



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Final Mitigated Negative Declaration

PMND Date: May 11, 2011; as amended July 5, 2011
Case No.: 2009.1153E
Project Title: San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market Project
BPA Nos.: N/A
Zoning: PDR-2 (Core Production, Distribution, and Repair) Use District
65-J and 80-E Height and Bulk Districts
Assessor Block/Lot: 5262/004, 5268/007, 5268/010, 5268/011, 5269/002, 5269/007, 5269/008,
5269/009, 5281/003, 5281/005, 5282/031, 5282/033, 5284A/004, 5284A/005,
5284A/006, and 5285A/002
Lot Size: 572,515 square feet
Project Sponsor: City and County of San Francisco Market Corporation
Monica Melkesian and Michael Janis, (415) 550-4495
Lead Agency: San Francisco Planning Department
Staff Contact: Andrea Contreras – (415) 575-9044
Andrea.Contreras@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 project site is located in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood of San Francisco, in the area bounded by Caltrain right-of-way to the east, Innes Avenue to the northeast, Toland Street to the northwest, Kirkwood Avenue and Rankin Street to the southwest, and a San Francisco Water Department facility to the southeast. A small portion of the project site lies northwest of Toland Street. The proposed project is a phased development plan to expand the existing San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market ("Produce Market") on the site. The site is split into three subareas: the Main Site, the 901 Rankin Street site to the east, and the 2101 Jerrold Avenue site to the west. The maximum development scenario would demolish 12 of the 13 buildings currently located on the site and construct four new warehouse structures on the Main Site and one new warehouse structure on the 901 Rankin Street site. No alterations are proposed at the 2101 Jerrold Avenue site. All warehouses would have accessory office space. Two of the warehouse structures on the Main Site would have rooftop parking, and the warehouse structure on the 901 Rankin Street site would include a meeting hall/education center containing a demonstration kitchen. In addition, a small (approximately 3,961-square-foot) Operations Center would be constructed on the Main Site. There would be a total of 440 parking spaces and 186 loading spaces. The maximum development scenario would have a total building floor area of 525,855 square feet. The project sponsor proposes to reconfigure the roadways around the project site to improve site access and safety. This would entail redirecting Jerrold Avenue through-traffic around the Main Site onto Innes Avenue.

A less expensive project variant is also proposed. Under the variant, all structures on the project site would be demolished except the four warehouse buildings. The existing warehouse buildings would be renovated to upgrade their functionality. The installation would include seismic strengthening, access for disabled individuals, and new building systems. The building footprints and main roof lines would remain largely intact. The variant would also include the new warehouse on the 901 Rankin Street site, the Operations Center on the Main Site, and the same roadway modifications as under the proposed project. The variant would have a total building floor area of 377,711 square feet.

The proposed project and project variant would meet all applicable provisions of the *Planning Code* and would not require any variances or Conditional Use approvals. The project and variant would require a *General Plan* referral and Board of Supervisors approval for 1) the proposed street vacation and dedications, 2) the demolition and change in use of a City-owned building at the 901 Rankin Street site, and 3) a ground lease between the City and County of San Francisco and a new entity that would replace the City and County of San Francisco Market Corporation, for the Main Site, the 901 Rankin Street site, and the 2101 Jerrold Avenue site. The project and variant would require approval by the Department of Building Inspection for demolition and site/building permits, approval by the Bureau


of Streets and Mapping of the Department of Public Works for street and sidewalk permits and for curb and road modifications, and approval by the Municipal Transportation Agency for bus rerouting and any bus stop relocation.


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 188 to 199.

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


BILL WYCKO
Environmental Review Officer


Date of Adoption of Final Mitigated
Negative Declaration

cc: City and County of San Francisco Market Corporation, Project Sponsor
Julian Bañales, Current Planning, Southeast Quadrant Leader
Stephen Shotland, Long Range Planning
Supervisor Malia Cohen, District 10
Master Decision File/Bulletin Board
Distribution List

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
A. Project Description.....	1
B. Project Setting	38
C. Compatibility with Existing Zoning and Plans	42
San Francisco Planning Code	42
Required Approvals	44
Plans and Policies.....	45
D. Summary of Environmental Effects	46
E. Evaluation of Environmental Effects.....	47
1. Land Use and Land Use Planning	48
2. Aesthetics	51
3. Population and Housing	56
4. Cultural and Paleontological Resources	60
5. Transportation and Circulation.....	72
6. Noise	104
7. Air Quality	110
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	122
9. Wind and Shadow.....	136
10. Recreation.....	140
11. Utilities and Service Systems	142
12. Public Services	148
13. Biological Resources	150
14. Geology and Soils.....	154
15. Hydrology and Water Quality	161
16. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	166
17. Mineral and Energy Resources.....	183
18. Agriculture and Forest Resources.....	185
19. Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	187
F. Mitigation Measures and Improvement Measures	188
G. Public Notice and Comment	197
H. Determination.....	200
I. List of Preparers	201

List of Figures

	<i>Page</i>
Figure 1 Project Location	2
Figure 2 Project Lots.....	4
Figure 3 Existing Site Plan and Photo View Locations.....	7
Figure 4 Photos of Project Site.....	8
Figure 5 Photos of Project Site.....	9
Figure 6 Proposed Site Plan.....	13
Figure 7 Proposed Sample Floor Plans, Buildings 1 and 3.....	14
Figure 8 Proposed Sample Elevations and Sections, Buildings 1 and 3	15
Figure 9 Proposed Sample Floor Plans, Buildings 2 and 4.....	16
Figure 10 Proposed Sample Roof Plan, Buildings 2 and 4	17
Figure 11 Proposed Sample Elevations and Sections, Buildings 2 and 4	18
Figure 12 Proposed Site Plan and Section, Operations Center.....	19
Figure 13 First Floor Plan, 901 Rankin Street Building.....	20
Figure 14 Second Floor Plan, 901 Rankin Street Building	21
Figure 15 Section, 901 Rankin Street Building	22
Figure 16 Proposed Site Plan, Variant	28
Figure 17 Proposed Sample Floor Plans, Variant, Buildings K, L, M, N.....	28
Figure 18 Proposed Sample Elevations and Sections, Variant, Buildings K, L, M, N	30
Figure 19A Proposed Project Roadway Vacations.....	32
Figure 19B Proposed Project Roadway Dedications	33
Figure 20 Study Area and Analysis Locations.....	74
Figure 21 Existing Network and Stop Location.....	77

List of Tables

	<i>Page</i>
Table 1 Lot and Block Numbers and Sizes	3
Table 2 Existing Buildings on Project Site	4
Table 3 Project Characteristics.....	12
Table 4 Project Variant Characteristics	25
Table 5 Summary of Existing, Proposed, and Project Variant Characteristics	26
Table 6 San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market Expansion – Net New Uses	26
Table 7 Intersection Level of Service 2030 Weekday a.m. Peak Hour.....	86
Table 8 Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions	115
Table 9 Project Operational Emissions (lbs./day)	118
Table 10 GHG Reductions from the AB 32 Scoping Plan Sectors.....	124
Table 11 GHG Regulations Applicable to the Proposed Project	130

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INITIAL STUDY
SAN FRANCISCO WHOLESALE PRODUCE MARKET PROJECT
PLANNING DEPARTMENT CASE NO. 2009.1153E

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PROJECT SITE

The 572,515-square-foot (-sq.ft.) (13.14-acre) project site consists of three sub-areas, known as the Main Site, the 901 Rankin Street site, and the 2101 Jerrold Avenue site. The existing Main Site is occupied by the San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market ("Produce Market"), which is located on an approximately rectangular site bounded by Toland Street, Innes Avenue, Caltrain right-of-way, Jerrold Avenue, Rankin Street, and Kirkwood Avenue, in the Bayview Hunters Point area of San Francisco (see Figure 1, page 2). The Produce Market's functions are to warehouse and distribute wholesale produce from a number of produce vendors and growers in the region to grocers, restaurants, and individuals in San Francisco and the Bay Area. The Produce Market Main Site, which is centered on Jerrold Avenue, occupies 13 separate parcels containing a total of approximately 348,074 sq.ft., or 7.99 acres. The 901 Rankin Street site is an irregularly-shaped City-owned property located immediately east of the existing Produce Market Main Site, and bounded by Rankin Street, Jerrold Avenue, Caltrain right-of-way, and a San Francisco Water Department administrative building and storage yard. The 901 Rankin Street site consists of two parcels occupying a total of approximately 126,959 sq.ft., or 2.91 acres. The 2101 Jerrold Avenue site is a square parcel immediately west of the Main Site occupying approximately 97,482 sq.ft., or 2.24 acres. Table 1, page 3, lists the Assessor's Parcel Numbers and lot sizes within the project site, and Figure 2, page 4, shows the lots listed in Table 1.

The project site is located within a PDR-2 (Core Production, Distribution, and Repair) use district, the Main Site is located within an 80-E height and bulk district, and 901 Rankin Street is located within a 65-J height and bulk district. Table 2, page 4, describes existing uses on the project site, which include industrial, office, retail, and parking, as well as the height of the existing buildings.



Source: During Associates


6-24-11

Project Location Figure 1

Table 1 Block and Lot Numbers and Sizes		
Parcel Description/Bldg. on Parcel	Block/lot numbers	Area (sq.ft./acres)
<i>Main Site</i>		
Cash & Carry	5268/011	27,475/0.63
Produce Building	5284A/004	12,695/0.29
Lettuce Lane Parking	5284A/005	4,652/0.11
Building K	5284A/006	46,770/1.07
South Parking (along Selby)	5282/031	5,074/0.12
Building M	5282/033	66,543/1.53
Center strip east	5269/008	31,602/0.73
Center strip west	5268/010	26,183/0.60
Building L	5268/007	47,406/1.09
North Parking (along Selby)	5269/007	5,584/0.13
Building N	5269/002	55,978/1.29
Parking east	5262/004	7,287/0.17
Parking east	5269/009	10,825/0.25
Total area of Main Site		348,074/7.99
<i>901 Rankin Street site</i>		
901 Rankin Street Modular Bldg.	5281/003	38,807/0.89
901 Rankin Street Main Bldg.	5281/005	88,152/2.02
Total area of 901 Rankin Street site		126,959/2.91
<i>2101 Jerrold Avenue site</i>		
2101 Jerrold Avenue building and parking	5285A/002	97,482/2.24
Total area of 2101 Jerrold Avenue site		97,482/2.24
Total area of Project Site		572,515/13.14

Notes: All square footages are approximate and were obtained from a combination of existing sources. Square footage and acreage numbers are rounded. Public rights-of-way are not included above.

Source: Jackson Liles Architecture, 2010.



Source: Jackson Liles Architecture

7-5-11

Project Lots Figure 2

Table 2
Existing Buildings on Project Site

Building or Use	Building GSF	Parking GSF	Parking Spaces	Loading Spaces	Height (feet)	Height (stories)
Main Site						
Main Site Bldg. L Total	51,411	—	—	32	27.5	1 plus
Retail (café)	750	—	—	—	—	
Office	8,925	—	—	—	—	
Industrial	41,736	—	—	—	—	
Parking	—	18,483	60	—	—	
Main Site Bldg. N Total	61,477	—	—	39	27.5	1 plus
Office	10,759	—	—	—	—	
Industrial	50,718	—	—	—	—	
Parking	—	25,445	83	—	—	
Main Site Bldg. M Total	68,599	—	—	39	27.5	1 plus
Office	3,744	—	—	—	—	
Industrial	64,855	—	—	—	—	
Parking	—	19,960	73	—	—	
Main Site Bldg. K Total	50,957	—	—	32	27.5	1 plus
Office	8,935	—	—	—	—	
Industrial	42,022	—	—	—	—	
Parking	—	14,777	65	—	—	
Cash & Carry Bldg. Total	16,292	—	—	—	30	1
Industrial	16,292	—	—	—	—	
Parking	—	7,518	17	—	—	
Produce Bldg. Total	8,151	—	—	—	35	3
Retail (bank)	2,717	—	—	—	—	
Office	5,434	—	—	—	—	
Parking	—	10,444	22	—	—	
Carport Bldg. (Industrial) (assoc. with Produce Bldg.)	4,866	—	—	—	10	1
Dock #1 (Industrial)	2,711	—	—	—	24	1
Dock #2 (Industrial)	5,383	—	—	—	24	1
Dock #3 (Industrial)	5,342	—	—	—	24	1
Total Main Site	275,185	96,627	320	142	10-35	1 - 3
901 Rankin Street site						
901 Rankin Street Main Bldg. (Office/Service)	45,210	—	—	4	25	1
Parking	—	32,833	78	—	—	
901 Rankin Modular Bldg. (Office)	1,440	—	—	—	12	1
Total 901 Rankin Street site	46,650	32,833	78	4	12-25	1
2101 Jerrold Avenue site						
2101 Jerrold Avenue Building Total	51,050	—	—	22	40	1 plus
Office	7,310	—	—	—	—	—
Industrial	43,740	—	—	—	—	—
Parking	—	6,400	33	—	—	—
Total 2101 Jerrold Avenue site	51,050	6,400	33	22	40	1 plus
Total Project Site	372,889	135,860	431	168	10-40	1 - 3

Note: GSF = gross square feet. 1-plus-story heights refer to one-story buildings with mezzanines.


Source: Jackson Liles Architecture, 2011.

Figures 3 through 5, pages 7 to 9, present a map of the site and views of the site. The relatively flat project site sits at approximately ten feet above mean sea level (MSL).

The Main Site consists of four primary building locations or quadrants, as defined by the intersection of Jerrold Avenue and an elevated segment of Interstate 280 (I-280), which passes over the middle of the Main Site over Selby Street in the northeast-southwest direction (see Figure 3, page 7). Each of these four quadrants (referred to as Northwest, Northeast, Southeast, and Southwest) is currently occupied by an existing Produce Market warehouse, called Buildings L, N, M, and K, respectively. The northwest quadrant is also occupied by the Cash & Carry building, and the southwest quadrant is additionally occupied by the Produce Building, which contains the administrative offices associated with the Produce Market and also a bank. All four warehouses are 27.5 feet in height and are about 100 feet in width, except Building M, which extends to about 170 feet in width on the east side. The length of Buildings L, N, M, and K, is about 440 feet, 550 feet, 620 feet, and 440 feet, respectively. The square footage of the warehouses is 51,411, 61,477, 68,599, and 50,957, respectively. All four warehouses are similar in construction, with each consisting of a loading dock high concrete slab on grade industrial building with an office mezzanine. These buildings are constructed with structural steel frames and metal siding. Construction of the buildings on the Main Site took place in 1963.


The 901 Rankin Street subarea contains an irregularly-shaped 45,210-sq.ft. city government office building 25 feet in height. The main structure at this site is a series of pre-engineered rigid-frame buildings, clad in ribbed sheet metal, constructed from 1948 to 1952. The subarea also houses varying numbers of modular buildings containing government office uses, including the City and County of San Francisco Department of Technology and Municipal Transportation Agency offices. At the time of publication of this document there was one such structure on the site.

The 2101 Jerrold Avenue subarea contains a rectangular 40-foot-high, 51,050-square-foot warehouse approximately 320 feet in length and 160 feet in width. The square footage of the warehouse is 51,050. The warehouse is similar in construction to the warehouses on the Main Site, consisting of a loading dock-high concrete slab on grade industrial building with an office mezzanine. The building is constructed with a structural steel frame and metal siding. Construction of the building took place in 1963.




Source: Jackson Likes Architecture
7-5-11

Existing Site Plan and Photo View Locations Figure 3



A. View Looking East from Jerrold Avenue and Toland Street




B. View Looking East at Existing Building L

Source: Jackson Liles Architecture
12-22-10

Photos of Project Site Figure 4



A. View Looking West from Jerrold Avenue and Rankin Street



B. View of 901 Rankin Looking South from Jerrold Avenue and Rankin Street

Source: Jackson Liles Architecture

10-10-10

Photos of Project Site Figure 5

PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project is a phased development plan that would expand the existing San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market, encompassing five main building areas: the 901 Rankin Street site, and the four quadrants of the Main Site. No physical changes are proposed for the building on the 2101 Jerrold Avenue site. The phased development plan provides for a range of development intensity to allow the Produce Market to develop in response to market demand and financial considerations such as terms and availability of financing. For the purpose of environmental review, this Initial Study describes the maximum development scenario as the proposed project in order to provide an evaluation of the maximum physical change that could result from project implementation.

The maximum development scenario would demolish all of the buildings currently located on the Main Site and the 901 Rankin Street site. On the Main Site, new buildings at the approximate location of the existing warehouse structures would be constructed. The new buildings would be taller, at 44 and 45 feet, have a bigger footprint than the existing buildings, and would house warehouse and accessory office functions. The buildings, referred to as Buildings 1, 2, 3, and 4, would be located in the northeast, southeast, northwest, and southwest quadrants, respectively (see Figure 6). The square footage of each building is summarized by use in Table 3, page 12. The southeast and southwest building sites would contain approximately 147 unenclosed parking spaces on the roofs of the warehouse portions of the buildings, and may contain solar panels, although plans for solar panels have not yet been finalized. The proposed project would entail removal of the existing parking east of Toland Avenue and installation of a combination of parallel and perpendicular parking along Innes and Kirkwood Avenues, for a total of 23 to 43 net new on-street parking spaces. The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) will determine the final configuration of street parking.

The project would primarily increase the amount of industrial space for each of the four warehouses on the Main Site, from the existing range of approximately 42,000 to 65,000 sq.ft. to a proposed range of approximately 71,000 to 77,000 sq.ft per warehouse.¹ The industrial use associated with the docks, the carport building, and the Cash & Carry building (35,000 sq.ft.) would be eliminated. The project would also increase office space in each of the four warehouse

¹ For the purpose of this discussion, most square footages are rounded to the nearest 1,000 square feet.

buildings, from the current range of approximately 4,000 to 11,000 sq.ft. to a proposed range of approximately 13,000 to 15,000 sq.ft per building. The office use contained in the existing Produce Building (approximately 5,000 sq.ft.) would be relocated to the 901 Rankin Street site building as described below. The retail (bank) use within the Produce Building would be relocated to Building 4, and expanded from 2,715 sq.ft. to 3,250 sq.ft. In addition, an approximately 4,000-sq.ft. Operations Center would be constructed in the northeast quadrant of the Main Site, and would contain support and service uses, a break area for truck drivers, and a truck center for minor maintenance activities and truck washing.

The existing buildings at 901 Rankin Street would be demolished and a new approximately 110,000-sq.ft. warehouse building would be constructed in its place, with approximately 80,000 sq.ft. of warehouse space, an approximately 10,000-sq.ft. meeting hall/education center containing a demonstration kitchen, and about 20,000 sq.ft. of office space. The current buildings contain about 47,000 sq.ft. of offices associated with the City and County of San Francisco Department of Technology and Municipal Transportation Agency offices, which are in the process of relocating.

The headquarters for the Produce Market would be moved from the existing Produce Building on the southwest corner of the Main Site into the 901 Rankin building.

As noted above, no physical changes are proposed for the 2101 Jerrold Avenue site.

The total project area would be 525,855 sq.ft. (see Table 3, page 12). Figures 6 to 11, pages 13 to 18 illustrate the proposed warehouses on the Main Site. Figure 12, page 19, illustrates the proposed Operations Center. Figures 13 to 15, pages 20 to 22, illustrate the proposed building on the 901 Rankin Street site.

Text continues on page 23.


**Table 3
Project Characteristics**

Building or Use	Building GSF	Parking GSF	Parking Spaces	Loading Spaces	Height (feet)	Height (stories)
Main Site						
Main Site Bldg. 3 Total	89,829	–	–	40	45	1-plus
Retail (café)	750	–	–	–	–	
Office	13,647	–	–	–	–	
Industrial	75,432	–	–	–	–	
Parking	–	36,822	99	–	–	
Main Site Bldg. 1 Total	84,121	–	–	37	45	1-plus
Office	12,656	–	–	–	–	
Industrial	71,465	–	–	–	–	
Parking	–	36,507	98	–	–	
Main Site Bldg. 2 Total	91,222	–	–	40	44	1-plus
Office	14,407	–	–	–	–	
Industrial	76,815	–	–	–	–	
Parking	–	32,753	89	–	–	
Main Site Bldg. 4 Total	91,424	–	–	40	44	1-plus
Retail (bank)	3,250	–	–	–	–	
Office	14,666	–	–	–	–	
Industrial	73,508	–	–	–	–	
Parking	–	33,067	89	–	–	
Operations Center Total	3,961	–	–	–	16	1
Industrial	3,961	–	–	–	–	
Total Main Site	360,557	139,149	375	157	16-45	1 – 1 plus
901 Rankin Street site						
901 Rankin Street Bldg. Total	114,248	–	–	29	40.25	1-plus
Office	23,234	–	–	–	–	
Industrial	81,004	–	–	–	–	
Meeting Hall/Education Center/ Demonstration Kitchen	10,010	–	–	–	–	
Parking	–	23,441	65	–	–	
Total 901 Rankin Street site	114,248	23,441	65	29	40.25	1-plus
2101 Jerrold Avenue site						
2101 Jerrold Avenue Building Total	51,050	–	–	22	40	1 plus
Office	7,310	–	–	–	–	–
Industrial	43,740	–	–	–	–	–
Parking	–	6,400	33	–	–	–
Total 2101 Jerrold Avenue site	51,050	6,400	33	22	40	1 plus
Total Project Site	525,855	169,259	473	208	16-45	1 – 1 plus

Notes: GSF = gross square feet. Some of the square footage totals may not appear to add correctly due to rounding.

One-plus-story heights refer to one-story buildings with mezzanines.


Source: Jackson Liles Architecture, 2011.




Source: Jackson Liles Architecture
6/24/11

Proposed Site Plan Figure 6


Proposed Sample Floor Plans, Buildings 1 and 3 Figure 7



Source: Jackson Liles Architecture
1-4-11




South Elevation




West Elevation



East Elevation




Warehouse Section



Core Section

Source: Jackson Lee Architecture
5-4-11


Proposed Sample Elevations and Sections, Buildings 1 and 3 Figure 8



Source: Jackson Liles Architecture


1-4-11

Proposed Sample Floor Plans, Buildings 2 and 4 Figure 9




Source: Jackson Liles Architecture
1+11

Proposed Sample Roof Plan, Buildings 2 and 4 Figure 10




South Elevation




West Elevation



East Elevation



Warehouse Section




Core Section

RR = Restroom


Source: Jackson Liles Architecture

1-4-11

Proposed Sample Elevations and Sections, Buildings 2 and 4 Figure 11



Floor Plan




Section



Source: Jackson Liles Architecture

6-24-11


Proposed Site Plan and Section, Operations Center Figure 12



Source: Jackson Liles Architecture

10-8-10


First Floor Plan, 901 Rankin Street Building Figure 13



Source: Jackson Liles Architecture

1-4-11

Mezzanine Floor Plan, 901 Rankin Street Building Figure 14



Source: Jackson Liles Architecture
10-8-10

Section, 901 Rankin Street Building Figure 15

PROJECT VARIANT

The project sponsor is also considering a variant of the proposed project that would involve renovating the existing four warehouse buildings on the Main Site to upgrade their functionality. The renovation would include seismic strengthening, access for disabled individuals, and new building systems, and would increase the gross square footages of the buildings. The variant warehouses on the Main Site would largely retain the existing rooflines and building footprints. The gross square footages of the Main Site warehouses would increase from between approximately 51,000 to 69,000 sq.ft. per building to between approximately 57,000 to 79,000 sq.ft. per building.² Overall, the renovation of the four warehouses would increase the total industrial square footage at the Main Site from approximately 199,000 to 218,000 sq.ft., the office square footage from 32,000 to 38,000 sq.ft., and the retail square footage from 1,000 to 4,000 sq.ft. The project variant would not include the proposed project's rooftop parking or the potential solar panels on the buildings in the southeast and southwest quadrants. The project variant would retain the existing surface parking on the west side of the Main Site.

Other than the renovation of the warehouses and parking configuration at the Main Site, other aspects of the proposed project would be the same under the project variant. The project variant would involve demolishing the other structures on both the Main Site (the Cash & Carry Building, Produce Building, the Carport Building and Docks 1, 2, and 3) and the 901 Rankin Street site (the 901 Rankin Street Main Building and Modular Building). Under the project variant, no physical alternations to the 2101 Jerrold Avenue site would occur. The Produce Market administrative office use contained in the existing Produce Building (approximately 5,000 sq.ft.) would be relocated to the 901 Rankin Street site building described below. The retail (bank) use within the Produce Building would be relocated to Building 4, and expanded from 2,715 sq.ft. to 3,250 sq.ft. In addition, an approximately 4,000-sq.ft. Operations Center would be constructed in the northeast quadrant of the Main Site, and would contain small field offices, a break area for truck drivers, and a truck center for minor maintenance activities and truck washing.

The square footage of each building under the variant is detailed by use in Table 4. Table 5 summarizes the total square footage by use for the existing buildings on site, the proposed

² For the purpose of this discussion, most square footages are rounded to the nearest 1,000 square feet.

project, and the project variant. Table 6 indicates the net new square footage of the proposed project. Figures 16 to 18, pages 28 to 30, illustrate the Main Site warehouses of the project variant.

Text continues on page 31.

<p align="center">Table 4 Project Variant Characteristics</p>						
Building or Use	Building GSF	Parking GSF	Parking Spaces	Loading Spaces	Height (feet)	Height (stories)
Main Site						
Main Site Bldg. L Total	56,637	–	–	32	29	1-plus
Retail (café)	750	–	–	–	–	
Office	8,312	–	–	–	–	
Industrial	47,575	–	–	–	–	
Parking	–	16,910	54	39	29	1-plus
Main Site Bldg. N Total	67,553	–	–	–	–	
Office	10,033	–	–	–	–	
Industrial	57,520	–	–	–	–	
Parking	–	25,366	80	–	–	
Main Site Bldg. M Total	78,761	–	–	38	29	1-plus
Office	10,885	–	–	–	–	
Industrial	67,876	–	–	–	–	
Parking	–	19,411	65	–	–	
Main Site Bldg. K Total	56,601	–	–	32	29	1-plus
Retail (bank)	3,250	–	–	–	–	
Office	8,295	–	–	–	–	
Industrial	45,056	–	–	–	–	
Parking	–	12,941	43	–	–	
Operations Center	3,961	–	–	–	16	1
Industrial	3,961	–	–	–	–	
Office	–	–	–	–	–	–
Total Main Site	263,513	74,628	242	141	16-29	1 – 1 plus
901 Rankin Street site						
901 Rankin Street Bldg.	114,248	–	–	29	40.25	1-plus
Office	23,235	–	–	–	–	
Industrial	81,004	–	–	–	–	
Meeting Hall/Education Center/Demonstration Kitchen	10,009	–	–	–	–	
Parking	–	23,441	65	–	–	
Total 901 Rankin Street site	114,248	23,441	65	29	40.25	1-plus
2101 Jerrold Avenue site						
2101 Jerrold Avenue Building Total	51,050	–	–	22	40	1 plus
Office	7,310	–	–	–	–	–
Industrial	43,740	–	–	–	–	–
Parking	–	6,400	33	–	–	–
Total 2101 Jerrold Avenue site	51,050	6,400	33	22	40	1 plus
Total Project Site	428,811	104,469	340	192	16-40.25	1 – 1 plus

Notes: GSF = gross square feet. Some of the square footage totals may not appear to add correctly due to rounding.

One-plus-story heights refer to one-story buildings with mezzanines.

Source: Jackson Liles Architecture, June 2011.

Table 5 Summary of Existing, Proposed, and Project Variant Characteristics			
Use or Characteristic	Existing	Proposed	Project Variant
Retail GSF	3,467	4,000	4,000
Office GSF	50,150 ¹	85,920	68,070
Industrial GSF	322,875	425,925	346,732
Other – Meeting Hall	0	10,009	10,009
Total Building GSF	376,492	525,855	428,812
Loading GSF	114,091	139,801	128,754
Parking GSF	135,859	168,989	104,469
Parking Spaces	430	473	340
Loading Spaces	168	208	192
Number of Buildings	13	7	7
Building Heights/ Number of Stories	10-40'/1 – 3	16-45'/1 – 1 plus	16-40.25'/1 – 1 plus

Notes: GSF = gross square feet. Existing Use or Characteristic numbers include the modular building at the 901 Rankin Street site, and the carport and docks on the Main Site. One-plus-story heights refer to one-story buildings with mezzanines.

1. Includes 233,925 gsf at the Main Site, plus 46,650 at the 901 Rankin Street site and 7,310 at the 2101 Jerrold Avenue site.

Source: Jackson Liles Architecture, June 2011.

<p align="center">Table 6 San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market Expansion Net New Uses</p>			
Land Use Category	Approximate Gross Square Feet (gsf)		
	Existing Uses	Proposed Uses	Net New
PROPOSED PROJECT			
Industrial	322,875 ^[a]	425,925 ^[b]	103,050
Retail	3,467	4,000	533
Meeting Hall	0	10,010 ^[c]	10,010
General Office	50,150 ^[d]	85,920 ^[e]	35,770
TOTAL	376,492	525,855	149,363
PROJECT VARIANT			
Industrial	322,875 ^[a]	346,732 ^[b]	23,857
Retail	3,467	4,000	533
Meeting Hall	0	10,010 ^[c]	10,010
General Office	50,150 ^[d]	68,070 ^[f]	17,920
TOTAL	376,492	428,812	52,320

Notes:

a Includes 233,925 gsf at the Main Site, plus 46,650 gsf at 901 Rankin Street and 43,740 gsf at 2101 Jerrold Avenue.

b Includes Operations Center where SFWPM security personnel would be based.


c At 901 Rankin Street.

d Includes 37,797 gsf at the Main Site, plus 5,040 gsf at 901 Rankin Street and 7,310 gsf at 2101 Jerrold Avenue.

e Includes 55,375 gsf at the Main Site, plus 23,235 gsf at 901 Rankin Street and 7,310 gsf at 2101 Jerrold Avenue.


f Includes 37,525 at the Main Site, plus 23,235 gsf at 901 Rankin Street and 7,310 gsf at 2101 Jerrold Avenue.

Source: Jackson Liles Architecture – June 2011.




Source: Jackson Liles Architecture
6-24-11

Proposed Site Plan, Variant Figure 16



Mezzanine




First floor

Source: Jackson Liles Architecture
1.5.11

Proposed Sample Floor Plans, Variant Buildings K, L, M, N Figure 17




South Elevation




West Elevation



East Elevation



Warehouse Section



Core Section

Source: Jackson Liles Architecture


1-5-11

Proposed Sample Elevations and Sections, Variant Buildings K, L, M, N Figure 18

Roadways, Rights-of-Way, and Vehicular Circulation


In the current street configuration, Kirkwood and Innes Avenues are discontinuous in the project vicinity, and Produce Market operational traffic conflicts with public traffic travelling along Jerrold Avenue, particularly during morning commute hours. This is an unsafe condition for merchant employees, customers, and the general public alike. The conditions along Jerrold Avenue pose a challenge for Produce Market staff monitoring access to the site and controlling access to the products throughout the Produce Market facility. In addition, food safety regulations, handling procedures, and food security-related issues have changed since construction of the current facility in 1963, and regulations are expected to continue to evolve. To increase vehicular and pedestrian safety, improve site security, enable more operationally efficient utilization of the site, and provide a facility which can meet current and future government-regulated and private sector driven requirements, the project sponsor proposes to vacate Jerrold Avenue on the Main Site and reroute through-traffic around the Main Site on Innes and Kirkwood Avenues. Innes Avenue is envisioned as the primary route for through traffic. These proposed street improvements are intended to control access to the Produce Market, better facilitate the flow of traffic around the Produce Market, and improve the existing transportation network in the project area. The proposed alterations to rights-of-way in the vicinity of the project site are described below and illustrated in Figures 19A and B, pages 32 and 33.

- Vacate a portion of Kirkwood Avenue to the east of Rankin Street on the 901 Rankin Street site. The existing structures on the 901 Rankin Street site partially cover a portion of this existing right-of-way, which is not currently used for off-site vehicular traffic.
- Vacate the portion of Jerrold Avenue between Toland Street and Rankin Street. Vehicular traffic not related to the Produce Market would be rerouted to the north on an improved Innes Avenue. Produce Market traffic would also use an improved Kirkwood Avenue between Toland and Rankin Streets for local access.
- Lease the portion of Selby Street (underneath I-280) between Innes and Kirkwood Avenues.
- Vacate the Lettuce Lane and Milton I. Ross Lane rights-of-way, and a small portion of the Rankin Street right-of-way between Lots 2 and 9 on Assessor's Block 5269, which are internal to the existing Produce Market facility.
- Dedicate portions of the land occupied by the Produce Market facilities to create two new intersections at Toland/Innes and Toland/Kirkwood.



Source: Adavant Consulting
6/24/11

Proposed Project Roadway Vacations Figure 19A



Source: Adavant Consulting
6/24/11

No scale

Proposed Project Roadway Dedications Figure 19B

- Dedicate a portion of existing Produce Market facilities to become a portion of the Innes Avenue right-of-way, to allow the connection of Innes Avenue to Toland Street and remove the existing Innes Avenue dead end from the existing street grid.
- Dedicate a portion of existing Produce Market facilities to become a portion of the Kirkwood Avenue right-of-way, to allow the connection of Kirkwood Avenue to Toland Street and remove the existing Kirkwood Avenue dead end from the existing street grid.
- Relocate the portion of Rankin Street between Jerrold Avenue and Innes Avenue to parallel the existing and adjacent Caltrain right-of-way, and reconfigure the intersection of Jerrold Avenue and Rankin Street.

In addition to these physical changes, the project sponsor would meet with the SFMTA to determine whether the 23-Monterey bus line which currently traverses the project site along Jerrold Avenue could be rerouted as part of the proposed project and as proposed in Muni's Transit Effectiveness Project.

Project Variant

The project variant would require the same alterations to rights-of-way in the site vicinity as the proposed project, and the rerouting of the 23-Monterey bus line.

Other Project Characteristics

Similar to the existing conditions on the project site, the proposed project would cover almost all the site with impervious surfaces (buildings and paving). This project site is in a combined sewer area and has been determined to trigger compliance with the Stormwater Design Guidelines (SDG). As per the requirements of the SDG, this project must achieve LEED Sustainable Sites Credit 6.1, "Stormwater Design: Quantity Control." Therefore this project must implement a stormwater management approach that reduces existing stormwater runoff flow rate and volume by 25 percent for a two-year 24-hour design storm. The project would minimize disruption of natural hydrology by implementing Low Impact Design approaches such as reduced impervious cover, reuse of stormwater, or increased infiltration. In accordance with the Stormwater Management Ordinance (SMO), the project site will be designed with Low Impact Design (LID) approaches³ and stormwater management systems to comply with the

³ Low Impact Design (LID) - An LID approach uses stormwater management solutions that promote the use of ecological and landscape-based systems that mimic pre-development drainage patterns and hydrologic processes by increasing retention, detention, infiltration, and treatment of stormwater at its source.

SDGs). The proposed project would divert rainwater from the buildings and marshalling yard to a rainwater retention catchment where it would be retained for a period of time before discharge to the combined sewer system. Project landscaping would include upgraded streetscapes with street trees and green wall plantings, landscaping at any uncovered grade parking lots, and landscaping at rainwater catchment areas. The project sponsor would remove the 12 existing street trees during construction, which would be replaced following major construction as part of the proposed upgraded streetscapes noted above. Upgraded streetscapes would include improved pedestrian conditions, including new sidewalks and crosswalks.

The proposed buildings would have a contemporary, rectilinear design and be finished with modern materials, similar to the existing Produce Market warehouse at 2101 Jerrold Avenue, directly west of the Main Site.

The foundations of the buildings with rooftop parking under the proposed project, Buildings 2 and 4, would be driven pre-cast pre-stressed concrete piles with pile caps and grade beams. The grade beams would extend approximately two feet below existing grade, and the piles would extend approximately 60 feet below existing grade. The foundations of the other buildings would be spread footings, which would require excavation to a depth of approximately 1.5 to 2.5 feet below the existing ground surface. Excavation would be balanced by fill elsewhere on the project site, with little or no removal of soil from the site.

The construction cost for the proposed project would be approximately \$71,963,930. The project sponsor and developer is the City and County of San Francisco Market Corporation, and the project architect is Jackson Liles Architecture.

Project Variant

Like the proposed project, the project variant would cover almost all the site with impervious surfaces (buildings and paving) and divert rainwater to a rainwater catchment system. The variant also includes street trees, green wall plantings, and landscaping at uncovered parking lots and rainwater catchment areas. The project variant would also include removal of the 12 existing street trees, which would be replaced as part of the aforementioned street trees. The project variant would also include the same improved pedestrian conditions, including new sidewalks and crosswalks. The project variant would renovate the façades of the existing warehouse buildings in a similar fashion to the proposed project.

The foundations for all buildings under the project variant would be similar to the spread footings of Buildings 1 and 3 of the proposed project, requiring excavation to a depth of approximately 1.5 to 2.5 feet below the existing ground surface, and excavation would be balanced with fill elsewhere on the project site. Construction cost for the project variant would be an undetermined amount less than the proposed project.

Project Phasing

Phase I would consist of demolition of the existing structures on the 901 Rankin Street site and the construction of a new warehouse facility on that site. This would allow the project sponsor to meet demand for warehouse space at the Produce Market facility, and to provide space for existing operations to temporarily relocate during construction of subsequent phases of the development plan. Phase I includes all roadway improvements discussed above, which would also include demolition of the Cash & Carry Building, the Carport Building and the docks on the Main Site. Phase I would also include the proposed rerouting of 23-Monterey bus line. This phase is anticipated to have an approximately 18-month construction period, with construction to begin in spring 2012 and occupancy in fall 2013.

Phases II and III would involve construction and/or renovation on the Main Site. Each of these subsequent phases of the project would have an approximately two-year construction period. Phase II is anticipated to be developed between 2017 and 2020; and Phase III is anticipated to be developed between 2025 to 2028. After Phase I is completed, the level of financing made available by project operations would determine how much subsequent build-out would be pursued in Phase II, which would determine how much build-out would be pursued in Phase III. Therefore, depending on what combination of building approaches is ultimately constructed, the project's level of development could vary. For purposes of environmental analysis of the proposed phased development plan, this Initial Study assumes that the maximum build-out would occur under the proposed project. Under this scenario, Phase II would include demolition of the Produce Building and the two warehouses on the eastern half of the Main Site (Buildings N and M) and construction of Buildings 1 and 2, and the Operation Center. Phase III would include development on the western portion of the Main Site, that is demolition of Buildings L and K, and construction of Buildings 3 and 4. Landscaping would occur throughout all three phases.

Project Variant

The timing of and activities included in Phase I, which include development of the 901 Rankin Street site, the proposed roadway modifications, and smaller building demolitions, would be the same for both the proposed project and the project variant. The timing of Phases II and III would be the same as under the proposed project. The activities included in Phases II and III would depend on the financing made available by project operations after Phase I construction is completed. If the project variant is pursued, Phase II would involve demolition of the Produce Building and renovation of the warehouses on the eastern portion of the Main Site (Buildings N and M), and Phase III would involve renovation of the warehouses on the western portion of the Main Site (Buildings L and K). As with the proposed project, landscaping would occur throughout all three phases.

REQUIRED APPROVALS

The proposed project would meet all applicable provisions of the *Planning Code* and would not require any variances or Conditional Use approvals.

Construction of the project would require that the Planning Department find the following components conform to the *General Plan*, and to prepare *General Plan* referrals to this effect:⁴

- The proposed street vacation and dedications and sidewalk improvements (also requires Board of Supervisors approval).
- The remapping of the site—the project sponsor seeks to remap the existing real property at the time of the vacations to create one lot at the 901 Rankin Street site and two to four lots on the Main Site.
- The demolition of a City-owned building at the 901 Rankin Site and a change in use from public office and maintenance functions to an industrial warehouse at that site (also requires Board of Supervisors approval).
- A ground lease between the City and County of San Francisco and a new entity that would replace the City and County of San Francisco Market Corporation, for the Main Site, 901

⁴ The Planning Department is required to prepare written reports (known as *General Plan* referral reports) on conformity with the *General Plan*, for the use of the Board of Supervisors prior to its action on the acquisition, vacation, sale, change in use or title of public property, subdivision of land, construction or improvement of public buildings or structures, plans for public housing or public-assisted private housing, or redevelopment project plans, within the City and County (San Francisco Administrative Code, Article III, Section 2A.53(a).)

Rankin Street site, and the 2101 Jerrold Avenue site (also requires Board of Supervisors approval).

The proposed project would require:

- Approval by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) for meeting the requirements of the most recent version of the Stormwater Design Guidelines for projects with over 5,000 sq.ft. of disturbed ground area.
- Approval by the Department of Building Inspection for demolition and site/building permits.
- Approval by the Bureau of Streets and Mapping of the San Francisco Department of Public Works (SFDPW) for street and sidewalk permits.
- Approval by the SFMTA for curb or road modifications and bus stop or route modifications.

Project Variant

Like the proposed project, the project variant would meet all applicable provisions of the *Planning Code* and would not require any variances or Conditional Use approvals. The project variant would require the same *General Plan* referral from the Planning Department, and would require the same approvals as the proposed project.

B. PROJECT SETTING

The approximately 572,515-square-foot (13.14-acre) project site is located in the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood of San Francisco. The area surrounding the project site (Main Site and 901 Rankin Street site) is described below. Figures 3 through 5, pages 7 to 9, present a site map and views of the site.

The project site is located in an area of commercial and industrial uses; there are no residences near the project site. To the east of the project site, Caltrain railroad tracks run in a north-south direction along an elevated berm, with a bridge over Jerrold Avenue. Farther east, on the other side of the railroad berm, are an industrial building and parking area, an asphalt plant, and the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant (Southeast Plant). South of the 901 Rankin Street site is a one-story San Francisco Water Department administrative building and storage yard. Southwest of the Main Site on the opposite side of Kirkwood Avenue, are four large one-story

windowless industrial buildings (417, 418, 427, and 428 Kirkwood Avenue). Northwest of the Main Site and southwest of Jerrold Avenue, on the opposite side of Toland Street, is a paved parking lot and a one-story-with-mezzanine San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market warehouse at 2101 Jerrold Avenue. To the southwest of 2101 Jerrold Avenue on the northwest side of Toland Street are two two-story industrial buildings (600 and 700/740 Toland Street). Northwest of the project site and northeast of Jerrold Avenue, on the north corner of Jerrold Avenue and Toland Street, is the two-story Sugar Bowl Bakery and parking lot (480 Toland Street). Northeast of 480 Toland Street are two two-story industrial buildings (450 and 290-300 Toland Street). To the northeast of the Main Site is a two- to three-story industrial building (301 Toland Street) that extends from Toland Street to the I-280 alignment in the middle of the Main Site. Southeast of I-280 and northeast of the Main Site are three tall one-story industrial buildings (1970 and 1950 Innes Avenue). East of these buildings is the elevated railroad right-of-way mentioned above.

There are two new proposed projects within 0.5 mile from the proposed project:

- 2121 Evans Street: the addition of 215 parking spaces and approximately 14,000 sq.ft. of wholesale space to the existing approximately 61,000-sq.ft. wholesale Restaurant Depot, about 0.2 mile from the project site; and
- 3433 – 3rd Street building, an approximately 50,000 square-foot, 5-story union office building with ground-floor retail and 34 parking spaces about 0.5 mile from the project site.

The proposed project at 2121 Evans Street is currently under entitlement and environmental review at the Planning Department, and 3433 – 3rd Street is currently under environmental review at the Planning Department.

Jerrold Avenue passes through the middle of the Main Site in a northwest-southeast direction. Within the Main Site, the travel lanes of Jerrold Avenue are separated by a median that contains open dock structures, parking areas, and approximately 12 mature street trees. Jerrold Avenue provides the main northwest-southeast access to the project site, and Toland Street provides the main northeast-southwest access. Innes Avenue, Kirkwood Avenue, and Rankin Street are not continuous in the project vicinity; consequently, none are thoroughfares and are utilized mainly by local traffic. In the project vicinity, Jerrold Avenue is the only northwest-southeast street that crosses the Caltrain right-of-way between Evans Avenue to the north and Quint Street to the south. Cesar Chavez Street is located approximately 0.4 miles to the north, United States

Highway 101 (U.S. 101) is located approximately 0.4 miles to the west, and the interchange of I-280 and U.S. 101 is located approximately 0.6 miles to the southwest. An elevated segment of I-280 traverses the Main Site in a northeast-southwest direction, above the Selby Street right-of-way. To the north of the project site, the nearest I-280 access is from the Cesar Chavez Street on- and off-ramps. There is no access to I-280 between the project site and the interchange with United States Highway 101 (U.S. 101). The western terminus of the Islais Creek Channel (the nearest part of San Francisco Bay) is approximately 0.4 miles to the northeast.

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) operates several bus lines in the project vicinity (approximately a 0.25-mile radius), one of which, the 23-Monterey, passes through the project site on Jerrold Avenue, and adjacent to the site on Toland Street south of Jerrold Avenue. The 19-Polk passes along Evans Avenue, approximately 0.25 miles north of the project site, and the 24-Divisadero and 44-O'Shaughnessy pass along Palou Avenue approximately 0.25 miles south of the site. SFMTA also operates the T Muni streetcar line along Third Street; the nearest stations are Hudson/Innes and Kirkwood/LaSalle, both approximately 0.3 miles to the southeast. As mentioned above, the Caltrain line runs along the eastern boundary of the project site, but there are no stations near the project site.

The project vicinity is currently developed with commercial and industrial uses featuring a number of large warehouse type structures, along with some smaller non-residential buildings. Structures are one to three stories tall, and are usually set close to the sidewalk or offset by paved parking areas, with little or no landscaping, and are constructed with steel frames and metal siding, a style similar to the buildings on the project site. The larger warehouse type structures generally are windowless. The non-residential buildings of the project vicinity are characterized by mid-twentieth century utilitarian design, often with metal siding. Scattered trees in the vicinity include approximately 12 mature street trees in the medians on Jerrold Avenue, one tree at the Cash & Carry building, and four trees at the Produce Building.

The project site and vicinity are relatively flat and have a densely urbanized low-rise visual character. View corridors are limited to streets, from which the most prominent features are the elevated segment of I-280 (approximately 55 feet in height) that bisects the Main Site, and the hills west of U.S. 101 (Bernal Heights), east of Third Street, and south of Palou Avenue.

The project site is located within a Core Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR-2) use district as governed by Section 210.11 of the City of San Francisco *Planning Code*. The intent of the PDR-2 district is “to encourage the introduction, intensification, and protection of a wide range of light and contemporary industrial activities. Thus, this 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. The conservation of existing flexible industrial buildings is also encouraged. These districts permit certain non-industrial, non-residential uses, including small-scale retail and office, entertainment, certain institutions, and similar uses that would not create conflicts with the primary industrial uses or are compatible with the operational characteristics of businesses in the area. Light industrial uses in these districts may be conducted entirely within an enclosed structure, partly within enclosed structures, or some functions may occur entirely in open areas. These uses may require trucking activity multiple times per day, including trucks with up to 18 wheels or more, and occurring at any time of the day or night. As part of their daily operations, PDR activities in these areas may emit noises, vibrations, odors, and other emissions, as permitted by law. Within the requirements of local, state, and federal health and safety regulations, and within the stipulation of this code, which may impose additional use size maximums and minimum distance requirements on certain activities, raw materials used for production, manufacturing, repair, storage, research, and distribution may be stored on site and may include chemical, biological, and other hazardous, explosive, or flammable materials. In considering any new land use not contemplated in this District, the Zoning Administrator shall take into account the intent of this District as expressed in this Section and in the *General Plan*.”⁵ The area surrounding the project site is also zoned PDR-2. The project site is not located within a Community Plan Area.

The project site is located within the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area B. In May 2006, the Board of Supervisors amended the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan to include a majority of the Bayview Hunters Point community. This new area, referred to as “Area B,” is generally bounded by Cesar Chavez Street to the north, US Highway 101 to the west, San Mateo County to the south and the San Francisco Bay to the east. The goals of the Redevelopment Plan include creating new affordable and mixed-income housing, furthering

⁵ City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco *Planning Code*, Section 210.11, PDR-2 (Core Production, Distribution, and Repair) Districts. Available online at http://library2.municode.com/4201/home.htm?infobase=14139&doc_action=whatsnew, accessed April 6, 2010.

economic development, creating jobs, addressing environmental problems, providing open space, fostering cultural development, and improving the physical environment and transportation systems of the area.

The Main Site portion of the project site is located in the 80-E height and bulk district, and the 901 Rankin Street portion is located in the 65-J height and bulk district, which permit structures up to a height of 80 and 65 feet, respectively. In the E bulk district, the maximum length is 110 feet and the maximum diagonal dimension is 140 feet for the portion of buildings over 65 feet. In the J bulk district, the maximum length is 250 feet and the maximum diagonal dimension is 300 feet for the portion of buildings over 40 feet. The 65-J height and bulk district surrounds the project site in all directions except the northeast, which is in the 80-E height and bulk district.

C. COMPATIBILITY WITH EXISTING ZONING AND PLANS

	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 by reference the City's 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 conforms to the *Planning Code*, an exception is granted pursuant to provisions of the *Planning Code*, or a reclassification of the site occurs.

The project site is zoned PDR-2 (Core Production, Distribution, and Repair). The proposed warehouses with accessory office space, retail, and meeting hall/education center with demonstration kitchen, are principally permitted uses in a PDR-2 district (*Planning Code* Sections 218, 221, and 225). The proposed project would meet all applicable provisions of the *Planning Code* and would not require any variances or Conditional Use authorizations.

The PDR-2 district permits development at a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 5.0:1 in a 65 or 68 foot height district, and at higher FARs for taller height districts. The proposed project would have a maximum of 525,855 sq.ft. of space, on a site of approximately 572,515 sq.ft. in size. This would be well below the 5.0:1 FAR, which would allow up to 2,862,575 sq.ft. of space on site. Thus, the project would comply with the density controls of the *Planning Code*.

As noted in the previous section, the project site is within an 80-E height and bulk district, and a 65-J height and bulk district, which permit structures up to a height of 80 and 65 feet, respectively. The proposed project buildings would be a maximum of 42.67 feet in height and under the height limit, and would not exceed the maximum length and diagonal dimensions for both the J and E bulk districts.

Based on the *Planning Code* Section 152, three off-street loading spaces would be required for the first 100,000 gsf, plus one extra space for each additional 80,000 gsf, resulting in eight off-street freight loading spaces. The proposed project would meet the *Planning Code* requirements for off-street freight loading facilities by providing approximately 186 loading spaces at the Main Site and the 901 Rankin Street site, although the exact number is not known at this time. As noted above, no physical alterations are proposed for the 2101 Jerrold Avenue site; therefore, no additional loading spaces would be required for this subarea.

Based on *Planning Code* Section 151-the proposed project would be required to provide 237 parking spaces on the Main Site and 901 Rankin Street site, and 17 handicapped accessible parking spaces. On these two subareas, the project would include 440 parking spaces of which 18 would be handicapped accessible, and would thereby meet the code requirements. As noted above, no physical alterations are proposed for the 2101 Jerrold Avenue site; therefore, no additional parking spaces would be required for this subarea.

Project Variant

As noted above, the project site is zoned PDR-2. The project variant warehouses with accessory office space, retail, and meeting hall/education center with demonstration kitchen are principally permitted uses in a PDR-2 district. The project variant would meet all applicable provisions of the *Planning Code* and would not require any variances or Conditional Use authorizations.

As noted above, FAR for the site is permitted up to 5.0:1. The project variant would have a smaller FAR than the proposed project, which complies with the density controls of the *Planning Code*; therefore, the project variant would comply with the density controls of the *Planning Code*.

As noted above, the proposed project would not exceed the maximum height, length, or diagonal dimensions permitted in the 80-E and 65-J bulk districts. With smaller dimensions than the proposed project, the project variant would also conform to the height and bulk requirements of 80-E and 65-J districts.

Seven off-street loading spaces would be required for the Main Site and the 901 Rankin Street site under the project variant. The variant would provide approximately 170 loading spaces on these two subareas, thereby meeting the code-required number of off-street loading spaces. As noted above, no physical alterations are proposed for the 2101 Jerrold Avenue site; therefore, no additional loading spaces would be required for this subarea.

The project variant would be required to include a minimum of 189 off-street parking spaces for the project variant construction at the Main Site and the 901 Rankin Street site. The project variant would meet this requirement by providing 307 parking spaces at those sites. As noted above, no physical alterations are proposed for the 2101 Jerrold Avenue site; therefore, no additional parking spaces would be required for this subarea.

REQUIRED APPROVALS

As described on page 36, the proposed project would require Planning Department *General Plan* referrals (GPR) for the proposed street vacations and dedications, remapping of the site, new sidewalk improvements, and the change in use of the public 901 Rankin Street. A GPR is also required for the ground lease between the City and County of San Francisco and the new entity that would replace the City and County of San Francisco Market Corporation, for the Main Site, 901 Rankin Street site, and the 2101 Jerrold Avenue site. The ground lease and the street vacations and dedications would also require Board of Supervisors' approval, based upon the GPR findings. Remapping the project site would additionally require Zoning Administrator approval. The proposed project would require approval by the Department of Building Inspection for demolition and site/building permits; approval by the Bureau of Streets and

Mapping of the SFDPW for street and sidewalk permits, and approval by the SFMTA for curb or road modifications. The project sponsor would also meet with the SFMTA to determine whether the 23-Monterey bus line (which currently traverses the project site along Jerrold Avenue) could be rerouted as part of the proposed project.

Project Variant

The project variant would require the same *General Plan* referrals from the Planning Department, and would require all the same approvals as the proposed project

PLANS AND POLICIES

San Francisco General Plan

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 compatibility of the project and project variant with *General Plan* policies that do not relate to physical environmental issues will be considered by decision-makers as part of their decision whether to approve or disapprove the proposed project or project variant, and any potential conflicts identified as part of that process would not alter the physical environmental effects of the proposed project or project variant.

Proposition M

In November 1986, the voters of San Francisco approved Proposition M, the Accountable Planning Initiative, which added Section 101.1 to the City's *Planning Code* to establish eight Priority Policies. These policies, and the sections of this Environmental Evaluation addressing the environmental issues associated with the policies, are: (1) preservation and enhancement of neighborhood-serving retail uses; (2) protection of neighborhood character (Question 1c, Land Use); (3) preservation and enhancement of affordable housing (Question 3b, Population and Housing, with regard to housing supply and displacement issues); (4) discouragement of commuter automobiles (Questions 5a, b, f, and g, Transportation and Circulation); (5) protection of industrial and service land uses from commercial office development and enhancement of resident employment and business ownership (Question 1c, Land Use); (6) maximization of earthquake preparedness (Questions 13 a-d, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity); (7) landmark and

historic building preservation (Question 4a, Cultural Resources); and (8) protection of open space (Questions 8a and b, Wind and Shadow, and Questions 9a and c, Recreation and Public Space). Prior to issuing a permit for any project which requires an Initial Study under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion, or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the *General Plan*, the City is required to find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies. As noted above, the consistency of the proposed project with the environmental topics associated with the Priority Policies is discussed in the Evaluation of Environmental Effects, providing information for use in the case report for the proposed project. The case report and approval motions for the project will contain the Department's comprehensive project analysis and findings regarding consistency of the proposed project with the Priority Policies.

D. SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The proposed project and project variant 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 type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials |
| <input checked="" 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 |

This Initial Study examines the project to identify potential effects on the environment. On the basis of this study, project-specific effects that have been determined to be potentially significant include: cultural and paleontological resources, biological resources, and

hazards/hazardous materials. This Initial Study identifies mitigation measures which would reduce impacts to cultural and paleontological resources, biological resources, and hazards/hazardous materials to a less-than-significant level. In addition, although project-related transportation and circulation impacts would be less than significant, improvement measures are recommended to further reduce these impacts. These mitigation and improvement measures are discussed under relevant topical sections of the checklist.

Impacts of the project and project variant that have been determined to be less than significant include: land use; aesthetics; population and housing; transportation and circulation; noise; air quality; greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions; wind and shadow; recreation; utilities and service systems; public services; geology and soils; hydrology and water quality; mineral/energy resources; and agricultural and forest resources. Those issues are discussed below.

E. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

All items on the Initial Study Environmental Evaluation Checklist have been checked either "Not Applicable," "No Impact," "Less Than Significant," or "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated." These categories indicate that, upon evaluation, staff has determined that the proposed project and project variant could not have a significant adverse environmental effect in relation to these items. For Checklist items checked other than "Not Applicable," the Initial Study discusses that particular issue. For all of the items checked "Not Applicable," the conclusions regarding potential significant adverse environmental effects are based on field observation, staff and consultant experience and expertise on similar projects, and/or standard reference material available within the Planning Department, such as the Department's *Transportation Guidelines for Environmental Review*, or the California Natural Diversity Data Base and maps, published by the California Department of Fish and Game. For each Checklist item, the evaluation has considered both the individual and cumulative impacts of the proposed project and project variant.

The following evaluates the potential environmental effects resulting from proposed changes to the environment. The new ground lease proposed for the three subareas of the Produce Market would not result in any physical environmental effects. As noted, no physical alterations are proposed for the 2101 Jerrold Avenue site. Only the proposed physical changes to the project

site are evaluated in Section E. "Project site" hereafter refers to the Main Site and the 901 Rankin Street site, and "proposed project" hereafter refers only to those physical changes on the project site.

<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>
1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING— Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

Land use impacts of a proposed project are considered significant if the project would divide an established community; conflict with plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or have a substantial adverse impact upon the existing character of the vicinity.

The project site⁶ is located on an approximately rectangular site bounded by Innes Avenue on the north, Caltrain right-of-way to the east; a San Francisco Water Department administrative building and storage yard, Rankin Street, and Kirkwood Avenue to the south and Toland Street to the west, in the Bayview Hunters Point area of San Francisco (Rankin Street, Jerrold Avenue, Caltrain right-of-way, and Toland Street to the west. The project site is located within the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area B, Parcel 1. To the north lies the Potrero Hill neighborhood, with I-280 and Islas Creek channel to the east. The Bayview neighborhood extends to the south and to the west is US 101 and Bernal Heights, with the Mission neighborhood to the northwest of the project site.

⁶ As noted above, "project site" hereafter refers to the Main Site and the 901 Rankin Street site, and "proposed project" hereafter refers only to those physical changes on the project site.

The proposed project would demolish all of the 12 buildings currently located on the project site and construct four new warehouse structures on the Main Site and one new warehouse structure on the 901 Rankin Street site. The roadways around the project site would be reconfigured to improve site access and safety. This would entail redirecting Jerrold Avenue through-traffic around the Main Site onto Innes Avenue.

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

While the configuration of the streets in the project vicinity would be altered, this would not physically divide the arrangement of existing uses and activities that surround it. The proposed project's 20 to 42-foot, eight-inch-tall structures would be consistent with the surrounding area's one-to- three-story commercial and industrial buildings and the elevated two-level I-280, and the scale and massing of the proposed buildings would be similar to and consistent with that of the buildings in the immediate vicinity. While the proposed project would result in an increased amount of building area on the site, it would not physically divide an established community. Thus, the proposed project would not cause a significant adverse land use impact due division of an established community, and this impact would be *less than significant*.

Impact LU-2: The proposed project would be consistent with any applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations 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. (Less than Significant)

As discussed in Section C, Compatibility with Existing Zoning and Plans, page 28, the project would be consistent with most applicable policies, plans, and code requirements as they relate to environmental effects. Land use plans and policies are those which directly address physical environmental issues and/or contain targets or standards which must be met in order to preserve or improve characteristics of San Francisco's physical environment. The proposed project would not obviously or substantially conflict with any such adopted environmental plan

or policy. Therefore, the proposed project's potential to conflict with a plan or policy adopted for the purpose of mitigating an environmental effect, would be *less than significant*.

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

The proposed project would be compatible with the dense, urban, commercial, and industrial character of the project vicinity. The project would replace existing office/retail and industrial buildings with larger buildings containing warehouse with accessory office space, retail space, and a meeting hall/education center containing a demonstration kitchen, along with parking and loading areas. Warehouse, accessory office, and retail uses are already present in the project vicinity, and the proposed meeting hall would not be substantially different from existing uses or introduce substantial land use conflicts. Although the project would intensify use of the project site with expanded buildings and increased operations, it would be compatible with the existing commercial and industrial character of the project vicinity, and the size, character, and uses of existing structures in the area. The proposed building height in the context of the surrounding development is discussed further under the topic of Aesthetics, beginning on page 51. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a substantial effect to the land use character of the area; the proposed project's impact on land use character would be considered *less than significant*.

Impact LU-4: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would result in less-than-significant cumulative land use impacts. (Less than Significant)

Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with the proposed projects at 2121 Evans and 3433 Third Streets, as discussed in "Project Setting," page 38,⁷ would further increase retail and PDR development around the western Bayview Hunters Point industrial area. The planned additional retail, office, and PDR buildings in the project vicinity would not

⁷ The proposed project at 2121 Evans Street is currently under entitlement and environmental review at the Planning Department, and 3433 – 3rd Street is currently under environmental review at the Planning Department.

substantially and adversely alter the prevailing mix of land uses that is dominated by PDR and retail/wholesale development. The proposed project, in combination with cumulative development, would have a less-than-significant impact.

For the reasons stated above, the land use impacts of the proposed project and project variant, both project-specific and cumulative, would be *less than significant*.

Impact LU-5: The project variant would result in less-than-significant project-specific and cumulative land use impacts. (Less than Significant)

The project variant would involve the same uses and the same 901 Rankin Street site building as the proposed project. Unlike the proposed project, it would renovate the existing warehouses, and would result in approximately 17,851 sq.ft. less office space and 79,243 sq.ft. less industrial space. Therefore, land use impacts associated with development of the project variant would be similar to or less than those of the proposed project, and would also be considered *less than significant*.

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
2. AESTHETICS—Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

A visual quality analysis is somewhat subjective and considers the project design in relation to the surrounding visual character, heights and building types of surrounding uses, its potential to obstruct views or vistas, and its potential for light and glare. The proposed project's specific

design would be considered to have a significant adverse environmental effect on visual quality only if it would cause a substantial and demonstrable negative change in the visual character or quality of the area.

Impact AE-1: The proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse impact on scenic views and vistas. (Less than Significant)

The relatively flat topography of the project area and surrounding urban development limit public views of other parts of the city from the project site. There are no scenic vistas from the project site or the immediate surrounding area, nor is the project site visible from any nearby open spaces (Selby and Palou Mini Park, approximately 0.25 miles south from the project site). Portions of the hills west of U.S. 101 (Bernal Heights), east of Third Street, and south of Palou Avenue are visible along the corridors of local streets including Jerrold Avenue, Toland Street, and Rankin Street. Street-level views to the east from the site are screened by the elevated Caltrain right-of-way, and street-level views to the west from the 901 Rankin Street site and the eastern half of the Main Site are partially screened by the elevated two-level I-280. The project generally would be constructed within the existing street pattern. While the configuration of the streets on the site and nearby would be altered, neither this reconfiguration nor the proposed building expansions would be expected to substantially degrade or obstruct any public scenic views or vistas; therefore, impacts to scenic vistas would be *less than significant*.

There are no residences in the vicinity of the project site from which views would be affected by the proposed project. Views from non-residential buildings to the east of the project site are currently screened by the elevated Caltrain right-of-way and I-280 and would not be substantially affected by the project. Because the commercial warehouse buildings to the southwest of the site are windowless, views from these buildings would not be affected. Views from the commercial buildings on the northwest side of Toland Street, and to the northeast of the site, are currently screened by the existing buildings on the project site and the elevated Caltrain right-of-way, and would not be substantially affected. The proposed project would not substantially change views of the existing skyline because existing buildings, the elevated Caltrain right-of-way, and I-280 already screen most of the field of view that would be occupied by the proposed project. Nevertheless, the project may result in some reduced private views

from non-residential buildings, which would be an undesirable change for those individuals whose views would be blocked by the proposed buildings. However, reductions or alterations of private views that would be created by this project are typical in a developed urban setting. For these reasons, the incremental change in visual setting would be considered *less-than-significant*.

Impact AE-2: The proposed project would not substantially damage any scenic resources. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would not damage any public scenic resources, except street trees, or other features that contribute to a scenic public setting because there are no such resources within view of the public right-of-way on the project site. There are approximately 12 mature (20 to 30 feet in height) street trees in the medians on Jerrold Avenue, along with one tree at the Cash & Carry building and four trees at the Produce Building which would be removed as part of the project. The proposed project would replace the street trees subject to San Francisco's Urban Forestry Ordinance, *Public Works Code* section 801 et seq. Thus, impact on scenic resources would be considered *less than significant*.

Impact AE-3: The proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. (Less than Significant)

The project vicinity is occupied by low-rise commercial and industrial buildings (one to three stories). Buildings with a mid-twentieth century utilitarian design predominate, and most are rectilinear in character. Structures are usually set close to the sidewalk or offset by paved parking areas, with little or no landscaping. There are approximately 12 mature street trees in the medians on Jerrold Avenue, along with one tree at the Cash & Carry building and four trees and a small amount of landscaping at the Produce Building, which would be removed and replaced with new street trees. The proposed buildings would have a contemporary, rectilinear design and be finished with modern materials, similar to the existing Produce Market warehouse at 2101 Jerrold Avenue, directly west of the Main Site, and not part of the project site. Project landscaping would include upgraded streetscapes with street trees and green wall plantings, landscaping at any uncovered grade parking lots, and landscaping at rainwater

catchment areas. The proposed project is consistent with the rectilinear lines of the simple commercial styles common in the project vicinity. The proposed project would not be particularly prominent or aesthetically inconsistent with the visual character of the existing neighborhood.

The project would change the visual character of the project site, by replacing the site's existing industrial, office, and retail buildings ranging in height from ten to 35 feet, with industrial, office, retail, and meeting hall buildings with heights up to 42 feet, eight inches. The proposed buildings would be visible along the adjacent segments of Jerrold Avenue, Toland Street, Kirkwood Avenue, Innes Avenue, and Rankin Street, and would present form and massing similar to the large warehouses immediately southwest and northeast of the project site. The proposed buildings would be among the tallest buildings in the project vicinity, but would be lower than the elevated I-280, and would be within the height limits established by the height and bulk districts. Intervening buildings would screen most views of the project at other street-level vantage points, including public sidewalks. While intensifying the use on the project site, the proposed project would not add a new or visually inconsistent presence to the area. When considered together with the established style of mid-twentieth century buildings in the area, the project would contribute to a visual environment that would remain consistent with the existing mixed commercial and industrial urban setting of the area.

For all of the above reasons, the proposed project would not be expected to cause a substantial and demonstrable negative change, or disrupt the existing visual character of the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project's environmental effect on aesthetics and urban design would be *less than significant*.

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

The project site is currently occupied by industrial, office, and retail buildings. The proposed project would construct industrial, office, retail, and meeting hall buildings up to three stories and 42 feet, eight inches in height. Two of the warehouse buildings may include rooftop parking, and all of the project buildings would have outdoor security lighting. Lighting visible

from exterior vantage points also would include interior lighting of the retail and office spaces of the project buildings. The project's exterior lighting would be consistent with exterior lighting typical of other commercial and industrial buildings in the project vicinity. Exterior lighting fixtures, including those of the rooftop parking, if any, would be directed downward to minimize visible light and glare on and off the project site, including light and glare that would be visible to drivers on the elevated I-280 that crosses the project site. The project would comply with Planning Commission Resolution 9212, which prohibits the use of mirrored or reflective glass. Mirrored glass would not be used in the new buildings. For these reasons, the proposed project would not generate obtrusive light or glare that would substantially impact other properties. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact on light and glare.

Impact AE-5: The proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development in the project vicinity, would result in less-than-significant impacts to aesthetic resources. (Less than Significant)

As stated, the proposed project would have no impact on scenic resources. Therefore, it would not make a substantial contribution to cumulative impacts to scenic resources. Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with the proposed projects at 2121 Evans and 3433 Third Streets,⁸ would result in a change to the visual character of the project site vicinity. However, this change would not result in a negative impact to existing visual character that would be considered adverse. Rather, it would continue the trend of increased retail and PDR development in the area. From long-range views, the project would appear similar or smaller than the number of existing or planned buildings and would not significantly affect views. Therefore, the proposed project would have *less than significant* cumulative aesthetic impacts.

Impact AE-6: The project variant would result in less-than-significant project-specific and cumulative aesthetics impacts. (Less than Significant)

⁸ The proposed project at 2121 Evans Street is currently under entitlement and environmental review at the Planning Department, and 3433 – 3rd Street is currently under environmental review at the Planning Department.

The project variant would involve the same design at the 901 Rankin Street site as the proposed project. Unlike the proposed project, it would renovate the existing warehouses, largely retaining the existing roofline and building footprint. Building materials, architectural treatment, and lighting for the project variant would be similar to the proposed project. Changes in existing views with development of the project variant from surrounding streets and from more distant locations would be similar to or less substantial than those with the proposed project. The warehouses on the Main Site in the variant would be lower than the proposed project, and less noticeable from Innes and Kirkwood Avenues. Overall, the project variant's aesthetic effects would be the same or less substantial than the proposed project. Overall, the project variant would have *less-than-significant* impacts related to aesthetics.

Based on the above analysis and discussion, neither the proposed project nor project variant would result in substantial, adverse effects on visual quality or aesthetics, and their aesthetic impact, both project-specific and cumulative, would be *less than significant*.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, 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 that might not occur if the project were not approved and implemented.

The project site, which consists of the Main Site and the 901 Rankin Street site, currently has a total of 763 employees, of which 565 are employed by Produce Market and Produce Market merchants, and 198 are employed by businesses or government departments not related to Produce Market, such as the San Francisco Department of Technology and Municipal Transportation Agency offices at 901 Rankin Street.⁹ The 198 employees at 901 Rankin and other non Produce Market employees would be relocated to other location(s) in San Francisco. The proposed project would result in an increase in business activity and employment on the site. The Produce Market anticipates that there would be an increase of approximately 349 new employees at full build-out for a total of 914 employees. Thus, there would be a net increase of 151 employees on the site, compared to existing conditions.

San Francisco's employment was projected to be 593,370 in 2010, an increase of about seven percent from the 2005 level of 553,090.¹⁰ The 198 unrelated-entity employees that would be relocated would not be new to San Francisco, and it is anticipated that most or all of the existing 565 Produce Market-related employees would remain at the proposed project. Even if all the 349 additional employees associated with the proposed project were conservatively estimated to be new to San Francisco, this increase would represent about 0.87 percent of the City's estimated employment growth between 2005 and 2010. This potential increase in employment would not be considered significant in the context of total employment in greater San Francisco. This small employment increase also would not generate a substantial demand for additional housing in the context of citywide employment growth. Visitors to the site would increase in direct proportion to the increase in project employment. Construction of the project would be phased in such a manner that there would be no temporary displacement of Produce Market employees.

The proposed new buildings would be infill development consisting of warehouses with accessory office space, retail, and a meeting hall with a demonstration kitchen. The proposed buildings, which would replace existing warehouse, office, and retail buildings, would be

⁹ Brian Liles, Jackson Liles Architecture, San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market Retention and Expansion Project, Employment Summary by Phase with Total, May 18, 2010. This document is on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2009.1153E.

¹⁰ *Projection 2009 -- Building Momentum: Projections and Priorities 2009*.
<http://store.abag.ca.gov/projections.asp#pro09>, accessed May 4, 2011.

located in an urbanized area and would not be expected to substantially alter existing development patterns in the Bayview Hunter's Point area or in San Francisco as a whole. The proposed project would be within the density controls of the *Planning Code*. The growth associated with the proposed project is anticipated in the General Plan, and the proposed project would not induce substantial growth or an unsupported concentration of people in the Bayview Hunter's Point area on an individual or cumulative level. Therefore, the proposed project is within the *Planning Code* and zoning parameters controlling development and associated employment growth on the project site.

Overall, the increase in housing and employment would be less than significant in relation to the expected increases in the population and employment of San Francisco. The project would not directly or indirectly result in a significant increase in population. Therefore, project-related and cumulative impacts with respect to population growth would be *less than significant*.

Impact PH-2: The proposed project would not displace housing units, create a demand for additional housing, or displace a substantial number of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. (Less than Significant)

There are no dwelling units or residents on the project site, and the proposed project would not displace any dwelling units or residents or construct any new dwelling units. Therefore, the project would have no impact on San Francisco's existing housing stock or residents. The project would not be subject to the City's Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program (*Planning Code*, Sections 415 et seq.), and would not alter the existing citywide shortfall in affordable housing. Thus, the proposed project impact on residential displacement would be *less than significant*.

The increase of 349 employees over the approximately 15-year phased development would likely not create a noticeable demand for new housing in the City, primarily due to the fact that project employees come from San Francisco and other parts of the Bay Area, and the supply of housing over that period would accommodate any demand.

Impact PH-3: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development in the project vicinity, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts on population and housing. (Less than Significant)

Although the proposed project would increase the daytime population of the site compared to existing conditions, this increase would not be considered substantial, for the reasons discussed above. As also discussed above, the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing units. Cumulative development in the project vicinity would be primarily retail as described in "Project Setting," page 38. Similarly, the proposed cumulative retail and PDR development (separate from the proposed project) would not displace substantial numbers of people or housing units. This cumulative development could increase housing demand in the greater San Francisco area, but not greater than anticipated supply. Therefore the proposed project's cumulative impacts on population and housing would be *less than significant*.

Impact PH-4: The project variant would result in less-than-significant project-specific and cumulative population and housing impact. (Less than Significant)

The project variant would result in approximately 17,851 sq.ft. less office space and 79,243 sq.ft. less industrial space than the proposed project; therefore, it would generate less employment and have a lower population increase on site than the proposed project analyzed above. Population impacts associated with development of the project variant would be similar to or less than those of the proposed project, and would also be considered *less than significant*.

Based on the above analysis, the proposed project or project variant would have *less-than-significant* project-specific and cumulative physical environmental effects on housing demand or population growth.

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 archaeological 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact CP-1: The proposed project would not result in a significant impact to historic architectural resources. (No Impact)

Historical resources are those properties 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, 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, which are not listed but are otherwise determined to be historically significant, based on substantial evidence, would also be considered a historical resource.

An independent consultant prepared an Historical Resource Evaluation (HRE), which evaluated the 12 existing structures on the project site (identified in the project description Table 2, pages 11 and 12) for potential historical significance, the results of which are summarized below in this section.¹¹

¹¹ Kelley & VerPlanck, *Historical Resource Evaluation, San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market*, May 2010. This document is on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2009.1153E.

The Produce Market project site was originally part of the tidal marshland of Islais Creek. Prior to the 1920's, Islais Creek drained an area of San Francisco stretching from Twin Peaks and Glen Park to the Alemany Gap before flowing into San Francisco Bay. In 1925, State legislation enabled the creation of the Islais Reclamation District. This public works project infilled tidal marshlands and created much of the current-day industrial area between Bayshore Boulevard and Third Street, south of Cesar Chavez Avenue.. The earliest recorded construction date in the area bounded by Bayshore Boulevard to the west, César Chavez Street and Evans Avenue to the north, Third Street to the east, and Oakdale Avenue to the south, is 1890 (1917 Oakdale Avenue). About ten percent of industrial construction in the area predates the 1925 Reclamation Project, with another ten percent taking place between 1925 and 1940. Fifteen percent of buildings were constructed in the 1940s, close to twenty percent were constructed in the 1950s, twenty-five percent were constructed in the 1960s, and the remaining twenty percent have construction dates after 1970. A Lowes home improvement store opened in November 2010 at 491 Bayshore Boulevard, approximately one-half mile southwest of the project site.

Buildings K, L, M, and N, the main warehouses of the existing Produce Market, are related historically, architecturally and functionally. The four buildings were constructed in 1963 and intended for the Produce Market. In addition the three docks (staging pavilions), share those associations. Each of the main warehouse buildings are rectangular plan light steel frame 27.5-foot high structures on a concrete pad foundation. They are clad in corrugated steel, with shallow shed roofs. Each has a mezzanine level projecting over a continuous concrete loading platform, punctuated by nineteen paired metal sash sliding windows. Beneath the overhang, the primary elevations are punctuated by a series of large openings hung with rollup metal doors. The rear elevations of the warehouses abut the rights of way of Innes and Kirkwood Avenues, respectively, and have abandoned railroad spur tracks running along them. Designed originally as railcar receiving platforms, they feature a series of loading dock openings and the level of the foundation pad, all hung with rollup metal doors. End elevations are featureless.

There are some minor differences in the configuration of the four main buildings. A small extension at right angles to the building projects towards the Jerrold right of way at the east end of the southeast warehouse, and the southeast corner of that building is raised to accommodate clearance for a disused railroad siding turning from Rankin Street into Kirkwood Avenue. In

addition, small sections of the otherwise flush rear elevations on three buildings are recessed to create sheltered spaces at loading dock level.

The two staging pavilions between Selby and Toland streets have open end elevations, while the single pavilion east of Selby Street is closed on four sides with loading dock overhead doors in the end elevations.

Situated at the southeast corner of Toland Street and Jerrold Avenue, the Produce Building, constructed in 1963, is 35 feet tall with a flat roof, rectangular in plan, of reinforced concrete, with concrete block corner piers and unit-and-mullion curtain walls. The primary elevation facing Toland Street features a central double door entrance to a branch bank. There are fifteen narrow bays, fully glazed on the ground floor, with aluminum sash sliding window units, transoms and opaque spandrel panels on the second and third stories. The secondary Jerrold elevation features a recessed central entrance to the stair and elevator lobby accessing the office spaces on the second and third floors. A cantilevered metal canopy shelters the entrance. The five narrow bays contain aluminum window units identical to those on the primary elevation. The eastern elevation faces on narrow Lettuce Lane. Here, the first story is blind concrete block, while the upper stories repeat the fenestration of the Jerrold elevation. The south elevation faces a surface parking lot. It is utilitarian in design, with central exterior fire escape stairs recessed between the corner piers. To the east of the Produce Building between Lettuce Lane and Milton I. Ross lane is a 24-space carport constructed with corrugated metal.

The Cash & Carry building, constructed in 1981, is another light steel frame tall one-story warehouse building, rectangular in plan, clad in corrugated steel, with a flat roof on the northeast corner of Toland and Jerrold. This building sits on a grade level concrete slab with surface parking in front, and has five vehicular entrances on the Toland elevation all with metal rollup doors, as well as a solid metal door at each end of the elevation. The rear elevation facing east is on Milton I. Ross Lane. Here there is one vehicular entrance near Jerrold, two more at the opposite end, and two solid metal pedestrian doors between. The end elevations have no windows, doors or openings.

901 Rankin is located on the east side of Rankin Street between Kirkwood and McKinnon avenues. Constructed between 1948 and 1952, it is a light industrial building composed of six one-story front gabled volumes, all of light steel frame construction clad in steel stamped in a

vertical board and batten pattern. The building was constructed as a Butler Building, a pre-engineered rigid-frame building-type common in the 1940s for utilitarian and military uses, similar to the Quonset hut. The parcel is trapezoidal in shape, with its east side canted, and the northern two volumes of the building are shorter on their long axis than the others to conform with that shape. These two and another similar but flat roofed building at the rear enclose a paved open court. There is another cross gabled building at the rear of the fourth and fifth main volumes from the left. On the Rankin elevation, the third and fifth volumes have vehicular entrances with metal rollup doors, while the first and fourth have pedestrian entrances and all have multi-lite metal sash windows.

As noted, Buildings K, L, M, and N, the main warehouses, constitute the heart of the Produce Market and are related historically, architecturally, and functionally. The HRE evaluates the four warehouse buildings and the three dock units, the “core buildings.” The Produce Building, though related to the main complex historically, is not as closely related as the seven core buildings. The Cash & Carry warehouse is related to the core buildings architecturally, but not historically. 901 Rankin Street is unrelated historically and has only a general architectural relationship to the core structures. Because of these relationships, the Produce Building, Cash & Carry warehouse, and 901 Rankin are considered separately. All buildings were evaluated to determine if any are eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, either individually or as a contributor to a historic district.

In order to be eligible for listing a building must be demonstrated to be significant under one or more of the following criteria: *Criterion 1 (Event)*, Resources that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States; *Criterion 2 (Person)*; Resources that are associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history; *Criterion 3 (Architecture)*; Resources that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values; *Criterion 4 (Information Potential)*; Resources or sites that have yielded or have the potential to yield information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation. In addition to its basic eligibility, the property must generally be at least 50 years old and must retain historical integrity.

The HRE concludes that the subject buildings on the project site are not historic resources themselves, stating that the buildings are not eligible for inclusion in the California Register individually, or as contributors to a potential historic district (no potential historic district was identified). The HRE notes that although the Produce Market buildings are associated with the historic events of the relocation of the Produce Market, no specific individuals can be identified and no scholarly perspective has emerged on their importance. The HRE concludes that the existing buildings are typical and utilitarian in design, and that the building designs are common and are not significant examples of their type. The most important character defining-feature of the Produce Market is the overall plan of the present complex. Although no historical resources would be affected by a replacement building, the HRE states that the neighborhood does possess a degree of visual unity that should be respected by any replacement buildings.

The HRE also evaluated the potential for the proposed project to have an adverse effect on offsite historical resources (namely adjacent historic properties). No adjacent historical resources exist, so the project would not have an adverse effect on offsite historic resources or a potential historic district.

The buildings on the project site were determined ineligible for inclusion in the California Register of historic places, determined not to be historic resources or contributors to a potential historic district, and the proposed project's design was determined not to have an impact on offsite historic resources. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* on architectural historic resources or potential historic resources.

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)

The project site is underlain by up to about 19 feet of heterogeneous fill consisting of stiff to very stiff clay with varying amounts of silt, sand, and gravel, and loose to medium-dense sand and gravel with varying amounts of clay and silt.¹² The fill, which was likely placed on the site

¹² Treadwell & Rollo, *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market Redevelopment Project, San Francisco, California*, November 16, 2009. This document is on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2009.1153E.

after the 1906 San Francisco Earthquake and Fire, is underlain by up to about 24 feet of weak, compressible marine clay, locally known as Bay Mud. The Bay Mud is underlain by medium-dense to very dense sand and clayey sand, and medium-stiff to very stiff clay and sandy clay to depths of at least 100 feet below ground surface (bgs). The proposed project would require minor excavation to a depth of approximately 1.5 to 2.5 feet for the foundation, and piles would extend to approximately 60 feet below existing grade. Excavation would be balanced by fill elsewhere on the project site, with little or no removal of soil from the site. The amount of excavation is limited and the site is underlain by fill. Nearby prehistoric archeological sites have revealed shellmidden deposits and shellmounds, and an archeological testing program for the project is recommended.¹³ Soil disturbance resulting from the proposed project is not expected to affect archaeological resources. However, it is possible that undiscovered subsurface archaeological resources at the site could be disturbed by project construction and/or pile driving, which would be a *potentially significant* impact. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-CP-2**, below, would reduce project impacts on archaeological resources to a *less-than-significant* level.

Mitigation Measure M-CP-2

Archeological Resources

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 archeological consultant from a pool of qualified archaeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist. 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

¹³ MEA Preliminary Archaeological Review: Checklist. *SF Wholesale Produce Market: Retention and Expansion*. March 4, 2010. This document is on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2009.1153E.

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).

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. 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 shall be implemented the archeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:

- The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the 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, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

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

Human Remains 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) (*Public Resources 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 should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

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 Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department

shall receive three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest 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 result in damage to, or destruction of, as-yet unknown paleontological resources, should such remains exist beneath the project site. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Paleontology is a multidisciplinary science that combines elements of geology, biology, chemistry, and physics in an effort to understand the history of life on earth. Paleontological resources, or fossils, are the remains, imprints, or traces of once-living organisms preserved in rocks and sediments. Paleontological resources include vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant fossils or the trace or imprint of such fossils. The fossil record is the only evidence that life on earth has existed for more than 3.6 billion years. Fossils are considered non-renewable resources because the organisms from which they derive no longer exist. Thus, once destroyed, a fossil can never 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 likely not be present. Lithological units which may be fossiliferous include sedimentary and volcanic formations. The project would result in soils disturbance to a depth of approximately 2.5 to 3.5 feet for the foundation, and piles would extend to approximately 60 feet below existing grade. The amount of excavation for foundations is limited, and the fill at the site is not conducive to deposition and preservation of fossils. However, pile driving could disturb the sedimentary soils below the fill, resulting in *potentially significant* impact. Mitigation Measure M-CP-3, below, addresses the possibility of inadvertent discovery of paleontological resources. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-CP-3**, potential impacts to paleontological resources would be reduced to a *less-than-significant* level.

Mitigation Measure M-CP-3

Paleontological Resources

In the event that any project soils-disturbing activities encounter evidence of a potential paleontological resource (fossilized vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant remains or the trace or imprint of such remains), the project sponsor shall contact the ERO and a qualified paleontologist¹⁴ to undertake an appropriate assessment of the discovery and, if warranted, further field evaluation, data recovery, documentation, recordation, and curation in accordance with the *Standard Guidelines for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Nonrenewable Paleontological Resources* of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP).

Impact CP-4: The proposed project would potentially result in damage to, or destruction of, as-yet unknown human remains that exist beneath the project site. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

There is no record of the site being used as a burial ground nor have any human remains been identified below the surface of the project site. However, human remains have been discovered in San Francisco, and the excavation for the proposed project may inadvertently affect as-yet unknown human remains on the project site, resulting in a *potentially significant* impact. **Mitigation Measure M-CP-2** above addresses the issue of discovery of human remains. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-CP-2**, no significant physical environmental effects on human remains would be reduced to a *less-than-significant* level.

Impact CP-5: The proposed project would not result in damage to, or destruction of, unique geological features. (No Impact)

The project site does not contain any geologic features; therefore the proposed project would have *no impact* on any geologic features.

¹⁴ Qualified Paleontologist – a paleontologist meeting the professional qualifications standards of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology.

Impact CP-6: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts to cultural resources. (Less than Significant)

Given that the buildings on the Produce Market site are not considered historical resources for purposes of CEQA, the proposed project would not considerably contribute to a cumulative impact to historic architectural resources. In addition, as stated above, there are no known paleontological resources at the project site, and the underlying fill is not of the type that would typically contain paleontological resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not considerably contribute to any cumulative impact to paleontological resources. Cumulative development in the project vicinity described in the "Project Setting" that could potentially impact archaeological resources would be required to implement mitigation measures similar to those of the proposed project, reducing their project-specific impacts to less-than-significant levels. In combination with the proposed project, these individually less-than-significant impacts, when combined, would result a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact to cultural and paleontological resources.

Impact CP-7: The project variant could result in damage to cultural and paleontological resources. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

The project variant, which would alter or demolish all of the buildings on the site, would have the same less-than-significant impact on historical architectural resources.

The project variant would not require the same excavation and foundation work as the proposed project as there would less soil disturbance and different foundation work for a renovated structure. However, the project variant would result in *potentially significant* impacts related to archeological and paleontological resources, and the potentially for discovery of human remains. The project variant would require the same **mitigation measures (M-CP-2 and M-CP-3)**, would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Like the proposed project, the project variant's effect on unique geological features would be *less than significant*, both project-specific and cumulatively.

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, or other standards 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Checklist item 5c is not applicable.

A transportation impact report for the proposed project and project variant was prepared by an independent consultant,¹⁵ reviewed by Planning Department staff; the results are summarized below.

¹⁵ Advant Consulting, Final 2 Report San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market Retention and Expansion Project Transportation Study, February 7, 2011. This document is on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2009.1153!.

Project Area Street Network

Regional Access

Travel to and from the project site involves the use of regional highway transportation facilities that link San Francisco with other parts of the Bay Area, as well as Northern and Southern California. The Produce Market is accessible by local streets with connections to and from regional freeways and highways in the State system. Figure 20, page 74, shows a map of the study area and intersection analysis locations.


U.S. Highway 101 (U.S. 101): U.S. 101 is generally a north/south freeway, connecting San Francisco with the Peninsula and beyond to the south, and Marin County and beyond to the north. It connects with Interstate 80 (I-80), approximately two miles to the north of the project site.

Interstate 280 (I-280): I-280 is generally a north-south freeway, connecting San Francisco with the Peninsula and the South Bay. I-280 has an interchange with U.S. 101 approximately one mile southwest of the project site Produce Market.

Local Access

Bayshore Boulevard is a north-south arterial that generally parallels U.S. 101 with three travel lanes each way, separated by a median, in the Congestion Management Program (CMP) Network. Bayshore Boulevard is designated by the General Plan as a Major Arterial in a Transit Preferential Street (Secondary, between César Chavez and Silver Avenue), and a Neighborhood Commercial Street.

César Chavez Street is a major east-west arterial between Douglass Street to the west and the Port of San Francisco North Container Terminal, east of Third Street. The General Plan designates César Chavez Street as a Major Arterial in the CMP Network, , as a Secondary Arterial east of Third Street, and is part of the MTS Network. It is identified in the General Plan as a route with significant truck traffic east of U.S. 101.



Source: Advant Consulting

Legend

- PROJECT SITE
- SIGNALIZED STUDY INTERSECTION
- UNSIGNALIZED STUDY INTERSECTION
- TRANSIT STUDY AREA
- PARKING STUDY AREA



Source: Advant Consulting

6/24/11

Study Area and Analysis Locations Figure 20

Evans Avenue is an east-west arterial, with two travel lanes each way, extending between César Chavez Street and Jennings Street. The General Plan identifies Evans Avenue as a Major Arterial in the CMP Network, as a Secondary Arterial, and as part of the MTS Network. It is also identified as a route with significant truck traffic between César Chavez Street and Jennings Street.

Industrial Street is an east-west street with two travel lanes each way and a raised center median, extending from Bayshore Boulevard to Oakdale Avenue. The General Plan identifies Industrial Street as a Secondary Arterial.

Innes Avenue is an east-west discontinuous street extending from Milton I. Ross Lane, east of Toland Street, to Coleman Street, at the Hunters Point Shipyard. The General Plan identifies Innes Avenue as a Secondary Arterial, part of the MTS Network, and a street with significant truck traffic. In the study area, Innes Avenue is a paved but unimproved roadway extending from Milton I. Ross Lane to Rankin Street without lane markings. Innes Avenue is part of Bicycle Route #68 between Hunters Point Boulevard and Donahue Street.

Jerrold Avenue is an east-west street with one lane each way, extending from Bayshore Boulevard to Coleman Street, at the Hunters Point Shipyard. While not an arterial, Jerrold Avenue is one of four east-west streets that cross the elevated Caltrain tracks in the vicinity of the project site. Jerrold Street bisects the Produce Market Main Street Site between Toland Street and Rankin Street, and tractor-trailer vehicles associated with market operations have been observed to temporarily block Jerrold Avenue while maneuvering into their loading areas.

Kirkland Avenue is an east-west discontinuous street extending from Milton I. Ross Lane, east of Toland Street, to Earl Street, at the Hunters Point Shipyard. In the study area, Kirkland Avenue is a paved but unimproved roadway extending from Milton I. Rose Lane to Rankin Street without lane markings.

Oakdale Avenue is an east-west arterial extending from Bayshore Boulevard to Griffith Street, at the Hunters Point Shipyard. The General Plan identifies Oakdale Avenue as a Secondary Arterial, and as a route with significant truck traffic.

Rankin Street is a north-south discontinuous street between the Islais Creek Channel and Revere Avenue. In the study area, Rankin Street is a paved but unimproved roadway extending from Innes Avenue to McKinnon Avenue without lane markings.

Third Street is the principal north-south arterial in the southeast part of San Francisco, extending from its interchange with U.S. 101 at Bayshore Boulevard, to its intersection with Market Street in downtown San Francisco, and serving as a through street and an access way to the industrial areas north and east of U.S. 101. In the vicinity of the project, Third Street has two travel lanes each way, with the T-Third light rail operating in an exclusive median right-of-way. The General Plan identifies Third Street as a Major Arterial in the CMP Network and as a Transit Preferential Street, and as a route with significant truck traffic.


Toland Street is a north-south street with one lane each way, extending from Evans Avenue to Oakdale Avenue.

Selby Street is a north-south discontinuous street located under the I-280 freeway overpass between Evans Avenue and Revere Avenue.

Project Area Transit Network

The project site is directly served by the 23-Monterey motor coach line operated by the San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni). Additional transit service is provided by the 24-Divisadero (trolley bus) and the 44-O'Shaughnessy (motor coach) operating on Palou Avenue, as well as the 19-Polk (motor coach) operating on Evans Avenue. Figure 21, page presents the transit routes and stop locations in the vicinity of the project site. Approximately 80 total passengers ride the 23-Monterey to and from the project site on a typical weekday. The 23-Monterey traverses the project site along Jerrold Avenue and buses can be subject to intermittent delays when Produce Market trucks maneuver in and out of their loading docks, which block the travel lanes.

Capacity utilization relates the number of passengers per transit vehicle to the design capacity of the vehicle. The 23-Monterey line operates at a 44 percent (eastbound) and at a 52 percent (westbound) utilization factor at the maximum load point during the weekday a.m. peak hour, well below Muni's maximum capacity standard of 85 percent.



Source: Advant Consulting

6-24-11

Existing Transit Network and Stop Locations Figure 21

Project Area Pedestrian Conditions

Pedestrian activity in the project area is very light, with most of the activity centering around the southeast corner where a bank branch and the Produce Market offices are located.

The majority of the streets immediately surrounding the Main Site and 901 Rankin Street do not have curbs, gutters, or sidewalks. Sidewalks are on both sides of Toland Street between Kirkwood and Innes Avenues. A short section of sidewalk is on the north side of Innes Avenue stretching westward from the corner of Innes Avenue and Rankin Street for approximately 320 feet toward the corner of Innes Avenue and Selby Street. Additionally, a series of curbs and planters are shaped to facilitate the split in the direction of the travel lanes of traffic at both ends of the Main Site on Jerrold Avenue at Toland Street and at Rankin Street.

No sidewalks are on Jerrold Avenue internal to the Main Site. A small portion of sidewalk is on the south side of Jerrold Avenue east of Rankin Street extending east toward Quint Street.

Several marked pedestrian crosswalks are across Jerrold Avenue within the Main Site, one on each side of Selby Street, plus three located mid-block and connecting Docks 1, 2, and 3 in the center of the road with the nearby warehouse buildings. No marked pedestrian crosswalks are at the intersection of Jerrold Avenue with Rankin Street, or at the intersection of Kirkwood Avenue with Rankin Street.

Project Area Bicycle Network

Bikeways are typically classified as Class I, Class II, or Class III facilities. Class I bikeways are bike paths with exclusive right-of-way for use by bicyclists or pedestrians. Class II bikeways are bike lanes striped within the paved areas of roadways and established for the preferential use of bicycles, while Class III bikeways are signed bike routes that allow bicycles to share streets with vehicles.

There are six bicycle routes in the vicinity of the proposed project, including the following:

- Route #5 is the eastern-most north-south bicycle route. This route runs between Visitation Valley and North Beach, primarily as a Class III facility along Bayshore Boulevard, Third Street, and Illinois Street, and as a Class II facility along The Embarcadero and San Bruno Avenue.

- Route #7 is a Class III bike route that runs between Mariposa Street and Carroll Avenue, via Indiana Street, Third Street, Phelps Street, Palou Avenue, and Keith Street. It is a Class III facility, with wider travel lanes that allow bicyclists to ride outside of the path of vehicle travel being provided on sections of Indiana and Phelps Streets, and on Keith Street.
- Route #25 runs between the southeastern part of San Francisco and the Marina District, along San Bruno Avenue, Bayshore Boulevard, and Oakdale Avenue in the Bayview Hunters Point area. Near the project site, Route #25 is a Class III facility. To the north of the project, Route #25 runs as both a Class II facility (e.g., along Potrero Avenue, Harrison Street, and 11th Street), and as a Class III facility (e.g., 10th Street, Polk Street).
- Route #60, runs between the Great Highway/Vicente and César Chavez /Illinois. In the vicinity of the project, Route #60 is a Class III facility along César Chavez Street between Bayshore Boulevard and Mississippi Street, and a Class II facility between Mississippi and Illinois Streets.
- Route #68, runs from the Innes north gate to Hunters Point Shipyard along Innes Avenue, Hunters Point Boulevard and Evans Avenue to César Chavez. This route has dedicated bike lanes (Class II facility) on both sides of Evans Avenue, and Hunters Point Boulevard between Innes Avenue and Third Street.
- Connector Route #170 runs along Oakdale Avenue between Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard. Between Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard, this route has Class II bicycle lanes on both sides of the street.
- Connector Route #907 is a two-block Class III facility along Indiana Street that begins at César Chavez Street (Route #60) and travels south, to end at Tulare Street.

No City-designated bicycle routes traverse or are adjacent to the project site. During a site visit, approximately 30 bicyclists were observed at the intersection of Jerrold Avenue and Toland Street during the two-hour weekday a.m. peak period (7 to 9 a.m.), two-thirds of them traveling east-west on Jerrold Avenue. No substantial safety or right-of-way issues were observed, with only minor conflicts between bicyclists, and large trucks turning at the intersection.

The San Francisco Bicycle Plan (SFBP) Final EIR¹⁶ was certified by the San Francisco Planning Commission on June 25, 2009 and the SFMTA voted to adopt the 2009 SFBP on June 26, 2009. In August 2009, the Board of Supervisors affirmed certification the SFBP Final EIR.

¹⁶ *San Francisco Bicycle Plan Final EIR*. June 4, 2009. This document is on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case Number 2007.0347E.

The two near-term bicycle improvements included in the 2009 SFBP in the vicinity of the project site are:

- SFBP Project 5-4: The Bayshore Boulevard Bicycle Lanes Project will involve the installation of Class II bicycle lanes in both directions of travel along most of Bayshore Boulevard between César Chavez Street and Silver Avenue (Bicycle Route #25). Sharrows¹⁷ would be added in each direction between César Chavez Street and approximately the beginning of the couplet split (i.e., at Jerrold Avenue).
- SFBP Project 5-5: The César Chavez Bicycle Lanes Project will involve the installation of Class II bicycle lanes in both directions on Bicycle Route #60 on César Chavez Street between Kansas Street (near U.S. 101) and Mississippi Street (near I-280). To accommodate the bicycle lanes, one of the two eastbound travel lanes will be removed.

The SFBP also includes 24 long-term improvements that are proposed to be designed and implemented citywide over time. These improvements would complete the bicycle route network envisioned in the SFBP, close network gaps, refine and rationalize the bicycle route network, and improve safety and the bicyclists' experience. The long-term improvements have been environmentally assessed in the SFBP Final EIR on a program level, pending further design and additional environmental review prior to their implementation. The following long-term improvement has been identified in the vicinity of the project site:

- Long-Term Improvement L-11: Industrial Street between Loomis Street and Oakdale Avenue. This long-term improvement calls for implementation of Class II or Class III bicycle facilities in both directions on Industrial Street between Loomis Street and Oakdale Avenue. Its intent is to provide an alternative route to connect existing Bicycle Route #25 on Bayshore Boulevard south of Industrial Street with existing Bicycle Route 170 on Oakdale Avenue, via a lower traffic volume street than Bayshore Boulevard. This improvement complements the near-term Bicycle Plan Project 5-4 (Bayshore Boulevard Bicycle Lanes, César Chavez to Silver Avenue).

Parking Conditions

The existing parking conditions were qualitatively assessed during the weekday morning period on March 12, 2010 (Friday) within the area bounded Upton Street to the west, Hudson Avenue to the north, Quint Street to the east and La Salle Avenue to the south. On-street parking in the vicinity of the proposed project is uncontrolled with no maximum parking time

¹⁷ Directional symbols painted on the pavement to indicate shared vehicle and bicycle lanes.

limits. On-street parking is not permitted one day a week on most streets between midnight and 6 a.m. for street cleaning, minimizing overnight and long-term parking. On-street parking spaces are well utilized during the morning period with an estimated overall occupancy of 85 to 90 percent.

Emergency Vehicle Access

The project site is served by the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD). The nearest SFFD station to the project site is Station 9, at 2245 Jerrold Avenue at Napoleon Street, about two blocks west. In addition, Station 25 is located at 3305 Third Street at Cargo Way, approximately one mile east of the project site. No transportation related issues such as traffic congestion, street widths or roadway alignments, have been observed that would preclude a rapid response by emergency vehicles and personnel to the project site.

Produce Market Operations

The Produce Market is comprised of over 30 produce and food-related merchants, which can for the most part be characterized as being one of three business operating models:

- *Wholesale Merchants*, who sell directly to their customers who come to the Produce Market to shop among the various Produce Market merchants. These customers pick up their produce in person from the individual merchants.
- *Distributors*, who sell and deliver the product to their customers; the customer does not need to come to the Produce Market. Distributors have their own fleet of trucks with which they deliver their product. These trucks are typically single unit vehicles, 24 feet or less in length, and make a number of stops along a set route. The distributors provide a substantial customer base for the wholesale business merchants.
- *Hybrid Businesses* merchants who have developed a business model that has both wholesale and distribution characteristics.

The merchants of the Produce Market operate at the facility at varying levels of activity throughout the day as outlined below.

- *Warehouse Functions*: Starting between 8 p.m. and midnight, wholesale and distribution business activity begins, predominantly involving receiving of incoming produce at the warehouse. Receiving continues throughout the early morning as the focus of activity shifts to either preparing material to be distributed to the customer of the distributors and/or the

wholesale shopping, purchasing and loading. The wholesale activities increase between 3 and 7 a.m. and are largely completed by 9 a.m. Outbound merchant distribution activity travel takes place in the morning with most trucks leaving before 9 a.m., and is mostly completed in the early to late afternoon (1 to 4 p.m.) when the trucks return from their delivery routes.

- *Office and Administrative Functions:* Beginning in the early morning hours between 5 and 7 a.m. the back office functions that are accessory to and support the warehouse functions outlined above commence. These supportive functions take place largely during normal business hours.

According to the project sponsor and field data, between 70 and 110 trucks (mostly tractor-trailer vehicles) arrive at the site on a weekday for deliveries, more than 85 percent of them before 7 a.m., while approximately five trucks arrive on a weekend day. In addition, approximately 100 to 130 trucks (typically single unit vehicles) perform deliveries for the Produce Market merchants on a typical weekday.

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 San Francisco General Plan states that the City will “Consider the transportation system performance measurements 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. The trips generated by the proposed project, 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 are analyzed below.

Travel Demand Characteristics

Methodology

The transportation effects of the proposed project were determined by calculating the daily person trips generated by the different types of land uses, and the portion of those trips that would occur during the a.m. peak hour. The mode split analysis then determined the portion of these trips made via automobile, transit, or any other mode of transportation, based upon the origin/destination of the trips, the purpose of the trips, and the availability of various modes. The trips were then distributed to geographical origins/destination areas in San Francisco and in the Bay Area. Finally, automobile occupancy rates were determined, to yield the average number of individuals in a vehicle, and, thus, determine the number of vehicles that would be traveling to and from the project study area.

The methods commonly used for forecasting trip generation of stand-alone development projects in San Francisco are based on person-trip generation rates, trip distribution information, and mode split data described in the *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review (SF Guidelines)*. These data are based on a number of detailed travel behavior surveys conducted within San Francisco. The data in the *SF Guidelines* are generally accepted as more appropriate than conventional methods for use on projects in the complex environs of San Francisco because of the relatively unique mix of uses, density, availability of transit, and cost of parking commonly found in San Francisco. On the other hand, the *SF Guidelines* do not include travel demand data for somewhat uncommon land use types such as a Produce Market. Thus, a project-specific methodology was developed based on traffic counts, surveys and other professionally-recognized data sources to generate an accurate trip generation rate for the specialized Produce Market. This methodology was based on the characteristics of the specialized operations that take place at the Produce Market, as described above.

Currently the observed traffic volume at the Produce Market is approximately 3,881 person trips a day, about 298 peak hour person trips, about 1,884 vehicle trips per day, and approximately 151 a.m. peak hour vehicle trips occur at the Produce Market. There are a total of approximately 380 truck trips on a typical day, which represents a total of about 193 daily trucks, two thirds of which arrive and depart before 9 a.m. The majority of Produce Market-

bound traffic uses the west approach to the main site. The number of total vehicles in the project area is higher during the a.m. peak hour (7 to 9 a.m.) than the p.m. peak hour (4 to 6 p.m.).

Existing Traffic Conditions

Existing intersection operating conditions were evaluated for the weekday a.m. peak period (the most congested period for the 12 study intersections between 7 and 9 a.m. on weekdays).¹⁸ Most of the intersections studied are controlled by traffic signals except Jerrold/Toland, which is controlled by a four-way STOP, and Jerrold/Rankin, Kirkwood/Rankin, and Oakdale/Toland, which are uncontrolled.

The operating characteristics of signalized and unsignalized intersections are described by the concept of Level of Service (LOS). LOS is a quantitative description of the performance of an intersection based on the average delay per vehicle. Intersection levels of service ranges from LOS A, which indicates free flow or excellent conditions with short delays, to LOS F, which indicates congested or overloaded conditions with extremely long delays. LOS A through LOS D are considered excellent to satisfactory service levels, LOS E is undesirable, and LOS F conditions are considered unacceptable.

Both signalized and unsignalized intersections were evaluated using the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology. For signalized intersections, this methodology determines the capacity of each lane group approaching the intersection. The LOS is then based on average delay (in seconds per vehicle) for the various movements within the intersection. A combined weighted average delay and LOS are presented for the intersection.

For unsignalized intersections, the average delay and LOS operating conditions are calculated by approach (e.g., northbound) and movement (e.g., northbound left-turn), for those movements that are subject to delay. As such, in the LOS summary tables, the operating conditions for unsignalized intersections are presented for the worst approach.

In San Francisco, LOS E and F are considered unacceptable operating conditions for signalized and unsignalized intersections. Table 7 below (page 86) presents the results of the intersection

¹⁸ The transportation analysis indicates that traffic on Jerrold Avenue peaks an hour later between 10 to 11 a.m. However, Jerrold Avenue traffic during the 7 to 9 a.m. period was only five to ten percent below the maximum levels on the streets outside the project site.

LOS analysis for the existing weekday a.m. peak hour conditions at the 12 existing study intersections. During the weekday a.m. peak hour, all 12 study intersections operate at acceptable LOS (LOS D or better), with average delays per vehicle of less than 44 seconds.

Proposed Project Transportation Network Changes

The proposed project would to alter a number of the existing right-of-ways in the vicinity of the project site, specifically:

- Vacate the portion of Jerrold Avenue between Toland and Rankin streets so that only authorized and inspected vehicles can access the Main Site.
- Vacate the portion of Selby Street underneath Highway I-280 between Innes and Kirkwood Avenues.
- Vacate a portion of Kirkwood Avenue to the east of Rankin Street for the purpose of securing property for the new building at the 901 Rankin Street site.
- Vacate a number of small right-of-ways such as Lettuce Lane and Milton Ross Street, two City streets that are internal to the existing Produce Market facility, as well as a portion of Rankin Street between Innes and Jerrold Avenues.
- Dedicate portions of the existing Main Site property to remove existing dead ends from the street grid and facilitate vehicular access and circulation around and to the Produce Market.
- Relocate the portion of Rankin Street between Jerrold Avenue and Innes Avenue to parallel the existing and adjacent Caltrain right-of-way.

Thus the proposed project would reroute Jerrold Avenue traffic not destined to the Produce Market around the Main Site via a reconfigured Innes Avenue; local traffic destined to nearby uses could also use a reconstructed Kirkwood Avenue; vehicular traffic on both Innes and Kirkwood would operate two-ways with one lane each way.

The proposed project would also provide new sidewalks that entirely encompass the project site, and new crosswalks at some locations, improving the existing pedestrian conditions in the area. All of the new sidewalks would include street lighting, tree planting and additional landscaping. Two pedestrian and vehicular access gates would be provided into and out of the Main Site one on the west side at Toland Street, and one the east side at Rankin Street.

Table 7
Intersection Level of Service
2030 Weekday a.m. Peak Hour

Intersection	Traffic Control Device	Existing		Existing plus Project		2030 Cumulative	
		Delay ^a	LOS	Delay ^a	LOS	Delay ^a	LOS
1. Jerrold/Toland ^b	Four-way STOP	12.6 (NB)	B	19.1 (SB)	C	>50 (NB)	F
2. Jerrold/Rankin ^b	Uncontrolled	12.9 (SB)	B	9.1 (NB)	A	9.3 (NB)	A
3. Kirkwood/Rankin ^b	Uncontrolled	9.4 (EB)	A	10.3 (EB)	A	10.2 (EB)	B
4. Oakdale/Toland ^b	Uncontrolled	17.0 (SB)	C	17.6 (SB)	C	>50 (SB)	F
5. Evans/Napoleon/Toland	Traffic Signal	37.1	D	38.1	D	>80	F
6. César Chavez/Evans	Traffic Signal	21.1	C	21.3	C	>80	F
7. Bayshore/US101 NB off-ramp/Jerrold	Traffic Signal	42.7	D	42.9	D	>80	F
8. Bayshore/Oakdale	Traffic Signal	29.5	C	29.8	C	51.3	D
9. Bayshore/Alemany/Industrial	Traffic Signal	43.8	D	43.9	D	>80	F
10. Third/Oakdale	Traffic Signal	17.4	B	17.4	B	24.6	C
11. Third/Jerrold.	Traffic Signal	21.9	C	22.1	C	>80	F
12. Third/Evans	Traffic Signal	34.8	C	34.8	C	>80	F
13. Innes/Toland ^b	STOP WB	New Intersection		15 (WB)	C	>50 (WB)	F
14. Kirkwood/Toland	STOP WB	New Intersection		10.5 (WB)	B	17.7 (WB)	C
15. Jerrold/Innes	STOP EB/WB	New Intersection		12.2 (WB)	B	16.0 (WB)	C

Notes: EB = eastbound; NB = northbound; SB = southbound, WB = westbound

a Intersection delay presented in seconds per vehicle.

b For non-signalized intersections, delay is presented for the worst minor approach.

Source: LCW Consulting, Adavant Consulting – September 2010.

Traffic Impacts

The proposed project would generate a net increase of 3,466 person trips on a typical weekday (inbound plus outbound), 186 of which would be person trips during the a.m. peak hour. During the weekday a.m. peak hour, the proposed project would generate approximately 1,561 net new daily vehicle trips and about 116 a.m. peak hour vehicle trips (97 inbound and 19 outbound). During the weekday a.m. peak hour, about 88 percent of all person-trips would be by auto (164), seven percent by transit (13), and five percent (9) by other modes (including walking).

The addition of project-generated traffic plus the traffic redistributed as a result of the closure of Jerrold Avenue between Toland and Rankin streets would result mostly in minor increases in the average delay per vehicle at all the study intersections as shown in Table 7 above. With the exception of three locations within the project site, Jerrold/Toland, Jerrold/Rankin, and Kirkwood/Rankin, all intersections would continue to operate at the same LOS as under existing conditions during the weekday a.m. peak hour. Traffic operations at the intersection of Jerrold/Rankin would actually improve (lower delay) as a result of the project, which would divert through traffic away from this intersection.

All study intersections would operate at LOS D or better under existing plus project conditions. Therefore, the proposed project's impact on intersection operations would be *less than significant*.

Queuing

Approximately 174 vehicles at 9 a.m., 97 vehicles at 1 a.m., and 44 vehicles at noon would access the Main Site. A maximum of eight inbound vehicles would queue at the Toland Street (west) gate at 9 a.m. with an estimated total queue length of 218 feet. Queuing during the other two periods would be shorter, 174 feet and 131 feet at 1 a.m. and at noon, respectively. All three inbound lanes (two entry-only lanes and a reversible entry/exit lane) at the Toland Street gate would have to be operational at 9 a.m., 1 a.m., and perhaps at noon time if needed. In the event of a queue developing outside of the gate, entering truckers would be expected to wait on Jerrold Avenue without blocking traffic on Toland Street, and the proposed project would result in *less-than-significant* queuing impacts.

Improvement Measure I-TR-1, below, would improve potential queue spillbacks.

Improvement Measure I-TR-1

To reduce the potential for traffic queue spillbacks onto the intersection of Jerrold/Toland it is recommended that the third reversible entry/exit lane be implemented under both the proposed project and project variant , and that each queuing lane be 75 feet long at minimum, and 100 feet long preferable.

Impact TR-2: The proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. (Less than Significant)

As noted above, by rerouting traffic around the project site, the proposed project would result in fewer conflicts between Jerrold Avenue through-traffic and Produce Market operations. The roadway reconfiguration would result in improvements to the existing roadway network.

All roadway and curb modifications being proposed by the project would be subject to review by the Transportation Advisory Staff Committee (TASC) and approval by the Board of Supervisors for street vacations and dedications. The proposed project would have compatible uses in the area; the existing Produce Market currently operates on the Main Site. For these reasons, the proposed project would result in *less-than-significant* impacts related to design or incompatible uses.

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

No transportation-related issues, such as traffic congestion, street widths, or roadway alignments, have been identified that would result in a significant impact to the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) vehicles or other emergency vehicles accessing the project site. The proposed extension of Innes Avenue and Kirkwood Avenue to connect with Toland Street would provide additional connectivity to the area, while the redirection of through traffic from Jerrold Avenue to Innes Avenue would avoid the temporary blocking of travel lanes when Produce Market trucks maneuver in and out their loading docks.

The detailed design of the new roadways and intersections, currently under development, would take into consideration the requirements of SFFD trucks.¹⁹ All roadway and curb modifications being proposed by the project would be subject to review by the TASC. The TASC members include emergency responder staff from various City departments. For these reasons, the proposed project's impacts on emergency 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 Impacts

Transit-related policies include, but are not limited to: (1) discouragement of commuter automobiles (*Planning Code* Section 101.1, established by Proposition M, the Accountable Planning Initiative); and (2) the City's "Transit First" policy, established in the City's Charter Section 16.102. The proposed project would not conflict with transit operations as discussed above and would also not conflict with the transit-related policies established by Proposition M or the City's Transit First Policies

The proposed project would generate 13 transit trips (10 inbound and 3 outbound) during the weekday a.m. peak hour. These transit trips to and from the proposed project would utilize the 23-Monterey bus line, and may include transfers to/from other Muni bus lines and light rail lines, or other regional transit providers, including Caltrain, SamTrans, AC Transit, Golden Gate Transit and BART. Muni's 23-Monterey bus line currently operates well below capacity (between 44 and 52 percent) during the weekday a.m. peak hour and the addition of the new transit trips would not substantially affect its utilization.

SFMTA recommends that the 23-Monterey be rerouted to the Transit Effectiveness Program (TEP)-proposed alignment on Oakdale Avenue by the time the proposed project is

¹⁹ The Transportation Impact study addressed the adequacy of the new roadway configuration proposed by the project in Appendix A. BKF engineers prepared turning radii test for a single unit truck, a fire truck and two different tractor-trailer trucks. The results indicated that any of these vehicles can properly make the turns with the new proposed roadway configuration.

implemented.²⁰ If this were not possible, then the 23-Monterey would be moved from Jerrold Avenue to Innes Avenue on an interim basis. The route would experience two new turns where Innes Avenue meets Jerrold Avenue; however, these would be wide (about 135 degrees) free (non-stop-sign controlled) turns, that would not be expected to substantially affect bus operations. The interim relocation of the 23-Monterey away from the Main Site would likely improve its operation since buses would then not be subject to intermittent delays when Produce Market trucks maneuver in and out their loading docks, blocking the travel lanes.

There are six existing bus stops (three eastbound and three westbound) in the immediate project vicinity located at Jerrold/Toland, Jerrold/Selby, and Jerrold/Rankin. The two existing bus stops at Jerrold/Toland would not be affected by the interim realignment of the 23-Monterey, while the two bus stops at Jerrold/Rankin would have to be moved slightly to the new reconfigured intersection. The two existing intermediate stops at Selby Avenue would likely be eliminated²¹ since the proposed project would not provide pedestrian access from the Main Site onto Innes Avenue at Selby Street for controlled access reasons. Transit riders would instead board or alight at the bus stops at the intersections of Jerrold/Toland and Jerrold/Rankin, which would be adjacent to the pedestrian entry/exit gates.

Regardless of the routing, implementation of the proposed project, the 23-Monterey would continue to operate below Muni's capacity utilization standard of 85 percent, and its travel time would not be substantially affected. No other Muni services would be affected by the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project's impact on transit service would be *less than significant*.

Parking

Per *Planning Code* 151.17 the proposed project would be required to provide 237 parking spaces. In addition, the *Planning Code* would require the proposed project to provide 17 handicapped-accessible parking spaces. Since the proposed project would include 440 parking spaces of

²⁰ Jerry Robbins, SFMTA Memorandum to Andrea Contreras, San Francisco Planning Department, August 9, 2010. This document is on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2009.1153!.

²¹ The elimination of these bus stops was discussed at a meeting at the SFMTA offices on June 6, 2010. At the meeting, SFMTA staff agreed to the elimination of these stops if the 23-Monterey TEP proposed re-route was not implemented by the time the project was constructed.

which 18 would be handicapped-accessible, the proposed project would meet the *Planning Code* requirements. Approximately 307 spaces would be provided under the project variant, which would meet the *Planning Code* requirement.

The proposed project would generate a demand for 443 spaces during the a.m. peak period (7 to 9 a.m.), and 435 spaces during the midday peak period.²² As noted in Table 5, page 26, the proposed project would construct 43 spaces in addition to the 397 spaces existing conditions on the site, for a total of 440 spaces between the Main Site and the 901 Rankin Street site. Therefore, the proposed project would not meet parking demand for the a.m. peak period, but would meet the midday peak demand.

Up to 22 on-street parking spaces on the east side of Toland Street between Innes and Kirkwood Avenues would be removed by the proposed project as part of the street network modifications. The existing spaces would be replaced by new streetscape and additional on-street parking. Formalized on-street parking spaces would be created on both sides of Innes and Kirkwood Avenues as part of the roadway reconstruction. Approximately 220 to 240 new on-street spaces would be provided along Innes and Kirkwood Avenue.²³ The net increase of 23 to 43 on-street parking spaces associated with the proposed project would reduce overall parking occupancy in the parking study area.

San Francisco does not consider parking supply as part of the permanent physical environment and therefore, does not consider changes in parking conditions to be environmental impacts as defined by CEQA. However, this report presents a parking analysis to inform the public and the decision makers as to the parking conditions that could occur as a result of implementing the proposed project.

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.

²² Adavant, op cit, page 56.

²³ The Transportation Impact Study reviewed several perpendicular parking scenarios for Innes Street which are shown at the end of Appendix A in the Study. The study noted that any of the scenarios would be viable, and that the MTA would decide at the time of the street design phase which one to implement.

Parking deficits are considered to be social effects, rather than impacts on the physical environment as defined by CEQA. Under CEQA, a project's social impacts need not be treated as significant impacts on the environment. Environmental documents should, however, address the secondary physical impacts that could be triggered by a social impact (CEQA Guidelines Section 15131(a)). The social inconvenience of parking deficits, such as having to hunt for scarce parking spaces, is not an environmental impact, but 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. In the experience of San Francisco transportation planners, however, 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 in particular, would be in keeping with the City's "Transit First" policy. The City's Transit First Policy, established in the City's Charter Section 16.102 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 above, the 23 Monterey bus line traverses the project site along Jerrold Avenue. Additional transit service is provided by the 24-Divisadero (trolley bus) and the 44-O'Shaughnessy (motor coach) operating on Palou Avenue, as well as the 19-Polk (motor coach) operating on Evans Avenue.

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. Moreover, 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. Hence, 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, noise and pedestrian safety analyses, reasonably addresses potential secondary effects.

Pedestrian Impacts

Overall, the proposed project would add up to 22 pedestrian trips to the surrounding streets (this includes 13 transit trips and nine other trips) during the weekday a.m. peak hour. The increase in pedestrian volumes would be accommodated on the sidewalks adjacent to the project site and the existing crosswalks at the intersection of Jerrold/Toland and would not substantially affect the current pedestrian conditions in the area.

As noted above, the proposed project is not expected to substantially and negatively affect pedestrian facilities in the vicinity, and would include pedestrian improvements. Moreover, because Jerrold Avenue would be rerouted there would be fewer conflicts between pedestrians circulating within the Produce Market and Jerrold Avenue through traffic. Therefore, the proposed project would not obviously conflict with any adopted policies or plans relating to pedestrians.

Given the existing low pedestrian volumes on the sidewalks and crosswalks adjacent to the project site, combined with the proposed new sidewalks around the site, the proposed project's impact on pedestrian conditions would be *less than significant*.

Bicycle Impacts

On June 26, 2009, SFMTA approved an update to the City's Bicycle Plan. The proposed project would not result in significant impacts to bicycle conditions in the project area and would therefore not conflict with the City's bicycle plan, or other plan, policy or program related to bicycle use in San Francisco.

The proposed project would provide a total of 90 bicycle parking spaces, including 48 Class I bicycle parking spaces and 42 Class II bicycle parking spaces. Bicycle parking would be located at-grade adjacent to the surface parking lot nearest each of the building entrances. The proposed project would also provide 20 showers and 40 lockers adjacent to the common area restrooms on the second floor of each warehouse building.

The proposed project would be required to meet the *Planning Code* requirements for provision of bicycle parking spaces and for showers and lockers. The proposed project would be required by *Planning Code* Section 155.1 to provide 90 bicycle spaces; therefore, it would meet this

requirement. Per *Planning Code* Section 155.3, the proposed project would be required to provide 20 showers and 40 lockers; therefore, it would meet this requirement.

It is anticipated that a portion of the nine “other” trips generated by proposed project, primarily the meeting hall and general office uses, would be bicycle trips. Roadway improvements around the project site would not substantially negatively affect bicycling conditions. With the current bicycle and traffic volumes on adjacent streets, bicycle travel generally occurs without major impedances or safety problems.

Although the proposed project would result in an increase in the number of vehicles in the vicinity of the project site, these new trips would not be substantial enough to affect bicycle travel in the area, and therefore, the impact on bicyclists would be *less than significant*.

An improvement measure was identified in the transportation study that would improve operation of the existing Bicycle Route 25; however the project sponsor has chosen not to implement this measure.

Loading Impacts

Freight delivery and service vehicle demand for the retail and office uses was estimated based on the methodology and truck trip generation rates presented in the *SF Guidelines* (see Travel Demand Characteristics, page 83). The freight demand for the Produce Market use (the number of daily and peak hour trucks), has been integrated with the specialized trip generation rate for that use since the deliveries are an intrinsic part of the land use category in the *Guidelines*. The freight deliveries for the Produce Market use have been further subdivided into single-unit and multi-unit trucks based on field data collected at the Produce Market.²⁴ It is anticipated that the majority of the deliveries to the retail and office uses would consist of single-unit trucks and vans.

The retail and office uses would generate 11 delivery/service vehicle trips to the project site per day. These daily truck trips correspond to a demand of 0.4 loading spaces during an average

²⁴ A single unit truck is a vehicle on a single motorized frame with more than two axles or more than four tires. A multi-unit semi-trailer truck, also known as a semi or a tractor-trailer is an articulated vehicle consisting of a towing engine (tractor), and a semi-trailer that carries the freight. A semi-trailer does not trail completely behind the towing vehicle, but is attached at a point that is forward of the rear-most axle of the towing unit, so that some fraction of the weight of the trailer is carried by the rear axle(s) of the tractor.

hour or 0.6 loading spaces during the peak hour of loading/unloading activities. The Produce Market's industrial uses would generate 165 deliveries in a day, which corresponds to 42 spaces during the average hour and 52 spaces during the peak hour. Peak hour truck arrivals and departures to/from the wholesale merchants occur between 11 p.m. and 1 a.m., with 85 percent of the truck movements being completed before 9 a.m. Distributor trucks peak arrivals and departures take place during the day, from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

The proposed project would provide loading dock areas for the warehousing use, as shown in Figure 6, page 13. The marshalling yard would facilitate loading activities by providing an area for fewer potential conflicts with traffic. Each of the four buildings at the Main Site would provide about 36 to 40 truck spaces along the docking bay off-street, for an approximate total of about 150 spaces. The 901 Rankin Street building would provide about 20 truck spaces. The exact number and location of additional off-street freight loading spaces that may be provided for the office and retail uses have not yet been established.

Based on the *Planning Code* Section 152, three off-street loading spaces would be required for the first 100,000 gsf of warehouse use, plus one extra space for each additional 80,000 gsf of warehouse use, resulting in requirement of 50 off-street freight loading spaces. The proposed project would meet the *Planning Code* requirements for off-street freight loading facilities.

The net-new uses associated with the proposed project, as shown in Table 6, Net New Uses, page 26, would generate a loading demand for 42 spaces during the average loading hour and 52 spaces during the peak loading hour. In addition, an existing loading demand of 67 spaces during the average loading hour and 84 spaces during the peak loading hour also would need to be accommodated by the proposed project, for a total loading demand of 109 spaces during the average loading hour and 136 spaces during the peak loading hour. The off-street loading spaces provided by the proposed project would accommodate both the average and the peak loading demand, and the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* loading impact.

Construction Impacts

Detailed plans for construction of the proposed project have not been developed; however, preliminary construction information related to the number of construction trucks and

construction workers traveling to and from the site on a daily basis was developed by Swinerton Management and Consulting. Construction activities associated with the proposed project are anticipated to occur within three phases:

- **Phase 1: 901 Rankin Street Site – Spring 2012 to fall 2013 (18 months).** This phase includes roadway reconfigurations, demolition, excavation and shoring, foundation, base building and exterior finishing, and interior finishing.
- **Phase 2: Main Site – Between 2017 and 2020 (24-month construction period).** This phase includes demolition, excavation and shoring, foundation, base building and exterior finishing, and interior finishing.
- **Phase 3: Main Site – Between 2025 and 2028 (24-month construction period).** This phase includes street vacations, dedications, roadway reconfigurations, demolition, excavation and shoring, foundation, base building and exterior finishing, and interior finishing.

Construction at the 901 Rankin Street site is expected to occur over an 18-month period between spring 2012 and fall 2013. Construction within the remainder of the Main Site would occur at some point in the future, depending on demand for warehouse space. At the present, it is anticipated that construction of improvements at the Main Site would occur over two 24-month periods.

Construction-related activities would typically occur Monday through Friday, between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m. Construction is not anticipated to occur on Saturdays, Sundays or major legal holidays, but may occur on an as-needed basis. The hours of construction would be stipulated by the Department of Building Inspection, and the contractor would need to comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance²⁵ and the latest edition of the SFMTA Blue Book.²⁶

Construction staging for equipment and materials would occur within the project site. It is not anticipated that any lane closures, or closure of crosswalks or pedestrian pathways, would be required, beyond the proposed permanent closure of Jerrold Avenue. Any temporary sidewalk or traffic lane closures on adjacent streets would be coordinated with the City in order to

²⁵ The San Francisco Noise Ordinance permits construction activities seven days a week, between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m.

²⁶ Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets, Seventh Edition, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, October 2006.

minimize the impacts on traffic. In general, lane and sidewalk closures are subject to review and approval by the SFDPW.

During construction of the 901 Rankin Street site, it is not anticipated that any bus stop relocations on the 23-Monterey bus route would be required, however, if it is determined that temporary Muni stop relocation would be needed during construction, the relocation would be coordinated with the Muni Street Operations/Special Events office. In addition, prior to construction, the project contractor would coordinate with Muni's Street Operations/Special Events Office to coordinate construction activities and reduce any impacts to transit operations.

Construction of improvements along Innes Avenue, Kirkwood Avenue and Rankin Street would be coordinated with SFDPW and SFMTA, and would not affect the existing traffic circulation in the project vicinity. Once the improvements are completed and Jerrold Avenue is vacated, the 23-Monterey bus line (motor coach) could be rerouted if the line has not yet been relocated to the TEP-recommended alignment along Oakdale Avenue.

Construction at the Main Site during Phases 2 and 3 is currently anticipated to occur over two 24-month periods, during which the average number of construction trucks and construction workers would be similar to the number estimated for the 901 Rankin Street site.

Throughout the construction period, there would be a flow of construction-related trucks into and out of the site. In general, the impact of construction truck traffic would be a temporary lessening of the capacities of local streets due to the slower movement and larger turning radii of trucks, which may affect traffic operations. It is anticipated that there would be an average of between two and eight truck trips per day traveling to the project site, with the greatest number during the excavation and shoring phase. It is anticipated that construction-related trucks would access the site via Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard (from within San Francisco), via I-80 (from the East Bay), and U.S. 101 (from the South Bay).

It is anticipated that there would be an average of between seven and 12 construction workers per day at the project site. The mode of travel of construction workers is not known, however, it is anticipated that the majority of workers would drive to and from the site; some workers may take transit or bicycle. The addition of the worker-related vehicle- or transit-trips would not

substantially affect transportation conditions, as any impacts on local intersections or the transit network would be similar to, or less than, those associated with the proposed project.

Construction workers who drive to the site would cause a temporary parking demand, and which would be accommodated on-site or within the parking study area within unrestricted on-street parking spaces.

Overall, the proposed construction would not affect traffic, transit, pedestrian and bicycle circulation, and any potential impacts that would occur would not be considered significant due to their temporary and limited duration. Therefore, construction transportation impacts associated with the proposed project would be *less than significant*.

The project sponsor and construction contractor(s) would meet with the Traffic Engineering Division of SFMTA, the Fire Department, Muni, and the Planning Department to determine feasible measures to reduce traffic congestion, including potential transit disruption and pedestrian circulation impacts during construction of the proposed project. Any parking lane and sidewalk closures would have to be coordinated with City staff in order to minimize the effects on local traffic and circulation. Temporary lane and sidewalk closures would be subject to review and approval by the SFDPW and the *Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation* (ISCOTT). In addition, if it is determined that a Muni bus stop relocation would be necessary for construction activity, it would be coordinated with the Muni Street Operations and Special Events office to ensure that the stop could be temporarily relocated nearby

Impact TR-5: The proposed project in combination of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would have significant cumulative transportation impacts. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

The data and results from the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan EIR Transportation Study²⁷ were used to obtain future year 2030 Cumulative traffic volumes and lane geometries for the weekday a.m. peak hour at eight of the 15 study intersections (see Figure 20, page 74). The six intersections immediately adjacent to the project site (Jerrold/Toland, Kirkwood/Rankin, Jerrold/Rankin, Innes/Toland, Kirkwood/Toland, and

²⁷ *Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan EIR Transportation Study* CHS Consulting, LCW Consulting and Fehr & Peers Associates, Inc. November 2009. This document is on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2007.0946E.

Jerrold/Innes), plus the intersection of Oakdale/Toland were not evaluated as part of the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Plan. Therefore, future year 2030 Cumulative traffic volumes at these seven intersections were estimated by assessing changes in traffic volumes and traffic flow patterns in the area taken from the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Plan transportation study, as well as future traffic growth estimated by the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) countywide travel demand forecasting model for the local streets. The SFCTA travel demand model takes into account both the future development planned for this area as well as the expected growth in housing and employment for the remainder of San Francisco and the nine-county Bay Area. Table 7 page 86 presents the 2030 Cumulative intersection operating conditions (delay and LOS) for the weekday a.m. peak hour. The table includes the proposed project plus the reassignment of traffic due to the closure of Jerrold Avenue between Toland and Rankin streets to non-Produce Market bound vehicles.

Under 2030 Cumulative conditions, vehicle delays would increase at the study intersections over Existing conditions, with the exception of Jerrold/Rankin, due to the rerouting of through traffic associated with the proposed project's roadway network changes. Nine of the 15 study intersections would operate at LOS F during the 2030 Cumulative weekday a.m. peak hour; the remaining six intersections would operate at LOS D or better.

At each intersection operating at LOS F, the proposed project's contribution to movements was examined to determine whether the increase due to project trips would contribute considerably to critical movements operating at LOS E or LOS F.

Nine of the 15 study intersections would operate at LOS F during the 2030 Cumulative weekday a.m. peak hour. The proposed project would substantially contribute to the Year 2030 poor operating conditions at two of the nine failing intersections, Jerrold/Toland and Innes/Toland, resulting in *potentially significant* impacts.

Implementation of both of the following two mitigation measures would reduce the cumulative impacts to *less-than-significant* levels.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-5a

- Jerrold Avenue/Toland Street – The unsignalized intersection of Jerrold/Toland would operate at LOS F during the 2030 Cumulative weekday a.m. peak hour. The contribution of the proposed project generated vehicles plus the re-routed traffic

would be substantial, about 17 percent, and therefore, its contribution to the 2030 Cumulative impacts at this intersection would be considered significant. In order to mitigate this significant impact, the northbound approach would need to be restriped within the existing right-of-way to provide an exclusive left-turn lane, and, at the same time, the intersection would need to be signalized. No additional on-street parking spaces on Toland Street would have to be eliminated, beyond the 22 spaces proposed for removal for construction of the proposed project. With the implementation of these two measures the intersection operations would improve to LOS B during the weekday a.m. peak hour.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-5b

- Innes Avenue/Toland Street – The proposed unsignalized intersection of Innes/Toland would operate at LOS F during the 2030 Cumulative weekday a.m. peak hour. The contribution of the proposed project generated vehicles plus the re-routed traffic would be substantial, about 72 percent, and therefore, its contribution to the 2030 Cumulative impacts at this intersection would be considered significant. In order to mitigate this significant impact, the intersection would need to be signalized. With signalization, the intersection operations would improve to LOS D during the weekday a.m. peak hour.

The two traffic mitigation measures described above would not be needed at the outset of the proposed project development. The intersections of Jerrold/Toland and Innes/Toland would continue to operate at acceptable levels once the proposed project becomes operational, but would deteriorate over time as cumulative travel in the area increases. Therefore, if the project is approved and Jerrold Avenue is closed to vehicular traffic not related to the Produce Market, the project sponsor would start regular monitoring of traffic conditions, as described below, at the intersections of Jerrold/Toland and Innes/Toland on a typical day during the a.m. peak period (7 to 9 a.m.), so that the proposed mitigation measures can be implemented before the critical movements at these two locations start to operate poorly (i.e., at LOS E or F).

Once Jerrold Avenue is closed to vehicular traffic not related to the Produce Market, the project sponsor shall be responsible for monitoring the traffic conditions at the intersection of Jerrold/Toland and Innes/Toland one year after completion of the roadway reconfiguration; then every five years for the subsequent 10-year period, then every three years through year 2030 or one year after build-out, whichever occurs later. If signalization occurs prior to 2030 or a year after build-out, monitoring would no longer be necessary or required.

When the results of the monitoring analyses indicate that the intersection of Jerrold/Toland and/or Innes/Toland is close to operating at an unacceptable LOS, the SFMTA will commit to signalizing it/them or making improvements so that they would continue to operate at an acceptable LOS in the future. The project sponsor shall be responsible for paying their fair share contribution to the costs of signalizing and/or restriping each of the two intersections.

The fair share contribution at the intersection of Jerrold /Toland is calculated as 17 percent of the total cost of signalization and restriping of the northbound approach. The fair share contribution at the intersection of Innes /Toland is calculated as 72 percent of the total cost of signalization. The payment of the fair share contribution to SFMTA would reduce the project's cumulative impacts at these two intersections to a less-than-significant level.

The unsignalized intersection of Oakdale /Toland would operate at LOS F during the 2030 Cumulative weekday a.m. peak hour; this intersection was not analyzed as part of the *Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Plan*. The proposed project contribution to the southbound critical movement that would operate at LOS E or F during the a.m. peak hour would be three percent. As a result, the contribution of the proposed project to the 2030 Cumulative conditions at this location would not be considered a significant impact. An improvement measure has been identified in the transportation study that would improve operations at this intersection to LOS D or better. However, the project sponsor has chosen not to implement this improvement measure.

As discussed above, the proposed project would not result in a reduction in LOS of intersections in the site vicinity to an unsatisfactory level with mitigation incorporated. Cumulative growth in the area is anticipated to result in intersection LOS falling to an unsatisfactory level; however, the proposed project's payment of the fair share contribution to SFMTA would reduce the project's cumulative impacts at these two intersections to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the project is not expected to conflict with policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the roadway system.

Project construction activities, in combination with other major development in the vicinity of the project area listed in the "Project Setting," could temporarily result in cumulative construction-related transportation effects on local or regional roads, but would not result in permanent, cumulatively considerable, transportation impacts.

Transit Effectiveness Project and Recent Muni Service Changes

The Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) represents a thorough review of San Francisco's public transit system initiated by SFMTA in collaboration with the City Controller's Office and aimed at improving reliability, reducing travel times, providing more frequent service and updating Muni bus routes and rail lines to better match current travel patterns.

The TEP recommendations were unanimously endorsed by the SFMTA Board of Directors on October 21, 2008, pending any requisite environmental impact assessments. They include new routes and route extensions, more service on busy routes and elimination or consolidation of certain routes or route segments with low ridership.

As noted above (Transit Impacts Section), Muni's TEP includes the rerouting of the 23-Monterey away from the Produce Market to operate on Oakdale Avenue, Industrial Street and Palou Avenue, instead of Toland Street, Jerrold Avenue and Phelps Street to provide a more direct route. No timeline has been set by SFMTA for this route change, which is not contingent on other route adjustments or realignments in Muni's system.

Jerrold Avenue Caltrain Bridge Replacement

The Peninsula Rail Corridor (Caltrain) provides rail passenger service on the Peninsula between Gilroy and San Francisco. It currently operates 86 trains each weekday, with a combination of local, limited stops and Baby Bullet services with evening peak period headways of approximately 6 to 20 minutes.

Two Caltrain main tracks, one northbound and one southbound, currently traverse over Jerrold Avenue between Rankin and Quint Streets via a steel span bridge which has two end-spans and three intermediate spans with an approximate total length of 192 feet. The rail bridge has deteriorated with time and regular use and Caltrain is in the process of designing and constructing a new replacement bridge. The project would replace the three intermediate spans with a single span bridge that can accommodate, if needed, four lanes of traffic on Jerrold Avenue, plus shoulders and sidewalks on each side of the street, and would also perform roadway reconstruction, and associated track work as needed, at an estimated total construction cost of \$20 million.

The construction contract was awarded in July 2010, with construction completion anticipated in mid-2011. Jerrold Avenue would have to be closed to traffic once or twice as part of bridge replacement, although potential traffic closures would be planned for weekends or late at night.

Impact TR-6: The project variant would result in less-than-significant operational impacts. (Less than Significant)

The project variant would construct the same addition to the street parking supply as the proposed project; however, it would reduce the amount of parking on-site over existing conditions. Approximately 310 spaces would be constructed on-site under the variant (compared to 440 for the proposed project), which would not provide any rooftop parking, but would be able to provide some additional spaces under I-280 and west of Toland Street.

The two entry-only lanes at the Toland Street west access gate would be sufficient to accommodate the expected inbound flow under the project variant, although implementation of a third reversible lane is still recommended to accommodate unexpected peaks in demand. In the event of a queue developing outside of the gate, entering truckers would be expected to wait on Jerrold Avenue without blocking traffic on Toland Street.

The project variant would involve fewer square feet of uses than the proposed project, and so would be anticipated to have similar or reduced transportation grid demand for traffic, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Because operations for the proposed project would result in less-than-significant project-specific impacts, project-specific operations for the project variant would be *less-than-significant* as well.

Improvement Measure I-TR-1 would be applicable to the project variant.

Impact TR-7: The project variant, in combination of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would have significant cumulative transportation impacts. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Because the proposed project would result in potentially significant cumulative impact to intersection operating conditions, it is assumed that the project variant would as well. **Mitigation Measures M-TR-5a and M-TR-5b** (page 99) would be applicable under the project variant, which would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Conclusion

The proposed project and project variant would not cause a substantial increase in traffic, in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. As reflected in the trip generation explained above, the proposed project and project variant would result in less-than-significant impacts related to increases in vehicle traffic in the project vicinity and surrounding intersections. The proposed project and variant would not include any hazardous design features or incompatible uses that could result in hazardous conditions and the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access to the site, or any surrounding sites. The proposed project and variant would not cause a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by existing and proposed transit capacity, and alternative travel modes. The proposed project and project variant would have cumulative traffic impacts that would be less-than-significant with mitigation incorporated.

<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>
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"/>

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
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 airstrip; therefore checklist items 6e and 6f are not applicable to the proposed project or project variant.

Impact NO-1: The proposed project would not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of established standards, nor would the proposed project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels or otherwise be substantially affected by existing noise. (Less than Significant)

The Environmental Protection Element of the San Francisco *General Plan* contains Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise.²⁸ These guidelines, which are similar to state guidelines promulgated by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, indicate maximum acceptable noise levels for various newly developed land uses. For "Wholesale and Some Retail, Industrial/Manufacturing, Transportation, Communication, and Utilities" uses, the maximum "satisfactory" noise level without incorporating noise insulation into a project is 77.5 dBA (Ldn),²⁹ while above 82.5 dBA (Ldn) the guidelines indicate that industrial, office, retail and meeting space development should be discouraged. Where noise levels exceed 75 dBA, a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements would normally be necessary prior to final review and approval, and new construction or development of commercial uses would be

²⁸ City and County of San Francisco, Planning Department, San Francisco *General Plan*, Environmental Protection Element, Policy 11.1.

²⁹ Sound pressure is measured in decibels (dB), with zero dB corresponding roughly to the threshold of human hearing, and 120 dB to 140 dB corresponding to the threshold of pain. The acronym "dBA" stands for decibels using the A-weighted scale. A decibel is a unit of measurement for sound loudness (amplitude.) Because sound pressure can vary by over one trillion times within the range of human hearing, a logarithmic loudness scale is used to keep sound intensity numbers at a convenient and manageable level. Owing to the variation in sensitivity of the human ear to various frequencies, sound is "weighted" to emphasize frequencies to which the ear is more sensitive, in a method known as A-weighting and expressed in units of A-weighted decibels (dBA.) Ldn takes into account the fact that sensitivity to noise increases during the evening and night hours. Combined, dBA Ldn is a 24-hour descriptor that incorporates artificial noise penalties added to quiet time events.

required to have noise insulation features included in the design. Based on modeling of traffic noise volumes conducted by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH),³⁰ the traffic noise level in the project area vicinity is generally between 60 dBA and 79 dBA. Therefore, the project site is located in an area where, at the upper end of the range, a detailed noise reduction analysis would normally be required but below the level at which the proposed uses would generally be discouraged. Therefore, the proposed project would locate commercial uses in an environment with noise levels that can be above those considered normally acceptable for these uses, but in an area where such uses are not generally discouraged. Therefore, while the proposed project would not generally be discouraged in the area, the project sponsor would be required to comply with the San Francisco *General Plan* noise standards discussed above by performing a detailed noise reduction analysis and including noise insulation features in the project's design. Compliance with the Noise Ordinance would ensure that effects from exposure to ambient noise would not result in significant impacts.

Ambient noise levels in the project vicinity are typical of noise levels in greater San Francisco, which are dominated by vehicular traffic, including trucks, cars, Muni buses, and emergency vehicles. As discussed above, ambient noise in the project vicinity has been measured at between 60 and 79 dBA. Jerrold Avenue and Toland Street are heavily traveled in the early morning hours and generate high levels of traffic noise. Later in the day and evening, these streets are moderately traveled, and generate moderate levels of traffic noise. Innes Avenue, Kirkwood Avenue, and Rankin Street are lightly traveled, and generate low levels of traffic noise. In addition to surface streets, the elevated I-280 generates high noise levels throughout the day and night. Noise from I-280 dominates the noise environment in the central portion of the Main Site, but is attenuated near the eastern and western ends of the site. Surrounding land uses, which include a variety of commercial and industrial uses, generally do not conduct operations that are noticeably noisy; however, truck traffic generated by these surrounding uses can be noisy at times. The existing noise levels would have a *less-than-significant* impact on the proposed project.

Generally, traffic must double in volume to produce a noticeable increase in average noise levels. Based on the transportation calculations prepared for the project (see Transportation and

³⁰ Traffic noise map available on DPH website: <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Noise/default.asp>, accessed January 29, 2011.

Circulation, page 72), traffic volumes would not double on area streets as a result of the proposed project; therefore, the proposed project would not cause a noticeable increase in the ambient noise level in the project vicinity. The effect of the proposed project on ambient noise levels in the site vicinity would be *less than significant*.

The project would intensify the uses on the project site and include new mechanical equipment, such as cooling or air conditioning units, which would increase operational noise on the project site. These operations would be subject to Section 2909 of the Noise Ordinance. As amended in November 2008, this section establishes a noise limit from mechanical sources, such as building equipment, specified as a certain noise level in excess of the ambient noise level at the property line: for noise generated by residential uses, the limit is 5 dBA in excess of ambient, while for noise generated by commercial and industrial uses, the limit is 8 dBA in excess of ambient, and for noise on public property, including streets, the limit is 10 dBA in excess of ambient.³¹ Compliance with Article 29, Section 2909, would minimize noise from building operations. Therefore, noise effects related to building operation would be *less than significant*.

Impact NO-2: During construction, the proposed project would result in a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels and vibration in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, but any construction-related increase in noise levels and vibration would be considered a less than significant impact. (Less than Significant)

Demolition, excavation, and building construction would temporarily increase noise in the project vicinity. Construction equipment would generate noise and possibly vibrations that could be considered an annoyance by occupants of nearby properties. Approximately 230 piles would be driven approximately 60 feet into the heterogeneous fill, Bay Mud, and sand and clayey sand at the site, which would generate potentially significant noise and vibration during pile driving.

According to the project sponsor, the construction period for Phase I (including demolition of the existing structures on the 901 Rankin Street site, demolition of smaller structures on the Main Site, the construction a new warehouse facility at 901 Rankin Street, and roadway

³¹ Entertainment venues are also subject to a separate criterion for low-frequency (bass) noise.

improvements) would last approximately 18 months, and the construction periods for Phases II and III (including construction on the Main Site) would each be approximately 24 months. Construction noise levels for activities other than pile driving 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 the period during which new foundations and exterior structural and facade elements would be constructed. Interior construction noise would be substantially reduced by exterior walls. Construction noise is regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the *Police Code*), amended in November 2008. The ordinance requires that noise levels from individual pieces of construction equipment, other than impact tools, not exceed 80 dBA³² at a distance of 100 feet from the source. Impact tools (jackhammers, hoerammers, impact wrenches) must have both intake and exhaust muffled to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works or the Director of Building Inspection. Section 2908 of the Ordinance prohibits construction work between 8 p.m. and 7 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 or the Director of Building Inspection. The project must comply with regulations set forth in the Noise Ordinance.

There are no residences, schools, or health care facilities in the project vicinity with sensitive receptors that could be affected by project construction noise. The closest noise receptors to the project site that have the potential to be adversely affected by construction noise are employees and visitors of the various commercial and industrial facilities surrounding the site. Construction activities (other than pile driving, which would be employed in project construction) typically generate noise levels no greater than 90 dBA (for instance, for excavation) at 50 feet from the activity, while other activities, such as concrete work, are much less noisy. Pile driving can generate noise levels in excess of 100 dBA at 50 feet each time the hammer strikes the pile. While potentially more startling than constant noise levels, pile driving noise would be intermittent and would occur over a relatively short duration of approximately eight to twelve weeks. Moreover, pile driving noise occurs only when a pile is being driven, with breaks when driving one pile is complete and another is being placed in position. Closed

³² The acronym "dBA" stands for decibels using the A-weighted scale. A decibel is a unit of measurement for sound loudness (amplitude.) The A-weighted scale is a logarithmic scale that approximates the sensitivity of the human ear.

windows typically can reduce daytime interior noise levels to an acceptable level. Therefore, for nearby receptors, although construction noise and vibration could be annoying at times, it would not be expected to exceed noise and ground borne vibration levels commonly experienced in an urban environment. For this reason, and because there are no sensitive receptors in the project vicinity, the impact of construction noise and vibration would be considered *less than significant*.

Impact NO-3: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative noise impacts. (Less than Significant)

Two other projects are proposed within the project vicinity, 2121 Evans and 3433 – 3rd Street.³³ Depending on schedules, there could be overlap in construction of one or more project(s) and the proposed Produce Market project. However, each project would be required to implement noise control measures, and therefore construction noise would be reduced to the maximum extent feasible. Moreover, for each project, the period of noisiest activity would be much less lengthy than the duration of the entire construction period, substantially reducing the potential for overlap between projects' phases of maximum construction noise. Given this, the proposed project would not contribute considerably to any potential cumulative construction noise impacts.

Concerning operational noise, project traffic would not make a considerable contribution to either existing or future cumulative traffic volumes such that traffic noise would perceptibly increase. Likewise, noise generated by operation of the proposed Produce Market project would not make a substantial contribution to ambient noise levels in the vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulative effect on operational noise.

In light of the above, noise effects related to the proposed project, both project-specific and cumulative, would be less than significant.

³³ The proposed project at 2121 Evans Street is currently under entitlement and environmental review at the Planning Department, and 3433 – 3rd Street is currently under environmental review at the Planning Department.

Impact NO-5: The project variant would result in less-than-significant project-specific and cumulative noise impacts. (Less than Significant)

The project variant would include the same uses and less square footage than the proposed project, and would generate less traffic than the proposed project. Therefore, operational and traffic noise associated with the variant would be the same or less than the proposed project. The project variant would have a similar construction schedule as the proposed project, and would be expected to generate similar construction noise. Noise impacts of the proposed project are expected to be the same or reduced under the project variant, i.e., *less than significant*.

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

In 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) issued updated CEQA Guidelines (*2010 Guidelines*) to assist lead agencies in evaluating air quality impacts of projects and plans proposed in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). The Guidelines provide procedures for evaluating potential air quality impacts during the environmental review process consistent with CEQA requirements. The *2010 Guidelines* and BAAQMD's new CEQA air quality thresholds of significance adopted June 2, 2010 supersede the *1999 CEQA Air Quality*

Guidelines (1999 Guidelines).³⁴ According to the BAAQMD, the recently adopted thresholds of significance for criteria air pollutants, GHG emissions (addressed in Section E.8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions), and health risks from new sources of air emissions apply to environmental analyses that have begun on or after adoption of the revised CEQA thresholds. Thresholds of significance pertaining to the health risk impacts of sources upon sensitive receptors apply to environmental analyses begun on or after January 1, 2011. A neighborhood notice was sent out on September 10, 2010 to owners and occupants of properties within 300 feet of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would be subject to the thresholds identified in the 1999 Guidelines. However, because the revised thresholds of significance have generally been lowered and are more stringent standards than those in the 1999 Guidelines, the following analysis is based on the revised 2010 CEQA thresholds.

Impact AQ-1: The proposed project would emit criteria air pollutants, but not in excess of any air quality standard or in amounts that would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria air pollutant or conflict with implementation of an air quality plan. (Less than Significant)

The Federal Clean Air Act (CAA), as amended, and the California Clean Air Act (CCAA) legislate ambient air quality standards and related air quality reporting systems for regional regulatory agencies and require such agencies to develop mobile and stationary source control measures to meet these standards. BAAQMD is the primary responsible regulatory agency in the Bay Area for planning, implementing and enforcing the federal and state ambient standards for criteria pollutants.³⁵ Criteria air pollutants include ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5})³⁶ and lead.

³⁴ Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines*, June 2010 (BAAQMD 2010 Guidelines.) This document is available online at www.baaqmd.gov, accessed July 22, 2010.

³⁵ State and Federal air quality standards for the Bay Area's attainment status available at the BAAQMD website at <http://www.baaqmd.gov>, accessed February 2, 2011.

³⁶ PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ refer to particulate matter that is 2.5 microns in diameter or less and particulate matter that is 10 microns in diameter or less, respectively.

The San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin encompasses San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, Napa and parts of Solano and Sonoma counties. The basin has a history of air quality violations for ozone, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter and currently does not meet the state ambient air quality standards for ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. The BAAQMD has adopted air quality management plans over the years to address control methods and strategies for meeting air quality standards, the latest plan being the *2010 Clean Air Plan*.

The *2010 Clean Air Plan* is intended to: (1) update the *2005 Ozone Strategy* in accordance with the requirements of the CCAA to implement “all feasible measures” to reduce ozone; (2) provide a control strategy to reduce ozone, particulate matter (PM), air toxics, and GHGs in a single, integrated plan; (3) review progress in improving air quality in recent years; and (4) establish emission control measures to be adopted or implemented in the 2010-2012 timeframe. The *2010 Air Quality Plan* was adopted by the BAAQMD on September 15, 2010.

The BAAQMD *2010 Guidelines* notes that the first step in determining the significance of criteria air pollutants and precursors related to project operation and from exhaust during project construction is to compare the attributes of the proposed project with the applicable screening criteria. The purpose of this comparison is to provide a conservative indication of whether construction or operation of the proposed project would result in the generation of criteria air pollutants and/or precursors that exceed the Guidelines’ thresholds of significance. If all of the screening criteria are met by a proposed project, then the lead agency or applicant does not need to perform a detailed air quality assessment of the project’s air pollutant emissions, and construction or operation of the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to air quality. If the proposed project does not meet all the screening criteria, then project emissions need to be quantified and analyzed against the BAAQMD’s thresholds of significance.³⁷

The *2010 Guidelines* notes that the screening levels are generally representative of new development on Greenfield sites³⁸ without any form of mitigation measures taken into consideration. In addition, the screening criteria do not account for project design features,

³⁷ Op cit, footnote 34, p. 3-1.

³⁸ Greenfield sites are previously undeveloped sites considered for development, as opposed Brownfield or Greyfield sites, which have already been developed but left abandoned or are considered underutilized.

attributes, or local development requirements that could also result in lower emissions. For projects that are mixed-use, infill, and/or proximate to transit service and local services, emissions could be less than the Greenfield-type project that these screening criteria are based upon.

The *2010 Guidelines* provides two thresholds for construction-related criteria air pollutants: (1) exhaust emissions from construction vehicles, and (2) fugitive dust. Both thresholds are discussed below.

Construction-Related Exhaust Emissions

The *2010 Guidelines* provides thresholds of significance for construction-related criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions from vehicle exhaust. The thresholds as determined by the BAAQMD are whether the proposed project would emit: reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NO_x) or PM_{2.5} at levels in excess of 54 lbs/day or 10 U.S. tons/year, or whether the proposed project would emit PM₁₀ at levels in excess of 82 lbs/day or 15 U.S. tons/year. The *2010 Guidelines* provide screening criteria that identify the size and type of project that is not anticipated to emit criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors in excess of the adopted thresholds of significance, but notes that the screening levels do not apply to projects that propose demolition activities.³⁹ Therefore, a quantitative analysis of the proposed project's construction-related emissions with respect to criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors was undertaken. Consistent with the *2010 Guidelines*, the proposed project's construction-related criteria air pollutant emissions were modeled using URBEMIS2007 (Version 9.2.4), with construction information provided by the project sponsor. The proposed construction would take place in three phases: Phase I, which is anticipated to have an approximately 18-month construction period; and Phases II and III, which are anticipated to have approximately 24-month construction periods each.⁴⁰ Table 8, below, shows the results of this analysis and compares these results to the applicable threshold of significance established by the BAAQMD. The analysis assumes that the proposed project would comply with Article 22B, San Francisco Construction Dust Ordinance, described further below.

³⁹ BAAQMD *2010 Guidelines*, op cit, pp 3-5.

⁴⁰ Additional detail on construction duration and model input are provided in a memorandum from Don Ballanti to Stu During, *Subject: Criteria Pollutant/Precursor Pollutant Air Quality Analysis for the San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market Project*, August 20, 2010. This document is on file and available for public review as part of Case No. 2009.1153E, at the Planning Department at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103.

As shown above, the proposed project's construction exhaust emissions would be well below the BAAQMD's thresholds of significance for construction-related criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors. Thus, the project's construction-related exhaust emissions would be *less than significant*.

Construction-Related Fugitive Dust Emissions

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 particulate matter exposure can cause health effects at lower levels than national standards. The current health burden of particulate matter demands that, where possible, public agencies take feasible available actions to reduce sources of particulate matter exposure. According to the California Air Resources Board, reducing ambient particulate

Table 8 Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions				
Phase	ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Average Pounds per Day				
Phase I (2012-2013)	9.65	20.35	5.86	2.07
Phase II (2017-2019)	8.81	10.23	3.19	1.00
Phase III (2025-2027)	8.49	6.69	2.69	0.81
BAAQMD Threshold of Significance	54.00	54.00	82.00	54.00
U.S. Tons per Year				
Phase I (2012-2013)	1.91	3.91	1.16	0.40
Phase II (2017-2019)	2.29	2.60	0.83	0.26
Phase III (2025-2027)	2.20	1.69	0.69	0.20
BAAQMD Threshold of Significance	10	10	15	10

Notes:

ROG = Reactive Organic Gases

NO_x = Nitrogen Oxides

PM₁₀ = Particulate Matter, 10 micron

PM_{2.5} = Particulate Matter, 2.5 micron

Source: Don Ballanti, August 10, 2010

matter 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 particulate matter in the local atmosphere. Depending on exposure, adverse health effects can occur due to this particulate matter in general and also due to specific contaminants such as lead or asbestos that may be constituents of soil.

For fugitive dust emissions, the *2010 Guidelines* recommend following the current best management practices approach, which has been a pragmatic and effective approach to the control of fugitive dust emissions. The *2010 Guidelines* note that individual measures have been

shown to reduce fugitive dust by anywhere from 30 percent to more than 90 percent and conclude that projects that implement construction best management practices would reduce fugitive dust emissions to a less-than-significant level.⁴¹

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco *Building and Health Codes*, generally referred hereto as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008), with the intent of reducing the quantity of dust generated during site preparation, demolition and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of on-site workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI).

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

The following regulations and procedures set forth in of Article 22B of the San Francisco *Health Code* (Construction Dust Control Requirements) generally contain the BAAQMD-recommended best management practices:

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily;
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials, or require such trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard;
- Pave, apply water at a minimum three times daily in dry weather, or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas;
- Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas;
- Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public street areas;
- Hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more);
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles;

⁴¹ 2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, op cit, pp..8-2 to 8-3.

- (dirt, sand, etc.);
- Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour;
- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways;
- Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible;
- Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off the tires of all trucks and equipment prior to leaving the site;
- Install wind breaks, or plant trees/vegetative wind breaks at windward side(s) of construction areas;
- Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph; and
- Limit the area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activity at any one time.

Compliance with the Dust Control Ordinance would ensure that the project's air quality impacts related to fugitive dust would be *less than significant*.

Criteria Air Pollutants and Ozone Precursors – Project Operations

As noted above, the BAAQMD 2010 *Guidelines* establish precursor screening criteria above which air quality emissions resulting from project operation and construction must be quantified and analyzed against the BAAQMD's thresholds of significance. For warehouse operations, the screening criterion is square footage. A warehouse project that is less than 864,000 sq.ft. would not result in the generation of operational-related criteria air pollutants and/or precursors that exceed the BAAQMD's significance thresholds. Although the proposed project would fall under this threshold, air quality emissions from operations were calculated due to the project's reliance on heavy truck deliveries, and are compared against the BAAQMD's significance thresholds below.

Operational emissions were calculated using the URBEMIS 2007 (Version 9.2.4) model, and are presented in Table 9. As shown in the table, emission increases attributable to the proposed project would be substantially below the significance thresholds established by the BAAQMD. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on regional criteria pollutant emissions would be *less than significant*.

Table 9 Project Operational Emissions (lbs./day)				
Phase	ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Vehicle Emissions	10.42	17.28	21.54	4.09
Area Source Emissions	1.55	1.35	0.02	0.02
Total Project Emissions	11.97	21.56	2.69	4.11
BAAQMD Threshold of Significance	54.00	54.00	82.00	54.00

Notes:

ROG = Reactive Organic Gases

NO_x = Nitrogen Oxides

PM₁₀ = Particulate Matter, 10 micron

PM_{2.5} = Particulate Matter, 2.5 micron

Source: Don Ballanti, August 10, 2010

Air Quality Plans

Since both construction and operational criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors would be below the BAAQMD's thresholds of significance, the proposed project would be consistent with regional air quality plans and the proposed project's emissions would not be expected to impede attainment or maintenance of ambient air quality standards in the Bay Area. As such, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of regional air quality plans and impacts of the proposed project related to conflicting with or obstructing implementation of an applicable air quality plan would be considered *less than significant*.

Impact AQ-2: The proposed project's emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant)

Construction-Related Impacts

Construction of individual projects would require construction equipment and would result in an increase in vehicle trips associated with construction workers and other off-road construction equipment. Diesel-powered construction equipment emit diesel particulate matter, which may affect nearby sensitive receptors. Sensitive receptors are people or institutions with

people that are particularly susceptible to illness from environmental pollution, such as the elderly, very young children, people already weakened by illness (e.g., asthmatics), residents, and persons engaged in strenuous exercise. As discussed in Section B. Setting, the closest sensitive receptors to the project site are residential uses over 0.25 miles from the project site to the south.

The BAAQMD has published Screening Tables for Air Toxics Evaluation During Construction.⁴² This document provides interim guidance for identifying whether a construction project could present a health risk to sensitive receptors. Based on the construction square footage, the screening table provides the minimum distance required between the fence line of a construction site and a nearby sensitive receptor to ensure that cancer and non-cancer risks associated with the project are less than significant, based on the BAAQMD's thresholds of significance. If a project meets the off-set distance, meaning that if no sensitive receptors are located within the off-set distance, a project's construction activities would have a less than significant impact with regard to the exposure of sensitive receptors to construction-related health risks.

The project site is approximately 11 acres. Based on the screening tables, the minimum off-set distance to the nearest sensitive receptor would be approximately 200 meters, or 656 feet. Given that the closest sensitive receptors are located over 0.25 miles, or 1,320 feet away from the project site, the proposed project's construction activities would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants that pose a potential health risk and construction-related health risks would be considered less than significant.

Project Operations

The proposed project would not include uses considered to be sensitive receptors and does not propose stationary sources that could pose a potential human health risk. The BAAQMD considers projects that generate less than 10,000 vehicle trips as minor, low-impact sources and recommends that a health risk analysis exclude these sources.⁴³ The project's anticipated

⁴² Bay Area Air Quality Management District. *Screening Tables for Air Toxics Evaluation During Construction*. May 2010. This document is available online at www.baaqmd.gov, accessed February 2, 2011.

⁴³ Bay Area Air Quality Management District. *Recommended Methods for Screening and Modeling Local Risks and Hazards*. May 2010, pg. 13. This document is available online at www.baaqmd.gov, accessed February 2, 2011.

increase of approximately 1,887 daily vehicle trips⁴⁴ would not exceed this screening level and would therefore not be considered a potential source for health risks. However, because the project's operation relies on heavy trucks, the SFDPH investigated community health risks from diesel exhaust emissions associated with heavy truck deliveries to the Produce Market. The SFDPH found that under a worst-case scenario of all truck deliveries per hour occurring via the same delivery entry point, diesel particulate matter was below detectable levels for all routes 1,000 feet from the Produce Market,⁴⁵ and therefore the proposed project is not expected to result in significant exposure of persons to hazards from diesel particulate matter.

Given that the proposed project would meet the construction-related health risk screening levels established by BAAQMD and that the proposed project does not include any sources that could pose a substantial health risk, the proposed project would have a *less-than-significant* health risk impact.

Impact AQ-3: The proposed project would not create objectionable odors that affect a substantial number of people. (Less than Significant)

Accumulation of compostable material would be expected to generate odors. While odors generated by compost may be regarded as objectionable, Recology is expected to collect the compost either daily or every other day, minimizing the generation of objectionable odors. Project operation would include the regular cleaning of compost collection areas and bins, which would help manage odor generation. Compost collection would take place outside the project buildings, minimizing the number of people affected by the odors. Moreover, odors from compost refuse are normal and generally accepted with uses such as the proposed project. For these reasons, the accumulation of compostable material would be considered to result in a less-than-significant odor impact.

Proposed construction would include a demonstration kitchen at the 901 Rankin Street site, the operation of which would result in the generation of odors noticeable to the people

⁴⁴ Adavant Consulting, op cit, p. 48, Table 3-6.

⁴⁵ Tom Rivard, San Francisco Department of Public Health, letter to Stu During, August 17, 2010. This document is on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2009.1153E.

participating in, or observing, the demonstration. Other people in or outside the building may be affected as well. Participants of and attendants at cooking demonstrations are not expected to consider odors attributable to the demonstration objectionable, and the numbers of those unaffiliated with cooking demonstrations who notice odors is not expected to be large. Moreover, cooking odors are not generally regarded as objectionable. For these reasons, cooking demonstrations would result in a less-than-significant odor impact.

Other project operations would not result in a perceptible increase or change in odors on the project site or in the vicinity of the project, as they would not include uses prone to generation of odors.

Other than construction of a new demonstration kitchen, the proposed project would involve expansion of the existing uses on the project site, which, by observation do not generate objectionable odors that affect a substantial number of people. Observation also indicates that the existing and surrounding land uses are not sources of noticeable odors. Therefore this impact would be *less than significant*.

Impact AQ-4: The proposed project would result in less-than-significant cumulative air quality impacts. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would be generally consistent with the *General Plan* and air quality management plans such as the *2010 Clean Air Plan*. Additionally, the *General Plan*, *Planning Code*, and the City Charter implement various transportation control measures identified in the City's Transit First Program, bicycle parking regulations, transit development fees, and other actions. Accordingly, the proposed project would not contribute considerably to cumulative air quality impacts, nor would it interfere with implementation of the *2010 Clean Air Plan*, which is the applicable regional air quality plan, developed to improve air quality towards attaining the state and federal air quality standards.

With respect to cumulative impacts from criteria air pollutants, BAAQMD's approach to cumulative air quality analysis is that any proposed project that would individually have a significant air quality impact would also be considered to have a significant cumulative air

quality impact.⁴⁶ The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to construction air quality emissions, operational air quality emissions, project-related motor vehicle emissions, exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutants, and odors. Therefore, cumulative air quality impacts associated with the proposed project would also be considered *less than significant*.

Impact AQ-5: The project variant would result in less-than-significant project-specific and cumulative air quality impacts. (Less than Significant)

The project variant would construct the same uses and less square footage than the proposed project; therefore traffic air emissions associated with the project variant would be reduced from the proposed project, as would air emissions from energy, heating, cooling, and lighting designs. The construction schedule would be similar to the proposed project, and the project would be expected to have the same or reduced construction air quality impacts than the proposed project. With the same uses, the project variant would not be expected to introduce any new source of odor compared to the proposed project, and the project variant's air quality impacts would be *less than significant*.

<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>
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 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"/>

⁴⁶ Bay Area Air Quality Management District. *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines*. June 2010, p. 2-1.

Environmental Setting

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are referred to as 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, methane, nitrous oxide, ozone, and water vapor.

While the presence of the primary GHGs in the atmosphere are naturally occurring, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O) are largely emitted from human activities, accelerating the rate at which these compounds occur within earth's atmosphere. Emissions of carbon dioxide are largely by-products of fossil fuel combustion, whereas methane results from off-gassing associated with agricultural practices and landfills. Other GHGs include hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride, and are generated in certain industrial processes. Greenhouse gases are typically reported in "carbon dioxide-equivalent" measures (CO₂E).⁴⁷

There is international scientific consensus that human-caused increases in GHGs have and will continue to contribute to global warming. Potential global warming impacts in California may include, but are not limited to, loss in snow pack, sea level rise, more extreme heat days per year, more high ozone days, more large forest fires, and more drought years. Secondary effects are likely to include a global rise in sea level, impacts to agriculture, changes in disease vectors, and changes in habitat and biodiversity.⁴⁸

The Air Resources Board (ARB) estimated that in 2006 California produced about 484 million gross metric tons of CO₂E (MMTCO₂E), or about 535 million U.S. tons.⁴⁹ The ARB found 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 22 percent and industrial sources at 20 percent. Commercial and residential fuel use (primarily for heating) accounted for 9 percent of GHG

⁴⁷ Because of the differential heat absorption potential of various GHGs, GHG emissions are frequently measured in "carbon dioxide-equivalents," which present a weighted average based on each gas's heat absorption (or "global warming") potential.

⁴⁸ California Climate Change Portal. Frequently Asked Questions About Global Climate Change. Available online at: <http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/publications/faqs.html>, accessed November 8, 2010.

⁴⁹ The abbreviation for "million metric tons" is MMT; thus, "million metric tons of CO₂ equivalents" is written as MMTCO₂E.

emissions. In the Bay Area, fossil fuel consumption in the transportation sector (on-road motor vehicles, off-highway mobile sources, and aircraft) and the industrial and commercial sectors are the two largest sources of GHG emissions, each accounting for approximately 36 percent of the Bay Area's 95.8 MMTCO₂E of GHG emissions emitted in 2007. Electricity generation accounts for approximately 16 percent of the Bay Area's GHG emissions, followed by residential fuel usage at 7 percent, off-road equipment at 3 percent, and agriculture at 12 percent.

Regulatory Setting

In 2006, the California legislature passed Assembly Bill No. 32 (*California Health and Safety Code* Division 25.5, Sections 38500, et seq., or AB 32), also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act. AB 32 requires the ARB to design and implement emission limits, regulations, and other measures, such that feasible and cost-effective statewide GHG emissions are reduced to 1990 levels by 2020 (representing a 25 percent reduction in emissions).

Pursuant to AB 32, ARB adopted a Scoping Plan in December 2008, outlining measures to meet the 2020 GHG reduction limits. In order to meet these goals, California must reduce its GHG emissions by 30 percent below projected 2020 business as usual emissions levels, or about 15 percent from today's levels.⁵⁰ The Scoping Plan estimates a reduction of 174 MMTCO₂E (about 191 million U.S. tons) from the transportation, energy, agriculture, forestry, and high global warming potential sectors, see Table 10, page 124. ARB has identified an implementation timeline for the GHG reduction strategies in the Scoping Plan.⁵¹ Some measures may require new legislation to implement, some will require subsidies, some have already been developed, and some will require additional effort to evaluate and quantify. Additionally, some emissions reductions strategies may require their own environmental review under CEQA or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

AB 32 also anticipates that local government actions will result in reduced GHG emissions. ARB has identified a GHG reduction target of 15 percent from current levels for local governments

⁵⁰ California Air Resources Board, California's Climate Plan: Fact Sheet. Available online at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/facts/scoping_plan_fs.pdf, accessed March 4, 2010.

⁵¹ California Air Resources Board. AB 32 Scoping Plan. Available Online at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/sp_measures_implementation_timeline.pdf, accessed March 2, 2010.

Table 10. GHG Reductions from the AB 32 Scoping Plan Sectors⁵²	
GHG Reduction Measures By Sector	GHG Reductions (MMTCO₂E)
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 Recommended Measures	
Government Operations	1-2
Agriculture- Methane Capture at Large Dairies	1
Methane Capture at Large Dairies	1
Additional GHG Reduction Measures	
Water	4.8
Green Buildings	26
High Recycling/ Zero Waste	
• Commercial Recycling	
• Composting	
• Anaerobic Digestion	9
• Extended Producer Responsibility	
• Environmentally Preferable Purchasing	
Total	42.8-43.8

⁵² Ibid.

themselves and notes that successful implementation of the plan relies on local governments' land use planning and urban growth decisions because local governments have primary authority to plan, zone, approve, and permit land development to accommodate population growth and the changing needs of their jurisdictions.

The Scoping Plan relies on the requirements of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) to implement the carbon emission reductions anticipated from land use decisions. SB 375 was enacted to align local land use and transportation planning to further achieve the State's GHG reduction goals. SB 375 requires regional transportation plans, developed by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), to incorporate a "sustainable communities strategy" in their regional transportation plans (RTPs) that would achieve GHG emission reduction targets set by ARB. SB 375 also includes provisions for streamlined CEQA review for some infill projects such as transit-oriented development. SB 375 would be implemented over the next several years and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's 2013 RTP would be its first plan subject to SB 375.

Senate Bill 97 (SB 97) required the Office of Planning and Research (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 add a new section to the CEQA Checklist (CEQA Guidelines Appendix G) to address questions regarding the project's potential to emit GHGs.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the primary agency responsible for air quality regulation in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). As part of their role in air quality regulation, BAAQMD has prepared the CEQA air quality guidelines to assist lead agencies in evaluating air quality impacts of projects and plans proposed in the SFBAAB. The guidelines provide procedures for evaluating potential air quality impacts during the environmental review process consistent with CEQA requirements. On June 2, 2010, the BAAQMD adopted new and revised CEQA air quality thresholds of significance and issued revised guidelines that supersede the 1999 air quality guidelines. The *2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (2010 Guidelines)* provide for the first time CEQA thresholds of significance for GHG emissions. OPR's amendments to the CEQA Guidelines as well as BAAQMD's *2010 Guidelines* and thresholds of significance have been incorporated into this analysis accordingly.

Impact GG-1: The proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, but not in levels that would result in a significant impact on the environment or conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. (Less than Significant)

The most common GHGs resulting from human activity are CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O.⁵³ State law defines GHGs to also include hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons and sulfur hexafluoride. These latter GHG compounds are usually emitted in industrial processes, and therefore not applicable to the proposed project. 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 expansion of the Produce Market, which would result in additional vehicle trips and an increase in energy use. The expansion could also result in an increase in overall water usage which generates indirect emissions from the energy required to pump, treat, and convey water. The expansion could also result in an increase in discarded landfill materials. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to annual long-term increases in GHGs as a result of increased vehicle trips (mobile sources) and operations associated with energy use, water use and wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal.

As discussed above, the BAAQMD has adopted CEQA thresholds of significance for projects that emit GHGs, one of which is a determination of whether the proposed project is consistent with a Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, as defined in the *2010 Guidelines*. On August 12, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Department submitted a draft of the City and

⁵³ 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 at the Office of Planning and Research's website at: <http://www.opr.ca.gov/ceqa/pdfs/june08-ceqa.pdf>, accessed March 3, 2010.

County of San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* to the BAAQMD.⁵⁴ This document presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco's Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy in compliance with the BAAQMD's 2010 *Guidelines* and thresholds of significance.

San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy identifies 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 taxis), and a mandatory composting ordinance. The strategy also identifies 42 specific regulations for new development that would reduce a project's GHG emissions.

San Francisco's climate change goals as are identified in the 2008 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Ordinance as follows:

- By 2008, determine the City's 1990 GHG emissions, the baseline level with reference to which target reductions are set;
- Reduce GHG emissions by 25 percent below 1990 levels by 2017;
- Reduce GHG emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2025; and
- Reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

The City's 2017 and 2025 GHG reduction goals are more aggressive than the State's GHG reduction goals as outlined in AB 32, and consistent with the State's long-term (2050) GHG reduction goals. San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* identifies the City's actions to pursue cleaner energy, energy conservation, alternative transportation and solid waste policies, and concludes that San Francisco's policies have resulted in a reduction in GHG emissions below 1990 levels, meeting statewide AB 32 GHG reduction goals. As reported, San Francisco's 1990 GHG emissions were approximately 8.26 million metric tons (MMT) CO₂E and 2005 GHG emissions are estimated at 7.82 MMTCO₂E, representing an approximately 5.3 percent reduction in GHG emissions below 1990 levels.

⁵⁴ San Francisco Planning Department. *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions in San Francisco*. 2010. The final document is available online at: http://sfmea.sfplanning.org.GHG_Reduction_Strategy.pdf, accessed May 4, 2011.

The BAAQMD reviewed San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* and concluded that the strategy meets the criteria for a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy as outlined in the *2010 Guidelines* and stated that San Francisco's "aggressive GHG reduction targets and comprehensive strategies 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."⁵⁵

Based on the BAAQMD's *2010 Guidelines*, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* would result in a less-than-significant impact with respect to GHG emissions. Furthermore, because San Francisco's strategy is consistent with AB 32 goals, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's strategy would also not conflict with the State's plan for reducing GHG emissions. As discussed in San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, new development and renovations/alterations for private projects and municipal projects are required to comply with San Francisco's ordinances that reduce GHG emissions. Applicable requirements are shown below in Table 11.

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, nor 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 success of reduced GHG emissions levels; (3) San Francisco has met and exceeded AB 32 GHG reduction goals for the year 2020; (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 BAAQMD's requirements for a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's regulations would not contribute significantly to global climate change. The proposed project would comply with these requirements as indicated above, and was determined to be consistent with

⁵⁵ Letter from Jean Roggenkamp, BAAQMD, to Bill Wycko, San Francisco Planning Department. October 28, 2010. This letter is available online at: <http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=1570>, accessed November 12, 2010.

San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*.⁵⁶ As such, the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* impact with respect to GHG emissions.

Table 11			
GHG Regulations Applicable to the Proposed Project			
Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
Transportation Sector			
Commuter Benefits Ordinance (<i>Environment Code</i> , Section 421)	<p>All employers of 20 or more employees must provide at least one of the following benefit programs:</p> <p>1. A Pre-Tax Election consistent with 26 U.S.C. Section 132(f), allowing employees to elect to exclude from taxable wages and compensation, employee commuting costs incurred for transit passes or vanpool charges, or</p> <p>(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</p> <p>(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.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Project Complies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply</p>	Although applicable, the Produce Market would not comply with this ordinance, nor would they require their individual merchants to comply with the Commuter Benefits Ordinance. As noted below, the proposed project would comply with all other applicable GHG regulations.
Emergency Ride Home Program	All persons employed in San Francisco are eligible for the emergency ride home program.	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>	The Produce Market would participate in the City's emergency ride home program.

⁵⁶ Greenhouse Gas Analysis: Compliance Checklist. March 30, 2011. This document is on file and available for public review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2009.1153E.

Table 11			
GHG Regulations Applicable to the Proposed Project			
Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
		<input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	
Transit Impact Development Fee (Administrative Code, Chapter 38)	Establishes fees for all commercial developments. Fees are paid to the SFMTA to improve local transit services.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would comply with the Transit Impact Development Fee. Since the Produce Market is a non-profit entity, the SFMTA may waive the transit fee.
Bicycle Parking in New and Renovated Commercial Buildings (Planning Code, Section 155.4)	Professional Services: (A) Where the gross square footage of the floor area is between 10,000-20,000 sq.ft., 3 bicycle spaces are required. (B) Where the gross square footage of the floor area is between 20,000-50,000 sq.ft., 6 bicycle spaces are required. (3) Where the gross square footage of the floor area exceeds 50,000 sq.ft., 12 bicycle spaces are required. Retail Services: (A) Where the gross square footage of the floor area is between 25,000 sq.ft. - 50,000 feet, 3 bicycle spaces are required. (2) Where the gross square footage of the floor area is between 50,000 sq.ft.- 100,000 feet, 6 bicycle spaces are required. (3) Where the gross square footage of the floor area exceeds 100,000 sq.ft., 12 bicycle spaces are required.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be required to provide 12 bicycle parking spaces; the proposed project would provide 90 spaces, meeting this requirement.
Energy Efficiency Sector			
San Francisco Green Building	Commercial buildings greater than 5,000 sf will be required to be at a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies	The proposed project would comply with the San Francisco Green

<p align="center">Table 11</p> <p align="center">GHG Regulations Applicable to the Proposed Project</p>			
Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
Requirements for Energy Efficiency (SF Building Code, Chapter 13C)	minimum 14% more energy efficient than Title 24 energy efficiency requirements. In 2008 large commercial buildings were required to have their energy systems commissioned, and in 2010, these large buildings were required to provide enhanced commissioning in compliance with LEED® Energy and Atmosphere Credit 3. Mid-sized commercial buildings were required to have their systems commissioned by 2009, with enhanced commissioning by 2011.	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	Building Ordinance (SFGBO).
San Francisco Green Building Requirements for Stormwater Management (SF Building Code, Chapter 13C) Or San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance (Public Works Code Article 4.2)	Requires all new development or redevelopment disturbing more than 5,000 sq.ft. of ground surface to manage stormwater on-site using low impact design. These projects are required to comply with LEED® Sustainable Sites Credits 6.1 and 6.2, or comply with the City's Stormwater ordinance and stormwater design guidelines.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would comply with Sustainable Sites Credit 6.1.
San Francisco Green Building Requirements for Water Efficient Landscaping (SF Building Code, Chapter 13C)	All new commercial buildings greater than 5,000 sq.ft. are required to reduce the amount of potable water used for landscaping by 50%.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would marshall rainwater for use in landscaping, and would comply with the SFGBO requirements for efficient landscaping.
San Francisco Green Building Requirements for Water Use Reduction (SF Building Code,	All new commercial buildings greater than 5,000 sf are required to reduce the amount of potable water used by 20%.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would comply with the SFGBO requirements for water use reduction.

Table 11			
GHG Regulations Applicable to the Proposed Project			
Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
Chapter 13C)			
Commercial Water Conservation Ordinance (SF <i>Building Code</i> , Chapter 13A)	<p>Requires all existing commercial properties undergoing tenant improvements to achieve the following minimum standards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All showerheads have a maximum flow of 2.5 gallons per minute (gpm). 2. All showers have no more than one showerhead per valve. 3. All faucets and faucet aerators have a maximum flow rate of 2.2 gpm/ 4. All Water Closets (toilets) have a maximum rated water consumption of 1.6 gallons per flush (gpf). 5. All urinals have a maximum flow rate of 1.0 gpf . 6. All water leaks have been repaired. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would comply with the SFGBO requirements for commercial water conservation.
Renewable Energy Sector			
San Francisco Green Building Requirements for Renewable Energy (SF <i>Building Code</i> , Chapter 13C)	<p>By 2012, all new commercial buildings will be required to provide on-site renewable energy or purchase renewable energy credits pursuant to LEED® Energy and Atmosphere Credits 2 or 6.</p> <p>Credit 2 requires providing at least 2.5% of the buildings energy use from on-site renewable sources.</p> <p>Credit 6 requires providing at least 35% of the building's electricity from renewable energy contracts</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements for renewable energy.
Waste Reduction Sector			
San Francisco Green Building Requirements for Solid Waste (SF <i>Building Code</i> ,	Pursuant to Section 1304C.0.4 of the SFGBO, all new construction, renovation and alterations subject to the ordinance are required to provide recycling, composting and	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	The proposed project would comply with the SFGBO requirements for solid waste.

Table 11			
GHG Regulations Applicable to the Proposed Project			
Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
Chapter 13C)	trash storage, collection, and loading that is convenient for all users of the building.	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	
Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance (<i>Environment Code</i> , 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	The proposed project would comply with the Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance.
San Francisco Green Building Requirements for Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling (SF <i>Building Code</i> , Chapter 13C)	Projects proposing demolition are required to divert at least 75% of the project's construction and demolition debris to recycling.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would comply with the SFGBO requirements for construction and demolition debris recycling.
San Francisco Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Ordinance (SF <i>Environment Code</i> , Chapter 14)	Requires that a person conducting full demolition of an existing structure to submit a waste diversion plan to the Director of the Environment which provides for a minimum of 65% diversion from landfill of construction and demolition debris, including materials source separated for reuse or recycling.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would comply with the San Francisco's Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Ordinance.
Environment/Conservation Sector			
Street Tree Planting Requirements for New Construction (<i>Planning Code</i> Section 138.1)	<i>Planning Code</i> Section 138.1 requires new construction, significant alterations or relocation of buildings within many of San Francisco's zoning districts to plant on 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	The proposed project would comply with San Francisco's Street Tree Planting Requirements for New Construction.
Wood Burning	Bans the installation of wood	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project	The proposed project would not

Table 11 GHG Regulations Applicable to the Proposed Project			
Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
Fireplace Ordinance (San Francisco <i>Building Code</i> , Chapter 31, Section 3102.8)	burning fire places except for the following: <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 	Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	include wood burning fireplaces.
Regulation of Diesel Backup Generators (San Francisco <i>Health Code</i> , Article 30)	Requires (among other things): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All diesel generators to be registered with the Department of Public Health • All new diesel generators must be equipped with the best available air emissions control technology. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Complies <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be required to comply with Article 30 of the San Francisco <i>Health Code</i> .

Impact GG-2: The proposed project would not result in a contribution to cumulatively considerable greenhouse gas emissions. (Less than Significant)

All potential future projects would be required to comply with San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, which ensures that cumulative development would have a *less-than-significant* greenhouse gas impact.

Impact GG-3: The project variant would result in less-than-significant project-specific and cumulative greenhouse gas emissions impact. (Less than Significant)

Like the proposed project, the project variant would comply with San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, resulting in *less-than-significant* greenhouse gas emissions impact.

<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>
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)

Winds in San Francisco are generally from the west, off the Pacific Ocean. Wind speeds, in general, are greatest in the spring and summer, and lowest in the fall, and generally the strongest wind speed is in the late afternoon and the lightest is in the morning.

Ground-level wind accelerations near buildings are controlled by three main elements: exposure, massing, and orientation. Exposure is a measure of the extent that the building extends above surrounding structures into the wind stream. A building that is surrounded by taller structures is not likely to cause adverse wind accelerations at ground level. Building massing controls how much wind is intercepted by a structure and patterns of wind distribution and accelerations. In general, a flat façade would have a greater potential for wind acceleration, particularly at the ground level, as compared to an articulated façade, i.e. buildings with unusual shapes or that utilize set-backs. Similar to massing, orientation determines how much wind is intercepted by the structure, a factor that directly determines wind acceleration. In general, buildings that are oriented with their wide axis (longest façade) across the prevailing wind direction will have a greater impact on ground-level winds than a building oriented with its narrow façade axis along the prevailing wind direction.

The existing buildings on the project site range in height from ten to 35 feet. An elevated, two-level segment of I-280 passes over the middle of the Main Site in the northeast-southwest direction. The buildings to the northeast are one to three stories in height. The Caltrain right-of way is about 20 feet above grade to the east. The buildings to the south of the site are one story in height, and the buildings to the west and northwest of the project site, on the opposite side of Toland Street, are two to three stories in height. There are no high-rise buildings in the area.

Relatively flat topography extends approximately one-half mile to the west, where Bernal Heights slopes upwards, reaching a peak of 433 feet above mean sea level (MSL) approximately 0.75 mile west of the project site. The project site sits at approximately at approximately ten feet above MSL.

For westerly and northwesterly winds, the tallest of the project buildings (about 42 feet eight inches) would rise approximately one to two stories above adjacent structures to the west and northwest. The widest axes of the four proposed warehouses (Buildings 1, 2, 3 and 4) would be oriented northwest-southeast, parallel to the prevailing winds, while the widest axis of the proposed 901 Rankin Street building would be oriented facing the prevailing winds. Thus, the proposed buildings would be partially exposed to the prevailing westerly and northwesterly winds. However, due to the orientation and limited height of the proposed structures (42 feet, eight inches), and the location of the elevated I-280 in the middle of the site perpendicular to the prevailing winds, any wind accelerations generated by the project would be limited. As a result, the project would not have a significant effect on wind at the entries to the project buildings or the adjacent sidewalks.

In summary, based on consideration of the height, exposure, massing, and orientation of the proposed project, the proposed buildings would not have the potential to cause significant changes to the wind environment in pedestrian areas adjacent or near the site. The proposed project would not affect the climate either in the neighborhood or regionally. Accordingly, the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* wind impact.

Impact WS-2: The proposed project in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts on wind patterns. (Less than Significant)

Due to the height of the proposed and recently completed buildings in the vicinity of, and the distance of the proposed and recently completed projects from the project site, at 2121 Evans Street and 3433 – 3rd Street,⁵⁷ the cumulative wind impacts would be *less than significant*.

Impact WS-3: The project variant would result in less-than-significant project-specific and cumulative wind impacts. (Less than Significant)

The project variant would entail the construction of the same structure on the 901 Rankin Street site as the proposed project, and would result in shorter structures on the Main Site; therefore the project variant is expected to have similar or reduced wind impacts as the proposed project (i.e., *less than significant*).

Impact WS-4: The proposed project would result in new shadows, but not in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas. (Less than Significant)

Section 295 of the *Planning Code* is intended to protect certain public open spaces from shadowing by new structures during the period between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, year round. *Planning Code* Section 295 restricts net new shadow on public open spaces under the jurisdiction of, or to be acquired by, the Recreation and Park Department, by any structure exceeding 40 feet, unless the Planning Commission, in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission, finds the impact to be less than significant.

The tallest of the project buildings would be up to approximately 42 feet, eight tall (Buildings 1 and 3) and subject to Section 295. The longest shadows would be added to the west in the mornings during the winter months and to the east in the winter afternoons. The closest public open space is the Selby and Palou Mini Park about 0.25 miles from the project site. However, the proposed project would have no shadow impact on any public open space protected by

⁵⁷ The proposed project at 2121 Evans Street is currently under entitlement and environmental review at the Planning Department, and 3433 – 3rd Street is currently under environmental review at the Planning Department.

Section 295.⁵⁸ The proposed project's shadow effects would be limited in scope and would not increase the total amount of shading above levels that are common and generally accepted in urban areas. As such, the proposed project would not adversely affect outdoor recreational facilities or other public areas. Thus, effects related to shading would be *less than significant*.

Impact WS-5: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects would result in less-than-significant shadow impacts. (Less than Significant)

Due to the height and proximity from the project site of the proposed and recently completed buildings in the vicinity of the project site, at 2121 Evans Street and 3433 – 3rd Street,⁵⁹ cumulative shadow impacts would be *less than significant*.

Impact WS-6: The project variant would result in less-than-significant project-specific and cumulative shadow impacts (Less than Significant)

The project variant would involve development of the same structure on the 901 Rankin Street site as the proposed project. At 40.25 feet in height, this would be the tallest building under the variant and would be subject to Section 295. The variant would involve development of smaller buildings on the Main Site than the proposed project. Therefore, the project variant is expected to have similar or reduced shadow impacts as the proposed project (i.e., *less than significant*).

⁵⁸ San Francisco Planning Department, Edgar Oropeza, Planner, Shadow Study, 2095 Jerrold Avenue (Block/Lot: Various), March 26, 2010. This letter is available for public review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, in Case No. 2009.1153K, and as part of Case No. 2009.1153E.

⁵⁹ The proposed project at 2121 Evans Street is currently under entitlement and environmental review at the Planning Department, and 3433 – 3rd Street is currently under environmental review at the Planning Department.

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
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 does not include recreational facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, checklist item 9b would not be applicable to the project.

Impact RE-1: The proposed project would not increase the use of existing parks and recreational facilities such that substantial the deterioration of such facilities would occur or be accelerated. The proposed project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction of expansion of recreational facilities, nor would it substantially physically degrade existing recreational resources. (Less than Significant)

The closest public open space is the Selby and Palou Mini Park about 0.25 miles from the project site. However, the project site is not located in an Open Space Service Area as identified by the San Francisco *General Plan* due to its walking proximity to open space areas,⁶⁰ and the project site does not lie within an area identified in the San Francisco *General Plan* as a High Need Area for new parks and recreation improvements.⁶¹ The proposed project does not include dwellings whose residents would increase the use of existing community recreational facilities in the area. The employees and visitors to the wholesaling, distribution, and related uses of the proposed project would not contribute substantially to the existing demand for public recreational

⁶⁰ City of San Francisco *General Plan*, Recreation and Open Space Element, Map 2: Public Open Space Service Areas, Adopted July 1995.

⁶¹ City of San Francisco *General Plan*, Recreation and Open Space Element, Map 9: Open Space Improvement Priority Plan, Adopted July 1995.

facilities in the project area and would not result in substantial physical deterioration of existing recreational resources. The proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of off-site recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment, and would therefore have a *less-than-significant* impact.

Impact RE-2: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects would result in less-than-significant impacts to recreational resources. (Less than Significant)

As noted above in the “Setting” discussion on page 39, two other projects are proposed within the project vicinity,⁶² which are primarily retail uses and would therefore not be expected to substantially increase demand for recreational facilities in the area. The proposed project’s employees would not substantially increase demand for recreational facilities in and around the project site. The closest public recreation field is the Selby and Palou Mini Park about 0.25 miles from the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact on recreational resources.

Impact RE-3: The project variant would result in less-than-significant project-specific and cumulative recreation impacts. (Less than Significant)

Similar to the proposed project, the project variant would not introduce residential uses that would create a demand for recreational facilities in the area, and would result in a *less-than-significant* impact on recreational facilities.

For the above-mentioned reasons, the proposed project’s and project variant’s impacts on recreational activities and facilities, both project-specific and cumulative, would be less than significant.

⁶² 2121 Evans Street is currently under entitlement and environmental review at the Planning Department, and 3433 – 3rd Street is currently under environmental review at the Planning Department.

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
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 well served by utilities and service systems, including sewer treatment plants, water supply facilities, and solid waste disposal. The proposed project would incrementally increase demand for and use of these services, but not in excess of amounts expected and provided for in this area.

Impact UT-1: The proposed project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), require or result in the construction of new, or expansion of existing, water, wastewater treatment facilities, or stormwater drainage facilities and the proposed project would be adequately served by the City's wastewater treatment provider. (Less than Significant)

The project site is served by San Francisco's combined sewer system, which handles both sewage and stormwater runoff. The proposed project would meet the wastewater pre-treatment

requirements of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), as required by the San Francisco Industrial Waste Ordinance in order to meet RWQCB requirements,⁶³ identified in the San Francisco "Stormwater Design Guidelines." The Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant (Southeast Plant) provides wastewater and stormwater treatment and management for the east side of the city, including the project site. Wastewater would be treated to the standards contained in the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant, prior to discharge into the Pacific Ocean.

Compliance with the Stormwater Management Ordinance (SMO) in general will require the project to maintain or reduce the existing volume and rate of stormwater runoff discharged from the site. To achieve this, the project would implement and install appropriate stormwater management systems that retain runoff onsite, promote stormwater reuse, and limit site discharges entering the combined sewer collection system. This in turn would limit the incremental demand on both the collection system and wastewater facilities resulting from stormwater discharges, and minimize the potential need for additional treatment capacity.

In accordance with the SMO, the project site will be designed with Low Impact Design (LID) approaches and stormwater management systems to comply with the Stormwater Design Guidelines (SDGs). As noted on page 34 under "Other Project Characteristics," similar to the existing conditions on the project site, the proposed project would cover almost the entire site with impervious surfaces (buildings and paving). For a project site with over 50 percent of impervious surfaces, such as the subject property, the project would be required to reduce stormwater runoff peak rate and total volume by 25 percent. The proposed project would be required to retain stormwater permanently on site. To achieve this, the proposed project would implement and install appropriate stormwater management systems that retain runoff on site, promote stormwater reuse, and limit site discharges before entering the combined sewer system. The proposed project would divert rainwater from the buildings and marshalling yard to a rainwater retention catchment where it would be used for project landscaping. Project landscaping would include upgraded streetscapes with street trees and landscaping at any uncovered grade parking lots, and landscaping at rain water catchment areas.

⁶³ 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.

Since the proposed project would not substantially change the amount of impervious surfaces on the site, it would not substantially affect the amount of stormwater discharged from the project site. Additionally, as new construction, the proposed project would be required to meet the standards for stormwater management identified in the San Francisco Green Building Ordinance (SFGBO), adopted May 6, 2008. The proposed project would not require new wastewater or stormwater collection and treatment facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less-than-significant* wastewater service impact.

Impact UT-2: The proposed project would increase the amount of water used on the site, but would be adequately served by existing entitlements and water resources. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project could increase the amount of water required to serve the proposed industrial, office, retail, meeting hall, demonstration kitchen, and truck washing uses by a maximum of 37 percent over a 15-year period or more.⁶⁴ However, the proposed project would not result in a population increase beyond that assumed for planning purposes by the SFPUC's *2005 Urban Water Management Plan*.⁶⁵ As required by the SFGBO, the project would be required to implement water conservation measures which include a 50 percent reduction in potable water used for landscaping (requiring either drought resistant landscaping or use of reclaimed water), and a 20 percent reduction in potable water for other uses (requiring installation of low-flow fixtures). As discussed under Topic 7, Air Quality, during project construction, the project sponsor and project building contractor must comply with Article 21, Section 1100 et seq. of the *San Francisco Public Works Code*, which requires that reclaimed water be used for dust control activities. Although the project would increase the amount of water required onsite, the increase in water use on the site is accounted for in the SFPUC's *2005 Urban Water Management Plan*, and

⁶⁴ With approximately 46 percent more square footage than the existing uses, it is assumed that the project would result in an equivalent increase of water usage. The water-intensive industrial uses of the proposed project represent only a 37 percent increase over existing uses; thus the estimate of 46 percent increase is conservative. Additionally, the requirements included in SFGBO, such as low-flow showerheads and toilets, as well as project design features, such as rainwater marshalling, would further reduce water usage. A minimum 20 percent reduction is assumed for these features. Eighty percent of 46 percent is approximately 37 percent.

⁶⁵ The SFPUC's *2005 Urban Water Management Plan* is based on data presented in the Association of Bay Area Government's *Projections 2002: Forecasts for the San Francisco Bay Area to the Year 2025*, which includes all known or expected development projects in San Francisco through the year 2025.

the project would be required to implement water conservation measures as required by the SFGBO. Therefore, the project would be served by the existing and planned water supply and would not require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less-than-significant* project-specific and cumulative water impacts.

Impact UT-3: The proposed project would increase the amount of solid waste generated on the project site, but would be adequately served by the City's landfill and would comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. (Less than Significant)

Solid waste from the project site would be collected by Golden Gate Disposal Company and hauled to the Norcal transfer station near Candlestick Point, and recycled as feasible, with non-recyclables being disposed of at the Altamont Landfill in Alameda County. The Altamont Landfill has a permitted maximum disposal of 6,000 tons per day and received about 1.29 million tons of waste in 2007 (the most recent year reported by the State). The total permitted capacity of the landfill is more than 124 million cubic yards; with this capacity, the landfill can operate until 2025.⁶⁶ However, the amount of solid waste that San Francisco can deposit at Altamont Landfill is governed by the City's agreement with the landfill operator, and the City is anticipated to reach its current limit between 2013 and 2015. The City is currently reviewing alternatives for longer-term disposal capacity, which may or may not involve continuing disposal at Altamont Landfill. The Department of the Environment anticipates having a new agreement in place during 2010.⁶⁷

Although the proposed project would incrementally increase total waste generation from the City, the increasing rate of diversion through recycling and other methods would result in a decreasing share of total waste that requires deposition into the landfill. Given this, and given

⁶⁶ California Integrated Waste Management Board, Active Landfill Profiles, Altamont Landfill. Available online at <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/Profiles/Facility/Landfill/LFProfile2.asp?COID=3&FACID=01-AA-0009>, accessed August 20, 2010

⁶⁷ San Francisco Department of the Environment, "Timeline and Analysis: Disposal Alternatives for San Francisco," January 25, 2008. Available online at http://www.sfdenvironment.org/downloads/library/1_salalternativesjanuary2008.pdf, accessed August 20, 2010

the long-term capacity available at the Altamont Landfill, the solid waste generated by project construction and operation would not result in the landfill exceeding its permitted capacity, and the project would result in a less-than-significant solid waste generation impact. The proposed project would be subject to the City's Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance, which requires all San Francisco residents and commercial landlords to separate their refuse into recyclables, compostables, and trash, thereby minimizing solid waste disposal and maximizing recycling. The project would also be subject to the City's Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Ordinance, which requires 75 percent of all construction and demolition debris to be diverted from landfills.

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) required 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 showed the City generated 1.88 million tons of waste material in 2002. Approximately 63 percent (1.18 million tons) was diverted through recycling, composting, reuse, and other efforts while 700,000 tons went to a landfill. Additionally, the City had a goal to divert most (75 percent) of its solid waste (through recycling, composting, etc.) by 2010 and to divert all waste by 2020. San Francisco Ordinance No. 27-06 requires a minimum of 65 percent of all construction and demolition debris to be recycled and diverted from landfills. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with City's Ordinance 100-09, the Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance, which requires everyone in San Francisco to separate their refuse into recyclables, compostables, and trash. Altamont Landfill is required to meet federal, state, and local solid waste regulations. Implementation of the proposed project would not impede the City from meeting these requirements, and the impact would be *less than significant*.

Impact UT-4: The proposed project in combination with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects would result in less-than-significant impacts to utilities and service systems. (Less than Significant)

The proposed cumulative development in the project site vicinity, as described in the "Project Setting," page 39,⁶⁸ was included in the 2005 *Urban Water Management Plan*. In addition, cumulative development would be required to pay the applicable Wastewater Capacity Charge to fund the cost of expansion of the wastewater conveyance and treatment system, if necessary. Cumulative development would also predominately replace existing buildings and impervious surfaces. Therefore, cumulative impacts to stormwater would be less than significant.

The proposed project would not substantially impact water supply, wastewater facilities, or solid waste services. Existing service provision plans address anticipated growth in the region. The proposed project and cumulative projects would not exceed growth projections for the area and therefore would not have a cumulative considerable effect on utilities and service systems. For the reasons discussed above, utilities and service systems would not be adversely affected by the project, either individually or cumulatively, and therefore impacts on utilities and service systems would be less than significant.

Impact UT-5: The project variant would result in less-than-significant project-specific and cumulative utilities and services systems impacts. (Less than Significant)

The project variant would construct the same uses and less square footage than the proposed project; therefore the impacts of the project variant on utilities and service systems would be similar to or less than the proposed project's impacts (i.e., *less-than-significant*).

⁶⁸ Two proposed projects have been identified within 0.5 miles of the project site: 2121 Evans Street, currently under entitlement and environmental review at the Planning Department; and 3433 – 3rd Street, currently under environmental review.

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
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"/>

Impact PS-1: The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with new or altered government facilities in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for any public services such as police and fire protection and schools and parks. (Less than Significant)

Police and Fire Protection

The project site receives police and fire protection services from the San Francisco Police Department and the San Francisco Fire Department, respectively. The proposed increase in intensity of the current wholesale, distribution, and related activities on the site would incrementally increase the demand for fire and police services to the project site. Police protection is provided by the Bayview Station located at 201 Williams Street, approximately 0.7 miles to the south. The nearest fire station is Station 9, located approximately two blocks to the west at 2245 Jerrold Avenue. The Police and Fire departments monitor changing conditions, such as new development, in their service areas, and they address associated staffing, equipment, and facility needs each year through the City's annual operating and capital budget process. Although the proposed project could increase the number of calls received from the area or the level of regulatory oversight that must be provided as a result of the increased concentration of activity on site, the increase in responsibilities would not likely be substantial in light of the existing demand for police and fire protection services in the Bayview Hunter's Point area. The proposed building would be required to comply with the current *Building Code's* fire safety and fire prevention standards. The increase in demand for police and fire protection services resulting from the proposed project expansion would not be substantially greater than existing demand for fire and police protection services in the project area, and meeting this

additional service demand would not require the construction of new police or fire prevention facilities. The proposed project would therefore not result in a significant project-specific or cumulative environmental impact on police or fire protection services.

Schools and Recreation Facilities

The San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) is currently not a growth district, and facilities throughout the City and County are generally underutilized. The SFUSD currently has more classrooms district-wide than it needs, and the surplus is predicted to increase over the next ten years as enrollment shrinks.⁶⁹ The SFUSD has responded to these trends with its decisions in January 2006 over school closures and mergers.⁷⁰ The proposed project does not include dwelling units, and would not generate any additional school-aged children. For these reasons, the proposed project's impact on school facilities would be less than significant.

Impact PS-2: The proposed project in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects would result in less-than-significant public services impacts. (Less than Significant)

In light of the above, public services would not be adversely affected by the project. Cumulative developments in the project vicinity, as described in the "Project Setting,"⁷¹ page 39, would be required to pay fees in accordance with Senate Bill 50. In addition, demand for police and fire services would increase, but not in excess of amounts expected and provided for in this area. Therefore, the proposed project would have *less-than-significant* cumulative impacts.

Impact PS-3: The project variant would result in less-than-significant project-specific and cumulative public services impacts (Less than Significant)

⁶⁹ SFUSD, *Facilities Master Plan*, 2003. Available for public review at the San Francisco Unified School District, 1550 Bryant Street, San Francisco.

⁷⁰ SFUSD, *School Closure Decision*, January 19, 2006, available online at http://portal.sfusd.edu/data/home/School_Closure_Decisions.pdf, accessed October 8, 2007.

⁷¹ Two proposed projects have been identified within 0.5 miles of the project site: 2121 Evans Street, currently under entitlement and environmental review at the Planning Department; and 3433 – 3rd Street, currently under environmental review.

The project variant would construct the same uses and less square footage than the proposed project; therefore the impacts of the project variant on public services would be similar to or less than the proposed project's impacts (i.e., *less than significant*).

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

There are no adopted habitat conservation plans applicable to the project site. Therefore, checklist items 12b, c, and f are not applicable to the project.

Impact BI-1: The proposed project would not have an adverse impact on special status species, riparian, wetland, or sensitive natural communities, and would not conflict with an approved local, regional, or state habitat construction plan. (Less than Significant)

The project site is within a developed urban area and is almost completely covered by impervious surfaces (buildings and pavement). The project sponsor proposes retention and expansion of the existing Produce Market, which would cover all or almost all the site with impervious surfaces, resulting in little change to the surfaces on the site. The proposed project would include landscaping and the existing street trees would be replaced. The site does not support any sensitive habitats or provide habitat for any rare or endangered plant or animal species, and the proposed project would not affect or substantially diminish plant or animal habitats, including riparian or wetland habitat.

Impact BI-2: The proposed project would not conflict with the City's local tree ordinance. (Less than Significant)

There are approximately 12 mature street trees in the existing medians on Jerrold Avenue, along with one tree at the Cash & Carry building and four trees and a small amount of landscaping at the Produce Building. The 20- to 30-foot-tall trees and other landscaping on the site provide limited habitat for common wildlife species adapted to urban life, including sparrows and other common bird species, as well as rodents. The proposed project would not affect any rare, threatened, or endangered species.

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted legislation that amended the City's Urban Forestry Ordinance, *Public Works Code* Sections 801 et. seq., to require a permit from the SFDPW⁷² to remove any protected trees within the SFDPW right-of-way and within ten feet of the right-of-way. Protected trees include landmark trees, significant trees, and street trees located on private or public property anywhere within the territorial limits of the City and

⁷² As part of the review process for an application for street or significant tree removal, an SFDPW inspector would evaluate the trees proposed for removal. If SFDPW approves the tree to be removed, it will be posted for a period of up to 30 days. If objections to the removal are received, the removal will be scheduled for public hearing. If SFDPW denies the removal, the applicant can request the case be scheduled for a public hearing. After the hearing, a hearing officer will make a recommendation to the SFDPW Director, who in turn will issue a final decision. The SFDPW Director's decision may be appealed to the Board of Appeals.

County of San Francisco. The *Public Works Code* requires that another significant tree or street tree be planted in place of a removed tree or that an in-lieu planting fee be paid. No landmark or significant trees exist on the project site and therefore, none would be removed as a result of the proposed project. The 17 street trees noted above would be removed as part of the project. The project would be subject to and would comply with all city requirements for tree protection and planting, which would reduce the impacts to street trees on the site, both project-specific and cumulative, to a less than significant level.

Impact BI-3: The proposed project would have a potentially significant impact on migratory species. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

The 17 street trees noted above may need to be removed during project construction and replaced with new street trees once construction is complete. Street trees are protected in San Francisco under Section 806 of the *Public Works Code*, which requires that a permit be obtained prior to removal. If the trees need to be removed, the project sponsor would apply for a permit and comply with any requirements set by the SFDPW. Prior to permitting for tree removal, the City would require an assessment of the trees by a biologist who would note the presence of any bird nests in the trees to be removed.

The lack of natural nesting habitats in urban areas tends to result in resident and migratory birds nesting in ornamental and/or street trees. The proposed project could result in disturbances to nesting birds that may be located on or near the project site, should construction occur during the bird nesting period (March 15 through August 31). Nesting birds, their nests, and eggs are fully protected by the *Fish and Game Code* (Sections 3503, 3503.5) and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (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. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-BI-1**, below, would reduce project impacts on nesting resident and migratory bird species to a *less-than-significant* level.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-3

Protection of Nesting Birds During Construction

The project sponsor shall implement the following protective measures to ensure implementation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and compliance with State regulations during construction. Pre-construction surveys for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified ornithologist or wildlife biologist to ensure that no nests would be disturbed during project implementation. A preconstruction survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of demolition/construction activities during the early part of the breeding season (January through April) and no more than 30 days prior to the initiation of these activities during the late part of the breeding season (May through August). During this survey, the qualified person shall inspect all trees in and immediately adjacent to the impact areas for nests. If an active nest is found close enough to the construction area to be disturbed by these activities, the ornithologist, in consultation with California Department of Fish and Game, shall determine the extent of a construction-free buffer zone to be established around the nest.

Impact BI-4: The proposed project in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects would not result in impacts to biological resources. (Less than Significant)

Based on the above, the project and other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable development in the area,⁷³ would not result in any significant effect with regard to biology. Therefore, the project would not cumulatively contribute to any potential cumulative effects on biological resources by projects discussed in the "Project Setting," page 39.

Impact BI-5: The project variant would result in a potentially significant impact on migratory wildlife. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Since the project variant would involve the same landscaping activities as the proposed project, like the proposed project it would have a potentially significant impact on migratory wildlife. **Mitigation Measure M-BI-3** (page 153) would be applicable to the project variant.

⁷³ Two proposed projects have been identified within 0.5 miles of the project site: 2121 Evans Street, currently under entitlement and environmental review at the Planning Department; and 3433 – 3rd Street, currently under environmental review.

Impact BI-6: With the exception of migratory species, the project variant would result in less-than-significant project-specific and cumulative biology impacts. (Less than Significant)

The project variant would construct the same uses and less square footage than the proposed project, and would require the same mitigation measure; therefore the impacts of the project variant on biology would be similar to less than the proposed project's less-than-significant impacts.

<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This section describes the geology, soils, and seismicity characteristics of the project area as they relate to the proposed project. This analysis is based on a *Geotechnical Investigation* conducted by Treadwell & Rollo on November 17, 2008.⁷⁴ The scope of the report consisted of reviewing existing data presented on foundation plans for the existing buildings, geologic maps and reports available from the City and County of San Francisco, the California Geological Survey (CGS; formerly California Division of Mines and Geology), as well as the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG).

Impact GE-1: The proposed project would not expose persons or structures to substantial, adverse seismic and geologic hazards. (Less than Significant)

The project site is located approximately 10 kilometers (6 miles) east of the San Andreas Fault, 17 kilometers (11 miles) east of the San Gregorio Fault, and 19 kilometers (12 miles) west of the Hayward Fault. The project site is not within an Earthquake Fault Zone as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, and no known fault or potentially active fault exists on the site. Based on its San Francisco location, it is likely that the site would experience periodic minor earthquakes and potentially a major (moment magnitude [Mw] greater than 7.1 characteristic) earthquake on one or more of the nearby faults during the life of the proposed development. In a seismically active area, such as the San Francisco Bay area, the possibility exists for future faulting in areas where no faults previously existed. During an earthquake along any of the major faults mentioned above, the ground at the project site would experience very strong shaking. Strong shaking during an earthquake can result in ground failure associated with soil liquefaction,⁷⁵ lateral spreading,⁷⁶ and cyclic densification.⁷⁷

⁷⁴ Treadwell & Rollo, *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market Redevelopment Project, San Francisco, California*, November 16, 2009. This document is on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2009.1153E.

⁷⁵ Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which saturated, cohesionless soil experiences a temporary loss of strength due to the buildup of excess pore water pressure, especially during cyclic loading such as that induced by earthquakes. Soil most susceptible to liquefaction is loose, clean, saturated, uniformly graded, fine-grained sand and silt of low plasticity that is relatively free of clay.

⁷⁶ Lateral spreading is a phenomenon in which surficial soil displaces along a shear zone that has formed within an underlying liquefied layer. Upon reaching mobilization, the surficial blocks are transported downslope or in the direction of a free face by earthquake and gravitational forces.

⁷⁷ Soil compaction, or cyclic densification, is a phenomenon in which non-saturated, cohesionless soil is densified by earthquake vibrations, causing settlement.

The Community Safety Element of the *General Plan* contains maps that indicate areas of the City where one or more geologic hazards exist. Maps 2 and 3 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 7.1 on the San Andreas Fault and one of magnitude 7.1 on the northern segment of the Hayward fault. On these maps, the project site falls into Class VIII “Moderate” of the Modified Mercalli Intensity scale. The geotechnical investigation for the project concludes that ground shaking at the project site during a major earthquake on one of the regional active faults will be strong to very strong.

The project site is not in an area of potential landslide hazard, as designated on Map 5 in the Community Safety Element.

The project site is located within an area delineated by the California Division of Mines and Geology as historically or potentially subject to liquefaction, as mapped in the San Francisco *General Plan*,^{78,79} and the geotechnical investigation indicates that the layers of medium dense sand and silty sand beneath the Bay Mud deposits at the site are potentially liquefiable. Potential hazards associated with soil liquefaction include total and differential settlement, lateral spreading, ground ruptures, and sand boils.⁸⁰ The geotechnical investigation estimates that approximately 2 to 3.5 inches of liquefaction-induced settlement may occur during and immediately after a large earthquake on one of the nearby active faults. Due to the relatively wide spacing of the borings in the geotechnical investigation, differential settlements are difficult to quantify, but the geotechnical investigation estimates that differential settlement associated with liquefaction-induced reconsolidation would be on the order of 1.5 inches across a 30-foot distance. The geotechnical investigation also concluded that there is a moderate potential for surface manifestations of liquefaction.

Lateral spreading occurs when a continuous layer of soil liquefies at depth and the soil layers above move toward an unsupported face, such as an open slope cut or in the direction of a regional slope or gradient. Because the site is relatively flat and relatively far from an open face,

⁷⁸ City and County of San Francisco, Community Safety Element, San Francisco *General Plan*, April 1997, Map 4.

⁷⁹ As defined by the State of California Seismic Hazard Zones, City and County of San Francisco Official Map (November 17, 2001.)

⁸⁰ A sand boil is sand and water that come out onto the ground surface during an earthquake as a result of liquefaction at shallow depth.

such as a creek channel, the geotechnical investigation judges that the potential for liquefaction-induced lateral spreading at the site is low.

Seismically-induced compaction or cyclic densification of non-saturated sand (i.e., sand above the groundwater table) due to earthquake vibrations may cause differential settlement. The upper four to seven feet of soil at the site contains sufficient clay content to resist cyclic densification. This soil is underlain by three- to six-foot-thick layers of loose, non-saturated sand, clayey sand, and silty sand that are potentially susceptible to cyclic densification. The geotechnical investigation concludes that non-saturated soil at the site could settle about 0.5 inch as a result of cyclic densification following a large earthquake.

The geotechnical analysis conducted by Treadwell & Rollo sets forth recommendations for site preparation and fill compaction, foundations, concrete slab-on-grade floors, seismic design, loading dock retaining walls, and pavements, to address the ground-shaking, liquefaction, and settlement potential on the site. The geotechnical investigation found the site suitable for development providing that its recommendations were incorporated into the design and construction of the proposed development. The project sponsor has agreed to follow the recommendations of the geotechnical investigation in constructing the proposed project.

Potential seismic and geologic hazards would be addressed through compliance with the California *Building Code*, as implemented through the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). The final building plans and the geotechnical report would be reviewed by DBI prior to issuance of a building permit. To ensure compliance with all San Francisco *Building Code* provisions regarding structural safety, DBI would determine necessary engineering and design features for the project to reduce potential damage to structures from groundshaking, liquefaction and compressibility. These potential hazards would be ameliorated through DBI requirement for a geotechnical report and review of the building permit application; thus, the project would result in *less-than-significant* impacts related to seismic and geologic hazards.

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

The Treadwell & Rollo geotechnical investigation for the project site conducted four soil borings to assess subsurface conditions, which indicate the ground surface at the site is underlain by up

to about 19 feet of heterogeneous fill consisting of stiff to very stiff clay with varying amounts of silt, sand, and gravel, and loose to medium-dense sand and gravel with varying amounts of clay and silt.⁸¹ The fill is underlain by up to about 24 feet of weak, compressible marine clay, locally known as Bay Mud. The Bay Mud is underlain by medium-dense to very dense sand and clayey sand, and medium-stiff to very stiff clay and sandy clay to depths of 100 feet below ground surface (bgs), the maximum depth explored.

Groundwater was encountered at depths of approximately ten feet bgs in three of the test borings. Groundwater was not measured in the other boring because the groundwater level was obscured by the drilling method used. Previous explorations in the site vicinity encountered groundwater at seven to ten feet bgs in the geotechnical consultant's report for the site of the Produce Market warehouse at 2101 Jerrold Avenue, prepared in 1998. Seasonal fluctuations in water level and changes in the water level of nearby bodies of water may influence the groundwater level at the project site, and groundwater levels may be higher than levels encountered during the subsurface investigation due to the seasonal fluctuations.

Building Construction Considerations

Foundations

The liquefaction potential during the strong to very strong ground shaking that may occur in the event of an earthquake was taken into consideration in the recommendations presented in the geotechnical investigation. The investigation considered two types of foundation systems: 1) continuous, shallow spread footings resting on at least a two-foot-thick layer of compacted fill, underlain by a layer of geotextile tensile fabric, and 2) driven, 14-inch-square, precast, pre-stressed concrete piles that gain support through end-bearing in layers of dense to very dense soil below the Bay Mud.

Excavation

Construction of the foundation would require excavation about approximately 1.5 to 2.5 feet below the existing ground surface of the site. Excavation would be offset by fill elsewhere on the project site, with little or no removal of soil from the site. Any soil removed from the project

⁸¹ Treadwell & Rollo, *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market Redevelopment Project, San Francisco, California*, November 16, 2009, op cit.

site would be trucked to an appropriate landfill following testing pursuant to City and State requirements for hazardous materials.

Dewatering

Groundwater was encountered at depths of approximately ten feet bgs in the three test borings for which water level was measured. Because the project would require excavation to a depth of 1.5 to 2.5 feet bgs, it is not anticipated that groundwater would be encountered during construction. However, were dewatering to be required during construction, it would be subject to the requirements of the City's Industrial Waste Ordinance (Ordinance Number 199-77), requiring that groundwater meet specified water quality standards before it may be discharged into the sewer system. The Bureau of Environmental Regulation and Management (BERM), of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission must be notified of projects necessitating dewatering, and may require groundwater analysis before discharge. Potential degradation of groundwater quality as a result of dewatering during project construction would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through the BERM requirement for retention of groundwater pumped from the project site in a holding tank, and analysis of the quality of this groundwater before it is discharged to the combined sanitary and storm drain sewer system.

Should dewatering be necessary, the final soils report would address the potential settlement and subsidence impacts of this dewatering. Based on this discussion, the soils report would determine whether or not a lateral movement and settlement survey should be done to monitor any movement or settlement of surrounding buildings and adjacent streets. If a monitoring survey were recommended, DBI would require that a Special Inspector (as defined in Article 3 of the *Building Code*) be retained by the project sponsor to perform this monitoring. Groundwater observation wells might be installed to monitor potential settlement and subsidence. If, in the judgment of the Special Inspector, unacceptable movement were to occur during construction, groundwater recharge would be used to halt this settlement. The project sponsor would delay construction if necessary. Costs for the survey and any necessary repairs to service lines under the street would be borne by the project sponsor. If dewatering were necessary, the project sponsor and its contractor would follow the geotechnical engineers' recommendations regarding dewatering to avoid settlement of adjacent streets, utilities, and buildings that could potentially occur as a result of dewatering.

For the reasons discussed above, the proposed project's soil erosion and stability impacts would be *less than significant*.

Impact GE-3: The proposed project would not result in the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems, nor change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site. (No Impact)

The project site is in an area served by the City's sewer system. The project would not substantially change the topography of the site, and the site does not contain unique geologic or physical features. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts on septic systems or unique geologic features.

Impact GE-4: The proposed project in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects would result in less-than-significant impacts to geology and soils. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would result in no impact to topographical features, loss of topsoil or erosion, or risk of injury or death involving landslides. Therefore, the project would not have a considerable contribution to related cumulative impacts, if any, of the projects listed in the "Project Setting."⁸² In addition, other reasonably foreseeable future project's building plans would be reviewed by DBI, and potential geologic hazards would be ameliorated during the DBI permit review process. Therefore, the cumulative impacts to geology, soils, and seismicity would be less than significant.

Impact GE-5: The project variant would result in less-than-significant project-specific and cumulative geology and soils impacts (Less than Significant)

⁸² Two proposed projects have been identified within 0.5 miles of the project site: 2121 Evans Street, currently under entitlement and environmental review at the Planning Department; and 3433 – 3rd Street, currently under environmental review.

The project variant would the construct the same or smaller structures than the proposed project. All buildings in the project variant would require the shallow spread footings described on page 158 under Foundations. If the project variant is implemented, the project sponsor would follow all recommendations of the geotechnical consultant, and like the proposed project, the project variant would have *less-than-significant* geology and soils impacts

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project does not propose housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, checklist item 15g does not apply.

Impact HY-1: The proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and would result in less-than-significant impacts to water quality. (Less than Significant)

The proposed retention and expansion of the San Francisco Produce Market would not substantially degrade water quality or contaminate a public water supply. All wastewater from the proposed project building, and stormwater runoff from the project site, would flow into the city's combined sewer system to be treated at the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant prior to discharge into San Francisco Bay. Treatment would be provided pursuant to the effluent discharge standards contained in the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for the plant. In accordance with the permit, discharges to the Bay are in conformance with requirements of the Clean Water Act, Combined Sewer Overflow Control Policy, and the associated state requirements in the Water Quality and Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin. During operations and construction, the proposed project would be required to comply with all local wastewater discharge and water quality requirements. Thus, the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* water quality impact.

Impact HY-2: The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge, or otherwise substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site resulting in erosion or flooding on- or off-site. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would require excavation to a depth of approximately 1.5 to 2.5 feet below ground surface. The geotechnical investigation for the site encountered groundwater at depths of approximately ten feet bgs in the three test borings for which water level was measured. Therefore, it is not anticipated that groundwater would be encountered during construction. If dewatering is required during excavation, SFPUC-BERM must be notified of projects requiring dewatering, and may require groundwater analysis before discharge. Any groundwater

discharged during construction of the proposed project would be subject to requirements of the City's Industrial Waste Ordinance (Ordinance Number 199-77) that groundwater meet specified water quality standards before it may be discharged into the combined sanitary and storm drain sewer system.

The project site is almost completely covered with impervious surfaces and natural groundwater flow would continue under and around the site. Construction of the proposed project would not substantially increase impervious surface coverage on the site, or substantially reduce infiltration and groundwater recharge. Therefore, the proposed project would result in *less-than-significant* groundwater quality and surface flow impacts.

Impact HY-3: The proposed project would result in a less-than-significant drainage impact. (Less than Significant)

Compliance with the Stormwater Management Ordinance (SMO) in general would require the project to reduce the existing volume and rate of stormwater runoff discharged from the site. To achieve this, the project would implement and install appropriate stormwater management systems that retain runoff onsite, promote stormwater reuse, and limit site discharges before entering the combined sewer collection system.

As noted above, the project site is almost completely covered with impervious surfaces, and the proposed project would not substantially change the amount of impervious surface area. For a project site with over 50 percent of impervious surfaces, such as the subject property, the project would be required to reduce stormwater runoff peak rate and total volume by 25 percent. The proposed project would be required to retain stormwater permanently on site. To achieve this, the proposed project would implement and install appropriate stormwater management systems that retain runoff on site, promote stormwater reuse, and limit site discharges before entering the combined sewer system. The proposed project would divert water from the buildings and marshalling yard through a rainwater retention catchment, where it would be used for project landscaping. As a result, there would be a 25 percent decrease in the quantity and rate of stormwater runoff from the site, which would continue to drain to the city's combined storm and sanitary sewer. Since stormwater flows from the proposed project could be accommodated by the existing combined sewer system, the proposed project would not significantly impact surface or groundwater quality, nor cause substantial flooding or erosion.

Over the construction period, there would be a potential for erosion and transportation of soil particles during site preparation, excavation, foundation pouring, and construction of the building shell. Once in surface water, runoff, sediment and other pollutants could leave the construction site and ultimately be released into San Francisco Bay. As discussed above, stormwater runoff from project construction would drain to the combined sewer and stormwater system and be treated at the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant. Pursuant to *Building Code* Chapter 33 (Excavation and Grading) and the City's NPDES permit, the project sponsor would be required to implement measures to reduce potential erosion impacts. Thus, the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* drainage impact.

Impact HY-4: The proposed project would not result in an increase in risks from flooding. (Less than Significant)

Development in the City and County of San Francisco must account for flooding potential. Areas located on fill or bay mud can subside to a point at which the sewers do not drain freely during a storm (and sometimes during dry weather). As a result, flooding near these streets and sewers can occur.

Flood risk assessment and flood protection projects are conducted by federal agencies including the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). Together, flood management agencies and cities implement the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) under the jurisdiction of FEMA and its Flood Insurance Administration. Currently, the City of San Francisco does not participate in the NFIP and no flood maps are published for the City. However, FEMA recently has prepared draft Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) for the City and County of San Francisco. FIRMs identify areas subject to flood inundation that have 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").

Because FEMA has not previously published a FIRM for the City and County of San Francisco, there are no identified SFHAs within San Francisco's geographic boundaries. FEMA has completed the initial phases of a study of the San Francisco Bay. On September 21, 2007, FEMA issued a preliminary FIRM of San Francisco for review and comment by the City. The City has

submitted comments on the preliminary FIRM to FEMA. FEMA anticipates publishing a revised preliminary FIRM after completing the more detailed analysis that Port and City staff requested in 2007. After reviewing comments and appeals related to the revised preliminary FIRM, FEMA will finalize the FIRM and publish it for flood insurance and floodplain management purposes.

FEMA has tentatively identified SFHAs along the City's shoreline in and along the San Francisco Bay consisting of Zone A (in areas subject to inundation by tidal surge) and Zone V (areas of coastal flooding subject to wave hazards).⁸³ According to the preliminary map, the project site is not within zone A or zone V.⁸⁴ In addition, there are no natural waterways within or near the project site that could cause stream-related flooding. The project site is not located within an area that would be flooded as the result of failure of a levee or dam.⁸⁵ Thus the proposed project would have *less-than-significant* impacts regarding flood hazards.

Impact HY-5: The proposed project would not result in an increase in risks from seiche, tsunami, and mudflow. (Less than Significant)

The project is not located in an area identified as subject to seiche or potential inundation in the event of a tsunami along the San Francisco coast, based on a 20-foot water level rise at the Golden Gate (Maps 6 and 7 of the Community Safety Element of the San Francisco *General Plan*). In addition, the developed area of the project site would not be subject to mudflow.

Impact HY-6: The proposed project in combination with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable project would result in less-than-significant hydrology and water quality impacts. (Less than Significant)

⁸³ City and County of San Francisco, Office of the City Administrator, National Flood Insurance Program Flood Sheet, available online at http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/risk_management/factsheet.pdf, accessed July 31, 2008.

⁸⁴ Federal Emergency Management Agency, Preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Map, City and County of San Francisco, California, Panel 0235A, September 21, 2007, available online at <http://sfgsa.org/index.aspx?page=828>, accessed April 5, 2010.

⁸⁵ ABAG, <http://www.abag.ca.gov/cgi-bin/pickdamx.pl>, accessed April 5, 2010.

As stated above, the proposed project would result in no impact to groundwater levels or existing drainage patterns. Therefore, it would not considerably contribute to cumulative impacts, if any, from cumulative development projects described in the "Project Setting."⁸⁶ Cumulative development projects also fall outside the flood plain designated on the City's interim flood plain maps. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to flooding would be less than significant. Finally, cumulative development projects would be required to follow dust control and dewatering water quality regulations, similar to the proposed project. Therefore, cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts would be less than significant.

Impact HY-7: The project variant would result in less-than-significant project-specific and cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts.

The project variant would construct similar structures with the same foundations that the 901 Rankin Street site building and Buildings 1 and 3 of the Main Site would use under the proposed project, i.e., shallow spread footings described on page 158 under Foundations; therefore the impacts of the project variant on hydrology and water quality would be similar to or less than the proposed project's impacts, i.e., *less than significant*.

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

⁸⁶ Two proposed projects have been identified within 0.5 miles of the project site: 2121 Evans Street, currently under entitlement and environmental review at the Planning Department; and 3433 – 3rd Street, currently under environmental review.

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, checklist items 16e and 16f are not applicable to the proposed project.

An independent consultant, Treadwell & Rollo conducted Environmental Site Characterizations.^{87,88} The results of these reports are summarized below.

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)

The proposed project would involve demolition and of the existing structures on the project site and construction of industrial, office, retail, meeting hall, and demonstration kitchen buildings. Operation of the proposed food wholesaling and distribution, office, retail, and meeting hall uses may involve relatively small quantities of hazardous materials for routine purposes

⁸⁷ Treadwell & Rollo *Environmental Site Characterization, San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market, 2905 (sic) Jerrold Avenue, San Francisco, California*, November 19, 2010. This document is on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2009.1153E.

⁸⁸ Treadwell & Rollo, *Environmental Site Characterization, 901 Rankin Street, San Francisco, California*, November 19, 2010. This document is on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2009.1153E.

including cleaners, disinfectants, and chemical agents required to maintain sanitation of restroom facilities. These commercial products are labeled to inform users of potential risks and to instruct them in appropriate handling procedures. For these reasons, cleaning agents used by employees and visitors of businesses in the project buildings would not pose a substantial public health or safety hazard related to hazardous materials. Therefore, the project would have a *less-than-significant* impact related to the use of hazardous materials.

Impact HZ-2: The proposed project may create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Prior Uses of the Site

Based on available historic aerial photographs, historic Sanborn Maps, and USGS topographic maps, it appears that the Produce Market has been occupied by large commercial and/or industrial warehouses from the 1940s to the present. Prior to the current use of the site as the Produce Market, it was occupied by four large warehouses owned and operated by the United States Marine Corps until the construction of the existing facility in the early 1960s. The specific use of the warehouses while being used by the Marine Corps is unknown.

At the 901 Rankin Street site, all of the current structures were built between the years of 1948 and 1956. Records indicate that the structures have housed a radio shop, machine shop, paint shop, cable storage, warehouse, garage, and offices. The remainder of the area north of the structures is a storage yard which has been historically used as parking and traffic signal storage, as well as the location of the public safety and telecommunication trailers. No changes to land use at 901 Rankin Street were documented.

Surrounding property mainly has been used by commercial warehouses, light industrial facilities, and parking areas. Several warehouses located directly to the south of the Main Site were used as the United States Marine Corps Annex until the 1970s when they were no longer labeled as United States government property. A wastewater treatment plant has been located to the southeast of the Main Site from the 1950s to the present. The property southwest of the 901 Rankin Street site has been occupied by the San Francisco Water Department since the 1960s

and contains a storage yard, parking lot, and administrative buildings. The area running just beyond the southeastern corner of the 901 Rankin Street site to its northeastern corner has been occupied by a railroad line since the early 1900s. Just east of the railroad line, a municipal asphalt plant has been in operation since the 1950s. Other businesses located within close proximity of the project site have included grocery storage, a bakery, a scrap metal yard, equipment rental, and city bus storage.

Soil and Groundwater Contamination at the Project Site

As identified in Section 14, Geology, subsurface conditions consist of up to about 19 feet of loose to medium-dense heterogeneous fill underlain by Bay Mud, which is underlain by medium-dense to very dense sand and clayey sand and medium-stiff to very stiff clay and sandy clay to 100 feet bgs. The upper part of the fill unit at the site likely contains debris from the 1906 San Francisco Earthquake and Fire which often contains elevated levels of lead and petroleum hydrocarbons.

901 Rankin Street site

In March 2010, four exploratory borings were drilled and eight soil samples collected from the 901 Rankin Street site and analyzed for:

- Total petroleum hydrocarbons as diesel (TPH-D) and total petroleum hydrocarbons as motor oil (TPH-MO);
- Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPH-G);
- Semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs);
- Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs);
- Leaking underground fuel tank (LUFT) five metals; and
- Total lead.

TPH-D was detected above the reporting limit (5.0 mg/kg) in seven of the eight samples analyzed, at concentrations ranging from 1.4 mg/kg to 22 mg/kg. No TPH-G, VOCs, SVOCs, or PCBs were detected at or above reporting limits. Total lead was detected above the reporting limit (5.0 mg/kg) in six of the eight samples analyzed, at concentrations ranging from 5.1 mg/kg to 12 mg/kg. Total chromium was detected at a concentration of 54 mg/kg, but soluble chromium levels were not above the reporting limit (0.002 milligrams per liter (mg/L)).

These soil sample results were compared to California Total Threshold Limits Concentration (TTLC) and Soluble Threshold Limits Concentration (STLC) hazardous and Federal Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) hazardous waste criteria. Based on this information, the Environmental Site Characterization indicates that the fill material at the 901 Rankin Street site will likely need to be disposed of as unrestricted waste at a Class II non-hazardous waste landfill.

Main Site

In December 2005, one 10,000-gallon gasoline underground storage tank (UST) was removed from the Produce Market site near the corner of Rankin Street and Jerrold Avenue under the supervision of the SFDPH and the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD). Petroleum odors were detected and groundwater was encountered during the removal activities. The soil underlying the UST had visible staining and holes were observed in the UST. Five soil samples were collected from the Main Site; three from the bottom and sidewalls of the UST excavation and two composite samples from the stockpiled soil from the excavation. The soil samples were analyzed for:

- TPH-G; and
- Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene, Xylenes, and Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE).

One groundwater sample was collected from the water that recharged into the bottom of the UST excavation. The groundwater sample was analyzed for:

- Diesel (TPH-D);
- Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene, Xylenes, and MTBE; and
- Organic Lead.

Analysis of the soil samples collected from the UST excavation sidewalls and bottom, and analysis of the groundwater sample that was collected from the UST excavation indicated that the levels were not above laboratory reporting limits concentrations of TPH-G at 20,200 micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$), benzene at 717 $\mu\text{g/L}$, toluene at 260 $\mu\text{g/L}$, ethylbenzene at 833 $\mu\text{g/L}$, and total xylenes at 2,540 $\mu\text{g/L}$.

In March 2010, 27 exploratory borings were conducted at the Main Site for soil analysis, and four exploratory borings were conducted for groundwater analysis. Soil samples were analyzed some or all of the following:

- TPH-D and TPH-MO
- VOCs and TPH-G
- SVOCs
- PCBs
- California Assessment Manual (CAM) 17 metals
- Leaking Underground Fuel Tank (LUFT) five metals;
- Total Lead; and
- Asbestos.

Groundwater samples were analyzed for TPH-G, TPH-DTPH-D, and VOCs.

TPH-G was detected above the reporting limit (1.0 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg)) in seven of the 42 samples analyzed, at concentrations ranging from 1.2 mg/kg to 120 mg/kg. TPH-D was detected above the reporting limit (1.0 mg/kg) in 29 of the 43 samples analyzed, at concentrations ranging from 1.1 mg/kg to 620 mg/kg. TPH-MO was detected above the reporting limit (5 mg/kg) in 15 of the 22 samples analyzed, at concentrations ranging from 5.3 mg/kg to 450 mg/kg. Fluoranthene was detected at a concentration of 0.54 mg/kg.

Total lead was detected above the reporting limit (5.0 mg/kg) in 36 of the 41 samples analyzed, at concentrations ranging from 5.0 mg/kg to 660 mg/kg. Total chromium was detected above the reporting limit (5.0 mg/kg) in all 11 samples analyzed, at concentrations ranging from 3.8 mg/kg to 1,500 mg/kg.

Analytical results of groundwater samples collected indicated no TPH-G or VOCs were detected at or above reporting limits, with the exception of low levels of tetrachlorethene at a concentration of 5.5 micrograms per liter (ug/L) and toluene at a concentration of 0.55 ug/L. Low levels of TPH-D were detected in three of the four samples tested at concentrations ranging from 150 to 460 ug/L.

Since elevated levels of petroleum hydrocarbons and heavy metals were detected at the Main Site, soils-disturbing activity could result in exposure of hazardous materials to construction workers and the public, resulting in a *potentially significant* impact. The Environmental Site Characterization indicates that a Soil Management Plan (SMP) and a Site Health and Safety Plan (HSP) would be required prior to construction, and that implementation of said plans would reduce risks from hazardous materials to a less-than-significant level.

The SFDPH reviewed the Environmental Site Characterizations and confirmed that an SMP is warranted that includes a dust control plan in compliance with San Francisco *Health Code* Article 22B, soil handling and disposal plans and contingency measures.⁸⁹ This plan should also address levels of contamination that exceed the RWQCB's Environmental Screening levels for commercial land use.

Mitigation Measure HZ-2a includes the required SMP, and **Mitigation Measure HZ-2b** includes the required HSP. **Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2c** would require decontamination of vehicles to prevent migration of hazardous materials off-site. Implementation of all three measures would reduce impacts related to contaminated soils and/or groundwater at the project site to a *less-than-significant* level.

Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2a

Hazards (Handling of Contaminated Soil)

Step 1: Preparation of Soil Mitigation Plan

Based on the potential for encountering contaminated soils during site excavation, the SFDPH has determined that the preparation of a Soil Mitigation Plan (SMP) is warranted. The SMP shall include a discussion of the level of contamination of soils on the project site and mitigation measures for managing contaminated soils on the site, including, but not limited to: 1) the alternatives for managing contaminated soils on the site (e.g., encapsulation, partial or complete removal, treatment, recycling for reuse, or a combination); 2) the preferred alternative for managing contaminated soils on the site and a brief justification; 3) the specific practices to be used to handle, haul, and dispose of contaminated soils on the site; and 4) contingency plans to be implemented during soil excavation if unanticipated hazardous materials are encountered. The SMP should

⁸⁹ Rhajiv Bhatia, SFDPH, letter to Monica Melkesian, Subject; San Francisco Warehouse Produce Market, January 23, 2011. This document is on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case No. 2009.1153E.

include a dust control plan in compliance with San Francisco Health Code Article 62B and should address the RWQCB's Environmental Screening Levels for commercial land use. The SMP shall be submitted to the SFDPH for review and approval. A copy of the SMP shall be submitted to the Planning Department to become part of the case file.

Step 2: Handling, Hauling, and Disposal of Contaminated Soils

(a) Specific Work Practices: Based on the results of the soil tests conducted, the SFDPH determined that the soils on the project site are contaminated at or above potentially hazardous levels, the construction contractor shall be alert for the presence of such soils during excavation and other construction activities on the site (detected through soil odor, color, and texture and results of on-site soil testing), and shall be prepared to handle, profile (i.e., characterize), and dispose of such soils appropriately (i.e., as dictated by local, state, and federal regulations) when such soils are encountered on the site.

(b) Dust Suppression: Soils exposed during excavation for site preparation and project construction activities shall be kept moist throughout the time they are exposed, both during and after work hours.

(c) Surface Water Runoff Control: Where soils are stockpiled, visqueen shall be used to create an impermeable liner, both beneath and on top of the soils, with a berm to contain any potential surface water runoff from the soil stockpiles during inclement weather.

(d) Soils Replacement: If necessary, clean fill or other suitable material(s) shall be used to bring portions of the project site, where contaminated soils have been excavated and removed, up to construction grade.

(e) Hauling and Disposal: Contaminated soils shall be hauled off the project site by waste hauling trucks appropriately certified with the State of California and adequately covered to prevent dispersion of the soils during transit, and shall be disposed of at a permitted hazardous waste disposal facility registered with the State of California.

Step 3: Preparation of Closure/Certification Report

After excavation and foundation construction activities are completed, the project sponsor shall prepare and submit a closure/certification report to the SFDPH for review and approval. The closure/certification report shall include the mitigation measures in the SMP for handling and removing contaminated soils from the project site, whether the construction contractor modified any of these mitigation measures, and how and why the construction contractor modified those mitigation measures.

Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2b

Disposal of Contaminated Soil/Site Health and Safety Plan

Any contaminated soils shall be excavated by a qualified Removal Contractor and disposed of at an appropriate landfill, as governed by applicable laws and regulations, or other appropriate actions shall be taken in coordination with the SFDPH.

If DPH determines that the soils on the project site are contaminated with contaminants at or above potentially hazardous levels, and a Site Health and Safety Plan (HSP) is required by the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health prior to initiating any earth-moving activities at the site. The protocols shall include at a minimum:

- Sweeping of adjacent public streets daily (with water sweepers) if any visible soil material is carried onto the streets.
- Characterization of excavated native soils proposed for use on site prior to placement to confirm that the soil meets appropriate standards.
- The dust controls specified in the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (176-08).
- Protocols for managing stockpiled and excavated soils.
- The HSP shall identify site access controls to be implemented from the time of surface disruption through the completion of earthwork construction. The protocols shall include at a minimum:
 1. Appropriate site security to prevent unauthorized pedestrian/vehicular entry, such as fencing or other barrier of sufficient height and structural integrity to prevent entry, based upon the degree of control required.
 2. Posting of "no trespassing" signs.
 3. Providing on-site meetings with construction workers to inform them about security measures and reporting/contingency procedures.

If groundwater contamination is identified, the Site Health and Safety Plan shall identify protocols for managing groundwater during construction to minimize worker and public exposure to contaminated groundwater. The protocols shall include procedures to prevent unacceptable migration of contamination from defined plumes during dewatering.

The Site Health and Safety Plan shall include a requirement that construction personnel be trained to recognize potential hazards associated with underground features that could contain hazardous substances, previously unidentified contamination, or buried hazardous debris. Excavation personnel shall also be required to wash hands and face before eating, smoking, and drinking.

The Site Health and Safety Plan shall include procedures for implementing a contingency plan, including appropriate notification and control procedures, in the event unanticipated subsurface hazards are discovered during construction. Control procedures shall include, but would not be limited to, investigation and removal of underground storage tanks or other hazards.

Mitigation Measure HZ-2c

Decontamination of Vehicles

The DPH has determined that the soils on the project site are contaminated with contaminants at or above potentially hazardous levels, all trucks and excavation and soil handling equipment shall be decontaminated following use and prior to removal from the site. Gross contamination shall be first removed through brushing, wiping, or dry brooming. The vehicle or equipment shall then be washed clean (including tires). Prior to removal from the work site, all vehicles and equipment shall be inspected to ensure that contamination has been removed.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-HZ-2a to M-HZ-2c would ensure that effects from soil and groundwater contamination at the project site would be reduced to a *less-than-significant* level with mitigation incorporated.

Soil and Groundwater Contamination at Nearby Sites

A search of several government database sources⁹⁰ that list potential sources of, or activities involving, hazardous substances or petroleum products that might affect the soil and/or groundwater quality at the project site and vicinity identified a number of listings within a one-half mile radius of the site, in addition to the Produce Market site itself (discussed above). The most pertinent listings include the Central Shops at 1800 Jerrold Avenue, the former Chevron Service Station at 2101 Jerrold Avenue, the former Clementina Site at 2177 Jerrold Avenue, the MJB Steel Product Company at 2245 McKinnon Avenue, the Kennedy Van and Storage, Inc. at 2225 McKinnon Avenue, the Thompson Properties at 2045 McKinnon Avenue, and the San Francisco Water Department Facilities at 1990 Newcomb Street. Based on either the distance to the subject project site, regulatory closure, the lack of plume migration, or the cross gradient

⁹⁰ Database lists include the No Further Remedial Action Planned (NFRAP), Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), the RCRA Treatment, Storage and Disposal (TSD) Facilities List, the RCRA Sites with Known Contamination COR List, The RCRA Generators List and the RCRA No Longer Regulated (NLR) List and California EPA (Cal-EPA) and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Calsites database.

location, the potential for the past and any future release of these listing to have an adverse affect on the environmental conditions at the project site is considered minimal.

All other database listings had no violations, were closed by the regulatory agency, were hydrologically cross-gradient or down-gradient from the project site, or were a significant distance (greater than a 1/2 mile) from the project site. As a result, these listings are not expected to pose a significant environmental risk to the project site.

Site Reconnaissance

A site reconnaissance, to look for visual evidence of past or present use or storage of petroleum products and/or hazardous materials that could potentially affect the soil and/or groundwater quality, was conducted at the Main Site. No evidence of hazardous materials use and/or storage was observed during the reconnaissance of the Produce Building, the four warehouses, and the truck docking structures. Although the Cash & Carry produce sales building was not accessible at the time of the reconnaissance, based on the nature of the business (warehouse supplies catering to food service operators), it is unlikely that hazardous materials are used and/or stored inside the facility. No evidence of hazardous materials use and/or storage, significant staining, spillage, and/or ponded liquids or unconfined solids was observed during the reconnaissance of the exterior areas of the Main Site.

A reconnaissance of the interior of the main building at the 901 Rankin Street site found no evidence of hazardous materials use and/or storage. In the exterior areas of the 901 Rankin Street site, no evidence of hazardous materials use and/or storage, significant staining, spillage, and/or ponded liquids or unconfined solids was observed.

Adjacent properties, including Innes Avenue and commercial property located to the north; Rankin Street and Caltrain property located to the east; Kirkwood Avenue, San Francisco Water Department, and commercial property to the south; and Toland Street and commercial property located to the west, were observed from public sidewalks and roadways. No apparent signs of chemical releases or leaks were noted at any nearby properties.

Hazardous Building Materials

The following discusses potential hazardous building materials existing on the project site, including lead-based paint, asbestos, polychlorinated biphenyls, and mercury.

Lead-Based Paint

The existing buildings on the project site were built between 1948 and the early 1960s. The existing buildings on the project site which are proposed for demolition may contain lead-based interior or exterior paint. Demolition of these structures must comply with *Building Code* Chapter 34, Section 3423—Work Practices for Lead-Based Paint on Pre-1979 Buildings and Steel Structures. Where there is any work that may disturb or remove lead paint on the exterior of any building built prior to December 31, 1978, or any steel structures to which lead-based paint disturbance or removal would occur, and exterior work would disturb more than 100 square or linear feet of lead-based paint, Chapter 34 requires specific notification and work standards, and identifies prohibited work methods and penalties.

Chapter 34 contains performance standards, including establishment of containment barriers, at least as effective at protecting human health and the environment as those in the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Guidelines (the most recent Guidelines for Evaluation and Control of Lead-Based Paint Hazards) and identifies prohibited practices that may not be used in disturbance or removal of lead-based paint. Any person performing work subject to the ordinance shall make all reasonable efforts to prevent migration of lead paint contaminants beyond containment barriers during the course of the work, and any person performing regulated work shall make all reasonable efforts to remove all visible lead paint contaminants from all regulated areas of the property prior to completion of the work.

The ordinance also includes notification requirements, contents of notice, and requirements for signs. Notification includes notifying bidders for the work of any paint-inspection reports verifying the presence or absence of lead-based paint in the regulated area of the proposed project. Prior to commencement of work, the responsible party must provide written notice to the Director of DBI, of the location of the project; the nature and approximate square footage of the painted surface being disturbed and/or removed; anticipated job start and completion dates for the work; whether the responsible party has reason to know or presume that lead-based paint is present; whether the building is residential or nonresidential, owner-occupied or rental

property, approximate number of dwelling units, if any; the dates by which the responsible party has or would fulfill any tenant or adjacent property notification requirements; and the name, address, telephone number, and pager number of the party who will perform the work. (Further notice requirements include Sign When Containment is Required, Notice by Landlord, Required Notice to Tenants, Availability of Pamphlet related to protection from lead in the home, Notice by Contractor, Early Commencement of Work [by Owner, Requested by Tenant], and Notice of Lead Contaminated Dust or Soil, if applicable.) The ordinance contains provisions regarding inspection and sampling for compliance by DBI, and enforcement, and describes penalties for non-compliance with the requirements of the ordinance.

These regulations and procedures established by the San Francisco *Building Code* would ensure that potential impacts of demolition, associated with lead-based paint disturbance during construction activities, would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Asbestos

The existing buildings on the project site were built between 1948 and the early 1960s. Due to their age, asbestos-containing materials may be found within the buildings proposed for demolition. Section 19827.5 of the California *Health and Safety Code*, adopted January 1, 1991, requires that local agencies not issue demolition or alteration permits until an applicant has demonstrated compliance with notification requirements under applicable Federal regulations regarding hazardous air pollutants, including asbestos. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (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.

Notification includes the names and addresses of operations and persons responsible; 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 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 District randomly inspects asbestos removal operations. In addition, the District would inspect any removal operation for which a complaint has been received.

The local office of the State Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) must be notified of asbestos abatement to be carried out. Asbestos abatement contractors must follow state regulations contained in 8CCR1529 and 8CCR341.6 through 341.14 where there is asbestos-related work involving 100 sq.ft. or more of asbestos containing material. Asbestos removal contractors must be certified as such by the Contractors Licensing Board of the State of California. The owner of the property where abatement would occur must have a Hazardous Waste Generator Number assigned by and registered with the Office of 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 the disposal of it. Pursuant to California law, DBI would not issue the required permit until the applicant has complied with the notice requirements described above.

These regulations and procedures, already established as a part of the permit review process, would ensure that any potential hazardous building materials impacts due to the presence of asbestos would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Other Hazardous Building Materials

In addition to asbestos-containing building materials and lead-based paint, buildings can contain other potentially hazardous building materials, including polychlorinated biphenyl (PCBs) in fluorescent light fixtures. Newer fixtures would not contain PCB ballasts; however, confirmation would require individual inspection of each fixture or accurate replacement records to determine their age. Fluorescent light bulbs are also regulated (for their disposal) due to their mercury content.

Inadvertent release of such materials during demolition and construction could expose construction workers, occupants, or visitors to these substances and could result in various adverse health effects if exposure were of sufficient quantity. Although abatement or notification programs described above for asbestos and lead-based paint have not been adopted for PCB and mercury testing and cleanup, or for other hazardous building materials, items containing these or other toxic substances that are intended for disposal must be managed as hazardous waste and handled in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) worker protection requirements.

Nonetheless, potential impacts associated with encountering PCBs, mercury, lead, or other hazardous substances in building materials would be considered a *potentially significant* impact. Hazardous building materials sampling and abatement pursuant to existing federal, state, and local laws and regulations prior to renovation work, as described in **Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2d**, below, would reduce potential impacts associated with PCBs, mercury, lead, and other toxic building substances in structures to a *less-than-significant* level. With Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2d implemented, the proposed project would not have the potential to pose a direct (through material removal, if required) or indirect (through transport of materials or accidental release) public health hazard to construction workers, others at the construction site, or people in the surrounding neighborhood.

Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2d

Other Hazardous Building Materials (PCBs, Mercury)

The project sponsor shall ensure that pre-construction building surveys for PCB- and mercury-containing equipment (including elevator equipment), fluorescent lights, lead, mercury, and other potentially toxic building materials are performed prior to the start of demolition. Any hazardous building materials so discovered shall be abated according to federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

The City adopted Ordinance 253-86 (signed by the Mayor on June 27, 1986), which requires analyzing soil for hazardous wastes within specified areas, known as the Maher area, when over 50 cubic yards of soil is to be disturbed and on sites specifically designated by the Director of Public Works.⁹¹ The project site is not within the Maher area; therefore, the project would not be subject to this ordinance.

Impact HZ-3: The proposed project would not handle hazardous materials within a quarter mile of a school. (No Impact)

⁹¹ The Maher Ordinance applies to that portion of the City bayward of the original high tide line, where past industrial uses and fill associated with the 1906 earthquake and bay reclamation often left hazardous waste residue in soils and groundwater. The ordinance requires that soils must be analyzed for hazardous wastes if more than 50 cubic yards of soil are to be disturbed.

There are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* on schools within one-quarter mile of the project site.

Impact HZ-4: The project site is not located on a State hazardous materials database. (No Impact)

The project site is not located on the Cortese List, compiled under Government Code Section 65962.5. Other hazardous materials databases include the Department of Toxic Substances Control's (DTSC's) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program's EnviroStor database, which identifies sites that have known contamination or hazardous sites for which there may be reasons to investigate further. The database includes the following site types: Federal Superfund sites (National Priorities List); State Response, including Military Facilities and State Superfund; Voluntary Cleanup; and School sites. EnviroStor provides similar information to the information that was available in CalSites, and provides additional site information, including, but not limited to, identification of formerly-contaminated properties that have been released for reuse, properties where environmental deed restrictions have been recorded to prevent inappropriate land uses, and risk characterization information that is used to assess potential impacts to public health and the environment at contaminated sites. The project site is not listed within the EnviroStor database and would not, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* with respect to being located on a state database of hazardous materials sites.

Impact HZ-5: The proposed project would not impair or interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan or expose people to a significant risk involving fires. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project does not contain any features that would result in additional exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires. San Francisco ensures fire safety and emergency accessibility within new and existing developments through provisions of its *Building* and *Fire Codes*. The project would conform to these standards, which may include development of an emergency procedure manual and an exit drill plan for the

proposed development. Potential fire hazards (including those associated with hydrant water pressure and blocking of emergency access points) would be addressed during the building permit review process. Conformance with these standards would ensure appropriate life safety protections for the residential structures. Consequently, the project would have a *less-than-significant* impact on fire safety and emergency access.

Impact HZ-6: The proposed project in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects would result in less-than-significant cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts. (Less than Significant)

Cumulative development projects described in the “Project Setting”⁹² would be required to follow applicable regulations for hazardous materials disposal during demolition and construction, and project operations would use substantially similar amounts and types of hazardous materials as the proposed project. Any accidental spill or release of the materials would not combine with the proposed project to create significant hazards or hazardous materials impacts. The Phase II ESA would evaluate site contamination from all potential sources, including prior uses of the site and both on- and off-site sources.

Impact HZ-7: The project variant would result in a potentially significant hazardous materials impact. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

The project variant would construct similar structures with the same uses on the same site and would involve soil-disturbing activity. Therefore, it would require **Mitigation Measures MHZ-2a to M-HZ-2d** (page 172 and 180) as the proposed project. Implementation of the measures would reduce the project variant’s hazard impacts to a *less-than-significant* level.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-HZ-2a to M-HZ-2d and the existing regulations and procedures of the building permit review process would reduce to less-than-significant levels

⁹² Two proposed projects have been identified within 0.5 miles of the project site: 2121 Evans Street, currently under entitlement and environmental review at the Planning Department; and 3433 – 3rd Street, currently under environmental review.

the potential public health and safety hazards discussed above, including possible soil and groundwater contamination, hazardous building materials, other hazardous materials use, and potential fire hazards for the proposed project. Therefore, potential impacts related to hazards would be less than significant.

Therefore, potential impacts related to hazards would be less than significant, both individually and cumulatively.

<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>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact ME-1: The proposed project would have no impact on mineral resources. (No Impact)

All land in San Francisco, including the project site, is designated Mineral Resource Zone 4 (MRZ-4) by the California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) under the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (CDMG, Open File Report 96-03 and Special Report 146 Parts I and II). This designation indicates that there is inadequate information available for assignment to any other MRZ and thus, the site is not a designated area of significant mineral deposits. Since the project site is 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 area whose operations or accessibility would be affected by the construction or operation of the proposed project. Therefore, checklist items 17a and 17b are not applicable to the proposed project.

Impact ME-2: The proposed project would consume additional energy, but not in large amounts or in a wasteful manner. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would consist of industrial, office, retail, and meeting hall uses, along with parking and loading areas. Development of these uses would not result in consumption of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy. The proposed project would meet or exceed current state and local standards regarding energy consumption, including Title 24 of the *California Code of Regulations* enforced by DBI. For this reason, the proposed project would not cause a wasteful use of energy, and would have a less-than-significant impact on energy and natural resources. No substantial environmental effects, either project-specific or cumulative, are expected from the proposed project. As noted above under Project Description, the proposed project may include solar panels on the roofs of Buildings 2 and 4, in the southeast and southwest quadrants, respectively, which would partially reduce energy use associated with the project. However, plans for inclusion of solar panels have not yet been finalized.

Electric generation to serve the proposed project would consume natural gas and coal fuel. The proposed project would not use substantial quantities of other non-renewable natural resources. It would not use fuel or water in an atypical or wasteful manner. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less-than-significant* effect on the use, extraction, or depletion of a natural resource nor contribute to a cumulative impact.

Impact ME-3: The proposed project in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects would result in less-than-significant impacts to mineral and energy resources. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would require typical utility connections and would connect into existing power and communications grids. Any utility relocation would be completed without interruption of service to adjacent properties. San Francisco consumers in the past experienced rising energy costs and uncertainties regarding the supply of electricity. The root causes of these conditions are under investigation and are the subject of much debate. Part of the problem is thought to be that the State does not generate sufficient energy to meet its demand and must import energy from outside sources. Another part of the problem may be the lack of cost controls as a result of deregulation. The California Energy Commission (CEC) is considering

applications for the development of new power-generating facilities in San Francisco, the Bay Area, and elsewhere in the State. These facilities will eventually increase the supply of energy. These efforts, together with conservation, will be part of the statewide effort to achieve sufficiency of energy supply relative to demand. The project-generated demand for electricity would be small in the context of the overall demand within San Francisco and the State, and would not in and of itself require a major expansion of power facilities. No new power or communications facilities would be necessary as a result of project implementation, and thus the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* physical environmental effect.

Impact ME-4: The project variant would have less-than-significant project-specific and cumulative mineral and energy resources impacts. (Less than Significant)

The project variant would construct similar structures without any solar panels on the same site as the proposed project and may be less energy-efficient than the proposed project. However, like the proposed project, the project variant would not consume large amounts of fuel, water, or energy. Like the proposed project, it would be required to conform to current state and local energy convention standards. DBI enforces Title 24 compliance, and documentation demonstrating compliance with these standards is submitted with the application for the building permit. As a result, the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* impact on the use of energy and other non-renewable natural resources.

For the above reasons, the proposed project and project variant would not result in significant physical environmental effects, either project-specific or cumulative, with respect to power and communications facilities.

<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>
----------------	---	---	---	----------------------	---------------------------

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.

—Would the project

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Impact AF-1: The proposed project would not convert farmland, conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses or forest land, and would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land. (No Impact)

The project site is located in the City of San Francisco, an urban area, and therefore not agricultural in nature. The California Department of Conservation designates no land within the City boundaries as Williamson Act properties or important farmland.⁹³ The proposed project would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use, would not conflict with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts, nor cause other changes that would lead to the conversion of Farmlands of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use. No part of San Francisco falls under the State *Public Resource Code* definitions of forest land or timberland; therefore, the project would not conflict with zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, result in the loss of forest land, or convert forest land to non-forest use. Accordingly all checklist items under this topic (18a – 18e) are not applicable to the proposed project.

⁹³ San Francisco is identified as “Urban and Built Up Land” on the California Department of Conservation’s map, Important Farmland in California, available online at http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fnmmp/overview/Pages/survey_area_map.aspx, accessed July 7, 2009.

Impact AF-2: The proposed project in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects would not result in impacts to agricultural and forest resources. (No Impact)

As described above, the project would have no impact with respect to agriculture and forestry resources; therefore, the project would not contribute to any cumulatively considerable impact to agricultural and forest resources.

Impact AF-3: The proposed variant would result in a less-than-significant project-specific and cumulative agricultural and forest resources impact. (No Impact)

The project variant would be located at the site of the proposed project, and would have no impact on agricultural and forest resources.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE— Would the project:					
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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 Section E.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources, above, **Mitigation Measure M-CP-2** has been incorporated into the proposed project to address potential impacts on archeological resources, and **Mitigation Measure M-CP-3** has been incorporated into the

proposed project to address potential impacts on paleontological resources. Mitigation Measures M-TR-5a and M-TR-5b have been incorporated into the proposed project to address potential traffic congestion impacts. Mitigation Measure M-BI-3, contained in Section E.13, Biological Resources, above, has been incorporated into the proposed project to address potential impacts to nesting birds. Mitigation Measures M-HZ-2a to M-HZ-2d, contained in Section E.15, Hazardous Materials, have been incorporated into the proposed project to address potential soil and groundwater contamination and construction-related impacts to hazardous building materials. Implementation of these measures would reduce the potential impacts of the proposed project on archaeological resources, paleontological resources, traffic, nesting birds, soil and groundwater contamination, and hazardous building materials to a less-than-significant level. As discussed in Topics 1 through 18 above, the proposed project would not 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, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Other than the impacts discussed above, the project would not otherwise degrade the quality of the environment or cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

Cumulative analysis depends on a prediction of possible future environmental changes well beyond construction of the proposed project. The Setting section identifies three other projects recently completed or planned, and each section addresses cumulative impacts. No other cumulative impacts are anticipated. In summary, the proposed project would not have unavoidable environmental effects that are cumulatively considerable.

F. MITIGATION MEASURES AND IMPROVEMENT MEASURES

MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures have been identified to reduce potentially significant environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the project sponsor has agreed to implement all mitigation measures described below.

Mitigation Measure M-CP-2

Archeological Resources

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 archeological consultant from a pool of qualified archaeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist. 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).

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. 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 shall be implemented the archeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:

- The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the 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, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

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

Human Remains 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) (*Public Resources 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 should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

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 Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department shall receive three copies of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest 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-CP-3

Paleontological Resources

In the event that any project soils-disturbing activities encounter evidence of a potential paleontological resource (fossilized vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant remains or the trace or imprint of such remains), the project sponsor shall contact the ERO and a qualified paleontologist⁹⁴ to undertake an appropriate assessment of the discovery and, if warranted, further field evaluation, data recovery, documentation, recordation, and curation in accordance with the *Standard Guidelines for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Nonrenewable Paleontological Resources* of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP).

Mitigation Measure M-TR-5a

- Jerrold Avenue/Toland Street – The unsignalized intersection of Jerrold/Toland would operate at LOS F during the 2030 Cumulative weekday a.m. peak hour. The contribution of the proposed project generated vehicles plus the re-routed traffic would be substantial, about 17 percent, and therefore, its contribution to the 2030 Cumulative impacts at this intersection would be considered significant. In order to mitigate this significant impact, the northbound approach would need to be restriped within the existing right-of-way to provide an exclusive left-turn lane, and, at the same time, the intersection would need to be signalized. No additional on-street parking spaces on Toland Street would have to be eliminated, beyond the 22 spaces proposed for removal for construction of the proposed

⁹⁴ Qualified Paleontologist – a paleontologist meeting the professional qualifications standards of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology.

project). With the implementation of these two measures the intersection operations would improve to LOS B during the weekday a.m. peak hour.

Mitigation Measure M-TR-5b

- Innes Avenue/Toland Street – The proposed unsignalized intersection of Innes/ Toland would operate at LOS F during the 2030 Cumulative weekday a.m. peak hour. The contribution of the proposed project generated vehicles plus the re-routed traffic would be substantial, about 72 percent, and therefore, its contribution to the 2030 Cumulative impacts at this intersection would be considered significant. In order to mitigate this significant impact, the intersection would need to be signalized. With signalization, the intersection operations would improve to LOS D during the weekday a.m. peak hour.

Once Jerrold Avenue is closed to vehicular traffic not related to the Produce Market, the project sponsor shall be responsible for monitoring the traffic conditions at the intersection of Jerrold/Toland and Innes/Toland one year after completion of the roadway reconfiguration; then every five years for the subsequent 10-year period, then every three years through year 2030 or one year after build-out, whichever occurs later. If signalization occurs prior to 2030 or a year after build-out, monitoring would no longer be necessary or required.

When the results of the monitoring analyses indicate that the intersection of Jerrold/Toland and/or Innes/Toland is close to operating at an unacceptable LOS, the SFMTA will commit to signalizing it/them or making improvements so that they would continue to operate at an acceptable LOS in the future. The project sponsor shall be responsible for paying their fair share contribution to the costs of signalizing and/or restriping each of the two intersections.

The fair share contribution at the intersection of Jerrold /Toland is calculated as 17 percent of the total cost of signalization and restriping of the northbound approach. The fair share contribution at the intersection of Innes /Toland is calculated as 72 percent of the total cost of signalization. The payment of the fair share contribution to SFMTA would reduce the project's cumulative impacts at these two intersections to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-3

Protection of Nesting Birds During Construction

The project sponsor shall implement the following protective measures to ensure implementation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and compliance with State regulations during construction. Pre-construction surveys for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified ornithologist or wildlife biologist to ensure that no nests would be disturbed during project implementation. A preconstruction survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of demolition/construction activities during the early part of the breeding season (January through April) and no more than 30 days prior to the initiation of these activities during the late part of the breeding season (May through August). During this survey, the qualified person shall inspect all trees in and immediately adjacent to the impact areas for nests.

If an active nest is found close enough to the construction area to be disturbed by these activities, the ornithologist, in consultation with California Department of Fish and Game, shall determine the extent of a construction-free buffer zone to be established around the nest.

Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2a

Hazards (Handling of Contaminated Soil)

Step 1: Preparation of Soil Mitigation Plan

Based on the potential for encountering contaminated soils during site excavation, the SFDPH has determined that the preparation of a Soil Mitigation Plan (SMP) is warranted. The SMP shall include a discussion of the level of contamination of soils on the project site and mitigation measures for managing contaminated soils on the site, including, but not limited to: 1) the alternatives for managing contaminated soils on the site (e.g., encapsulation, partial or complete removal, treatment, recycling for reuse, or a combination); 2) the preferred alternative for managing contaminated soils on the site and a brief justification; 3) the specific practices to be used to handle, haul, and dispose of contaminated soils on the site; and 4) contingency plans to be implemented during soil excavation if unanticipated hazardous materials are encountered. The SMP should include a dust control plan in compliance with San Francisco Health Code Article 62B and should address the RWQCB's Environmental Screening Levels for commercial land use. The SMP shall be submitted to the SFDPH for review and approval. A copy of the SMP shall be submitted to the Planning Department to become part of the case file.

Step 2: Handling, Hauling, and Disposal of Contaminated Soils

(a) Specific Work Practices: Based on the results of the soil tests conducted, the SFDPH determined that the soils on the project site are contaminated at or above potentially hazardous levels, the construction contractor shall be alert for the presence of such soils during excavation and other construction activities on the site (detected through soil odor, color, and texture and results of on-site soil testing), and shall be prepared to handle, profile (i.e., characterize), and dispose of such soils appropriately (i.e., as dictated by local, state, and federal regulations) when such soils are encountered on the site.

(b) Dust Suppression: Soils exposed during excavation for site preparation and project construction activities shall be kept moist throughout the time they are exposed, both during and after work hours.

(c) Surface Water Runoff Control: Where soils are stockpiled, visqueen shall be used to create an impermeable liner, both beneath and on top of the soils, with a berm to contain any potential surface water runoff from the soil stockpiles during inclement weather.

(d) Soils Replacement: If necessary, clean fill or other suitable material(s) shall be used to bring portions of the project site, where contaminated soils have been excavated and removed, up to construction grade.

(e) Hauling and Disposal: Contaminated soils shall be hauled off the project site by waste hauling trucks appropriately certified with the State of California and adequately covered to prevent dispersion of the soils during transit, and shall be disposed of at a permitted hazardous waste disposal facility registered with the State of California.

Step 3: Preparation of Closure/Certification Report

After excavation and foundation construction activities are completed, the project sponsor shall prepare and submit a closure/certification report to the SFDPH for review and approval. The closure/certification report shall include the mitigation measures in the SMP for handling and removing contaminated soils from the project site, whether the construction contractor modified any of these mitigation measures, and how and why the construction contractor modified those mitigation measures.

Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2b

Disposal of Contaminated Soil/Site Health and Safety Plan

Any contaminated soils shall be excavated by a qualified Removal Contractor and disposed of at an appropriate landfill, as governed by applicable laws and regulations, or other appropriate actions shall be taken in coordination with the SFDPH.

If DPH determines that the soils on the project site are contaminated with contaminants at or above potentially hazardous levels, and a Site Health and Safety Plan (HSP) is required by the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health prior to initiating any earth-moving activities at the site. The protocols shall include at a minimum:

- Sweeping of adjacent public streets daily (with water sweepers) if any visible soil material is carried onto the streets.
- Characterization of excavated native soils proposed for use on site prior to placement to confirm that the soil meets appropriate standards.
- The dust controls specified in the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (176-08).
- Protocols for managing stockpiled and excavated soils.
- The HSP shall identify site access controls to be implemented from the time of surface disruption through the completion of earthwork construction. The protocols shall include at a minimum:
 1. Appropriate site security to prevent unauthorized pedestrian/vehicular entry, such as fencing or other barrier of sufficient height and structural integrity to prevent entry, based upon the degree of control required.
 2. Posting of "no trespassing" signs.
 3. Providing on-site meetings with construction workers to inform them about security measures and reporting/contingency procedures.

If groundwater contamination is identified, the Site Health and Safety Plan shall identify protocols for managing groundwater during construction to minimize worker and public exposure to contaminated groundwater. The protocols shall include procedures to prevent unacceptable migration of contamination from defined plumes during dewatering.

The Site Health and Safety Plan shall include a requirement that construction personnel be trained to recognize potential hazards associated with underground features that could contain hazardous substances, previously unidentified contamination, or buried hazardous debris. Excavation personnel shall also be required to wash hands and face before eating, smoking, and drinking.

The Site Health and Safety Plan shall include procedures for implementing a contingency plan, including appropriate notification and control procedures, in the event unanticipated subsurface hazards are discovered during construction. Control procedures shall include, but would not be limited to, investigation and removal of underground storage tanks or other hazards.

Mitigation Measure HZ-2c

Decontamination of Vehicles

The DPH has determined that the soils on the project site are contaminated with contaminants at or above potentially hazardous levels, all trucks and excavation and soil handling equipment shall be decontaminated following use and prior to removal from the site. Gross contamination shall be first removed through brushing, wiping, or dry brooming. The vehicle or equipment shall then be washed clean (including tires). Prior to removal from the work site, all vehicles and equipment shall be inspected to ensure that contamination has been removed.

Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2d

Other Hazardous Building Materials (PCBs, Mercury)

The project sponsor shall ensure that pre-construction building surveys for PCB- and mercury-containing equipment (including elevator equipment), fluorescent lights, lead, mercury, and other potentially toxic building materials are performed prior to the start of demolition. Any hazardous building materials so discovered shall be abated according to federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

IMPROVEMENT MEASURES

Improvement measures have been identified that reduce less-than-significant project impacts. The project sponsor has agreed to implement the following improvement measure. Additional

improvement measures were identified by the transportation impact study, which the project sponsor has not agreed to implement.

Improvement Measure I-TR-1

To reduce the potential for traffic queue spillbacks onto the intersection of Jerrold/Toland it is recommended that the third reversible entry/exit lane be implemented under both the proposed project and project variant , and that each queuing lane be 75 feet long at minimum, and 100 feet long preferable.

G. PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT

On September 10, 2010 the Planning Department mailed a Notice of Project Receiving Environmental Review to property owners within 300 feet of the project site, adjacent tenants, and other potentially interested parties. The Department received one question in response to this notice. Questions related to roadway reconfiguration and thick traffic raised by the public regarding were addressed in this Initial Study.

On May 11, 2011, the Planning Department published a Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration (PMND) for the San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market Project. The Department received three comment letters during the 20-day public review period. The three comment letters raised concerns regarding the vacation of Jerrold Avenue, discussed the merits of the street closure, and proposed alternate roadway reconfigurations. The Planning Department has addressed respondents' concerns in the text below.

One respondent requested the Department reconsider the effects of vacating Jerrold Avenue on the Bayview neighborhood in terms of reducing already limited connectivity and decreasing safety for drivers and bicyclists. The environmental effects of the Jerrold Avenue vacation are discussed in the Transportation and Circulation section of the Initial Study under Impacts TR-1 and-2, pages 82 to 88. With mitigation, the proposed street closure would not significantly conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for multi-modal traffic circulation performance. As stated in the Initial Study on page 87, under future conditions, vehicle delays would increase at the surrounding intersections due to the rerouting of through traffic associated with the project's proposed roadway reconfiguration. As discussed under Impact TR-5, beginning on page 98, the project would substantially contribute

to the projected poor operating conditions at two of the nine failing intersections in year 2030. However, as stated on page 99, with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-TR-5a, Jerrold Avenue/Toland Street signalization, and M-TR-5b, Innes Avenue/Toland Street signalization, the project is not expected to conflict with policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the roadway system. As discussed under Impact TR-4, beginning on page 89, the closure would not result in any conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle facilities, or pedestrian facilities, or decrease the performance or safety of these facilities. As discussed under Impacts TR-2 and -3, page 88, the closure and traffic rerouting onto Innes and Kirkwood Avenues would not substantially increase hazards, introduce incompatible uses, or result in inadequate emergency access. As described in the Initial Study, the closure of Jerrold Avenue would eliminate conflicts between Produce Market operations, such as tractor-trailer maneuvering and unloading, and vehicles, buses, bicyclists, and pedestrians traversing the site (pages 85, 87, 88, 93, and 94). However, the closure of Jerrold Avenue could be viewed as an adverse change and inconvenience by motorists, bicyclists, pedestrians and others who may prefer the current roadway configuration. The closure would result in Jerrold Avenue travelers making up to four additional turning movements around the project site, which could add additional travel time. However, under the CEQA significance criteria, this would not constitute a significant impact under CEQA. Project decision-makers, however, may wish to consider the merits of the project in non-CEQA-related areas.

A second respondent described the existing conditions at the Produce Market as “incredibly dangerous for bikes and pedestrians, and is barely safe for car traffic,” and suggested two alternate roadway configurations. The Initial Study (see page 104) found the project would not result in a significant impact with regard to transportation and circulation that could not be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Alternatives to the project are not required to be addressed in Mitigated Negative Declarations. Therefore, the alternate configurations suggested by the respondent do not require analysis under CEQA. As noted under Impacts TR-1 and -4, on pages 85 and 93, the project sponsor would provide new crosswalks and sidewalks with street lighting, tree planting, and landscaping around the project site as required by the Better Streets Plan and described in the Initial Study. This would improve conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists as compared to existing conditions.

The third respondent stated a similar concern that the closure of Jerrold Avenue would reduce already limited connectivity to the Bayview neighborhood and suggested an alternate roadway reconfiguration. These comments have been responded to above.

Subsequent to publication of the PMND, the project sponsor clarified that the project description includes the ground lease of the Produce Market in its entirety: the Main Site, the 901 Rankin Street site, and the 2101 Jerrold Avenue site. The site at 2101 Jerrold Avenue, a currently functioning produce distribution warehouse, is included in the ground lease but is not proposed for physical alteration. This information has been updated throughout the Initial Study. Although the preliminary project description evaluated in the Initial Study did not include the ground lease at 2101 Jerrold Avenue, the impact analysis and conclusions of the Initial Study do not change as a result of including these components in the project description. The increased square footages in this amended mitigated negative declaration, particularly in the project description setting, reflect the inclusion of the 2101 Jerrold Avenue site in the total project site, and no increase to the development described in the preliminary mitigated declaration has been proposed. Because no new significant impacts were identified in responding to concerns or project description clarification, recirculation of the PMND is not required.


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

May 9, 2011



Bill Wycko
Environmental Review Officer
for
John Rahaim
Director of Planning

I. LIST OF PREPARERS

Authors

Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco
Major Environmental Analysis
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Environmental Review Officer: Bill Wycko

Environmental Supervisor: Lisa Gibson

Environmental and Transportation Planner: Andrea Contreras, LEED AP

Senior Transportation Planner: Viktoriya Wise, LEED AP, AICP

Consultants

During Associates

100 Montgomery Street, Suite 2290
San Francisco, CA 94104

Stu During, Project Manager

Michael Kent

Morgan Gillespie

Clement Designs (Graphics Design)

358 Third Avenue, Suite 100
San Francisco, CA 94118
Kathy Clement

Kelley & VerPlanck (Historic Architectural Resources)

2912 Diamond St Ste 330
San Francisco, CA 94131
Tim Kelley

Treadwell & Rollo (Geotechnology and Hazards)

555 Montgomery Street
Suite 1300
San Francisco, CA 94111