.17 MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES

<u>Topics:</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	<u>Not Applicable</u>
17. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES—					
Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact ME-1: The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or a locally important mineral resource recovery site. (No Impact)

No known mineral resource is located on or near the project site. All land in San Francisco, including the project site, is designated Mineral Resource Zone 4 (MRZ-4) by the CDMG under the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975.¹¹⁹ This designation indicates there is inadequate information available for assignment to any other MRZ, and thus the proposed site is not a designated area of significant mineral deposits.

Because the project site is already developed, future evaluation or designation of the site would not affect or be affected by the proposed project. There are no operational mineral resource recovery sites in the project vicinity whose operations or accessibility would be affected by the construction or operation of the project. Thus, the project would have *no impact* on mineral resources.

Impact ME-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not encourage activities that would result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner. (Less than Significant)

The proposed laboratory and office uses for the project site would not consume significantly large amounts of fuel, water, or energy beyond the level anticipated for the project area. New buildings in San Francisco are required to conform to current state and local energy conservation standards, including CCR Title 24 (including the *California Building Code*, *California Energy Code*, and *California Green Building Standards Code*), as well as the SFBC. The DBI enforces *Building Code* compliance and documentation demonstrating compliance with standards would be submitted with the application for the building permit. In addition, the project sponsor is pursuing silver status under the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards. As a result, the proposed project would not cause a wasteful use of energy or other non-renewable resources, and would have a *less-than-significant* impact on energy resources.

¹¹⁹ CDMG, Open File Report 96-03 and Special Report 146 Parts I and II.

Impact C-ME-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the site vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant energy and minerals impact. (Less than Significant)

As described above, no known minerals exist at the project site, and therefore the proposed project would not contribute to any cumulative impact on mineral resources. The California Energy Commission is currently considering applications for the development of new power generating facilities in San Francisco, the Bay Area, and elsewhere in the state. These facilities could supply additional energy to the power supply grid within the next few years. These efforts, together with conservation, will be part of the statewide effort to achieve energy sufficiency. The project-generated demand for electricity would be negligible in the context of overall demand within San Francisco and the state, and would not in and of itself require an expansion of power facilities. Therefore, the energy demand associated with the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulative impact. Overall, the proposed project would result in *less-than-significant* cumulatively considerable impacts related to mineral and energy resources.

E.18 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

Topics:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
<p>18. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</p>					
<p>Would the project:</p>					
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact AF-1: The proposed project would not result in the conversion of farmland or forest land to non-farm or non-forest use, nor would it conflict with existing agricultural or forest use or zoning. (No Impact)

The project site is located within an urban area in the City and County of San Francisco. The California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program identifies the project site as "Urban and Built-up Land," which is defined as follows:

Land occupied by structures with a building density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres, or approximately six structures to a 10-acre parcel, and used for residential, industrial, commercial, construction, institutional, public administration, railroad and other transportation yards, cemeteries, airports, golf courses, sanitary landfills, sewage treatment, water control structures, and other developed purposes.^{120,121}

¹²⁰ California Department of Conservation, *Important Farmland in California*, 2008, December 2010. Available online at: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdfs/statewide/2008/fmmp2008_08_11.pdf. Accessed May 16.

¹²¹ California Department of Conservation, FMMP – Important Farmland Map Categories. Available online at: http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/mccu/Pages/map_categories.aspx. Accessed May 16, 2013.

Because the site does not contain agricultural uses and is not zoned for such uses, the proposed project would not convert any prime farmland, unique farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use, and would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural land use or a Williamson Act contract, nor would it involve any changes to the environment that could result in the conversion of farmland. There is likewise no forest land on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* to agricultural or forest resources.

Impact C-AF-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development in the site vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant agriculture and forest resources impact. (No Impact)

Neither the proposed project nor any of the nearby projects would result in conversion of farmland or forest land to non-farm or non-forest use, nor would any of the proposed developments conflict with existing agricultural or forest use or zoning for these uses. The proposed project would not contribute to any cumulative adverse impact relative to farmland and forest land and, therefore, there would be no cumulative effects and *no impact* would occur.

E.19 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE--					
Would the project:					
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have impacts that would be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

As discussed in the above text, the project is anticipated to have only *less-than-significant* impacts in the areas discussed with the implementation of identified mitigation measures. Significant impacts to archeological resources and air quality would be mitigated through implementation of mitigation measures described above, summarized in this section, and presented in full in Section F.

E.19.a) The proposed project is located in an archeologically sensitive area and construction activities have the potential to result in significant impacts to any below-ground archeological resources. Any adverse effect to CEQA-significant paleontological resources resulting from soils disturbance from the proposed project would be reduced to a *less-than-significant* level by implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-2: Archeology Resources (Testing), which addresses testing to determine the presence of archeological resources.

E.19.b) The proposed project, in combination with recently completed expansion of the Restaurant Depot store located just north of the project site on Evans Avenue;¹²² proposed Home Depot store located just north of the project site on Evans Avenue;¹²³ approved expansion of the San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market;¹²⁴ proposed construction of a 25,000-sf commercial building at 928 Toland Street, south of the project site;¹²⁵ and the planned redevelopment (replacement of existing units and expansion) of the Potrero Terrace and Potrero Annex public housing units to the north, on the opposite side of Cesar Chavez Street¹²⁶ would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant impacts to

¹²² SF Planning Department, Environmental Planning Division, Case No. 2009.0651.

¹²³ SF Planning Department, Environmental Planning Division, Case No. 2009.0362.

¹²⁴ SF Planning Department, Environmental Planning Division, Case No. 2009.1153.

¹²⁵ SF Planning Department, Environmental Planning Division, Case No. 2011.0859.

¹²⁶ SF Planning Department, Environmental Planning Division, Case No. 2010.0515.

land use, aesthetics, population and housing, cultural resources, transportation, noise, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, wind and shadow, recreation, utilities, public services, biological resources, geology, hydrology, hazardous materials, mineral resources, and agricultural resources. The proposed project's contributions to cumulative traffic at intersections in the vicinity would not be substantial. The proposed project would not be considered to substantially contribute incrementally to cumulative regional air quality conditions, or to contribute to significant cumulative noise impacts. The proposed project would be consistent with the land use and height controls for the site and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable land use or visual impact. No other significant cumulative impacts are anticipated. Accordingly, the impacts of the proposed project would be *less than significant* and the project would not have unavoidable environmental effects that are cumulatively considerable.

E.19.c) The proposed project is located in an area identified by the city and the BAAQMD as having poor air quality, termed "air pollution hot spots." The proposed project would require construction activities for the approximate 30-month construction phase. Project construction activities would result in short-term emissions of DPM and other toxic air contaminants that would add emissions to areas already adversely affected by poor air quality. This would result in a significant air quality impact to sensitive land uses. Implementation of the emissions-reducing Mitigation Measures M-AQ-2: Construction Emissions Minimization and M-AQ-4: Best Available Control Technology (BACT) for Diesel Generators would reduce this impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

F. MITIGATION MEASURES AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure M-CP-2: Archeology Resources (Testing)

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

Consultation with Descendant Communities: On discovery of an archeological site¹²⁷ associated with descendant Native Americans, the Overseas Chinese, or other descendant group an appropriate representative of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to consult with ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated archeological site. A copy of the Final Archaeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group.

Archeological Testing Program. The archeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archeological testing plan (ATP). The archeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA.

At the completion of the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archeological testing program the archeological consultant finds that significant archeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted.

¹²⁷ The term "archeological site" is intended here to minimally include any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archeological testing, archeological monitoring, and/or an archeological data recovery program. No archeological data recovery shall be undertaken without the prior approval of the ERO or the Planning Department archeologist. If the ERO determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:

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

Archeological Monitoring Program. If the ERO, in consultation with the archeological consultant, determines that an archeological monitoring program (AMP) shall be implemented, this AMP shall minimally include the following provisions:

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

Whether or not significant archeological resources are encountered, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.

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

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

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

Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects. The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines. Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement shall take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

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

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

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2: Construction Emissions Minimization

Construction Emissions Minimization Plan. Prior to issuance of a construction permit, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (EMP) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The EMP shall detail project compliance with the following requirements:

1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall meet the following requirements:
 - a) Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited;
 - b) All off-road equipment shall have:
 - Engines that meet or exceed either United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 2 off-road emissions standards; and
 - Engines that are retrofitted with a CARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS).¹²⁸
 - c) Exceptions:
 - Exceptions to A(1)(a) *may* be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site and that the requirements of this exception provision apply. Under this circumstance, the sponsor shall submit documentation of compliance with A(1)(b) for onsite power generation.
 - Exceptions to A(1)(b)(ii) *may* be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that a particular piece of off-road equipment with a CARB Level 3 VDECS is: (1) technically not feasible; (2) would not produce desired emissions reductions due to expected operating modes; (3) installing the control device would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator; or (4) there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that are not retrofitted with a CARB Level 3 VDECS and the sponsor has submitted documentation to the ERO that requirements of this exception provision apply. If granted an exception to A(1)(b)(ii), the project sponsor must comply with the requirements of A(1)(c)(iii).

¹²⁸ Equipment with engines meeting Tier 4 Interim or Tier 4 Final emission standards automatically meet this requirement; therefore, a VDECS would not be required

- If an exception is granted pursuant to A(1)(c)(ii), the project sponsor shall provide the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment as provided by the step down schedules shown in the table below.

OFF-ROAD EQUIPMENT COMPLIANCE STEP-DOWN SCHEDULE

Compliance Alternative	Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control
1	Tier 2	CARB Level 2 VDECS
2	Tier 2	CARB Level 1 VDECS
3	Tier 2	Alternative Fuel *

*Alternative fuels are not VDECS

HOW TO USE THIS TABLE:

If the requirements of (A)(1)(b) cannot be met, then the project sponsor would need to meet Compliance Alternative 1. Shall the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then Compliance Alternative 2 would need to be met. Shall the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 2, then Compliance Alternative 3 would need to be met.

2. The project sponsor shall require the idling time for off-road and on-road equipment be limited to no more than *two minutes*, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment. Legible and visible signs shall be posted in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Chinese) in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the *two minute* idling limit.
3. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications.
4. The EMP shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation.
For VDECS installed: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, CARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used.
5. The EMP shall be kept on-site and available for review by any persons requesting it and a legible sign shall be posted at the perimeter of the construction site indicating to the public the basic requirements of the EMP and a way to request a copy of the Plan. The project sponsor shall provide copies of the EMP to members of the public as requested.

Reporting. Monthly reports shall be submitted to the ERO indicating the construction phase and off-road equipment used during each phase including information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include actual amounts of alternative fuel used.

Within six months of completion of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit a final report summarizing construction activities to the ERO. The final report shall indicate the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase. For each phase, the report shall include detailed information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used.

Certification Statement and On-site Requirements. Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project sponsor must certify: (1) compliance with the EMP, and (2) that all applicable requirements of the EMP have been incorporated into contract specifications.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4: Best Available Control Technology (BACT) for Diesel Generators

All diesel generators shall have engines that: (1) meet Tier 4 Final or Tier 4 Interim emission standards, or (2) meet Tier 2 emission standards and are equipped with a California Air Resources Board (CARB) Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS).

Improvement Measures

Improvement Measure I-TR-1: Transportation Demand Management

As an improvement measure to reduce the parking shortfall and encourage use of alternate modes, the project sponsor should develop and implement a Transportation Demand Management ("TDM") Plan designed to reduce use of single-occupant vehicles and to increase the use of rideshare, transit, bicycle, and walk modes for trips to and from the Proposed Project. The TDM plan should include such measures as the following to reduce single occupancy vehicles and encourage alternate modes of travel:

- Ensure that bicycle safety strategies are developed along the Evans Avenue side of the property (e.g., avoiding conflicts with private cars accessing the parking garage on the east side of the property);
- Facilitate access to the Evans Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street bike routes through on-site signage;
- Require that the points of access to bicycle parking include signage indicating the location of these facilities;
- Facilitate access to carshare spaces (on the first level of the parking deck) through on-site signage;
- Require a TDM contact person who would be responsible for conducting employee surveys, coordinating carpool/ridematch services, and conducting annual TDM events;
- Provide information to employees and visitors on transit options and locations where transit passes can be purchased; and
- Require a transit pass subsidy for FSD and TC employees purchasing transit passes.

These measures would be in addition to those set of citywide commuter benefits provided to all City employees that allow them to reduce their monthly commuting expenses for transit, bicycling, vanpooling, and parking.

Improvement Measure I-TR-2: Construction Measures

The Department of Public Works (SFDPW) should require the following of the construction contractor:

- 1) Construction contractors should be prohibited from scheduling any truck trips, such as concrete mixers, heavy construction equipment, and materials delivery, etc., to the construction sites during the a.m. (7:00 to 9:00 a.m.) and p.m. (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.) peak commute periods.
- 2) All construction activities should adhere to the provisions in the City's Blue Book, including those addressing sidewalk and lane closures. To minimize construction impacts on nearby businesses and residents, the SFMTA should alert motorists, bicyclists, and nearby property owners of upcoming construction through its existing website and other available means, such as distribution of flyers, emails, and portable message or informational signs. Information provided should include contact name(s) for the SFMTA project manager, public information officer, and/or the SFMTA General Enforcement Division contact number (311).
- 3) Construction contractors should encourage construction workers to use carpooling and public transit to the construction site in order to minimize parking demand.

Improvement Measure I-TR-3: Queue Abatement

As an improvement measure to reduce the potential for queuing of vehicles accessing the project site, the SFPD should ensure that recurring vehicle queues do not occur on Evans Avenue or Toland Street adjacent to the site. A vehicle queue is defined as one or more vehicles (destined to the parking facility) blocking any portion of the Evans Avenue or Toland Street sidewalk or travel lanes on Evans Avenue or Toland Street travel lane for a consecutive period of three minutes or longer on a daily and/or weekly basis.

If the Planning Director, or his or her designee, suspects that a recurring queue is present, the Planning Department should notify the SFPD in writing. Upon request, the SFPD should hire a qualified transportation consultant to evaluate the conditions at the site for no less than seven days. The consultant should prepare a monitoring report to be submitted to the Planning Department for review. If the Planning Department determines that a recurring queue does exist, the SFPD should abate the queue within 90 days from the date of the written determination.

G. PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT

A "Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review" was mailed on July 23, 2013, to interested parties. The Planning Department received one comment letter in response to the notice. The commenter expressed concerns regarding street flooding that consistently occurs at the project location during moderate rainfall. The commenter suggested that a corrective measure for the flooding shall be incorporated into the 1995 Evans Project given project would be undertaken by the City and County of San Francisco. Section E.15 addresses hydrological setting for the project and addresses the potential flooding impacts of and to the project itself. The project will result in a decrease in storm water runoff from the 1995 Evans property when compared to existing conditions, but will not ameliorate flooding in the project vicinity. Measures to reduce existing flooding in the general area, not related to the project, are not addressed in this environmental document.


H. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial study:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, no further environmental documentation is required.

DATE

October 1, 2013



Sarah B. Jones
Environmental Review Officer
for
John Rahaim
Director of Planning

I. LIST OF PREPARERS

Initial Study Authors

San Francisco Planning Department
Environmental Planning Division
1650 Mission Street, Suite 500
San Francisco, California 94103
Environmental Review Officer: Sarah B. Jones
Senior Environmental Planner: Lisa Gibson
Environmental Coordinator: Elizabeth Purl
Transportation Planner: Andrea Contreras
Archeologist: Allison Vanderslice
Air Quality Planner: Jessica Range

Environmental Consultants

Weiss Associates
2200 Powell Street, Suite 925
Emeryville, California 94608

Environmental Science Associates
225 Bush Street, Suite 1700
San Francisco, California 94104

Carey & Company
460 Bush Street,
San Francisco, California 94108

LCW Consulting
3990 20th Street
San Francisco, California 94114

Project Sponsor

Department of Public Works
City and County of San Francisco
30 Van Ness, 4th Floor
San Francisco, California 94102
Attention: Magdalena Ryor

Project Architect

Crime Lab Design
2430 5th Street, Studio M
Berkeley, California, 94710

EXHIBIT 2: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM			
Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility
			Status/Date Completed

MITIGATION MEASURES AGREED TO BY PROJECT SPONSOR

CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Mitigation Measure M-CP-2 Archeology Resources (Testing)

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

Project sponsor/ archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.	Prior to any soil-disturbing activities on the project site.	Project sponsor to retain a qualified archeological consultant who shall report to the ERO.	Archeological consultant shall be retained prior to any soil-disturbing activities.
			Date archeological consultant retained:

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

Consultation with Descendant Communities: On discovery of an archeological site¹ associated with descendant Native Americans, the Overseas Chinese, or other descendant group an appropriate representative of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to consult with ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated archeological site. A copy of the Final Archaeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group.

Archeological Testing Program. The archeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archeological testing plan (ATP). The archeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA.

Project sponsor/
archeological
consultant at the
direction of the
ERO.

Prior to any
soil-disturbing
activities on
the project site.

Archeologist shall
prepare and submit
draft ATP to the
ERO. ATP to be
submitted and
reviewed by ERO
prior to any soil-
disturbing activities
on the project site.

Date ATP submitted
to the ERO: _____

Date ATP approved
by the ERO: _____

Date of initial soil
disturbing activities: _____

¹ The term "archeological site" is intended here to minimally include any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p>At the completion of the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archeological testing program the archeological consultant finds that significant archeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archeological testing, archeological monitoring, and/or an archeological data recovery program. No archeological data recovery shall be undertaken without the prior approval of the ERO or the Planning Department archeologist. If the ERO determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:</p> <p>a. The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or</p> <p>b. A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.</p>	<p>Project sponsor/archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.</p>	<p>After completion of the archeological testing program.</p>	<p>Archeological consultant shall submit a report of findings of the ATP to the ERO.</p>	<p>Date archeological findings report submitted to the ERO:</p>
				<p>ERO determination of significant archeological resource present? Y N</p>
				<p>Would resource be adversely affected? Y N</p>
				<p>Additional mitigation to be undertaken by project sponsor? Y N</p>

CASE NO. 2013.0342E
November 15, 2013

1995 EVANS AVENUE / SFPD FSD/TC
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Exhibit 2-3

Revised 10/5/12

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Responsibility for Implementation	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Schedule	Status/Date Completed
<p align="center">Adopted Mitigation Measures</p> <p><i>Archeological Monitoring Program.</i> If the ERO, in consultation with the archeological consultant, determines that an archeological monitoring program (AMP) shall be implemented, this AMP shall minimally include the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils-disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context; The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource; The archeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with project archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits; The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis; If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving activity 	<p>Project sponsor/ archeological consultant/ monitor/ contractor(s), at the direction of the ERO.</p>	<p>ERO and archeological consultant shall meet prior to commencement of soil-disturbing activities. If the ERO determines that an AMP is necessary, monitor throughout all soil-disturbing activities at the project site.</p>	<p>AMP required? Y N Date: _____ Date AMP submitted to the ERO: _____ Date AMP approved by the ERO: _____ Date AMP implementation complete: _____ Date written report regarding findings of the AMP received: _____</p>

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

(foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.

Whether or not significant archeological resources are encountered, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.

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

Archeological consultant at the direction of the ERO.	If there is a determination that an ADRP program is required.	Project sponsor/archeological consultant/monitor/contractor(s) shall prepare an ADRP if required by the ERO.	ADRP required? Y N Date: _____ Date of scoping meeting for ADRP: _____
			Date Draft ARDP submitted to the ERO: _____

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Schedule	Status/Date Completed
<p>The scope of the ARDP shall include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Field Methods and Procedures.</i> Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations. • <i>Cataloging and Laboratory Analysis.</i> Description of selected cataloging system and artifact analysis procedures. • <i>Discard and Deaccession Policy.</i> Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies. • <i>Interpretive Program.</i> Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archeological data recovery program. • <i>Security Measures.</i> Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities. • <i>Final Report.</i> Description of proposed report format and distribution of results. • <i>Curation.</i> Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities. 				Date ARDP approved by the ERO: _____
<p><i>Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.</i> The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines, Sec. 15064.5(d)).</p>	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant in consultation with the San Francisco Coroner, NAHC, and MLD.	Project sponsor/ archeological consultant to monitor (through-out all soil disturbing activities) for human remains and associated/unassociated funerary objects and, if found, contact the San Francisco Coroner, NAHC/MLD.	In the event human remains and/or funerary objects are found.	Human remains and associated/unassociated funerary objects found? Y N Date: _____

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

The agreement shall take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

Persons contacted: _____

Name: _____

Date: _____

Name: _____

Date: _____

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

Project sponsor/
archeological
consultant at the
direction of the
ERO.

After completion
of archeological
data recovery,
inventory,
analysis, and
interpretation.

Project sponsor/
archeological
consultant.

Following completion
of soil disturbing
activities at the site.
Considered complete
upon distribution of
the Final FARR.
Date Draft FARR
submitted to ERO: _____

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

Date FARR
approved by ERO: _____

Date of distribution
of Final FARR: _____

Date of submittal of
Final FARR to
information center: _____

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
Adopted Mitigation Measures			

AIR QUALITY

Mitigation Measure M- AQ-2 Construction Emissions Minimization Construction Emissions Minimization Plan. Prior to issuance of a construction permit, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (EMP) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The EMP shall detail project compliance with the following requirements:

1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall meet the following requirements:
 - a) Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited;
 - b) All off-road equipment shall have:
 - Engines that meet or exceed either United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 2 off-road emissions standards; and
 - Engines that are retrofitted with a CARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS).²

c) Exceptions:

- Exceptions to A(1)(a) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site and that the requirements of this exception provision apply. Under this circumstance, the sponsor shall submit documentation of compliance with A(1)(b) for onsite power generation.
- Exceptions to A(1)(b)(iii) may be granted if the project

Project Sponsor/contractor(s)
 Project sponsor/contractor(s) to submit EMP; ERO to approve EMP and ensure implementation.
 Prior to issuance of a permit specified in Section 106A.3.2.6 of the Francisco Building Code.
 Considered complete on finding by ERO that Plan is complete.
 Date EMP approved by the ERO:

² Equipment with engines meeting Tier 4 Interim or Tier 4 Final emission standards automatically meet this requirement; therefore, a VDECS would not be required.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Responsibility for Implementation	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Schedule	Status/Date Completed
---	--	----------	--------------------------

Adopted Mitigation Measures

sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that a particular piece of off-road equipment with a CARB Level 3 VDECS is: (1) technically not feasible; (2) would not produce desired emissions reductions due to expected operating modes; (3) installing the control device would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator; or (4) there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that are not retrofitted with a CARB Level 3 VDECS and the sponsor has submitted documentation to the ERO that requirements of this exception provision apply. If granted an exception to A(1)(b)(ii), the project sponsor must comply with the requirements of A(1)(c)(iii).

- If an exception is granted pursuant to A(1)(c)(ii), the project sponsor shall provide the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment as provided by the step down schedules shown in the table below.

OFF-ROAD EQUIPMENT COMPLIANCE STEP-DOWN SCHEDULE

Compliance Alternative	Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control
1	Tier 2	CARB Level 2 VDECS
2	Tier 2	CARB Level 1 VDECS
3	Tier 2	Alternative Fuel *

*Alternative fuels are not VDECS

HOW TO USE THIS TABLE:
If the requirements of (A)(1)(b) cannot be met, then the project sponsor would need to meet Compliance Alternative 1. Shall the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then Compliance Alternative 2 would need to be met. Shall the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 2, then Compliance Alternative 3 would need to be met.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/ Reporting Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
---	----------	--	--------------------------

Adopted Mitigation Measures

2. The project sponsor shall require the idling time for off-road and on-road equipment be limited to no more than *two minutes*, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment. Legible and visible signs shall be posted in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Chinese) in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the *two minute* idling limit.

3. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications.

4. The EMP shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation.
 For VDECS installed: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, CARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used

5. The EMP shall be kept on-site and available for review by any persons requesting it and a legible sign shall be posted at the perimeter of the construction site indicating to the public the basic requirements of the EMP and a way to request a copy of the Plan. The project sponsor shall provide copies of the EMP to members of the public as requested.

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p><i>Reporting.</i> Monthly reports shall be submitted to the ERO indicating the construction phase and off-road equipment used during each phase including information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include actual amounts of alternative fuel used.</p>	<p>Project Sponsor/ contractor(s)</p>	<p>Monthly during construction.</p>	<p>ERO to receive reports.</p>	<p>Considered complete on findings by ERO that Plan is being implemented.</p>
<p>Within six months of the completion of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities. The final report shall indicate the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase. For each phase, the report shall include detailed information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used.</p>	<p>Project Sponsor/ contractor(s)</p>	<p>Within six months of completion of construction activities.</p>	<p>ERO to receive reports.</p>	<p>Date report submitted to ERO:</p>
<p><i>Certification Statement and On-site Requirements.</i> Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project sponsor must certify (1) compliance with the Plan, and (2) all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into contract specifications.</p>	<p>Project Sponsor/ contractor(s)</p>	<p>Prior to construction activities requiring the use of off-road equipment</p>	<p>ERO to receive certification statement.</p>	<p>Considered complete on submittal of certification statement.</p> <p>Date certification statement submitted to ERO:</p>

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p><u>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4: Best Available Control Technology (BACT) for Diesel Generators</u></p>				
<p>All diesel generators shall have engines that: (1) meet Tier 4 Final or Tier 4 Interim emission standards, or (2) meet Tier 2 emission standards and are equipped with a California Air Resources Board (CARB) Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS).</p>	<p>Project Sponsor and contractor</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of any building permit.</p>	<p>Planning Department/ Department of Building Inspection (DBI)</p>	<p>Considered complete at completion of building construction.</p>
<p align="center">IMPROVEMENT MEASURES TRANSPORTATION</p>				
<p align="center"><u>Improvement Measure I-TR-1: Transportation Demand Management</u></p>				
<p>As an improvement measure to reduce the parking shortfall and encourage use of alternate modes, the project sponsor should develop and implement a Transportation Demand Management ("TDM") Plan designed to reduce use of single-occupant vehicles and to increase the use of rideshare, transit, bicycle, and walk modes for trips to and from the Proposed Project. The TDM plan should include such measures as the following to reduce single occupancy vehicles and encourage alternate modes of travel:</p>	<p>Project sponsor / San Francisco Police Department (SFPD)</p>	<p>After project construction.</p>	<p>SFPD; SFPD to provide contact name and number to Planning Department and San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency</p>	<p>Ongoing in compliance with adopted TDM Plan.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that bicycle safety strategies are developed along the Evans Avenue side of the property (e.g., avoiding conflicts with private cars accessing the parking garage on the east side of the property); • Facilitate access to the Evans Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street bike routes through on-site signage; • Require that the points of access to bicycle parking include signage indicating the location of these facilities; • Facilitate access to carshare spaces (on the first level of the parking deck) through on-site signage; • Require a TDM contact person who would be responsible for conducting employee surveys, coordinating carpool/ridematch services, and conducting annual TDM events; • Provide information to employees and visitors on transit options and locations where transit passes can be purchased; and • Require a transit pass subsidy for FSD and TC employees purchasing transit passes. 				

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
-----------------------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

Adopted Mitigation Measures

These measures would be in addition to those set of citywide commuter benefits provided to all City employees that allow them to reduce their monthly commuting expenses for transit, bicycling, vanpooling, and parking.

Improvement Measure I-TR-2: Construction Measures

The Department of Public Works (SFPDW) should require the following of the construction contractor:

- 1) Construction contractors should be prohibited from scheduling any truck trips, such as concrete mixers, heavy construction equipment, and materials delivery, etc., to the construction sites during the a.m. (7:00 to 9:00 a.m.) and p.m. (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.) peak commute periods.
- 2) All construction activities should adhere to the provisions in the City's Blue Book, including those addressing sidewalk and lane closures. To minimize construction impacts on nearby businesses and residents, the SFMTA should alert motorists, bicyclists, and nearby property owners of upcoming construction through its existing website and other available means, such as distribution of flyers, emails, and portable message or informational signs. Information provided should include contact name(s) for the SFMTA project manager, public information officer, and/or the SFMTA General Enforcement Division contact number (311).

- 3) Construction contractors should encourage construction workers to use carpooling and public transit to the construction site in order to minimize parking demand.

SFPDW and construction contractor.	During construction.	SFPDW to require construction contractor to follow construction measures to mitigate traffic.	During construction.
------------------------------------	----------------------	---	----------------------

MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Adopted Mitigation Measures	Responsibility for Implementation	Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Status/Date Completed
<p><u>Improvement Measure I-TR-3: Queue Abatement</u></p> <p>As an improvement measure to reduce the potential for queuing of vehicles accessing the project site, the SFPD should ensure that recurring vehicle queues do not occur on Evans Avenue or Toland Street adjacent to the site. A vehicle queue is defined as one or more vehicles (destined to the parking facility) blocking any portion of the Evans Avenue or Toland Street sidewalk or travel lanes on Evans Avenue or Toland Street travel lane for a consecutive period of three minutes or longer on a daily and/or weekly basis.</p> <p>If the Planning Director, or his or her designee, suspects that a recurring queue is present, the Planning Department should notify the SFPD in writing. Upon request, the SFPD should hire a qualified transportation consultant to evaluate the conditions at the site for no less than seven days. The consultant should prepare a monitoring report to be submitted to the Planning Department for review. If the Planning Department determines that a recurring queue does exist, the SFPD should abate the queue within 90 days from the date of the written determination.</p>	<p>Planning Department, SFPD, and project sponsor / consultant</p>	<p>Upon suspecting a recurring vehicle queue during project operation.</p>	<p>Planning Department to notify project sponsor / SFPD to prepare a monitoring report.</p>	<p>Ongoing following occupancy of facilities.</p> <p>Date monitoring report submitted to ERO:</p>

Wong, Linda (BOS)

From: Ngan, Sandy [Sandy.Ngan@sfdpw.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 10:19 AM
To: Wong, Linda (BOS); Young, Victor
Cc: Maglaque, Sheila B.; Higuera, Charles; Roux, Kenneth
Subject: RE: Mayor - Ordinance - Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response General Obligation Bond Election
Attachments: Agreement to Implement_BDC-PM13093011020.pdf

Linda and Victor,

Thanks for the meeting this morning. Per our discussion, attached is the Agreement to Implement (it has a signature) that should be kept in the same file as the MMRP for the Traffic Company & Forensics Services Division component of the ESER II Bond. With this, I believe we are good on the rest.

Please feel free to give me a call if you have any additional questions about the ESER 2014 Bond.

Thanks,

SANDY NGAN
REGULATORY AFFAIRS
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
INFRASTRUCTURE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION
30 Van Ness Ave., 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
T | (415) 558-4092
E | Sandy.Ngan@sfdpw.org

From: Filice, Frank
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2014 12:56 PM
To: Wong, Linda; Ngan, Sandy
Cc: Maglaque, Sheila B.; Higuera, Charles; Roux, Kenneth
Subject: FW: Mayor - Ordinance - Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response General Obligation Bond Election
Importance: High

Sandy please connect with Linda Wong at the Clerk of The Board office to review the Board legislation and point out how each of the attached documents fits into the bond legislation. Linda office is at room 244 City Hall. This is a straight forward exercise.

Frank V. Filice
Manager of Regulatory Affairs
San Francisco Department of Public Works
Infrastructure Design & Construction
30 Van Ness Ave 5th Floor
415.558.4011 (Phone)
415.558.4519 (fax)
frank.filice@sfdpw.org

From: Ryor, Magdalena
Sent: Friday, January 10, 2014 12:01 PM
To: Roux, Kenneth; Wong, Linda; Jones, Jermain; Young, Victor; Melissa.Whitehouse@sfgov.org
Cc: Higuera, Charles; Filice, Frank; Ngan, Sandy
Subject: Mayor - Ordinance - Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response General Obligation Bond Election
Importance: High

Dear All,

On behalf of Charles Higuera and Frank Filice, I am forwarding the following files, that were sent to me by Sandy Ngan, in response to your inquiry to receive documents referenced in the ESER 2014 Ordinance:

- GPR for ESER 2014 Bond Program;
- CEQA Clearance for ESER 2014 Bond Program;
- Class 32 Exemption – Medical Examiner’s Office (1 Newhall);
- Final MND - TC&FSD (1995 Evans);
- Final MMRP - TC&FSD (1995 Evans).

Please contact Frank Filice at 415-558-4011 with any questions you might have.

Best regards,

M. Magdalena Ryor, PhD, LEED AP BD+C, PMP, CCM

Project Manager
Department of Public Works
Building Design & Construction (BDC)
City and County of San Francisco
30 Van Ness, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 557-4659
magdalena.ryor@sfdpw.org
<http://www.sfdpw.org>



Join the Team. Keep SF Clean.

Take the Giant Sweep pledge:
<http://www.sfgiantsweep.org/>



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Agreement to Implement Mitigation Measures

Case No.: 2013.0342E
Project Title: 1995 Evans Avenue / San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) Forensic Service Division (FSD) & Traffic Company (TC)
Zoning: Industrial Use District PDR-2: Core Production, Distribution, and Repair – Bayview
80-E Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: Block 5231 / Lots 002B, 004, 005 and 006
Lot Size: 96,000 square feet
Project Sponsor: San Francisco Police Department
Contact: Magdalena Ryor, San Francisco Department of Public Works
Lead Agency: San Francisco Planning Department
Staff Contact: Elizabeth Purl- (415) 575-9028
elizabeth.purl@sfgov.org

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

MITIGATION MEASURES

The project sponsor has agreed to implement the following mitigation measures.

Mitigation Measure M-CP-2: Archeology Resources (Testing)

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

Consultation with Descendant Communities: On discovery of an archeological site¹ associated with descendant Native Americans, the Overseas Chinese, or other descendant group an appropriate representative of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to consult with ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated archeological site. A copy of the Final Archaeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group.

Archeological Testing Program: The archeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archeological testing plan (ATP). The archeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA.

At the completion of the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archeological testing program the archeological consultant finds that significant archeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archeological testing, archeological monitoring, and/or an archeological data recovery program. No archeological data recovery shall be undertaken without the prior approval of the ERO or the Planning Department archeologist. If the ERO determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:

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

Archeological Monitoring Program. If the ERO, in consultation with the archeological consultant, determines that an archeological monitoring program (AMP) shall be implemented, this AMP shall minimally include the following provisions:

- The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine

¹ The term "archeological site" is intended here to minimally include any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils-disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context;

- The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource;
- The archeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with project archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits;
- The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis;
- If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.

Whether or not significant archeological resources are encountered, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.

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

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

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

Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects. The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines. Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement shall take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

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

Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound, one unbound and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA.DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public

interest in or the high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2: Construction Emissions Minimization

Construction Emissions Minimization Plan. Prior to issuance of a construction permit, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (EMP) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The EMP shall detail project compliance with the following requirements:

1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall meet the following requirements:
 - a) Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited;
 - b) All off-road equipment shall have:
 - Engines that meet or exceed either United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 2 off-road emissions standards; and
 - Engines that are retrofitted with a CARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS).²
 - c) Exceptions:
 - Exceptions to A(1)(a) *may* be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site and that the requirements of this exception provision apply. Under this circumstance, the sponsor shall submit documentation of compliance with A(1)(b) for onsite power generation.
 - Exceptions to A(1)(b)(ii) *may* be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that a particular piece of off-road equipment with a CARB Level 3 VDECS is: (1) technically not feasible; (2) would not produce desired emissions reductions due to expected operating modes; (3) installing the control device would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator; or (4) there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that are not retrofitted with a CARB Level 3 VDECS and the sponsor has submitted documentation to the ERO that requirements of this exception provision apply. If granted an exception to A(1)(b)(ii), the project sponsor must comply with the requirements of A(1)(c)(iii).

² Equipment with engines meeting Tier 4 Interim or Tier 4 Final emission standards automatically meet this requirement; therefore, a VDECS would not be required.

- If an exception is granted pursuant to A(1)(c)(ii), the project sponsor shall provide the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment as provided by the step down schedules shown in the table below.

OFF-ROAD EQUIPMENT COMPLIANCE STEP-DOWN SCHEDULE

Compliance Alternative	Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control
1	Tier 2	CARB Level 2 VDECS
2	Tier 2	CARB Level 1 VDECS
3	Tier 2	Alternative Fuel *

*Alternative fuels are not VDECS

HOW TO USE THIS TABLE:

If the requirements of (A)(1)(b) cannot be met, then the project sponsor would need to meet Compliance Alternative 1. Shall the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then Compliance Alternative 2 would need to be met. Shall the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 2, then Compliance Alternative 3 would need to be met.

2. The project sponsor shall require the idling time for off-road and on-road equipment be limited to no more than *two minutes*, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment. Legible and visible signs shall be posted in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Chinese) in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the *two minute* idling limit.
3. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications.
4. The EMP shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation.

For VDECS installed: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, CARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used

5. The EMP shall be kept on-site and available for review by any persons requesting it and a legible sign shall be posted at the perimeter of the construction site indicating to the public the basic requirements of the EMP and a way to request a copy of the Plan. The project sponsor shall provide copies of the EMP to members of the public as requested.

Reporting. Monthly reports shall be submitted to the ERO indicating the construction phase and off-road equipment used during each phase including information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include actual amounts of alternative fuel used.

Within six months of completion of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit a final report summarizing construction activities to the ERO. The final report shall indicate the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase. For each phase, the report shall include detailed information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used.

Certification Statement and On-site Requirements. Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project sponsor must certify: (1) compliance with the EMP, and (2) that all applicable requirements of the EMP have been incorporated into contract specifications.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4: Best Available Control Technology (BACT) for Diesel Generators

All diesel generators shall have engines that: (1) meet Tier 4 Final or Tier 4 Interim emission standards, or (2) meet Tier 2 emission standards and are equipped with a California Air Resources Board (CARB) Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS).

IMPROVEMENT MEASURES

The project sponsor has agreed to implement the following improvement measures.

Improvement Measure I-TR-1: Transportation Demand Management

As an improvement measure to reduce the parking shortfall and encourage use of alternate modes, the project sponsor should develop and implement a Transportation Demand Management ("TDM") Plan designed to reduce use of single-occupant vehicles and to increase the use of rideshare, transit, bicycle, and walk modes for trips to and from the Proposed Project. The TDM plan should include such measures as the following to reduce single occupancy vehicles and encourage alternate modes of travel:

- Ensure that bicycle safety strategies are developed along the Evans Avenue side of the property (e.g., avoiding conflicts with private cars accessing the parking garage on the east side of the property);
- Facilitate access to the Evans Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street bike routes through on-site signage;
- Require that the points of access to bicycle parking include signage indicating the location of these facilities;
- Facilitate access to carshare spaces (on the first level of the parking deck) through on-site signage;

- Require a TDM contact person who would be responsible for conducting employee surveys, coordinating carpool/ridematch services, and conducting annual TDM events;
- Provide information to employees and visitors on transit options and locations where transit passes can be purchased; and
- Require a transit pass subsidy for FSD and TC employees purchasing transit passes.

These measures would be in addition to those set of citywide commuter benefits provided to all City employees that allow them to reduce their monthly commuting expenses for transit, bicycling, vanpooling, and parking.

Improvement Measure I-TR-2: Construction Measures

The Department of Public Works (SFDPW) should require the following of the construction contractor:

1. Construction contractors should be prohibited from scheduling any truck trips, such as concrete mixers, heavy construction equipment, and materials delivery, etc., to the construction sites during the a.m. (7:00 to 9:00 a.m.) and p.m. (4:00 to 6:00 p.m.) peak commute periods.
2. All construction activities should adhere to the provisions in the City's Blue Book, including those addressing sidewalk and lane closures. To minimize construction impacts on nearby businesses and residents, the SFMTA should alert motorists, bicyclists, and nearby property owners of upcoming construction through its existing website and other available means, such as distribution of flyers, emails, and portable message or informational signs. Information provided should include contact name(s) for the SFMTA project manager, public information officer, and/or the SFMTA General Enforcement Division contact number (311).
3. Construction contractors should encourage construction workers to use carpooling and public transit to the construction site in order to minimize parking demand.

Improvement Measure I-TR-3: Queue Abatement

As an improvement measure to reduce the potential for queuing of vehicles accessing the project site, the SFPD should ensure that recurring vehicle queues do not occur on Evans Avenue or Toland Street adjacent to the site. A vehicle queue is defined as one or more vehicles (destined to the parking facility) blocking any portion of the Evans Avenue or Toland Street sidewalk or travel lanes on Evans Avenue or Toland Street travel lane for a consecutive period of three minutes or longer on a daily and/or weekly basis.


If the Planning Director, or his or her designee, suspects that a recurring queue is present, the Planning Department should notify the SFPD in writing. Upon request, the SFPD should hire a qualified transportation consultant to evaluate the conditions at the site for no less than seven days. The consultant should prepare a monitoring report to be submitted to the Planning Department for review. If the Planning Department determines that a recurring

Agreement to Implement Mitigation Measures
September 27, 2013


2013.0342E
1995 Evans Avenue

queue does exist, the SFPD should abate the queue within 90 days from the date of the written determination.

I agree to implement the above mitigation measure(s) as a condition of project approval.



Property Owner or Legal Agent Signature



Date



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

General Plan Referral

Date: November 26, 2013

Case 2013.1597R
2014 Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond
(ESER)


Block/Lot No.: Bond would fund improvements to various locations.

Project Sponsor: Naomi Kelly
Office of the City Administrator
City Hall, Room 362
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Staff Contact: Kay Cheng– (415) 575-9094
kay.cheng@sfgov.org

Recommendation: Finding the proposed General Obligation Bond, on balance, is in conformity with the General Plan

**Recommended
By:**


John Rahaim, Director of Planning

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The City Administrator, on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco is proposing a \$400 million Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response (ESER) Bond for the June 2014 ballot. The purpose of the ESER 2014 Bond is to fund repairs and improvements that will allow San Francisco to more quickly and effectively respond to a major earthquake or other disaster. The ESER 2014 Bond program builds on the 2010 Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond that funded a wide range of projects.

The ESER 2014 Bond Program is made up of 5 components:

www.sfplanning.org

1. **Critical Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure:** seismic retrofit of 42 facilities throughout the city to be determined through consultation; no specific projects identified.
2. **Emergency Firefighting Water System:** construct additional cisterns, improve Emergency Firefighting Water system pipe and tunnel network; no specific projects identified.
3. **Police Facilities and Infrastructure:** address highest priority needs at its 9 district stations and related facilities ie, academy, stables and shooting range; no specific projects identified.
4. **Medical Examiner Facility:** major building alteration to reuse existing structure at 1 Newhall Street by adding second floor resulting in building total of 42,600 square feet, separate Categorical Exemption has been issued. (Case #2012.1172E)
5. **Traffic Company & Forensic Services Division:** relocate Traffic Company and Forensic Services Division (FSD) to single site at 1995 Evans, involves demolition of existing 4 structures at current 1995 Evans and construction of new 4-story 100,000 square foot building along with separate two-story 47,000 square foot parking structure. Draft mitigated Negative Declaration (Case #2013.0342E) has been prepared.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Not a project, per CEQA Guidelines Section 15378 (b)(4) - The creation of government funding mechanisms which do not involve any commitment to any specific project which may result in a potentially significant physical impact on the environment. (2013.1597R November 25, 2013)

GENERAL PLAN COMPLIANCE AND BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

Based on a review of the application, the Planning Department finds the proposed General Obligation Bond is consistent with the Eight Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 as described in the body of this Findings Letter and is, on balance, in-conformity with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan. *If the General Obligation Bond is approved, individual projects that receive Bond funding may require separate General Plan Referral(s) and other Planning Department authorizations and approvals.*

Note:

General Plan Objectives are shown in **BOLD UPPER CASE** font; Policies are in **Bold** font; staff comments are in *italic* font.

COMMUNITY SAFETY ELEMENT

OVERALL GOAL – The purpose of the Community Safety Element is to facilitate community resilience and reduce future loss of life, injuries, property loss, environmental damage, and social and economic disruption from natural or technological disasters.

OBJECTIVE 1

REDUCE STRUCTURAL AND NONSTRUCTURAL HAZARDS TO LIFE SAFETY AND MINIMIZE PROPERTY DAMAGE RESULTING FROM FUTURE DISASTERS.

POLICY 1.3

Assure that new construction meets current structural and life safety standards.

The proposed construction of new 4-story 100,000 square foot building along with separate two-story 47,000 square foot parking structure at 1995 Evans and all resulting new buildings should meet current structural and life safety standards.

POLICY 1.5

Support development and amendments to buildings code requirements that meet City seismic performance goals.

The Critical Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure Component of the 2014 ESER Bond proposes seismic retrofit of 42 facilities throughout the city to be determined through consultation.

POLICY 1.15

Abate structural and non-structural hazards in City-owned structures.

The proposed bond supports upgrading the City's aging infrastructure and enhance emergency response for the highest level of health, safety and welfare achievable for all San Franciscans

POLICY 1.16

Preserve, consistent with life safety considerations, the architectural character of buildings and structures important to the unique visual image of San Francisco, and increase the likelihood that architecturally and historically valuable structures will survive future earthquakes.

Older buildings are among those most vulnerable to destruction or heavy damage from a large earthquake. A major earthquake could result in an irreplaceable loss of the historic fabric of San Francisco. The City needs to achieve the related goals of increasing life safety and preserving these buildings for future generations by increasing their ability to withstand earthquake forces. When new programs are being considered to abate hazards posed by existing buildings and structures, the likely impacts of those programs on historic buildings must be thoroughly investigated. The resulting programs should encourage the retrofit of historic buildings in ways that preserve their architectural design character while increasing life safety.

Comment: If the proposed General Obligation Bond is approved, individual projects that receive funding to seismically strengthen or retrofit a landmark or building of historic significance should be incorporate measures to preserve existing historic design features and elements as well as to take measures to increase the building's chances of surviving future earthquakes.

POLICY 1.18

Identify and replace vulnerable infrastructure and critical service lifelines in high-risk areas.
The Critical Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure component of the bond proposes seismic retrofit of facilities to be determined through consultation.

POLICY 1.21

Ensure plans are in place to support populations most at risk during breaks in lifelines.
The proposed bond supports upgrading the City's aging infrastructure and enhance emergency response for the highest level of health, safety and welfare achievable for all San Franciscans

POLICY 1.25

Prepare for medical emergencies and pandemics
All of five components of the 2014 ESER Bond Program propose repairs and improvements that will allow San Francisco to more quickly and effectively respond to a major earthquake or other disaster.

OBJECTIVE 2

BE PREPARED FOR THE ONSET OF DISASTER BY PROVIDING PUBLIC EDUCATION AND TRAINING ABOUT EARTHQUAKES AND OTHER NATURAL AND MAN-MADE DISASTERS, BY READINGY THE CITY'S INFRASTRUCTURE, AND BY ENSURING THE NECESSARY COORDINATION IS IN PLACE FOR AREADY RESPONSE.

Most earthquake-related deaths and injuries will result from the failure of buildings and other structures as a result of shaking or ground failure. Damage to structures results in substantial economic losses and severe social, cultural and economic dislocations. In addition to the characteristics of the earthquake and of the site, a structure's performance will depend on structural type, materials, design, age and quality of construction and maintenance. The hazards posed by buildings and other structures can be reduced by assuring that new structures incorporate the latest engineering knowledge, by learning more about the risks posed by older structures and developing plans to reduce those risks, and by including a consideration of natural hazards in all land use, infrastructure, and public capital improvement planning.

Both technical and financial resources are needed to repair and retrofit City-owned structures. The City shall utilize its capabilities to assess hazards and to create and implement bond and other funding opportunity and to carry out retrofit projects. A number of City buildings have already been structurally upgraded utilizing bond financing.

POLICY 2.14

Support the Emergency Operations Center, and continue maintenance of alternative operations centers in the case of an emergency.

All of five components of the 2014 ESER Bond Program propose repairs and improvements that will allow San Francisco to more quickly and effectively respond to a major earthquake or other disaster.

POLICY 2.19

Seek funding for preparedness projects.

All of five components of the 2014 ESER Bond Program propose repairs and improvements that will allow San Francisco to more quickly and effectively respond to a major earthquake or other disaster.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ELEMENT - POLICE FACILITIES

OVERALL GOAL - The purpose of the Police Facilities Section of the Community Facilities Element is to establish objective, policies, and criteria, for meeting San Francisco's long-range police facility requirements. The objectives address broad goals as they relate to the distribution, location, design and use of police facilities.

OBJECTIVE 1

DISTRIBUTE, LOCATE, AND DESIGN POLICE FACILITIES IN A MANNER THAT WILL ENHANCE THE EFFECTIVE, EFFICIENT AND RESPONSIVE PERFORMANCE OF POLICE FUNCTIONS.

POLICY 1.2

Provide the number of district stations that balance service effectiveness with community desires for neighborhood police facilities.

The Police and Facilities and Infrastructure component of the ESER bond proposes to address highest priority needs at its 9 district stations and related facilities ie, academy, stables and shooting range.

POLICY 1.4

Distribute, locate, and design police support facilities so as to maximize their effectiveness, use, and accessibility for police personnel.

The Police and Facilities and Infrastructure component of the ESER bond proposes to address highest priority needs at its 9 district stations and related facilities ie, academy, stables and shooting range.

POLICY 1.6

Design facilities to allow for flexibility, future expansion, full operation in the event of a seismic emergency, and security and safety for personnel, while still maintaining an inviting appearance that is in scale with neighborhood development

The Police and Facilities and Infrastructure component of the ESER bond proposes to address highest priority needs at its 9 district stations and related facilities ie, academy, stables and shooting range.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ELEMENT - FIRE FACILITIES

The Fire Facilities Section of the Community Facilities Element is intended to serve as a guide to the greatest degree possible the following objective:

OBJECTIVE 5

DEVELOPMENT OF A SYSTEM OF FIREHOUSES WHICH WILL MEET THE OPERATING REQUIREMENTS OF THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IN PROVIDING FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES AND WHICH WILL BE IN HARMONY WITH RELATED PUBLIC SERVICE FACILITIES AND WITH ALL OTHER FEATURES AND FACILITIES OF LAND DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION PROVIDED FOR A OTHER SECTIONS OF THE GENERAL PLAN.

The Critical Firefighting Facilities and Infrastructure Component of the 2014 ESER Bond proposes seismic retrofit of 42 facilities throughout the city to be determined through consultation.

REQUIRED GENERAL PLAN REFERRAL SUBMITTALS FOR SPECIFIC PROJECTS

In the future, if the Bond is approved by the voters, individual projects that include the following elements should be referred to the Planning Department for General Plan conformity determination, pursuant to Section 4.105 of the Charter and Sections and 2A.53 of the Administrative Code:

- Demolition of buildings / structures
- Construction of new buildings / structures
- Additions to existing structures (enlargement)
- Relocation of structures and/or facilities
- Changes to land use, roads or park infrastructure
- Street vacations, widening, shortening, etc.
- Significant changes to park landscapes or land use within a park or public open space

PROPOSITION M FINDINGS – PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1

Planning Code Section 101.1 establishes Eight Priority Policies and requires review of discretionary approvals and permits for consistency with said policies. The Project, \$35 million of the \$195 million 2012 Neighborhood and Waterfront Park General Obligation Bond, proposed to be placed on the November 2010 ballot, is found to be consistent with the Eight Priority Policies as set forth in Planning Code Section 101.1 for the following reasons:

Eight Priority Policies Findings

The subject project is found to be consistent with the Eight Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 in that:

The proposed project is found to be consistent with the eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 in that:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced.

The Bond would have no adverse effect on neighborhood serving retail uses or opportunities for employment in or ownership of such businesses.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhood.

The Bond would have no adverse effect on the City's housing stock or on neighborhood character.

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced.

The Bond would have no adverse effect on the City's supply of affordable housing.

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.

The Bond would not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI's transit service, overburdening the streets or altering current neighborhood parking.

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for residential employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.

The Bond would not negatively affect the existing economic base in this area.

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

The Bond would not adversely affect achieving the greatest possible preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake. If approved, the proposed General Obligation Bond would provide a source of funds that would enable the City seismically upgrade the City's aging infrastructure and enhance emergency response and reduce the potential injuries that would likely be caused by earthquakes in the Bay region.

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

This Bond, if approved, would establish a government financing mechanism to seismically upgrade the City's aging infrastructure and enhance emergency response in the City. Specific projects are not identified in the proposed financing mechanism. If the General Obligation Bond is approved, landmarks or buildings of historic significance, and other individual structures proposed to receive funding may be required to receive separate General Plan referrals and/or other City authorization and approvals.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

The Bond would have no adverse effect on parks and open space or their access to sunlight and vistas.

<p>RECOMMENDATION: Finding the General Obligation Bond, on balance, in-conformity with the General Plan</p>
--

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



RECEIVED
OFFICE OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

DEC 10 PM 3:25

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: *me* Mayor Edwin M. Lee *je*
RE: Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response General Obligation Bond Election
DATE: December 10, 2013

Attached for introduction to the Board of Supervisors is the ordinance calling and providing for a special election to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, June 3, 2014, for the purpose of submitting to San Francisco voters a proposition to incur the following bonded debt of the City and County: \$400,000,000 to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement, and seismic retrofitting of Neighborhood Fire and Police Stations, the Emergency Firefighting Water System, seismically secure facilities for the Medical Examiner, the Police Department's Traffic Company, and the Police Department's Forensic Services Division, and other critical infrastructure and facilities for earthquake safety and related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes; authorizing landlords to pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax increase to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code; finding that the estimated cost of such proposed project is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy; reciting the estimated cost of such proposed project; fixing the date of election and the manner of holding such election and the procedure for voting for or against the proposition; fixing the maximum rate of interest on such bonds and providing for the levy and collection of taxes to pay both principal and interest; prescribing notice to be given of such election; finding that a portion of the proposed bond is not a project under CEQA and adopting findings under CEQA for the remaining portion of the proposed bond; finding that the proposed bond is in conformity with the priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1(b) and is consistent with the General Plan; consolidating the special election with the general election; establishing the election precincts, voting places and officers for the election; waiving the word limitation on ballot propositions imposed by Municipal Elections Code Section 510; complying with the restrictions on the use of bond proceeds specified in Section 53410 of the California Government Code; incorporating the provisions of the Administrative Code, Sections 5.30 – 5.36; and waiving the time requirements specified in Section 2.34 of the Administrative Code.

Please note this item is cosponsored by Supervisor Chiu.

I request that this item be calendared in Budget and Finance Committee on January 22nd, 2014.

Should you have any questions, please contact Jason Elliott (415) 554-5105.

*Received in Committee
1/22/14*

*Jul 4 13 11 90
12 11 89*


City and County of San Francisco Department of Public Works Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond 2014

Presented to the Board of Supervisors Budget & Finance Committee
January 22, 2014

Agenda

ESER 2014

- Neighborhood Fire Houses
- Police Stations and Infrastructure
- Medical Examiner Facility
- Motorcycle Police and Crime Lab
- Emergency Firefighting Water System



Department of Public Works

ESER 2014



- Neighborhood Fire Houses \$70-\$85M
- Police Stations and Infrastructure \$30M
- Medical Examiner Facility \$65M
- Motorcycle Police and Crime Lab \$165M
- Emergency Firefighting Water System \$70-\$55M

TOTAL \$400M



San Francisco
Water
Power
Sewer




Services of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

Department of Public Works

Background



- Recommended in City's 10-year Capital Plan
- Approved by Capital Planning Committee on December 9th
- Continuation of ESER General Obligation Bond Program
 - ESER 2010: \$412.3M
 - Public Safety Building (\$239M)
 - Neighborhood Fire Houses(\$72M)
 - Emergency Firefighting Water System (\$102M)
 - 81% of ESER 2010 proceeds has been expended to date
 - ESER 2021: ~\$219M



Department of Public Works

ESER 2014: Neighborhood Fire Houses



Scope

- ESER 2014 bond will be applied consistent with the designated Focused Scope, Comprehensive and Seismic/Replacement categories established in ESER 2010; i.e. highest priority projects for operational effectiveness; possible 50/50 split of bond funds between Focus Scope and Comprehensive, Seismic/Replacement

Total Project Budget Need

- \$277M - \$327M (*remaining need after ESER 2010*)

Funding Sources

- ESER 2014 bond - \$70 \$85M

Schedule




- Schedule will be developed to maintain SFFD service response levels and operational efficiency. Stations will remain open wherever feasible, and station closures will be carefully phased

Department of Public Works

ESEER 2014: Neighborhood Fire Houses



Fire Station ESEER 2010 Projects:

-  Station Complete
-  Some Work Complete
-  No Work To Date

ESER 2014: Police Stations and Infrastructure



Scope

- ESER2014 bond will be applied consistent with the designated *Focused Scope, Comprehensive and Seismic* categories established for the Neighborhood Fire Station in ESER2010, i.e. highest priority projects for operational effectiveness. Possible 50/50 split of bond funds between Focus and Comprehensive, Seismic/Replacement

Total Project Budget Need

- \$253M (rough order of magnitude) across all facilities

Funding Sources

- ESER2014 Bond - \$30M

Schedule

- Schedule will be developed to maintain SFPD service response levels and operational efficiency. Stations will remain open wherever feasible, and station closures will be carefully phased

Department of Public Works

ESER 2014: Police Stations and Infrastructure



Preliminary Facility Upgrade Designations:

Bayview:	Incremental
Central:	Replace
Ingleside:	Comprehensive
Mission:	Incremental
Northern:	Incremental
Park:	Comprehensive
Richmond:	Comprehensive
Taraval:	Incremental
Tenderloin:	Comprehensive
Police Academy:	Incremental
Golden Gate Park Stables:	Incremental
Lake Merced Range:	Incremental

Department of Public Works

ESER 2014: Medical Examiner Facility



Scope

- 42,575 ft² Replacement Facility at 1 Newhall St., India Basin

Total Project Budget

- \$65M - 1 Newhall St. alteration of existing building
- \$10.2M for Special Equipment (FF&E)

Pre-Development General Funding


- General Fund (Planning, Preliminary Design, Final Design): \$6.2M

Schedule

- Design/Pre-Construction start Winter 2013
- Trade Bids - Spring 2015
- Construction start Summer 2015
- Inauguration Winter 2016

Department of Public Works


ESER 2014: Medical Examiner Facility



PERSPECTIVE IMAGE A
Proposed Design Option

12/2012

Architectural Concept Illustration



Department of Public Works

ESER2014: Motorcycle Police and Crime Lab



Scope

- 105,000 ft² Replacement facility with 46,800 ft² Parking structure:

- 85,000 ft² FSD
- 20,000 ft² TC

Total Project Budget

- \$165M for 1995 Evans St. property acquisition and new building
- \$11.9M for Special Equipment (FF&E)

2608


Pre-Development General Funding

- General Fund (Planning, Test Fit, Preliminary Design): \$2.5M
- ### Schedule

- Design/Pre-Construction start Fall 2014
- Trades' Bidding start – Spring 2016
- Construction start Summer 2016
- **Inauguration Fall 2018**

Department of Public Works

ESER2014: Motorcycle Police and Crime Lab



Condens Planning

DPW / Bureau of Architecture
City & County of San Francisco

San Francisco Police Department Forensics Services Division

and Traffic Company

San Francisco, California

**Department of Public Works
ESER 2014: Emergency Firefighting Water
System Recommended Projects**



(millions)

Facilities (Twin Peaks Reservoir, Ashbury Heights Tank, Jones Street Tank, Pumping Stations 1 & 2)	\$20
Cisterns	\$25
Pipelines (including Potable Co- benefits)	\$25-\$10
Total	\$70 \$55

Department of Public Works
**ESER 2014: Emergency Firefighting Water
 System Recommended Future Projects**



AWSS	Facilities	Reliability Upgrades	
	Pipe Connections & Water Supply	Silver Avenue Connection	
		Twin Peaks Connection	
		University Mound Connection and Pump Station	
Potable Co-benefits	Cisterns	27 New	
	-	Sunset Main Replacement	
		Richmond Main Replacement	
		Hydrant Installation on WSIP-strengthened pipes	

Program completion year 2045 subject to available funding
Future projects to be funded subsequent to ESER 2010

AECOM/AGS CS-199 AWSS Facilities Preliminary Options Study

Department of Public Works

ESER2014: Emergency Firefighting Water System 30-Year Pipeline Replacement Plan




Replacement miles/yr.	Total General Obligation Bond Cost with \$137*
0.10	\$160
0.25	\$195
0.50	\$253
0.67	\$294
0.75	\$311

Equivalent to current potable pipeline @ 0.5%/yr. replacement rate

* Note: \$137M of combined AWSS and Potable Co-Benefits contribution, respectively 25% G.O. bond cost/75% revenue bond cost share

AECOM/AGS CS-199 AWSS Facilities Preliminary Options Study

Department of Public Works Existing and Future Emergency Firefighting Water System and all Future Emergency Firefighting Water System



Legend

- Existing AWSS
- WSIP Hardened Pipes
- Future AWSS Pipes
- Potable Co-Benefits
- Existing Cisterns
- 2010 Bond Cisterns
- Future AWSS Cisterns

AECOM/AGS CS-199 AWSS
Facilities Preliminary Options
Study

**Department of Public Works
Budget & Finance Committee**



1/22/14 Action:

Approval of the Earthquake Safety and Emergency
Response Bond - ESER 2014 - Ordinance and RPIN



Department of Public Works Conclusion - ESER 2014

Questions - Discussion




Services of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

San Francisco
Water
Power
Sewer

sfearthquakesafety.org

Department of Public Works

ESER 2014: Police Stations and Infrastructure



Blue Star icons represent station locations for each district