



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## Certificate of Determination EXEMPTION FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Case No.: 2015-014715ENV  
 Project Address: 2060 Folsom Street  
 Zoning: P (Public) Use District  
 50-X Height and Bulk District  
 Block/Lot: 3571/031  
 Lot Size: 29,075 square feet  
 Prior EIR: Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan (Mission)  
 Project Sponsors: Mission Economic Development Agency  
 Elaine Yee – (415) 282-3334  
 Chinatown Community Development Center  
 Shannon Dodge – (415) 929-1026  
 Staff Contact: Don Lewis, (415) 575-9168, [don.lewis@sfgov.org](mailto:don.lewis@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 an irregular-shaped lot located on the west side of Folsom Street between 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> streets in the Mission neighborhood. The project site is a surface parking lot with approximately 95 vehicle spaces, three light standards, and a small information kiosk/pay station. It is currently zoned P (Public) and within a 50-X height and bulk district. The project sponsor proposes the rezoning and height re-classification of the project site to an Urban Mixed Use (UMU) district and an 85-X height and bulk district. The proposed project involves removal of the surface parking lot and construction of a nine-story, 85-foot-tall (94-foot-tall with elevator penthouse), approximately 165,350-square-foot, mixed-use building. The proposed building would contain up to 134 affordable residential units, 9,670 square feet of


(Continued on next page.)

### EXEMPT STATUS

Exempt per Section 15183.3 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and California Public Resources Code Section 21094.5.

### DETERMINATION

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

  
 SARAH B. JONES  
 Environmental Review Officer

June 10, 2016  
 Date

cc: Elaine Yee, Project Sponsor  
 Shannon Dodge, Project Sponsor  
 Supervisor David Campos, District 9

Virna Byrd, M.D.F  
 Exemption/Exclusion File  
 Kimberly Durandet, Current Planning Division

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION (continued)**

community support services, 1,230 square feet of accessory office space, 4,420 square feet for a child development center, and 600 square feet of retail use. The proposed unit mix would include transitional age youth units (TAY; which are generally smaller than studio units), one-bedroom units, two-bedroom units, and three-bedroom units. It is anticipated that at least 20 percent of the proposed units would be transitional age youth units. No vehicular parking is proposed. The proposed project would include 107 Class I bicycle spaces at the ground-floor level and 12 Class II bicycle spaces would be located on the sidewalk in front of the project site (nine on Folsom Street and three on Shotwell Street). The existing 12-foot-wide curb cut on Shotwell Street would be removed and standard sidewalk and curb dimensions restored. The proposed project would install a 40-foot-long loading zone within two proposed sidewalk bulb-outs on Folsom Street for the residential use and the child development center. In addition, one 20-foot-long, on-street car share space would be located on Folsom Street. The Folsom Street sidewalk in front of the project site would be widened from 11 feet, 7 inches to 12 feet while the Shotwell Street sidewalk in front of the project site would be widened from 10 feet to 12 feet.

The proposed project includes an approximately 4,460-square-foot promenade that borders a park to the south (17<sup>th</sup> & Folsom Park), which is currently under construction, and a 2,960-square-foot open courtyard that would be located towards the center of the project site and would create an east and west building wing. Immediately north of the open courtyard would be a 1,530-square-foot outdoor open space for the child development center. The proposed project also includes an 860-square-foot roof deck for the residential units. The proposed project would replace five existing street trees along the project site (four on Folsom Street and one on Shotwell Street) and ten new trees would be planted (four on Shotwell Street, four within the proposed promenade, and two on Shotwell Street).

During the approximately 22-month construction period, the proposed project would require up to 30 feet of excavation below ground surface (bgs) for the proposed foundation work which would require cement deep soil mixing and any soil remediation deemed necessary, resulting in approximately 2,500 cubic yards of soil disturbance. The west wing of the proposed building would be supported by a shallow foundation (a mat slab) while the east wing would require a deep foundation (drilled piles would extend up to 65 feet bgs). Impact piling driving is not proposed. The project site is located within the Mission Plan Area of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans.

**PROJECT APPROVAL**

The proposed project at 2060 Folsom Street would require the following approvals:

**Actions by the Planning Commission**

- Approval of a Legislative Amendment for proposed zoning change and height re-classification under Section 302 of the Planning Code. The Planning Commission's approval of the Legislative Amendment would be the Approval Action for the project. The Approval Action date establishes the start of the 30-day appeal period for this CEQA exemption determination pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

### Actions by the Board of Supervisors

- Approval of a Legislative Amendment for proposed zoning change and height re-classification.

### Actions by the Planning Department

- Approval of a Large Project Authorization for development of a building greater than 25,000 gross square feet, if the proposed legislative amendment is approved. Per Planning Code Section 315, a Large Project Authorization for 100 percent Affordable Housing Projects may be approved by the Planning Department.

### Actions by City Departments

- Approval of a Site Mitigation Plan from the San Francisco Department of Public Health prior to the commencement of any excavation work.
- Approval of a Site Permit from the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for new construction.

## PROJECT SETTING

The project site is an irregular-shaped lot located on the west side of Folsom Street between 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> streets in the Mission neighborhood. The project site is primarily flat with no noticeable slope and has frontages on Folsom, and Shotwell streets. The project site is a surface parking lot with approximately 95 vehicle spaces, three light standards, and a small information kiosk/pay station. The project site has been previously developed with residential and light industrial structures (including a wrecking company, an auto washing area, a trailer manufacturing factory, and a paint booth). By 1987 the project site did not contain residential or light industrial structures and has since been used as a surface parking lot.

Land uses near the project site include industrial, residential, commercial, office, and public space. The 16<sup>th</sup> Street-Mission BART station, a major regional transit station, is located three blocks (approximately 900 feet) west of the project site. There are three Muni stops approximately 300 feet north of the project site near the intersection of 16<sup>th</sup> and Folsom streets. Within a quarter mile of the project site, the San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) operates the following bus lines: 12, 14, 14R, 22, 33, 49, and 55. There is a bicycle lane on 17<sup>th</sup> Street and a bicycle route on Folsom Street. Buildings in the project vicinity range from 15 to 40 feet in height. Surrounding parcels are zoned PDR-1-G (General Production, Distribution, and Repair) with the exception of one lot west of the project site that is zoned UMU (Urban Mixed Use). Height and bulk districts in the project vicinity are 50-X and 58-X.

Immediately adjacent to the south of the project site is a proposed park that is currently under construction.<sup>1</sup> Immediately adjacent to the north of the project site is the 2000-2014 Folsom Street building which is a reinforced-concrete industrial building (constructed in 1948) that ranges from one to three stories in height with frontages on Folsom, 16<sup>th</sup>, and Shotwell streets. The uses in the building include food manufacturing, office, and commercial.

Across Folsom Street to the east of the project site, from 17<sup>th</sup> Street to 16<sup>th</sup> Street, is a two-story residential building with ground-floor commercial ("Rite Spot Cafe"), a one-story industrial building with

<sup>1</sup> The site of the 17<sup>th</sup> & Folsom Park, which is under construction, was a former surface parking lot with approximately 219 spaces. It is anticipated that the park would open mid-2017.

warehouse and office uses (“Comcast Shipping and Receiving”), a two-story commercial building (“Sherman Williams Automotive Finishes”), a three-story residential building, and a three-story residential building with ground-floor retail.

Across 17<sup>th</sup> Street to the south of the project site, between Shotwell and Folsom street, is a one-story warehouse building (“Ocean Sash & Door Company”), a two-story commercial building (“Lutz Plumbing”), a one-story industrial building with an adjacent parking lot for approximately twelve vehicles (“Hans Art Automotive”), and a two-story industrial building (“Pacific Investment Services”).

Across Shotwell Street to the west of the project site, between 16<sup>th</sup> Street to 17<sup>th</sup> Street, is a two-story office building with an approximately 25-space parking lot (“Mission Neighborhood Health Center”), a two-story residential building with a ground-floor studio gallery, a two-story industrial building (“Dubbelju Motorcycle Rentals”), and a two-story industrial building (“Ocean Sash & Door Company”). At the southeast corner of Shotwell and 17<sup>th</sup> streets is a three-story performing arts building (“ODC Theater”).

Two blocks west of the project site is the 600 South Van Ness Avenue development (Case No. 2013.0614ENV) that is currently under construction. That project entails the construction of a five-story, mixed-use building with 27 dwelling units, 3,060 square feet of commercial use, and 20 off-street parking spaces. Two blocks northwest of the project site is an approved development at 490 South Van Ness (Case No. 2015-010406ENV) which entails replacing a former gasoline station with a seven-story, mixed-use development with 72 dwelling units, 1,100 square feet of commercial use, and 48 off-street parking spaces.<sup>2</sup>

## STREAMLINING FOR INFILL PROJECTS OVERVIEW

California Public Resources Code Section 21094.5 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.3 provides a streamlined environmental review process for eligible infill projects by limiting the topics subject to review at the project level where the effects of infill development have been previously addressed in a planning level decision<sup>3</sup> or by uniformly applicable development policies.<sup>4</sup> CEQA does not apply to the effects of an eligible infill project under two circumstances. First, if an effect was addressed as a significant effect in a prior Environmental Impact Report (EIR)<sup>5</sup> for a planning level decision, then that effect need not be analyzed again for an individual infill project even when that effect was not reduced to a less than significant level in the prior EIR. Second, an effect need not be analyzed, even if it was not analyzed in a prior EIR or is more significant than previously analyzed, if the lead agency makes a finding that uniformly applicable development policies or standards, adopted by the lead agency or a city or county, apply to the infill project and would substantially mitigate that effect. Depending on the effects addressed in the prior EIR and the availability of uniformly applicable development policies or standards that apply to the eligible infill project, the streamlined environmental review would range from complete exemption from environmental review to a narrowed, project-specific environmental document.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development purchased the property in 2015 with the intention of building an affordable housing development.

<sup>3</sup> Planning level decision means the enactment of amendment of a general plan or any general plan element, community plan, specific plan, or zoning code.

<sup>4</sup> Uniformly applicable development policies are policies or standards adopted or enacted by a city or county, or by a lead agency, that reduce one or more adverse environmental effects.

<sup>5</sup> Prior EIR means the environmental impact report certified for a planning level decision, as supplemented by any subsequent or supplemental environmental impact reports, negative declarations, or addenda to those documents.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.3, an eligible infill project is examined in light of the prior EIR to determine whether the infill project will cause any effects that require additional review under CEQA. The evaluation of an eligible infill project must demonstrate the following:

- (1) the project satisfies the performance standards of Appendix M of the CEQA Guidelines;
- (2) the degree to which the effects of the infill project were analyzed in the prior EIR;
- (3) an explanation of whether the infill project will cause new specific effects<sup>6</sup> not addressed in the prior EIR;
- (4) an explanation of whether substantial new information shows that the adverse effects of the infill project are substantially more severe than described in the prior EIR; and
- (5) if the infill project would cause new specific effects or more significant effects than disclosed in the prior EIR, the evaluation shall indicate whether uniformly applied development standards substantially mitigate<sup>7</sup> those effects.<sup>8</sup>

No additional environmental review is required if the infill project would not cause any new site-specific or project-specific effects or more significant effects, or if uniformly applied development standards would substantially mitigate such effects.

### INFILL PROJECT ELIGIBILITY

To be eligible for the streamlining procedures prescribed in Section 15183.3, an infill project must meet all of the following criteria.

- a) *The project site is located in an urban area on a site that either has been previously developed or that adjoins existing qualified urban uses on at least seventy-five percent of the site's perimeter.*<sup>9</sup>

The project site is located within an urban area and has been previously developed. According to historical Sanborn maps, the project site has been developed with residential and light industrial structures since 1889. Based on building permits, past businesses on the project site included a wrecking company, an auto washing area, a trailer manufacturing factory, and a paint booth. Based on the 1938 and 1946 aerial photographs, the project site was occupied by a building. Based on the 1987 aerial photograph, the building was no longer present and the project site was depicted as a paved parking lot. To date the project site remains developed as a paved parking lot.

<sup>6</sup> A new specific effect is an effect that was not addressed in the prior EIR and that is specific to the infill project or the infill project site. A new specific effect may result if, for example, the prior EIR stated that sufficient site-specific information was not available to analyze the significance of that effect. Substantial changes in circumstances following certification of a prior EIR may also result in a new specific effect.

<sup>7</sup> More significant means an effect will be substantially more severe than described in the prior EIR. More significant effects include those that result from changes in circumstances or changes in the development assumptions underlying the prior EIR's analysis. An effect is also more significant if substantial new information shows that: (1) mitigation measures that were previously rejected as infeasible are in fact feasible, and such measures are not included in the project; (2) feasible mitigation measures considerably different than those previously analyzed could substantially reduce a significant effect described in the prior EIR, but such measures are not included in the project; or (3) an applicable mitigation measure was adopted in connection with a planning level decision, but the lead agency determines that it is not feasible for the infill project to implement that measure.

<sup>8</sup> Substantially mitigate means that the policy or standard will substantially lessen the effect, but not necessarily below the levels of significance.

<sup>9</sup> For the purpose of this subdivision "adjoin" means the infill project is immediately adjacent to qualified urban uses, or is only separated from such uses by an improved public right-of-way. Qualified urban use means any residential, commercial, public institutional, transit or transportation passenger facility, or retail use, or any combination of those uses.

b) *The proposed project satisfies the performance standards provided in Appendix M of the CEQA Guidelines.*

The proposed project satisfies the performance standards provided in Appendix M of the CEQA Guidelines.<sup>10</sup> The Appendix M checklist, which can be located within the project file, covers the following topics for mixed-use residential projects: hazardous materials, air quality, transportation, and affordable housing. The project site is not included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code (i.e., the “Cortese” list), and is not located near a high-volume roadway or a stationary source of air pollution (i.e., project site is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone). The project site is located within a low vehicle travel area, within a half mile of an existing major transit stop, and consists of less than 300 affordable housing units.

c) *The proposed project is consistent with the general use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified in the Sustainable Communities Strategy.*

Plan Bay Area is the current Sustainable Communities Strategy and Regional Transportation Plan that was adopted by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) in July 2013, in compliance with California's governing greenhouse gas reduction legislation, Senate Bill 375.<sup>11</sup> To be consistent with Plan Bay Area, a proposed project must be located within a Priority Development Area (PDA), or must meet all of the following criteria:

- Conform with the jurisdiction’s General Plan and Housing Element;
- Be located within 0.5 miles of transit access;
- Be 100% affordable to low- and very-low income households for 55 years; and
- Be located within 0.5 miles of at least six neighborhood amenities.<sup>12</sup>

The project site is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods PDA, and therefore the project is consistent with the general use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified in Plan Bay Area.<sup>13</sup> As discussed above, the proposed project at 2060 Folsom Street meets criteria a, b, and c, and is therefore considered an eligible infill project.

## PLAN-LEVEL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The 2060 Folsom Street project site is located within the Mission Plan Area of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans which were evaluated in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (PEIR).<sup>14</sup> The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, which was certified in 2008, is a comprehensive programmatic document that presents an analysis of the environmental effects of implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, as well as the potential impacts under several proposed alternative scenarios. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR estimated that

<sup>10</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, *Eligibility Checklist: CEQA Guidelines Appendix M Performance Standards for Streamlined Environmental Review, 2060 Folsom Street*, May 3, 2016. This document (and all other documents cited in this report, unless otherwise noted), is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 as part of Case File No. 2015-014715ENV.

<sup>11</sup> Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Association of Bay Area Governments, Plan Bay Area. Available: <http://onebayarea.org/plan-bay-area/final-plan-bay-area.html>. Accessed April 25, 2016

<sup>12</sup> Choin, Miriam, Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Planning & Research Director, letter to Don Lewis, Environmental Planner, San Francisco Planning Department, February 22, 2016, *Re: 2070 Folsom Street Project SCS Consistency*.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E and State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048

implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan could result in approximately 7,400 to 9,900 net dwelling units and 3,200,000 to 6,600,0000 square feet of net non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) built in the Plan Area throughout the lifetime of the Plan (year 2025).

This determination and the Infill Environmental Checklist (Attachment A) concludes that the proposed project at 2060 Folsom Street: (1) is eligible for an infill streamlining exemption; (2) the effects of the infill project were analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and applicable mitigation measures from the PEIR have been incorporated into the proposed project; (3) the proposed project would not cause new specific effects that were not already addressed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR; and (4) there is no substantial new information that shows that the adverse environmental effects of the infill project are more significant than described in the prior EIR. Therefore, no further environmental review is required for the proposed 2060 Folsom Street project and this Certificate of Exemption for the proposed project comprise the full and complete CEQA evaluation necessary for the proposed project.

## POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR included analyses of environmental issues including: land use; plans and policies; visual quality and urban design; population, housing, business activity, and employment (growth inducement); transportation; noise; air quality; parks, recreation and open space; shadow; archeological resources; historic architectural resources; hazards; and other issues not addressed in the previously issued initial study for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzed a range of rezoning options for the project site, including an option to rezone the project site from a 50-foot height limit to a 68-foot height limit and from a P (Public) zoning district to an UMU district.<sup>15</sup> Thus, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR considered the incremental impacts of the proposed 2060 Folsom Street project. As a result, the proposed infill project would not result in adverse environmental effects that are more significant than were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Significant and unavoidable impacts were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR for the following topics: land use, historic architectural resources, transportation and circulation, and shadow. Regarding land use, the PEIR found a significant impact related to the cumulative loss of PDR. The approximately 29,075-square-foot project site at 2060 Folsom is a surface parking lot; therefore, there are no existing PDR uses at the project site. The project site is located within a P (Public) use district, which does not allow PDR uses. Since the project site was not part of the PDR land supply, the proposed project would not contribute to the significant land use impact identified in the PEIR. Regarding historic architectural resources, the PEIR found that changes in use districts and height limits under the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans could have substantial adverse changes on the significance of both individual historic resources and on historic districts within the Plan Area. The proposed project does not involve demolition of a structure and the project site is not located within a historic district. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to the significant historic resource impact identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Regarding transit, the PEIR found that the anticipated growth resulting from the zoning changes could result in significant impacts on transit ridership. Transit ridership generated by the

---

<sup>15</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)*, August 7, 2008. Case No. 2004.0160E, Figure C&R-1 Proposed Use Districts in Preferred Project and Figure C&R-2 Proposed Height Limited in Preferred Project. Available at <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>, accessed on May 25, 2016. This document also is available for review at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA, as part of Case No. 2004.0160E.

project would not contribute considerably to the transit impacts identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Finally, regarding shadow impacts, the PEIR could not conclude if the rezoning and community plans would result in less-than-significant shadow impacts because the feasibility of complete mitigation for potential new shadow impacts of unknown proposals could not be determined at that time. The proposed project would not substantially affect the adjacent 17<sup>th</sup> & Folsom Park since project shadow would be limited to early morning and evening hours in the summer months during periods that are typically low for park use.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts related to noise, air quality, archeological resources, historic resources, hazardous materials, and transportation. The Infill Environmental Checklist discusses the applicability of each mitigation measure from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and identifies uniformly applicable development standards that would reduce environmental effects of the project.<sup>16</sup> Table 1 below lists the mitigation measures identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR that would apply to the proposed project.

**Table 1 – Applicable Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures**

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
F-2: Construction Noise	Applicable: temporary construction noise from the use of heavy equipment would be generated	The project sponsor has agreed to develop and implement a set of noise attenuation measures during construction.
J-2: Properties with no Previous Studies	Applicable: project site is located in an area with no previous archaeological studies	The Planning Department has conducted a Preliminary Archeological Review. The project sponsor has agreed to implement procedures related to archeological testing in compliance with this mitigation measure.

As discussed in the attached Infill Environmental Checklist, the following mitigation measures identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR are not applicable to the proposed project: F-1: Construction Noise (Pile Driving), F-3: Interior Noise Levels, F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses, F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses, F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments, G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses, G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM, G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit other TACs, J-1: Properties with Previous Archeological Studies, J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District, K-1: Interim Procedures for Permit Review in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area, K-2: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Vertical Additions in the South End Historic District, K-3: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Alterations and Infill Development in the Dogpatch Historic District, L-1: Hazardous Building Materials, E-1: Traffic Signal Installation, E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management, E-3: Enhanced Transportation Funding, E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management, E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding, E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements, E-7: Transit Accessibility, E-8: Muni Storage and Maintenance, E-9: Rider Improvements, E-10: Transit Enhancement, and E-11: Transportation Demand Management.

<sup>16</sup> The Infill Environmental Checklist is attached to this document as Attachment A.

Please see the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program<sup>17</sup> (MMRP) for the complete text of the applicable mitigation measures. With implementation of these mitigation measures and uniformly applicable development standards, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

## **PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT**

A "Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review" was mailed on May 11, 2016 to adjacent occupants and owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site. No comments were received.

## **CONCLUSION**

As summarized above and further discussed in the Infill Environmental Checklist<sup>18</sup>:

1. The proposed project is eligible for the streamlining procedures, as the project site has been previously developed and is located in an urban area, the proposed project satisfies the performance standards provided in Appendix M of the CEQA Guidelines, and the project is consistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy;
2. The effects of the proposed infill project were analyzed in a prior EIR, and no new information shows that the adverse environmental effects of the infill project are more significant than that described in the prior EIR;
3. The proposed infill project would not cause any significant effects on the environment that either have not already been analyzed in a prior EIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed, or that uniformly applicable development policies would not substantially mitigate; and
4. The project sponsor will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR to mitigate project-related significant impacts.

Therefore, the proposed project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21094.5 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.3.

---

<sup>17</sup> The MMRP is attached to this document as Attachment B.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## ATTACHMENT A

### Infill Environmental Checklist

*Case No.:* 2015-014715ENV  
*Project Address:* 2060 Folsom Street  
*Zoning:* P (Public) Use District  
50-X Height and Bulk District  
*Block/Lot:* 3571/031  
*Lot Size:* 29,075 square feet  
*Prior EIR:* Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan (Mission)  
*Project Sponsors:* Mission Economic Development Agency  
Elaine Yee – (415) 282-3334  
Chinatown Community Development Center  
Shannon Dodge – (415) 929-1026  
*Staff Contact:* Don Lewis – (415) 575-9168  
[don.lewis@sfgov.org](mailto:don.lewis@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

### Project Location

The project site is an irregular-shaped lot located on the west side of Folsom Street between 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> streets, with frontages on Folsom and Shotwell streets, in the Mission neighborhood (see Figure 1, Project Location). The project site is a surface parking lot with approximately 95 vehicle spaces, three light standards, and a small information kiosk/pay station. It is currently zoned P (Public) and within a 50-X height and bulk district. Immediately adjacent to the south of the project site is the 17<sup>th</sup> & Folsom Park, which is under construction and under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department.

### Project Characteristics

The project sponsor proposes the rezoning and height re-classification of the project site to an Urban Mixed Use (UMU) district and an 85-X height and bulk district. The proposed project involves the removal of the surface parking lot and construction of a nine-story, 85-foot-tall (94-foot-tall with elevator penthouse), approximately 165,350-square-foot, mixed-use building. The proposed building would contain up to 134 affordable residential units, 9,720 square feet of community support services, 4,420 square feet for a child development center, 1,230 square feet of accessory office space, and 600 square feet of retail use. The unit mix would include transitional age youth units (which are generally smaller than studio units), one-bedroom units, two-bedroom units, and three-bedroom units. It is anticipated that at least 20 percent of the proposed units would be transitional age youth units. No off-street vehicular parking is proposed. The proposed project would include 107 Class I bicycle spaces at the ground-floor level and twelve Class II bicycle spaces would be located on the sidewalk in front of the project site (nine on Folsom Street and three on Shotwell Street). The existing 12-foot-wide curb cut on Shotwell Street would be removed and standard sidewalk and curb dimensions restored. The proposed project would install a 40-foot-long loading zone within two proposed sidewalk bulb-outs on Folsom Street for the

Figure 1: Project Location



residential use and the child development center. In addition, one 20-foot-long, on-street car share space would be located on Folsom Street. The Folsom Street sidewalk in front of the project site would be widened from 11 feet, 7 inches to 12 feet while the Shotwell Street sidewalk in front of the project site would be widened from 10 feet to 12 feet. The proposed project would replace five existing street trees along the project site (four on Folsom Street and one on Shotwell Street) and ten new trees would be planted (four on Shotwell Street, four within the proposed promenade, and two on Shotwell Street).

The ground-floor level would include the following: 5,400 square feet of community support services; two bicycle storage rooms that would contain the Class I bicycle spaces; a 4,420-square-foot child development center; 1,230 square feet of office space; a 1,020-square-foot lobby with reception accessed from Folsom Street; and a 600-square-foot café would be located along Folsom Street. The proposed project would also include the following ground-floor open space: a 4,460-square-foot promenade would border the under construction 17th & Folsom Park to the south, where two park access gates would be located; a 2,960-square-foot open courtyard would be located towards the center of the project site and would create an east and west building wing; and immediately north of the open courtyard would be a 1,530-square-foot outdoor area for the child development center (see Figures 2 and 3, Proposed Site Plan and Proposed Ground Floor).

The second-floor level would contain residential units, including two family day care units with a 550-square-foot open space, 3,970 square feet of community support services, and a 300-square-foot lounge for the transitional age youth units (see Figure 4, Proposed Second Floor). Floors three through seven would include residential units (see Figure 5, Proposed Floor Plans 3-7). Floors eight and nine would include residential units, an 860-square-foot roof garden for the residents, and a 350-square-foot community room (see Figure 6, Proposed Floor Plans 8-9). The roof-top would include building-related mechanical systems and solar thermal arrays (see Figure 7, Proposed Roof Plan). Project elevations are provided as Figures 8, 9, and 10. The proposed project would pursue GreenPoint Rated certification.

### **Project Construction**

During the approximately 22-month construction period, the proposed project would require up to 30 feet of excavation below ground surface (bgs) for the proposed foundation work which would require cement deep soil mixing and any soil remediation deemed necessary, resulting in approximately 2,500 cubic yards of soil disturbance. The west wing of the proposed building would be supported by a shallow foundation (a mat slab) while the east wing would require a deep foundation (drilled piles would extend up to 65 feet bgs). Impact piling driving is not proposed.


### **PROJECT APPROVAL**

The proposed project at 2060 Folsom Street would require the following approvals:

#### **Actions by the Planning Commission**


- Approval of a Legislative Amendment for proposed zoning change and height re-classification under Section 302 of the Planning Code. The Planning Commission's approval of the Legislative Amendment would be the Approval Action for the project. The Approval Action date establishes the start of the 30-day appeal period for this CEQA exemption determination pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Figure 2. Proposed Site Plan




Comments: Not to Scale  
 Source: Mithun, April 14, 2016

Figure 3. Proposed Ground Floor Plan




Comments: Not to Scale  
 Source: Mithun, April 14, 2016

Figure 4. Proposed Second Floor Plan




Comments: Not to Scale  
 Source: Mithun, April 14, 2016

Figure 5. Proposed Upper Floor Plans (Levels 3 to 7)




Comments: Not to Scale  
Source: Mithun, April 14, 2016

Figure 6. Proposed Upper Floor Plans (Levels 8 to 9)




Comments: Not to Scale  
Source: Mithun, April 14, 2016

Figure 7. Proposed Roof Plan



Comments: Not to Scale  
Source: Mithun, April 14, 2016

Figure 8. Proposed South Elevation (17th Street)




Comments: Not to Scale  
 Source: Mithun, April 14, 2016

Figure 9. Proposed East (Folsom) Elevation



Comments: Not to Scale  
 Source: Mithun, April 14, 2016

Figure 10. Proposed West (Shotwell) Elevation



Comments: Not to Scale  
 Source: Mithun, April 14, 2016

### Actions by the Board of Supervisors

- Approval of a Legislative Amendment for proposed zoning change and height re-classification.

### Actions by the Planning Department

- Approval of a Large Project Authorization for development of a building greater than 25,000 gross square feet, if the proposed legislative amendment is approved. Per Planning Code Section 315, a Large Project Authorization for 100 percent Affordable Housing Projects may be approved by the Planning Department.

### Actions by City Departments

- Approval of a Site Mitigation Plan from the San Francisco Department of Public Health prior to the commencement of any excavation work.
- Approval of a Site Permit from the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for new construction.

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

This Infill Environmental Checklist was prepared to examine the proposed project in light of a prior Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to determine whether the project would cause any effects that require additional review under CEQA. The Infill Environmental Checklist indicates whether the effects of the proposed project were analyzed in a prior EIR, and identifies the prior EIR's mitigation measures that are applicable to the proposed project. The Infill Environmental Checklist also determines if the proposed project would cause new specific effects<sup>1</sup> that were not already addressed in a prior EIR and if there is substantial new information that shows that the adverse environmental effects of the project are more significant<sup>2</sup> than described in a prior EIR. Such impacts, if any, will be evaluated in a project-specific Mitigated Negative Declaration or EIR. If no such impacts are identified, the proposed project is exempt from further environmental review in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21094.5 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.3.

The prior EIR for the proposed 2060 Folsom Street project is the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (PEIR).<sup>3</sup> The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified significant impacts related to land use, transportation, cultural resources, shadow, noise, air quality, and hazardous materials. Additionally, the PEIR identified significant cumulative impacts related

---

<sup>1</sup> A new specific effect is an effect that was not addressed in a prior EIR and that is specific to the infill project or the infill project site. A new specific effect may result if, for example, the prior EIR stated that sufficient site-specific information was not available to analyze the significance of that effect. Substantial changes in circumstances following certification of a prior EIR may also result in a new specific effect.

<sup>2</sup> More significant means an effect will be substantially more severe than described in the prior EIR. More significant effects include those that result from changes in circumstances or changes in the development assumptions underlying the prior EIR's analysis. An effect is also more significant if substantial new information shows that: (1) mitigation measures that were previously rejected as infeasible are in fact feasible, and such measures are not included in the project; (2) feasible mitigation measures considerably different than those previously analyzed could substantially reduce a significant effect described in the prior EIR, but such measures are not included in the project; or (3) an applicable mitigation measure was adopted in connection with a planning level decision, but the lead agency determines that it is not feasible for the infill project to implement that measure.

<sup>3</sup> Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E and State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048.

to land use, transportation, and cultural resources. Mitigation measures were identified for the above impacts and reduced all impacts to less-than-significant except for those related to land use (cumulative impacts on Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) use), transportation (program-level and cumulative traffic impacts at nine intersections; program-level and cumulative transit impacts on seven Muni lines), cultural resources (cumulative impacts from demolition of historical resources), and shadow (program-level impacts on parks). Mitigation measures identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR are discussed under each topic area, and measures that are applicable to the proposed project are provided under the Mitigation Measures Section at the end of this checklist.

The project sponsor proposes the rezoning and height re-classification of the project site to a UMU district and an 85-X height and bulk district. The proposed project would include the removal of the surface parking lot and construction of a nine-story, 85-foot-tall (94-foot-tall with elevator penthouse), approximately 165,350-square-foot, mixed-use building. The proposed building would contain up to 134 affordable residential units, 9,670 square feet of community support services, 1,230 square feet of office space, 4,420 square feet for a child development center, and 600 square feet of retail use. As discussed below in this checklist, the effects of the proposed infill project have already been analyzed and disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and are not more significant than previously analyzed.

## CHANGES IN THE REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT

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

- State statute regarding Aesthetics, Parking Impacts, effective January 2014, and state statute and Planning Commission resolution regarding automobile delay, and vehicle miles traveled, (VMT) effective March 2016 (see “CEQA Section 21099” heading below);
- The adoption of 2016 interim controls in the Mission District requiring additional information and analysis regarding housing affordability, displacement, loss of PDR and other analyses, effective January 2016;
- San Francisco Bicycle Plan update adoption in June 2009, Better Streets Plan adoption in 2010, Transit Effectiveness Project (aka “Muni Forward”) adoption in March 2014, Vision Zero adoption by various City agencies in 2014, Proposition A and B passage in November 2014, and the Transportation Sustainability Program process (see Checklist section “Transportation”);
- San Francisco ordinances establishing Construction Dust Control, effective July 2008, and Enhanced Ventilation Required for Urban Infill Sensitive Use Developments, amended December 2014 (see Checklist section “Air Quality”);
- San Francisco Clean and Safe Parks Bond passage in November 2012 and San Francisco Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan adoption in April 2014 (see Checklist section “Recreation”);
- Urban Water Management Plan adoption in 2011 and Sewer System Improvement Program process (see Checklist section “Utilities and Service Systems”); and

- Article 22A of the Health Code amendments effective August 2013 (see Checklist section “Hazardous Materials”).

## CHANGES IN THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Since the certification of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR in 2008, as evidenced by the volume of development applications submitted to the Planning Department since 2012, the pace of development activity has increased in the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR projected that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan could result in a substantial amount of growth within the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas, resulting in an increase of approximately 7,400 to 9,900 net dwelling units and 3,200,000 to 6,600,000 square feet of net non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) throughout the lifetime of the Plan (year 2025).<sup>4</sup> The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR projected that this level of development would result in a total population increase of approximately 23,900 to 33,000 people throughout the lifetime of the plan.<sup>5</sup> Growth projected in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was based on a soft site analysis (i.e., assumptions regarding the potential for a site to be developed through the year 2025) and not based upon the created capacity of the rezoning options (i.e., the total potential for development that would be created indefinitely).<sup>6</sup>

As of February 2016, projects containing 9,749 dwelling units and 2,807,952 square feet of non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) have completed or are proposed to complete environmental review<sup>7</sup> within the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas.<sup>8</sup> This level of development corresponds to an overall population increase of approximately 23,758 to 25,332 persons. Of the 9,749 dwelling units that are under review or have completed environmental review, building permits have been issued<sup>9</sup> for 4,583 dwelling units, or approximately 47 percent of those units (information is not available regarding building permit issuance for non-residential square footage).

---

<sup>4</sup> Tables 12 through 16 of the Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR and Table C&R-2 in the Comments and Responses show projected net growth based on proposed rezoning scenarios. A baseline for existing conditions in the year 2000 was included to provide context for the scenario figures for parcels affected by the rezoning, not projected growth totals from a baseline of the year 2000. Estimates of projected growth were based on parcels that were to be rezoned and did not include parcels that were recently developed (i.e., parcels with projects completed between 2000 and March 2006) or have proposed projects in the pipeline (i.e., projects under construction, projects approved or entitled by the Planning Department, or projects under review by the Planning Department or Department of Building Inspection). Development pipeline figures for each Plan Area were presented separately in Tables 5, 7, 9, and 11 in the Draft EIR. Environmental impact assessments for these pipeline projects were considered separately from the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning effort.

<sup>5</sup> Table 2 Forecast Growth by Rezoning Option Chapter IV of the Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR shows projected net growth based on proposed rezoning scenarios. A baseline for existing conditions in the year 2000 was included to provide context for the scenario figures for parcels affected by the rezoning.

<sup>6</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, Community Planning in the Eastern Neighborhoods, Rezoning Options Workbook, Draft, February 2003. This document is available at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1678#background>.

<sup>7</sup> For this and the Land Use and Land Use Planning section, environmental review is defined as projects that have or are relying on the growth projections and analysis in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR for environmental review (i.e., Community Plan Exemptions [CPE] or Focused Mitigated Negative Declarations and Focused Environmental Impact Reports with an attached Community Plan Exemption Checklist, or eligible infill projects).

<sup>8</sup> These estimates include projects that have completed environmental review and foreseeable projects (including the proposed project). Foreseeable projects are those projects for which environmental evaluation applications have been submitted to the San Francisco Planning Department.

<sup>9</sup> An issued building permit refers to buildings currently under construction or open for occupancy. This number includes all units approved under CEQA (including CPEs, eligible infill exemptions, Categorical Exemptions and other types of CEQA documents).

Within the Mission Plan Area, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR projected that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan could result in an increase of 800 to 2,100 net dwelling units and 700,000 to 3,500,000 non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) through the year 2025. This level of development corresponds to an overall population increase of approximately 4,719 to 12,207 persons. As of February 2016, projects containing 2,451 dwelling units and 355,842 square feet of non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) have completed or are proposed to complete environmental review within the Mission Plan Area. This level of development corresponds to an overall population increase of 8,764 to 10,650 persons. Of the 2,451 dwelling units that are under review or have completed environmental review, building permits have been issued for 989 dwelling units, or approximately 40 percent of those units. Therefore, currently anticipated growth within the Mission Plan Area is within the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR growth projections.

Growth that has occurred within the plan areas since adoption of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR has been planned for and the effects of that growth were anticipated and considered in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Although the number of housing units under review is approaching or exceeds the residential unit projections for the Mission and Showplace Square/Potrero Hill Area Plans of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, the non-residential reasonably foreseeable growth is well below what was anticipated. Therefore, population growth associated with approved and reasonably foreseeable development is within the population that was projected for 2025. Furthermore, the number of constructed projects within Eastern Neighborhoods is well below what has been approved for all plan areas.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR utilized the growth projections to analyze the physical environmental impacts associated with that growth for the following environmental impact topics: Land Use; Population, Housing, Business Activity, and Employment; Transportation; Noise; Air Quality; Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Utilities/Public Services; and Water. The analysis took into account the overall growth in the Eastern Neighborhoods and did not necessarily analyze in isolation the impacts of growth in one land use category, although each land use category may have differing severities of effects. The analysis of environmental topics covered in this checklist take into account the differing severities of effects of the residential and employee population.

In summary, projects proposed within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Areas have not exceeded the overall population growth that was projected in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR; therefore, foreseeable growth within the plan areas do not present substantial new information that was not known at the time of the PEIR and would not result in new significant environmental impacts or substantially more severe adverse impacts than discussed in the PEIR.

## SENATE BILL 743

### **Aesthetics and Parking**

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

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

The proposed project meets each of the above three criteria and thus, this checklist does not consider aesthetics or parking in determining the significance of project impacts under CEQA.<sup>10</sup> See Figures 8,9, and 10 for project elevations.

**Automobile Delay and Vehicle Miles Traveled**

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

In January 2016, OPR published for public review and comment a *Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA*<sup>11</sup> recommending that transportation impacts for projects be measured using a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) metric. On March 3, 2016, in anticipation of the future certification of the revised CEQA Guidelines, the San Francisco Planning Commission adopted OPR’s recommendation to use the VMT metric instead of automobile delay to evaluate the transportation impacts of projects (Resolution 19579). (Note: the VMT metric does not apply to the analysis of project impacts on non-automobile modes of travel such as riding transit, walking, and bicycling.) Instead, a VMT and induced automobile travel impact analysis is provided in the Transportation section.

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
<b>1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING—Would the project:</b>					
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>10</sup> San Francisco Planning Department. *Eligibility Checklist: CEQA Section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for 2060 Folsom Street*, May 11, 2016. This document (and all other documents cited in this report, unless otherwise noted), is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 as part of Case File No. 2015-014715ENV.

<sup>11</sup> This document is available online at: [https://www.opr.ca.gov/s\\_sb743.php](https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_sb743.php).

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
c) Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzes effects on land use and land use planning under Chapter IV.A, on pages 35-82; Chapter V, on page 501; Chapter VI on pages 526-527; Chapter VIII on pages C&R-16 to C&R-19, C&R-50 to C&R-64, and C&R-131; and Chapter IX, Appendix A on page 24.<sup>12</sup>

The project site is located within the boundary of the Mission Area Plan. The Mission Area Plan promotes a wide range of uses to create a livable and vibrant neighborhood. The Area Plan includes the following community-driven goals that were developed specially for the Mission: increase the amount of affordable housing; preserve and enhance the unique character of the Mission’s distinct commercial areas; promote alternative means of transportation to reduce traffic and auto use; improve and develop additional community facilities and open space; and minimize displacement. Through the Eastern Neighborhoods planning process, the project site was specifically called out for affordable housing development with a park adjacent to it. As an affordable residential project with ground-floor community facilities and an adjacent open space, the project is implementing that vision.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that adoption of the Area Plans would result in an unavoidable significant impact on land use due to the cumulative loss of PDR. The proposed project would not remove any existing PDR uses, and the project site is located within a P (Public) use district, which does not allow PDR uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to any impact related to loss of PDR uses that was identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the Area Plans would not create any new physical barriers in the Eastern Neighborhoods because the rezoning and Area Plans do not provide for any new major roadways, such as freeways that would disrupt or divide the plan area or individual neighborhoods. The proposed project would be developed within existing lot boundaries and would include a promenade that would connect with the proposed park at 17<sup>th</sup> & Folsom streets and would therefore not divide an established community.

Plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect are those that directly address environmental issues and/or contain targets or standards that must be met in order to maintain or improve characteristics of the City’s physical environment. Examples of such plans, policies, or regulations include the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s 2010 Clean Air Plan and the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board’s San Francisco Basin Plan. The proposed project would not obviously or substantially conflict with any plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

<sup>12</sup> Page numbers to the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR reference page numbers in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final EIR. The PEIR is available for review at <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>, accessed on May 25, or at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA, as part of Case No. 2004.0160E.

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to land use and land use planning, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
<b>2. POPULATION AND HOUSING—</b>					
<b>Would the project:</b>					
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzes effects on population and housing under Chapter IV.D, on pages 175-252; Chapter V, on pages 523-525; Chapter VIII on pages C&R-16 to C&R-19 and C&R-70 to C&R-84; and Chapter IX, Appendix A on page 25.

One of the objectives of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans is to identify appropriate locations for housing in the City’s industrially zoned land to meet the citywide demand for additional housing. The PEIR concluded that an increase in population in the Plan Areas is expected to occur as a secondary effect of the proposed rezoning and that any population increase would not, in itself, result in adverse physical effects, but would serve to advance key City policy objectives, such as providing housing in appropriate locations next to Downtown and other employment generators and furthering the City’s Transit First policies. It was anticipated that the rezoning would result in an increase in both housing development and population in all of the Area Plan neighborhoods. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population and density would not result in significant adverse physical effects on the environment related to population and housing. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The proposed building would contain up to 134 affordable residential units, 9,670 square feet of community support services, 1,230 square feet of office space, 4,420 square feet for a child development center, and 600 square feet of retail use. Implementation of the proposed project would result in a net increase of about 303 residents on the project site and a net increase of about 58 employees on the project

site.<sup>13</sup> The non-residential components of the project are not anticipated to create a substantial demand for increased housing as these uses would not be sufficient in size and scale to generate such demand. Moreover, the proposed project would not displace any housing, as none currently exists on the project site. The increase in population facilitated by the project would be within the scope of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analysis and would not be considered substantial. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to population and housing. As stated in the “Changes in the Physical Environment” section above, these direct effects of the proposed project on population and housing are within the scope of the population growth evaluated in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
<b>3. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:</b>					
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 <i>Planning Code</i> ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzes effects on cultural resources under Chapter IV.J, on pages 419-440; Chapter IV.K, on pages 441-474; Chapter V, on pages 512-522; Chapter VI on page 529; Chapter VIII on pages C&R-27 to C&R-29, C&R-120 to C&R-129, and C&R-139 to C&R-143; and Chapter IX, Appendix A on page 68.

<sup>13</sup> According to the 2010 Census, the average household size in San Francisco is 2.26 persons (134 \* 2.26 = 303). This number is conservative since at least 20 percent of the proposed units would be transitional age youth units which are single occupancy. Retail and office employment was calculated using information in the 2002 Transportation Impacts Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review (Transportation Guidelines).

### **Historic Architectural Resources**

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.5(a)(1) and 15064.5(a)(2), historical resources are buildings or structures that are listed, or are eligible for listing, in the California Register of Historical Resources or are identified in a local register of historical resources, such as Articles 10 and 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that future development facilitated through the changes in use districts and height limits under the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans could have substantial adverse changes on the significance of both individual historic resources and on historic districts within the Plan Areas. The PEIR determined that approximately 32 percent of the known or potential historic resources in the Plan Areas could potentially be affected under the preferred alternative. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR found this impact to be significant and unavoidable. This impact was addressed in a Statement of Overriding Considerations with findings and adopted as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans approval on January 19, 2009.

The project site, which is a surface parking, is not considered a historic resource. In addition, the project site is not located within a historic district or adjacent to a potential historic resource. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to the significant historic resource impact identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and no historic resource mitigation measures would apply to the proposed project.

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

### **Archeological Resources**

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the Area Plan could result in significant impacts on archeological resources and identified three mitigation measures that would reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level. Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure J-1 applies to properties for which a final archeological research design and treatment plan is on file at the Northwest Information Center and the Planning Department. Mitigation Measure J-2 applies to properties for which no archeological assessment report has been prepared or for which the archeological documentation is incomplete or inadequate to serve as an evaluation of potential effects on archeological resources under CEQA. Mitigation Measure J-3, which applies to properties in the Mission Dolores Archeological District, requires that a specific archeological testing program be conducted by a qualified archeological consultant with expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology.

The proposed project at 2060 Folsom Street would involve up to approximately 30 feet of excavation below ground surface for the proposed foundation work, which would require cement deep soil mixing, resulting in approximately 2,500 cubic yards of soil disturbance. The proposed project would be subject to Mitigation Measure J-2 in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR (Project Mitigation Measure 1). In accordance with Mitigation Measure J-2, a Preliminary Archaeological Review (PAR) was conducted by Planning Department staff archeologists, which determined that the proposed project has the potential to adversely affect CEQA-significant archeological resources. The PAR determined that the project sponsor would be required to prepare an Archeological Testing Program to more definitively identify the potential for California Register-eligible archeological resources to be present within the project site and determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effect of the project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level.<sup>14</sup> The project sponsor has agreed to implement Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR

---

<sup>14</sup> Randall Dean, Staff Archeologist, San Francisco Planning Department. Archeological Review Log.

Mitigation Measure J-2, as Project Mitigation Measure 1 (full text provided in the “Mitigation Measures” section below and in the MMRP, which is attached herein as Attachment B).

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

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
<b>4. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION—Would the project:</b>					
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzes effects on transportation and circulation under Chapter IV.E, on pages 253-302; Chapter V, on pages 502-506 and page 525; Chapter VI on pages 527-528; Chapter VIII

on pages C&R-23 to C&R-27, C&R-84 to C&R-96, and C&R-131 to C&R-134; and Chapter IX, Appendix A on page 26.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes would not result in significant impacts related to pedestrians, bicyclists, loading, emergency access, or construction.

However, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes could result in significant impacts on transit ridership, and identified seven transportation mitigation measures, which are described further below in the Transit sub-section. Even with mitigation, however, it was anticipated that the significant adverse cumulative impacts on transit lines could not be fully mitigated. Thus, these impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable. As discussed above under "SB 743", in response to state legislation that called for removing automobile delay from CEQA analysis, the Planning Commission adopted resolution 19579 replacing automobile delay with a VMT metric for analyzing transportation impacts of a project. Therefore, impacts and mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR associated with automobile delay are not discussed in this checklist.

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

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

### **Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis**

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

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

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

projects because a tour is likely to consist of trips stopping in multiple locations, and the summarizing of tour VMT to each location would over-estimate VMT.<sup>15,16</sup>

A project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would cause substantial additional VMT. OPR's Proposed Transportation Impact Guidelines recommend screening criteria to identify types, characteristics, or locations of projects that would not result in significant impacts to VMT. If a project meets one of the three screening criteria provided (Map-Based Screening, Small Projects, and Proximity to Transit Stations), then it is presumed that VMT impacts would be less than significant for the project and a detailed VMT analysis is not required. Map-Based Screening is used to determine if a project site is located within a transportation analysis zone (TAZ) that exhibits low levels of VMT<sup>17</sup>; Small Projects are projects that would generate fewer than 100 vehicle trips per day; and the Proximity to Transit Stations criterion includes projects that are within a half mile of an existing major transit stop, have a floor area ratio of greater than or equal to 0.75, vehicle parking that is less than or equal to that required or allowed by the Planning Code without conditional use authorization, and are consistent with the applicable Sustainable Communities Strategy.

For residential development, the existing regional average daily VMT per capita is 17.2.<sup>18</sup> For office development, regional average daily work-related VMT per employee is 19.1. For retail development, regional average daily retail VMT per employee is 14.9.<sup>19</sup> Average daily VMT for all three land uses is projected to decrease in future 2040 cumulative conditions. Refer to Table 1: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled, which includes the transportation analysis zone in which the project site is located, 592.

As shown in Table 1, the proposed project's residential, retail, and office uses would be located in a TAZ where existing VMT for residential, retail, and office uses are more than 15 percent below regional averages.<sup>20</sup> The existing average daily household VMT per capita is 4.6 for TAZ 592, which is 73 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per capita of 17.2. Future 2040 average daily household VMT per capita is 3.9 for TAZ 592, which is 76 percent below the future 2040 regional average daily VMT per capita of 16.1. The existing average daily VMT per office employee is 8.5 for TAZ 592, which is 56 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per office employee of 19.1. Future 2040 average

---

<sup>15</sup> To state another way: a tour-based assessment of VMT at a retail site would consider the VMT for all trips in the tour, for any tour with a stop at the retail site. If a single tour stops at two retail locations, for example, a coffee shop on the way to work and a restaurant on the way back home, then both retail locations would be allotted the total tour VMT. A trip-based approach allows us to apportion all retail-related VMT to retail sites without double-counting.

<sup>16</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, Executive Summary: Resolution Modifying Transportation Impact Analysis, Appendix F, Attachment A, March 3, 2016.

<sup>17</sup> A project would cause substantial additional VMT if it exceeds both the existing City household VMT per capita minus 15 percent and existing regional household VMT per capita minus 15 percent. In San Francisco, the City's average VMT per capita is lower (8.4) than the regional average (17.2). Therefore, the City average is irrelevant for the purposes of the analysis. For office projects, a project would generate substantial additional VMT if it exceeds the regional VMT per employee minus 15 percent. For retail projects, the Planning Department uses a VMT efficiency metric approach, and a project would generate substantial additional VMT if it exceeds the regional VMT per retail employee minus 15 percent.

<sup>18</sup> Includes the VMT generated by the households in the development.

<sup>19</sup> Retail travel is not explicitly captured in SF-CHAMP, rather, there is a generic "Other" purpose which includes retail shopping, medical appointments, visiting friends or family, and all other non-work, non-school tours. The retail efficiency metric captures all of the "Other" purpose travel generated by Bay Area households. The denominator of employment (including retail; cultural, institutional, and educational; and medical employment; school enrollment, and number of households) represents the size, or attraction, of the zone for this type of "Other" purpose travel.

<sup>20</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, *Eligibility Checklist: CEQA Section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for 2060 Folsom Street*, May 11, 2016.

daily VMT per office employee is 7.7 for TAZ 592, which is 55 percent below the future 2040 regional average daily work-related VMT per office employee of 17.0. The existing average daily VMT per retail employee is 9.7 for TAZ 592, which is 35 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per retail employee of 14.9. Future 2040 average daily VMT per retail employee is 9.4 for TAZ 592, which is 36 percent below the future 2040 regional average daily work-related VMT per retail employee of 14.6.

**Table 1: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled**

<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Existing</u>			<u>Cumulative 2040</u>		
	<u>Bay Area Regional Average</u>	<u>Bay Area Regional Average minus 15%</u>	<u>TAZ 592</u>	<u>Bay Area Regional Average</u>	<u>Bay Area Regional Average minus 15%</u>	<u>TAZ 592</u>
Households (Residential)	17.2	14.6	4.6	16.1	13.7	3.9
Employment (Office)	19.1	16.2	8.5	17.0	14.5	7.7
Employment (Retail)	14.9	12.6	9.4	14.6	12.4	9.7

Given the project site is located in an area where existing VMT is more than 15 percent below the existing regional average, the proposed project’s residential, office, and retail uses would not result in substantial additional VMT, and the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to VMT. Furthermore, the project site meets the Proximity to Transit Stations screening criteria, which also indicates that the proposed project’s residential, office and retail uses would not cause substantial additional VMT.<sup>21</sup>

**Induced Automobile Travel Analysis**

A project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would substantially induce additional automobile travel by increasing physical roadway capacity in congested areas (i.e., by adding new mixed-flow lanes) or by adding new roadways to the network. OPR’s Proposed Transportation Impact Guidelines includes a list of transportation project types that would not likely lead to a substantial or measureable increase in VMT. If a project fits within the general types of projects (including combinations of types), then it is presumed that VMT impacts would be less than significant and a detailed VMT analysis is not required.

The proposed project is not a transportation project. However, the proposed project would include features that would alter the transportation network. The existing 12-foot-wide curb cut on Shotwell Street would be removed and standard sidewalk and curb dimensions restored. The Folsom Street sidewalk in front of the project site would be widened from 11 feet, 7 inches to 12 feet while the Shotwell Street sidewalk in front of the project site would be widened from 10 to 12 feet. The proposed project would install a 40-foot-long loading zone and one 20-foot-long, on-street car share on Folsom Street for the residential units and the child development center. The proposed project would also include the installation of twelve Class 2 bicycle parking facilities on the sidewalk in front of the project site (nine of

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

Folsom Street and three on Shotwell Street). These features fit within the general types of projects that would not substantially induce automobile travel, and the impacts would be less than significant.<sup>22</sup>

### **Trip Generation**

The proposed building would contain up to 134 affordable residential units, 9,670 square feet of community support services, 1,230 square feet of office space, 4,420 square feet for a child development center, and 600 square feet of retail use. No off-street vehicular parking is proposed. The proposed project would include 107 Class I bicycle spaces at the ground-floor level and twelve Class 2 bicycle spaces would be located on the sidewalk in front of the project site (nine on Folsom Street and three on Shotwell Street).

Localized trip generation of the proposed project was calculated using a trip-based analysis and information in the 2002 *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review* (SF Guidelines) developed by the San Francisco Planning Department.<sup>23</sup> The proposed project would generate an estimated 1,546 person trips (inbound and outbound) on a weekday daily basis, consisting of 613 person trips by auto (488 vehicle trips accounting for vehicle occupancy data for this Census Tract), 577 transit trips, 167 walk trips and 188 trips by other modes. During the p.m. peak hour, the proposed project would generate an estimated 235 person trips, consisting of 88 person trips by auto (77 vehicle trips accounting for vehicle occupancy data), 94 transit trips, 23 walk trips and 30 trips by other modes.

### **Transit**

Mitigation Measures E-5 through E-11 in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR were adopted as part of the Plan with uncertain feasibility to address significant transit impacts. These measures are not applicable to the proposed project, as they are plan-level mitigations to be implemented by City and County agencies. In compliance with a portion of Mitigation Measure E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding, the City adopted impact fees for development in Eastern Neighborhoods that goes towards funding transit and complete streets. In addition, San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code, referred to as the Transportation Sustainability Fee (Ordinance 200-154, effective December 25, 2015).<sup>24</sup> The fee updated, expanded, and replaced the prior Transit Impact Development Fee, which is in compliance with portions of Mitigation Measure E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding. The proposed project would be subject to the fee. The City is also currently conducting outreach regarding Mitigation Measures E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding and Mitigation Measure E-11: Transportation Demand Management. Both the Transportation Sustainability Fee and the transportation demand management efforts are part of the Transportation Sustainability Program.<sup>25</sup> In compliance with all or portions of Mitigation Measure E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements, Mitigation Measure E-7: Transit Accessibility, Mitigation Measure E-9: Rider Improvements, and Mitigation Measure E-10: Transit Enhancement, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority (SFMTA) is implementing the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP), which was approved by the SFMTA Board of Directors in March 2014. The TEP (now called Muni Forward) includes system-wide review, evaluation, and recommendations to improve service and increase transportation efficiency. Examples of transit priority and pedestrian safety improvements within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area as part of Muni Forward include the 14

---

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>23</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, *Transportation Calculations for 2060 Folsom Street*, May 5, 2016.

<sup>24</sup> Two additional files were created at the Board of Supervisors for TSF regarding hospitals and health services, grandfathering, and additional fees for larger projects: see Board file nos. 151121 and 151257.

<sup>25</sup> <http://tsp.sfplanning.org>

Mission Rapid Transit Project, the 22 Fillmore Extension along 16<sup>th</sup> Street to Mission Bay (expected construction between 2017 and 2020), and the Travel Time Reduction Project on Route 9 San Bruno (initiation in 2015). In addition, Muni Forward includes service improvements to various routes within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area; for instance the implemented new Route 55 on 16<sup>th</sup> Street.

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

The project site is located within a quarter mile of several local transit lines including Muni lines 12, 14, 14R, 22, 33, 49, and 55. In addition, the 16th Street-Mission BART station, a major regional transit station, is three blocks west of the project site. The proposed project would be expected to generate 577 daily transit trips, including 94 during the p.m. peak hour. Given the wide availability of nearby transit, the addition of 94 p.m. peak hour transit trips would be accommodated by existing capacity. As such, the proposed project would not result in unacceptable levels of transit service or cause a substantial increase in delays or operating costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service could result.

Each of the rezoning options in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts relating to increases in transit ridership on Muni lines, with the Preferred Project having significant impacts on seven lines. Of those lines, the project site is located within a quarter-mile of Muni lines 22, 33, and 49. The proposed project would not contribute considerably to these conditions as its minor contribution of 94 p.m. peak hour transit trips would not be a substantial proportion of the overall additional transit volume generated by Eastern Neighborhood projects. The proposed project would also not contribute considerably to 2025 cumulative transit conditions and thus would not result in any significant cumulative transit impacts.

### **Pedestrians**

Trips generated by the proposed project would include walk trips to and from the proposed residential and non-residential uses, plus walk trips to and from transit stops. The proposed project would add up to 117 pedestrian trips to the surrounding streets during the weekday p.m. peak hour (this includes 94 transit trips and 23 walk trips). The new pedestrian trips could be accommodated on sidewalks and crosswalks adjacent to the project site and would not substantially overcrowd the sidewalks along Folsom or Shotwell streets.<sup>26</sup> Implementation of the proposed project would improve pedestrian circulation at the project site by removing the curb cut on Shotwell Street and by providing no off-street

---

<sup>26</sup> The Folsom Street sidewalk in front of the project site would be widened from 11 feet, 7 inches to 12 feet while the Shotwell Street sidewalk in front of the project site would be widened from 10 feet to 12 feet.

vehicle parking spaces. The project-generated 117 pedestrian trips during the weekday p.m. peak hour would be dispersed throughout the project vicinity and would not substantially affect pedestrian conditions.

**Bicycles**

The following bicycle facilities are located near the project site: Folsom Street has a north-south bike lane; 17<sup>th</sup> Street has an east-west bike lane; 16<sup>th</sup> Street has an east-west bike route, and Harrison Street has a primarily north-south bike lane. The proposed project would include 107 Class I bicycle spaces at the ground-floor level and 12 Class II bicycle spaces would be located on the sidewalk in front of the project site (nine on Folsom Street and three on Shotwell Street). As previously discussed, the proposed project would remove the existing curb cut on Shotwell Street and would not provide off-street vehicle parking spaces. Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially affect bicycle travel in the area.

**Loading**

The proposed project would install a 40-foot-long loading zone on Folsom Street for the residential use and the child development center. The proposed loading demand would be accommodated within the proposed loading zone and the proposed project would not create potentially hazardous traffic conditions involving traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians.

**Conclusion**

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

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Analyzed in the Prior EIR</i>	<i>Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR</i>			
		<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies</i>	<i>Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Significant Impact</i>
<b>5. NOISE—Would the project:</b>					
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Be substantially affected by existing noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzes effects related to noise under Chapter IV.F, on pages 303-322; Chapter V, on pages 507-509 and page 525-525a; Chapter VIII on pages C&R-96 to C&R-100 and C&R-134 to C&R-136; and Chapter IX, Appendix A on pages 26-29.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would result in significant noise impacts during construction activities and due to conflicts between noise-sensitive uses in proximity to noisy uses such as PDR, retail, entertainment, cultural/institutional/educational uses, and office uses. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also determined that incremental increases in traffic-related noise attributable to implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would be less than significant. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified six noise mitigation measures, three of which may be applicable to subsequent development projects.<sup>27</sup> These mitigation measures would reduce noise impacts from construction and noisy land uses to less-than-significant levels.

**Construction Noise**

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 relate to construction noise. Mitigation Measure F-1 addresses individual projects that include pile-driving, and Mitigation Measure F-2 addresses individual projects that include particularly noisy construction procedures (including pile-driving). Construction of the proposed project would be supported by a combination of a shallow

<sup>27</sup> Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-3, F-4, and F-6 address the siting of sensitive land uses in noisy environments. In a decision issued on December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require an agency to consider the effects of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project’s future users or residents except where a project or its residents may exacerbate existing environmental hazards (*California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District*, December 17, 2015, Case No. S213478. Available at: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/opinions/documents/S213478.PDF>). As noted above, the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* determined that incremental increases in traffic-related noise attributable to implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would be less than significant, and thus would not exacerbate the existing noise environment. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measures F-3, F-4, and F-6 are not applicable. Nonetheless, for all noise sensitive uses, the general requirements for adequate interior noise levels of Mitigation Measures F-3 and F-4 are met by compliance with the acoustical standards required under the California Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations Title 24).

foundation (a mat slab for the west wing) and a deep foundation (drilled piles would extend up to 65 feet bgs for the east wing). Impact pile driving is not proposed as part of the project, and therefore Mitigation Measure F-1 is not applicable. Since construction of the proposed project would require heavy construction equipment, Mitigation Measure F-2 is applicable. Mitigation Measure F-2 would require the project sponsor to develop and implement a set of noise attenuation measures during construction. The project sponsor has agreed to implement Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2 as Project Mitigation Measure 2 (full text provided in the "Mitigation Measures" section below and in the MMRP, which is attached herein as Attachment B).

In addition, all construction activities for the proposed project (approximately 22 months) would be subject to and required to comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code) (Noise Ordinance). Construction noise is regulated by the Noise Ordinance. The Noise Ordinance requires construction work to be conducted in the following manner: (1) noise levels of construction equipment, other than impact tools, must not exceed 80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the source (the equipment generating the noise); (2) impact tools must have intake and exhaust mufflers that are approved by the Director of Public Works (PW) or the Director of the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) to best accomplish maximum noise reduction; and (3) if noise from the construction work would exceed the ambient noise levels at the site property line by 5 dBA, the work must not be conducted between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. unless the Director of PW authorizes a special permit for conducting the work during that period.

DBI is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance for private construction projects during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.). The Police Department is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance during all other hours. Nonetheless, during the construction period for the proposed project of approximately 22 months, occupants of the nearby properties could be disturbed by construction noise. Times may occur when noise could interfere with indoor activities in nearby residences and other businesses near the project site. The increase in noise in the project area during project construction would not be considered a significant impact of the proposed project, because the construction noise would be temporary, intermittent, and restricted in occurrence and level, as the contractor would be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance and Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2, which would reduce construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

### **Operational Noise**

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5 addresses impacts related to individual projects that include uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise in the project vicinity. The proposed building would contain up to 134 affordable residential units, 9,670 square feet of community support services, 1,230 square feet of office space, 4,420 square feet for a child development center, and 600 square feet of retail use. The proposed uses would not substantially increase the ambient noise environment. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5 is not applicable.

The proposed project would be subject to the following interior noise standards, which are described for informational purposes. The California Building Standards Code (Title 24) establishes uniform noise insulation standards. The Title 24 acoustical requirement for residential structures is incorporated into Section 1207 of the San Francisco Building Code and requires that new residential structures be designed to prevent the intrusion of exterior noise so that the noise level with windows closed, attributable to exterior sources, shall not exceed 45 dBA in any habitable room. Title 24 allows the project sponsor to choose between a prescriptive or performance-based acoustical requirement for non-residential uses. Both compliance methods require wall, floor/ceiling, and window assemblies to meet certain sound

transmission class or outdoor-indoor sound transmission class ratings to ensure that adequate interior noise standards are achieved. In compliance with Title 24, DBI would review the final building plans to ensure that the building wall, floor/ceiling, and window assemblies meet Title 24 acoustical requirements. If determined necessary by DBI, a detailed acoustical analysis of the exterior wall and window assemblies may be required.

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

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

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
<b>6. AIR QUALITY—Would the project:</b>					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzes effects on air quality under Chapter IV.G, on pages 323-362; Chapter V, on pages 509-512; Chapter VIII on pages C&R-100 to C&R-107 and C&R-137 to C&R-138; and Chapter IX, Appendix A on pages 29-31.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified potentially significant air quality impacts resulting from construction activities and impacts to sensitive land uses<sup>28</sup> as a result of exposure to elevated levels of diesel particulate matter (DPM) and other toxic air contaminants (TACs). The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified four mitigation measures that would reduce these air quality impacts to less-than-significant levels and stated that with implementation of identified mitigation measures, the Area Plan would be consistent with the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy, the applicable air quality plan at that time. All other air quality impacts were found to be less than significant.

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 addresses air quality impacts during construction, and PEIR Mitigation Measures G-3 and G-4 address proposed uses that would emit DPM and other TACs.<sup>29</sup>

### **Construction Dust Control**

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

For projects over one half-acre, such as the proposed project, the Dust Control Ordinance requires that the project sponsor submit a Dust Control Plan for approval by the San Francisco Department of Public Health. DBI will not issue a building permit without written notification from the Director of Public Health that the applicant has a site-specific Dust Control Plan, unless the Director waives the requirement. The site-specific Dust Control Plan would require the project sponsor to implement additional dust control measures such as installation of dust curtains and windbreaks and to provide independent third-party inspections and monitoring, provide a public complaint hotline, and suspend construction during high wind conditions.

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

### **Criteria Air Pollutants**

While the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that at a program-level the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in significant regional air quality impacts, the PEIR states that “Individual development projects undertaken in the future pursuant to the new zoning and area plans

---

<sup>28</sup> The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) considers sensitive receptors as: children, adults or seniors occupying or residing in: 1) residential dwellings, including apartments, houses, condominiums, 2) schools, colleges, and universities, 3) daycares, 4) hospitals, and 5) senior care facilities. BAAQMD, Recommended Methods for Screening and Modeling Local Risks and Hazards, May 2011, page 12.

<sup>29</sup> The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also includes Mitigation Measure G-2, which has been superseded by Health Code Article 38, as discussed below, and is no longer applicable.

would be subject to a significance determination based on the BAAQMD's quantitative thresholds for individual projects."<sup>30</sup> The BAAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* (Air Quality Guidelines) provide screening criteria<sup>31</sup> for determining whether a project's criteria air pollutant emissions would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. Pursuant to the Air Quality Guidelines, projects that meet the screening criteria do not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants. Criteria air pollutant emissions during construction and operation of the proposed project would meet the Air Quality Guidelines screening criteria. The proposed mixed-use affordable housing development involves the construction of up to 134 dwelling units, which would meet the Air Quality Guidelines criteria air pollutant screening levels for operation and construction.<sup>32</sup> The proposed project also includes 9,670 community support services, 1,230 square feet of office space, 4,420 square feet for a child development center, and 600 square feet of retail space.<sup>33</sup> The proposed uses would collectively meet the criteria air pollutant screening levels. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants, and a detailed air quality assessment is not required.

### Health Risks

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

### Construction

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

### Siting New Sources

The proposed project would not be expected to generate 100 trucks per day or 40 refrigerated trucks per day. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-3 is not applicable. In addition, the

<sup>30</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, Eastern Neighborhood's Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report. See page 346. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=4003>. Accessed June 4, 2014.

<sup>31</sup> Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, updated May 2011. See pp. 3-2 to 3-3.

<sup>32</sup> Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, Updated May 2011. Table 3-1. Criteria air pollutant screening sizes for an Apartment, Mid-Rise Building is 494 dwelling units for operational and 240 dwelling units for construction. Criteria air pollutant screening sizes for a General Office Building is 346,000 square feet for operational and 277,000 square feet for construction, a Day-care Center is 53,000 square feet for operational and 277,000 square feet for construction, and a Regional Shopping Center is 99,000 square feet for operational and 277,000 square feet for construction.

proposed project would not include any sources that would emit DPM or other TACs.<sup>34</sup> Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-4 is not applicable and impacts related to siting new sources of pollutants would be less than significant.

**Conclusion**

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

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
<b>7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS—Would the project:</b>					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzes effects related to greenhouse gas emissions under Chapter IV.G, on pages 323-362; and Chapter VIII on pages C&R-105 to C&R-106.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR assessed the GHG emissions that could result from rezoning of the Mission Area Plan under the three rezoning options. The Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning Options A, B, and C are anticipated to result in GHG emissions on the order of 4.2, 4.3 and 4.5 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>E<sup>35</sup> per service population,<sup>36</sup> respectively. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that the resulting GHG emissions from the three options analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans would be less than significant. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The BAAQMD has prepared guidelines and methodologies for analyzing GHGs. These guidelines are consistent with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.4 and 15183.5 which address the analysis and determination of significant impacts from a proposed project’s GHG emissions and allow for projects that

<sup>34</sup> The proposed project does not include a back-up generator.

<sup>35</sup> CO<sub>2</sub>E, defined as equivalent Carbon Dioxide, is a quantity that describes other greenhouse gases in terms of the amount of Carbon Dioxide that would have an equal global warming potential.

<sup>36</sup> Memorandum from Jessica Range to Environmental Planning staff, Greenhouse Gas Analyses for Community Plan Exemptions in Eastern Neighborhoods, April 20, 2010. This memorandum provides an overview of the GHG analysis conducted for the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and provides an analysis of the emissions using a service population (equivalent of total number of residents and employees) metric.

are consistent with an adopted GHG reduction strategy to conclude that the project's GHG impact is less than significant. San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*<sup>37</sup> presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy in compliance with the BAAQMD and CEQA guidelines. These GHG reduction actions have resulted in a 23.3 percent reduction in GHG emissions in 2012 compared to 1990 levels,<sup>38</sup> exceeding the year 2020 reduction goals outlined in the BAAQMD's *2010 Clean Air Plan*,<sup>39</sup> Executive Order S-3-05<sup>40</sup>, and Assembly Bill 32 (also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act).<sup>41,42</sup> In addition, San Francisco's GHG reduction goals are consistent with, or more aggressive than, the long-term goals established under Executive Orders S-3-05<sup>43</sup> and B-30-15.<sup>44,45</sup> Therefore, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's GHG Reduction Strategy would not result in GHG emissions that would have a significant effect on the environment and would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations.

The proposed project would increase the intensity of use of the project site by removing a surface parking lot with a mixed-use building that contains up to 134 residential units, 9,670 square feet of community support services, 1,230 square feet of office space, 4,420 square feet for a child development center, and 600 square feet of retail use. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to annual long-term increases in GHGs as a result of increased vehicle trips (mobile sources), and residential and the non-residential operations that result in an increase in energy use, water use, wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal. Construction activities would also result in temporary increases in GHG emissions.

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

Compliance with the City's Commuter Benefits Program, transportation management programs, and bicycle parking requirements would reduce the proposed project's transportation-related emissions. Additionally, the proposed project does not provide any off-street vehicle parking spaces and includes

---

<sup>37</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions in San Francisco*, November 2010. Available at [http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/GHG\\_Reduction\\_Strategy.pdf](http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/GHG_Reduction_Strategy.pdf), accessed March 3, 2016.

<sup>38</sup> ICF International, *Technical Review of the 2012 Community-wide Inventory for the City and County of San Francisco*, January 21, 2015.

<sup>39</sup> Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Clean Air Plan*, September 2010. Available at <http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/air-quality-plans/current-plans>, accessed March 3, 2016.

<sup>40</sup> Office of the Governor, *Executive Order S-3-05*, June 1, 2005. Available at <https://www.gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=1861>, accessed March 3, 2016.

<sup>41</sup> California Legislative Information, *Assembly Bill 32*, September 27, 2006. Available at [http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/05-06/bill/asm/ab\\_0001-0050/ab\\_32\\_bill\\_20060927\\_chaptered.pdf](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/05-06/bill/asm/ab_0001-0050/ab_32_bill_20060927_chaptered.pdf), accessed March 3, 2016.

<sup>42</sup> Executive Order S-3-05, Assembly Bill 32, and the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan set a target of reducing GHG emissions to below 1990 levels by year 2020.

<sup>43</sup> Executive Order S-3-05 sets forth a series of target dates by which statewide emissions of GHGs need to be progressively reduced, as follows: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels (approximately 457 million MTCO<sub>2</sub>E); by 2020, reduce emissions to 1990 levels (approximately 427 million MTCO<sub>2</sub>E); and by 2050 reduce emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels (approximately 85 million MTCO<sub>2</sub>E).

<sup>44</sup> Office of the Governor, *Executive Order B-30-15*, April 29, 2015. Available at <https://www.gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=18938>, accessed March 3, 2016. Executive Order B-30-15 sets a state GHG emissions reduction goal of 40 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2030.

<sup>45</sup> San Francisco's GHG reduction goals are codified in Section 902 of the Environment Code and include: (i) by 2008, determine City GHG emissions for year 1990; (ii) by 2017, reduce GHG emissions by 25 percent below 1990 levels; (iii) by 2025, reduce GHG emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels; and by 2050, reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels.

one on-street car share vehicle parking space on Shotwell Street. These regulations and project components reduce GHG emissions from single-occupancy vehicles by promoting the use of alternative transportation modes with zero or lower GHG emissions on a per capita basis.

The proposed project would be required to comply with the energy efficiency requirements of the City’s Green Building Code, Stormwater Management Ordinance, and Water Conservation and Irrigation ordinances, which would promote energy and water efficiency, thereby reducing the proposed project’s energy-related GHG emissions.<sup>46</sup> Additionally, the project would be required to meet the renewable energy criteria of the Green Building Code, further reducing the project’s energy-related GHG emissions.

The proposed project’s waste-related emissions would be reduced through compliance with the City’s Recycling and Composting Ordinance, Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Ordinance, and Green Building Code requirements. These regulations reduce the amount of materials sent to a landfill, reducing GHGs emitted by landfill operations. These regulations also promote reuse of materials, conserving their embodied energy<sup>47</sup> and reducing the energy required to produce new materials.

Compliance with the City’s Street Tree Planting requirements would serve to increase carbon sequestration. Other regulations, including the Wood Burning Fireplace Ordinance would reduce emissions of GHGs and black carbon, respectively. Regulations requiring low-emitting finishes would reduce volatile organic compounds (VOCs).<sup>48</sup> Thus, the proposed project was determined to be consistent with San Francisco’s GHG reduction strategy.<sup>49</sup>

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

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
<b>8. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:</b>					
a) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>46</sup> Compliance with water conservation measures reduce the energy (and GHG emissions) required to convey, pump and treat water required for the project.

<sup>47</sup> Embodied energy is the total energy required for the extraction, processing, manufacture and delivery of building materials to the building site.

<sup>48</sup> While not a GHG, VOCs are precursor pollutants that form ground level ozone. Increased ground level ozone is an anticipated effect of future global warming that would result in added health effects locally. Reducing VOC emissions would reduce the anticipated local effects of global warming.

<sup>49</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, *Greenhouse Gas Analysis: Compliance Checklist for 2060 Folsom Street*, May 26, 2016.

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzes effects on wind and shadow under Chapter IV.I, on pages 380-418; Chapter VI on pages 529-530; Chapter VIII on pages C&R-118 to C&R-119; and Chapter IX, Appendix A on pages 31-32.

**Wind**

Based on the height and location of the proposed building, which would be approximately 85 feet tall (94 feet tall with elevator penthouse), a pedestrian wind assessment (“wind assessment”) was prepared by a qualified wind consultant for the proposed project.<sup>50</sup> The objective of the wind assessment was to provide a qualitative evaluation of the potential wind impacts of the proposed development, which provides a screening-level estimation of the potential wind impact from the project. The results of the wind assessment are summarized below.

Adjacent to the north of the project site is an existing two-story building that fronts on Folsom, Shotwell, and 16<sup>th</sup> streets. Further north of the project site across 16<sup>th</sup> Street is a one-story industrial building with a surface parking lot, and beyond that are one- to three-story buildings. South of the project site, across 17<sup>th</sup> Street, is a block with two- to three-story buildings. To the west of the project site across Shotwell Street are two-story buildings that form a wall along the project’s Shotwell Street frontage. Farther to the west are three- to five-story buildings that are located along the west side of South Van Ness Avenue. In addition to buildings, the street grid can also affect the wind environment. In the project vicinity, local west winds are channeled down the east-west streets of 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> streets. The project site’s direct exposure to west winds are reduced due to the sheltering of existing upwind buildings west of Shotwell Street and because the project is setback approximately 160 feet from 17<sup>th</sup> Street.

Considering the available information from wind tests and assessing the comparisons between street grids, street widths, and the height and density of surrounding development, the wind assessment concluded that there are no existing wind hazards around the project site. It is anticipated that the proposed building would likely result in an approximately two mile per hour change in ten percent exceeded wind speeds on nearby sidewalks and such changes are generally considered to be insubstantial. The proposed project would result in unnoticeable increases in wind speeds along the Shotwell Street sidewalks, and since the project site is approximately 160 feet from 17<sup>th</sup> Street, the wind speeds along sidewalks on 17<sup>th</sup> Street would also not be expected to result in noticeable changes. Furthermore, the wind speeds within the under construction 17<sup>th</sup> & Folsom Park would be expected to result in small increases at the northern end of the park, while low or no change in wind speeds would be expected at the southern end.

<sup>50</sup> Environmental Science Associates, *Potential Wind Effects of Mixed Use Residential Project, 2060 Folsom Street Development, San Francisco, CA*, May 13, 2016. The wind consultant reviewed the results of wind tunnel tests in the project vicinity.

In conclusion, the wind assessment found that implementation of the proposed project would not substantially affect the pedestrian wind environment.

### Shadow

Planning Code Section 295 generally prohibits new structures above 40 feet in height that would cast additional shadows on open space that is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, at any time of the year, unless that shadow would not result in a significant adverse effect on the use of the open space. Under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, sites surrounding parks could be redeveloped with taller buildings without triggering Section 295 of the Planning Code because certain parks are not subject to Section 295 of the Planning Code (i.e., under jurisdiction of departments other than the Recreation and Parks Department or privately owned). The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR could not conclude if the rezoning and community plans would result in less-than-significant shadow impacts because the feasibility of complete mitigation for potential new shadow impacts of unknown proposals could not be determined at that time. Therefore, the PEIR determined shadow impacts to be significant and unavoidable. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The proposed project would remove the existing surface parking lot and construct a new 85-foot-tall (94-foot-tall with mechanic elevator) building. The Planning Department prepared a shadow fan analysis that determined that the proposed project has potential to cast new shadow on the adjacent 17th & Folsom Park, which is under construction and under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department.<sup>51</sup> Therefore, a more refined shadow study was conducted to determine the project's shadow impact on the park.<sup>52</sup>

The 17th & Folsom Park is immediately adjacent to the south of the project site and would be approximately 0.73 acres (31,800 square feet) in size with frontages on 17th, Folsom, and Shotwell streets (see Figure 11). The park would include a natural grass lawn located towards the center of the park. West of the lawn would be an outdoor classroom/performance space that would include a demonstration garden for wildlife habitat and water conservation and an arbor with seatwall seating. To the north of the lawn would be a community garden, an operations and garden support area, and a garden educational area that could also be used for flexible space. To the east of the lawn would be an activity area that would include a children's play area, an adult fitness equipment area, and an interactive water feature that commemorates Mission Creek. A mixture of seating and native landscaped areas would be located throughout the park. The park boundary would be demarcated by both a living fence, made of espaliered fruit trees, and an ornamental fence and gate.

The 17th & Folsom Park has approximately 117,774,182 square feet hours ("sfh") of Theoretically Available Annual Sunlight ("TAAS"), which is the amount of theoretically available sunlight on the park annually if there were no shadows from structures, trees or other facilities. Shadows would exist on the future park in the morning, late afternoon, and evening during various times of year. The shadow load from existing surrounding development is 1,706,067 sfh annually, which is approximately 1.5 percent of the total TAAS. Existing shadows on the park would occur only in the early morning from the building along Folsom Street between 17th and 18th streets and in the late afternoon from the buildings along

---

<sup>51</sup> Construction on the 17<sup>th</sup> & Folsom Park commenced in March 2016 with an expected completion date of early/mid 2017.

<sup>52</sup> CADP, *2060 Folsom Street, 17<sup>th</sup> & Folsom Park Shadow Analysis*, June 6, 2016.

Shotwell between 17th and 18th Streets. These shadows are limited to the western and eastern edges of the park.

The proposed project would add 1,643,442 sfh of shadow on the park, which is a 1.4 percent increase in shadow as a percentage of TAAS. The net new shadow would almost double the shadow on the park, as the new shadow would be increased from 1.5 to 2.8 percent. New shadow would be cast in the summer in the early mornings and evenings with all shadows gone no later than 8:30 AM and not returning until 5:15 PM and lasting until approximately sunset.

The maximum net new shadow would occur on June 21<sup>st</sup> and contribute 21,795 sfh. On this day, the proposed project would cast new shadow on the park for approximately 4 hours and 19 minutes from 6:46 AM to approximately 8:30 AM (1 hour and 50 minutes) and from approximately 5:15 PM to 7:36 PM (2 hours and 29 minutes). During the morning hours, the net new shadow would reach the northwest corner of the park in a passive use area designated for the community garden, garden education area, the operations and garden support area, and portions of the performance space/outdoor classroom including the adjoining arbor with seatwall seating. An insubstantial portion of the lawn area would be shaded for a very limited time in the early morning. During the evening hours, the net new shadow would reach the northeast corner of the park in an active use area designated for the children's play area and the adult fitness equipment area. Project shadow would reach the children's play area at 5:15 PM and would reach the adult fitness equipment area at approximately 7 PM. Shadow would also occur on the community garden area in the evening hours.


The 17th & Folsom Park would have active and passive use throughout the year, with individuals more likely to use the park in spring and fall which historically have the most sunshine and lowest levels of rain and/or fog. Project shadow would occur only from April 5<sup>th</sup> to September 6<sup>th</sup>. At its shortest, new shadow would be cast for 8 minutes and 24 seconds on April 5<sup>th</sup> and September 6<sup>th</sup>, and at its longest, new shadow would be cast for 4 hours and 19 minutes on June 21<sup>st</sup>. The average shadow when the park receives new shadow from the project during both morning and evening would be approximately 2 hours and 37 minutes. The largest new shadow by area would occur on June 21<sup>st</sup> at 7:36 PM, when at its maximum, the new shadow area would be 11,114 square feet in size, covering approximately one third of the park (see Figure 12). The maximum new shadow in the morning would occur on June 21<sup>st</sup> at 6:48 AM (see Figure 13). The park is presumably at its lowest point of use from 6:48 AM to 8:30 AM and from 5:15 PM to sunset.<sup>53</sup>

Under CEQA, a project is considered to have a significant shadow impact if the project would create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas. The new shadow created by the proposed project would not be considered substantial since it would be limited to early morning and evening hours in the summer months during periods that are typically low for park use. Project shadow would begin to reach the children's play area at 5 PM, and approximately one third of the play area would be shaded at 6 PM. By 7 PM the children's play area would be entirely covered, which is when the adult fitness equipment area would begin to receive project shadow in the summer months. Project shadow would only reach a small sliver of the lawn area at 6:48 AM and would

---

<sup>53</sup> Recent observations conducted by CADP at Parque Ninos Unidos, which is located approximately six blocks away, indicates that park playground use on weekdays typically peaks in the hours after school at approximately 2:00 PM and begins to dissipate at 5:00 PM with a continued decline in playground use into the evening hours. At Parque Ninos Unidos, children are rarely present before 8:30 AM with parents and toddlers appearing after 8:30 AM.

Figure 11. 17th & Folsom Park Site Plan




Comments: Not to Scale  
Source: RPD, March 2016

Figure 12. Maximum Net New Shadow During Evening



Comments: Not to Scale  
Source: CADP, June 2016

Figure 13. Maximum Net New Shadow During Morning



Comments: Not to Scale  
Source: CADP, June 2016

be gone by 8 AM during the summer months. Furthermore, there would be no project shadow from 8:45 AM to 5:00 PM at any time throughout the year, which are times when park use is expected to be greater. Because project shadow would occur only during the early morning and evening hours which are times of low park use, the new shadow would not be expected to preclude or substantially reduce the use of the active areas, which includes the children’s play area, the adult fitness equipment area, and the lawn.

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

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

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
<b>9. RECREATION—Would the project:</b>					
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Physically degrade existing recreational resources?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzes effects on recreation under Chapter IV.H, on pages 363-379; Chapter V, on page 525a; Chapter VIII on page C&R-34 and pages C&R-107 to C&R 118; and Chapter IX, Appendix A on page 43.

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

implement funding mechanisms for an ongoing program to repair, upgrade and adequately maintain park and recreation facilities to ensure the safety of users.

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

An update of the Recreation and Open Space Element (ROSE) of the General Plan was adopted in April 2014. The amended ROSE provides a 20-year vision for open spaces in the City. It includes information and policies about accessing, acquiring, funding, and managing open spaces in San Francisco. The amended ROSE identifies areas within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area for acquisition and the locations where new open spaces and open space connections should be built, consistent with PEIR Improvement Measure H-2: Support for New Open Space. Two of these open spaces, Daggett Park and at 17<sup>th</sup> and Folsom, are both set to open in 2016. In addition, the amended ROSE identifies the role of both the Better Streets Plan (refer to "Transportation" section for description) and the Green Connections Network in open space and recreation. Green Connections are special streets and paths that connect people to parks, open spaces, and the waterfront, while enhancing the ecology of the street environment. Six routes identified within the Green Connections Network cross the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area: Mission to Peaks (Route 6); Noe Valley to Central Waterfront (Route 8), a portion of which has been conceptually designed; Tenderloin to Potrero (Route 18); Downtown to Mission Bay (Route 19); Folsom, Mission Creek to McLaren (Route 20); and Shoreline (Route 24).

Furthermore, the Planning Code requires a specified amount of new usable open space (either private or common) for each new residential unit. Some developments are also required to provide privately owned, publicly accessible open spaces. The Planning Code open space requirements would help offset some of the additional open space needs generated by increased residential population to the project area. Furthermore, the proposed project would be immediately adjacent to the under construction 17<sup>th</sup> & Folsom Park, thus providing convenient open space amenities for residents and other users of the project site.

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

---

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
<b>10. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:</b>					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzes effects on utilities and service systems under Chapter IX, Appendix A on pages 32-43.

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

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

droughts. Plans are in place to institute varying degrees of water conservation and rationing as needed in response to severe droughts.

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

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

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
<b>11. PUBLIC SERVICES—Would the project:</b>					
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzes effects on public services under Chapter IX, Appendix A on pages 32-43.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact to public services, including fire protection, police protection, and public schools. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on public services beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
<b>12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES— Would the project:</b>					
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzes effects on biological resources under Chapter IV.M, on page 500; and Chapter IX, Appendix A on page 44.

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

The project site is located within Mission Plan area of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan and therefore, does not support habitat for any candidate, sensitive or special status species. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to biological resources not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
<b>13. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—Would the project:</b>					
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzes effects on geology and soils under Chapter IX, Appendix A on pages 44-54.

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

A geotechnical investigation was prepared for the proposed project.<sup>54</sup> The project site is underlain by a surficial layer of loose to medium dense sandy soils that include fill. The loose to medium dense sands extend down to the top of natural soils, which vary from east to west across the project site. The eastern portion of the project site contains loose clayey sand and medium stiff silts and clays below the surficial fill materials. Groundwater was identified at 8.5 feet below the ground surface (bgs). The project site is located within a liquefaction zone, and the liquefiable soils that extend approximately 30 feet bgs across the project site would need to be improved. The geotechnical report recommends using cement deep soil mixing (CDSM). The CDSM method involves the in-situ mixing of soil with cement to create vertical columns or panels that harden into a strong and rigid material. Overlapping CDSM panels are installed to create a continuous vertical grid-like structure in which liquefiable soils are confined. The west wing of the proposed building can be supported entirely upon shallow foundations (spread footings and/or structural mats) providing that the soils are improved. Due to the presence of compressible silts/clays on the eastern portion of the project site, the east wing of the proposed building would need to be supported on deep foundations (piers or piles). Suitable deep foundation types at this site potentially include: 1) conventional drilled piers; 2) driven piles; 3) drilled displacement piles; and 4) auger-cast piles. Drilled displacement piles and auger-cast piles are recommended as they can be installed efficiently with minimal noise and vibrations. Impact piling driving is not proposed as part of the project.

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

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

---

<sup>54</sup> A3GEO, Inc., *Geotechnical Investigation Report, 2060 Folsom Street*, January 22, 2016.

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
<b>14. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY—Would the project:</b>					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 or siltation on- or off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzes effects on hydrology and water quality under Chapter IV.M, on page 500; and Chapter IX, Appendix A on pages 54-67.

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

The project site, which is currently an asphalt surface parking lot, is completely covered with an impervious surface, and thus implementation of the proposed project would not increase impervious surface cover. As a result, the proposed project would not increase stormwater runoff.

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

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
<b>15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS—Would the project:</b>					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzes effects on hazards and hazardous materials under Chapter IV.L, on pages 475-499; Chapter V, on page 523; Chapter VIII on page 34 and pages C&R-129 to C&R-130; and Chapter IX, Appendix A on page 67.

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

**Hazardous Building Materials**

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that future development in the Plan Area may involve demolition or renovation of existing structures containing hazardous building materials. Some building materials commonly used in older buildings could present a public health risk if disturbed during an accident or during demolition or renovation of an existing building. Hazardous building materials addressed in the PEIR include asbestos, electrical equipment such as transformers and fluorescent light ballasts that contain PCBs or di (2 ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), fluorescent lights containing mercury vapors, and lead-based paints. Asbestos and lead based paint may also present a health risk to existing building occupants if they are in a deteriorated condition. If removed during demolition of a building, these materials would also require special disposal procedures. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified a significant impact associated with hazardous building materials including PCBs, DEHP, and mercury and determined that that Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials would reduce effects to a less-than-significant level. Because the proposed development does not include demolition or renovation of an existing building, Mitigation Measure L-1 would not apply.

**Soil and Groundwater Contamination**

Since certification of the PEIR, Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance, was expanded to include properties throughout the City where there is potential to encounter hazardous materials, primarily industrial zoning districts, sites with industrial uses or underground storage tanks,

sites with historic bay fill, and sites in close proximity to freeways or underground storage tanks. The over-arching goal of the Maher Ordinance is to protect public health and safety by requiring appropriate handling, treatment, disposal and when necessary, remediation of contaminated soils that are encountered in the building construction process. Projects that disturb 50 cubic yards or more of soil that are located on sites with potentially hazardous soil or groundwater within Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area are subject to this ordinance.

The proposed project would require up to 30 feet of excavation below ground surface (bgs) for the proposed foundation work which would require cement deep soil mixing, resulting in approximately 2,500 cubic yards of soil disturbance. The project site has been developed with light industrial structures and residential structures that may have included a historic heating oil tank. Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH). In compliance with the Maher Ordinance, the project sponsor has submitted a Maher Application to DPH with the following reports that have been prepared to assess the potential for site contamination: Phase II Subsurface Investigation Report (2010), Soil and Ground Water Investigation Report (2011), and Geotechnical Investigation Report (2016).<sup>55</sup> The Phase II investigation included the installation of seven soil borings to five feet bgs to collect soil samples and five borings to groundwater to collect soil and groundwater samples. Discrete soil samples were analyzed for total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPH-g), TPH-diesel (TPH-d), TPH-motor oil (TPH-mo), asbestos and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Composite soil samples were analyzed for lead and asbestos. Groundwater samples were analyzed for TPH-g, TPH-d, TPH-mo and VOCs.

Analytical results indicated that TPH-g and VOCs were not detected (ND) in soil samples. TPH-d ranged from ND to 240 ppm, TPH-mo ranged from ND to 1,000 parts per million (ppm), lead in the composite samples ranged from 100 to 690 ppm. Asbestos samples were all less than one percent, which is the level above which a soil must be especially handled as an asbestos containing material. The TPH-d in soil was above the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs) for residential and commercial land use. TPH-mo and lead were above the residential ESLs. TPH-g, TPH-d, TPH-mo, and Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE) were above ESLs for gross contamination. Four additional borings were taken on the project site and were sampled at various depths. The deeper composite samples were analyzed for TPH as gasoline. None of these samples contained concentrations above the laboratory detection limit (ND). No volatile or semi volatile organic compounds were detected in any sample.

Metals analyses showed that antimony, arsenic, lead, mercury, nickel and vanadium exceeded ESL concentrations for shallow soils, over a non-drinking water source for the residential scenario.<sup>56</sup> The concentrations of arsenic, nickel and vanadium were described as within naturally occurring background ranges found in California. Soluble lead was analyzed using the California Waste Extraction Test<sup>57</sup> (WET) procedure. Each WET sample exceeded the State Soluble Threshold Limit Concentration (STLC) for lead. The value for nickel exceeded the ESL for construction worker protection.

---

<sup>55</sup> Stephanie Cushing, SFDPH, letter to Chinatown Community Development Center (co-project sponsor), Article 22A Compliance for 2060 Folsom Street, EHB-SAM Case Number 1403, April 27, 2016.

<sup>56</sup> A residential scenario is a residential land use that is stated in the RWQCB's ESLs. ESLs have been created for residential land use, commercial land use and construction worker exposure.

<sup>57</sup> The Waste Extraction Test is a method used in California to determine whether a waste is a toxic hazardous waste.

Groundwater samples were collected from two monitoring wells that were installed on the project site. The groundwater samples were analyzed individually for organic chemicals, and as a composite sample for inorganic chemicals. ESL values were not exceeded by any constituent measured in the groundwater samples.

The soils exceeding ESL values should be excavated and replaced with clean soil, placement of an adequate barrier material above the impacted soil, use of a site specific health and safety plan and/or other appropriate measures to eliminate or reduce the potential risks to future site residents, users of the proposed park or construction/trench workers. An indicator barrier should be placed between the native soil and the imported clean fill soil. Soils exceeding the Threshold Limit Concentration (TTLIC) must be removed and disposed as hazardous waste. Soils containing metals above the STLIC must be disposed as hazardous waste if they are removed from the site. Soils exceeding 200 mg/kg lead should not be exposed at the site and should be covered by at least two feet of clean soil over an indicator barrier. The project sponsor is required to submit a Site Mitigation Plan to DPH, in compliance with Health Code Article 38.

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

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
<b>16. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES—Would the project:</b>					
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzes effects on mineral and energy resources under Chapter IV.M, page 500; and Chapter IX, Appendix A on page 67.

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

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

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Analyzed in the Prior EIR</i>	<i>Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR</i>			
		<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies</i>	<i>Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Significant Impact</i>
<b>17. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:—Would the project:</b>					
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzes effects on agricultural resources under Chapter IV.M, on page 500.

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

As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on agriculture beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The project site is located in a built up urban environment and no forest resources exist on the project site.

Topics:	Analyzed in the Prior EIR	Not Analyzed in the Prior EIR			
		No Impact	Substantially Mitigated by Uniformly Applicable Development Policies	Less Than Significant or Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact
<b>18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE—Would the project:</b>					
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have impacts that would be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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. The project sponsor would be required to prepare an Archeological Testing Program to more definitively identify the potential for California Register-eligible archeological resources to be present within the project site and determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effect of the project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in the elimination of important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory.

The proposed project would not combine with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects to create significant cumulative impacts related to any of the topics discussed in this Infill Environmental Checklist. There would be no significant cumulative impacts to which the proposed project would make cumulatively considerable contributions.

Since construction of the proposed project would generate temporary noise from the use of heavy construction equipment that could affect nearby residents and other sensitive receptors, the project sponsor is required to develop and implement a set of noise attenuation measures during construction. In addition, all construction activities would be subject to and required to comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance. The proposed project would also be required to comply with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance, which would reduce the quantity of fugitive dust generated during project-related construction activities. The project site is not located within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone; therefore, the ambient health risk to sensitive receptors from air pollutants is not considered substantial. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

---

## MITIGATION MEASURES

### ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

#### **Project Mitigation Measure 1 – Archeological Testing (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure J-2)**

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

*Consultation with Descendant Communities:* On discovery of an archeological site<sup>58</sup> associated with descendant Native Americans, the Overseas Chinese, or other potentially interested descendant group an

---

<sup>58</sup> By the term "archeological site" is intended here to minimally include any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

appropriate representative<sup>59</sup> of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to offer recommendations to the ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated archeological site. A copy of the Final Archeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group.

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

At the completion of the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archeological testing program the archeological consultant finds that significant archeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archeological testing, archeological monitoring, and/or an archeological data recovery program. No archeological data recovery shall be undertaken without the prior approval of the ERO or the Planning Department archeologist. If the ERO determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:

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

*Archeological Monitoring Program.* If the ERO, in consultation with the archeological consultant, determines that an archeological monitoring program 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

---

<sup>59</sup> An "appropriate representative" of the descendant group is here defined to mean, in the case of Native Americans, any individual listed in the current Native American Contact List for the City and County of San Francisco maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission and in the case of the Overseas Chinese, the Chinese Historical Society of America. An appropriate representative of other descendant groups should be determined in consultation with the Department archeologist.

- work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archeological 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) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, ERO, and MLD shall have up to but not beyond six days of discovery make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects with appropriate dignity (CEQA Guidelines. Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. Nothing in existing State regulations or in this mitigation measure compels the project sponsor and the ERO to accept recommendations of an MLD. The archeological consultant shall retain possession of any Native American human remains and associated or unassociated burial objects until completion of any scientific analyses of the human remains or objects as specified in the treatment agreement if such agreement has been made or, otherwise, as determined by the archeological consultant and the ERO.

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

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

**NOISE*****Project Mitigation Measure 2 – Construction Noise (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-2)***

The project sponsor shall develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:

- Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around a construction site, particularly where a site adjoins noise-sensitive uses;
- Utilize noise control blankets on a building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site;
- Evaluate the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings housing sensitive uses;
- Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements;

Post signs on-site pertaining to permitted construction days and hours and complaint procedures and who to notify in the event of a problem, with telephone numbers listed.

---

**DETERMINATION**

On the basis of this evaluation:

- I find that the proposed infill project would not have any significant effects on the environment that either have not already been analyzed in a prior EIR or that are more significant than previously analyzed, or that uniformly applicable development policies would not substantially mitigate. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21094.5, CEQA does not apply to such effects. A Notice of Determination (Section 15094) will be filed.
- I find that the proposed infill project will have effects that either have not been analyzed in a prior EIR, or are more significant than described in the prior EIR, and that no uniformly applicable development policies would substantially mitigate such effects. With respect to those effects that are subject to CEQA, I find that such effects would not be significant and a Negative Declaration, or if the project is a Transit Priority Project a Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessment, will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed infill project will have effects that either have not been analyzed in a prior EIR, or are more significant than described in the prior EIR, and that no uniformly applicable development policies would substantially mitigate such effects. I find that although those effects could be significant, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the infill project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A Mitigated Negative Declaration, or if the project is a Transit Priority Project a Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessment, will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed infill project would have effects that either have not been analyzed in a prior EIR, or are more significant than described in the prior EIR, and that no uniformly applicable development policies would substantially mitigate such effects. I find that those effects would be significant, and an infill EIR is required to analyze those effects that are subject to CEQA.

**ATTACHMENT B: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM</b>				
<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation/Improvement Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
<b>MITIGATION MEASURES</b>				
<p><b>Project Mitigation Measure 1 – Archeological Testing (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure J-2.</b></p> <p>Based on a reasonable presumption that archeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of an archaeological consultant from the rotational Department Qualified Archaeological Consultants List (QACL) maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist. The project sponsor shall contact the Department archeologist to obtain the names and contact information for the next three archeological consultants on the QACL. The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this requirement. The archeological consultant’s work shall be conducted in accordance with this requirement 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 requirement 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</p>	<p>Project sponsor, project archeologist.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of any permit for soils-disturbing activities and during construction activities.</p>	<p>Project sponsor, project archeologist, ERO.</p>	<p>During soils-disturbing and construction activities.</p>

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation/Improvement Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
<p>Guidelines Sect. 15064.5 (a)(c).</p> <p><i>Consultation with Descendant Communities:</i> On discovery of an archeological site<sup>1</sup> associated with descendant Native Americans or the Overseas Chinese an appropriate representative<sup>2</sup> of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to consult with ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated archeological site. A copy of the Final Archaeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group.</p>	Project sponsor, construction contractor(s).	During construction.	Project sponsor, Planning Department.	Project sponsor shall submit monthly reports to the Planning Department during construction period.

1 By the term “archeological site” is intended here to minimally included any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.  
 2 An “appropriate representative” of the descendant group is here defined to mean, in the case of Native Americans, any individual listed in the current Native American Contact List for the City and County of San Francisco maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission and in the case of the Overseas Chinese, the Chinese Historical Society of America.

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation/Improvement Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
<p><i>Archeological Testing Program.</i> 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.</p>	Project sponsor, construction contractor(s).	Prior to the start of and during use of on-site heavy diesel equipment.	Project sponsor, Planning Department.	During demolition and construction activities. The project sponsor shall submit quarterly reports to the ERO during the construction period and a final report at the end of the construction period.

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation/ Improvement Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
--	--	---	--	--------------------------------

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.

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation/Improvement Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------

*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.

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation/ Improvement Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
--	--	---	--	--------------------------------

- 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.

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation/Improvement Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------

*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

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation/ Improvement Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
--	--	---	--	--------------------------------

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.

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation/ Improvement Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
--	--	---	--	--------------------------------

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

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation/ Improvement Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
--	--	---	--	--------------------------------

*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.

**MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

<b>Adopted Mitigation/Improvement Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility for Implementation</b>	<b>Mitigation/Improvement Schedule</b>	<b>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</b>	<b>Monitoring Schedule</b>
<p><b><u>Project Mitigation Measure 2: Construction Noise (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2)</u></b> The project sponsor shall develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around a construction site, particularly where a site adjoins noise-sensitive uses;</li> <li>• Utilize noise control blankets on a building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site;</li> <li>• Evaluate the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings housing sensitive uses;</li> <li>• Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements; and</li> <li>• Post signs on-site pertaining to permitted construction days and hours and complaint procedures and who to notify in the event of a problem, with telephone numbers listed.</li> </ul>	Project sponsor, construction contractor(s)	During construction	Project Sponsor to provide Planning Department with monthly reports during construction period.	Considered complete upon receipt of final monitoring report at completion of construction.