the like—would generally be less substantial than identified in the DEIR, and environmental conditions would be more similar to those of the existing setting. Thus, if the project were to result in less residential development, physical environmental impacts would generally be less severe than stated in the DEIR.

Effects on Employment of Living Wage and Health Care Security Ordinances

Comment [H8]

The Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning was begun prior to the approval of San Francisco's living wage ordinance and the health insurance. Both ordinances will increase the cost of business, particularly in labor-intensive PDR activities, resulting in less PDR employment and less demand for PDR space. *(Victor Vitlin, John Vitlin Trust)*

Response

The City's Minimum Wage Ordinance was first approved by the voters in 2003, and the effective local minimum wage has been increased each year since 2004. The Health Care Security Ordinance, approved in August 2006, created the Health Access Plan (now called Healthy San Francisco) for uninsured San Francisco residents. Although implementation of the health care ordinance is under legal challenge (a federal district court ruling did not favor the City's intent to require employee contributions), the City has nevertheless moved forward with implementation of the law. It cannot be stated with any certainty the extent to which any increased costs to business resulting from implementation of the two ordinances would decrease employment, particularly PDR employment, in the future. To the extent that these ordinances might increase costs sufficiently to decrease future hiring, result in reductions in existing employment, cause businesses to relocate out of San Francisco or to close, or some combination of the above, there could be an overall decrease in demand for certain types of real estate, including PDR space if PDR business and employment were to be affected. Such economic effects would not necessarily be translatable to physical impacts, and the extent to which physical impacts, such as buildings being abandoned and blighted conditions resulting, might occur, cannot be predicted. San Francisco's historic relative lack of large areas of abandoned or seriously underutilized property, particularly compared to many other U.S. cities, would appear to argue that many properties would ultimately transition to other uses. At any rate, there is no evidence to suggest that a potential increase in business costs resulting from implementation of the two ordinances noted would result in a significant adverse *physical* effect on the environment. Moreover, it is noted that neither the Minimum Wage Ordinance nor the Health Care Security Ordinances is part of the proposed Eastern Neighborhoods project. Any impacts of implementation of those

ordinances would occur independently of the Eastern Neighborhoods planning process and would not be impacts of the proposed Eastern Neighborhoods project.

PDR Displacement in East SoMa

Comment [H9]

"The DEIR shows that a super-majority of light industrial businesses and workers in the South of Market neighborhood are vulnerable to displacement through market forces" because East SoMa contains 23 percent of the plan area's PDR space and more than 185,000 square feet of PDR space would be lost due to pipeline projects alone. Moreover, under each rezoning option, existing PDR buildings are likely to be replaced by residential and mixed-use development, displacing residents with limited education, skills, and language abilities, increasing the need for affordable housing. *(Chris Durazo, South of Market Community Action Network [SOMCAN])*

Response

The comment is noted. Each of the above points is made in the Draft EIR, although one correction is required. Table 4, DEIR p. 40, states that 23 percent of land in East SoMa is in PDR use, not that East SoMa contains 23 percent of the plan area's PDR space. Instead, East SoMa's 35 acres of PDR land is approximately 4 percent of the Eastern Neighborhoods total, with the vast majority of PDR land in the Eastern Neighborhoods (64 percent) located in the Central Waterfront.

PDR-Generated Housing Demand

Comment [H10]

"Page S-16 – The new jobs created by increased PDR businesses in three neighborhoods as a result of Option B creates a need for new housing, services, police services, other utility services and to the extent workers are not housed in affordable housing units because they make too much money, will result in competition with non profits for land in the Eastern Neighborhoods. Please explain how the City's consultants reach the conclusion that no housing resources will be affected. Please explain why the same consultants did not mention the other City resources and services that would be affected." *(Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association)*

Response

As shown in Table 2, DEIR p. 34, the employment projections upon which the EIR's analysis are based show that PDR employment is anticipated to decline in the Eastern Neighborhoods under each of the three rezoning options. That is because, as stated on p. 57, "The amount of PDR space is expected to decrease under each of the three rezoning options as well as a 2025 No-Project scenario…." As a result, there would be no anticipated increase in housing demand in the project area as a result of changes in PDR employment. Citywide, on the other hand, the EPS study of PDR supply and demand

does project increased demand for PDR uses, which would likely result in increased PDR employment. Accordingly, one of the City's objectives for the proposed project is to increase housing through the identification of "appropriate locations for housing in the City's industrially zoned land to meet a citywide need for more housing, and affordable housing in particular."

In terms of effects on other City resources and services, the EIR analyzed impacts on Parks, Recreation, and Open Space in detail in Section IV.H. Effects related to water supply and wastewater treatment, solid waste, power and telecommunications, fire suppression and emergency medical services, police protection, and schools were analyzed in the Initial Study, EIR Appendix A, pp. 32 – 43, and were found to be less than significant. Additional analysis of potential water quality effects due to overflows of the City's combined sewer system (Appendix A, pp. 54 – 67) also concluded that this impact would also be less than significant.

Incubator Space

Comment [H11]

What is the definition of the term "incubator location" as used on DEIR p. I-7? Provide examples of such a location. *(M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association)*

Response

The comment refers to text quoted from the Socioeconomic Impacts Analysis, where the DEIR stated, on p. I-7, "The socioeconomic report cautioned, however, that the proposed project would not resolve 'the lingering tension between the need for incubator locations for emerging enterprises and the need to reserve a land supply for PDR where demand from higher-value uses and speculation do not disrupt traditional PDR clusters.'" The Socioeconomic Impacts Analysis explains further, on pp. 24 – 25, that "planners, policy-makers, and the community acknowledge the importance of retaining the 'incubator' function of industrial districts. Such districts typically offer location options for businesses that have limited ability to pay for building space. These can be PDR businesses or new, emerging economic activities that are to be encouraged because they offer prospects for growth in economic activity and jobs and contribute to the economic diversity of the City. In San Francisco, recent analysis has identified 'digital media' companies, 'clean technology' companies, and life sciences companies as particular targets for economic development efforts. Retaining existing PDR business activity and supporting new business growth depends on establishing new zoning districts for PDR-only-type business activity and promoting PDR space in mixed-use development."

As noted in the discussion of the Preferred Project, p. C&R-5, the Preferred Project proposes two special use districts (SUDs), an Innovative Industries SUD and a Life Science and Medical SUD, which could serve as locations for such incubator businesses. It is also noted that the Service Light Industrial (SLI) use district in Eastern SoMa, which would be retained under the Preferred Project, might potentially serve as a location for incubator businesses, as could locations in Western SoMa.

Transportation

Transportation Planning

Comment [T1]

The proposed project is too heavily weighted towards land use planning at the expense of transportation and other public improvements, and the DEIR transportation analysis is inadequate. In particular, the methodology for analysis of trip generation and modal split is flawed because it cannot account for factors such as provision of lesser amounts of parking or for more bicycle parking and better pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access. The DEIR analysis also does not account for reduced parking demand resulting from increasing the cost of parking; does not consider "barrier effects" posed to pedestrians and bicyclists by increased traffic; and does not quantify the impact of traffic in reducing operating speeds of transit. The transportation mitigation measures in the DEIR are "suggestive" but should include reducing traffic through reduced parking and transit incentives, development and implementation of effective parking management strategies, implementation of "complete streets" that provide for safe and convenient non-motorized travel and minimize "barrier effects," and a comprehensive program to improve the speed, reliability, capacity, and accessibility of transit in the Eastern Neighborhoods. *(Tom Radulovich, Livable City)*

Response

As stated on DEIR p. 267, the travel demand forecasts, including projections of travel mode (car, transit, bicycle, walk, etc.) were developed from the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) countywide travel demand forecasting model. This model is the standard analysis tool used for cumulative trip generation forecasting, and has been developed to assess the impacts that changes in land use, socioeconomic, and the transportation system can have on streets and transit. The model is unique to San Francisco and reflects the City's individual socioeconomic and land use characteristics, as well as its transportation network. Inputs to the model include the number and characteristics of housing units and jobs in each of the more than 750 "traffic analysis zones" in San Francisco. From this information, the model calculates what are referred to as "tours," each tour being a chain of trips made by an individual that begins and ends at home (i.e., travel to the gym, to work, to shopping, and back home). As such, the model is more complex than a traditional so-called "four-step" model that is based on

individual trips. Nevertheless, the model can only project travel forecasts in the level of detail that is input. At a planning level, such detail is typically far less detailed than when a particular project is being analyzed. Despite these limitations, the SFCTA model is the best available tool for forecasting travel demand over a wide area such as the Eastern Neighborhoods project area.

As to mitigation measures, many of the measures identified by the commenter are included as part of the proposed Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans project, at least at a conceptual level. For example, as indicated on DEIR pp. 296 – 298, each of the draft area plans proposes to eliminate minimum off-street parking requirements and instead establish maximum permissible amounts of parking for new development. The draft plans promote walking and bicycle use through policies calling for more bicycle parking, alleys to break up large developments and allow for pedestrian access, improvement of bicycle routes and connections, promoting active building streetfronts to encourage pedestrian activity, and introduction of traffic-calming measures. Other policies call for consideration and evaluation of specific improvements that could be undertaken in the future, such as installing mid-block crosswalks on long South-of-Market blocks; physical improvements to certain streets that might include converting one-way traffic to two-way flow to slow vehicular traffic and provide for safer and more attractive bicycle and pedestrian travel; potential additional bicycle lanes; and potential transit improvements, including transit corridors and bus-only lanes. To the extent feasible within the constraints of a program-level analysis, some of these proposals, such as reduced parking requirements and promotion of non-auto means of travel, were assumed in the DEIR analysis. Other proposals, such as relatively minor physical changes like using mid-block alleys to break up large development sites and ensuring active street frontages, would not result in physical environmental impacts. Still others among these physical improvements, such as conversion of traffic flows and installation of new bicycle or transit-only lanes, would be required to undergo separate environmental review under CEQA prior to implementation. However, because these features were analyzed as part of the proposed project, either as active proposals or at a programmatic level as future strategies to be undertaken, they need not be identified as mitigation measures in the DEIR. Finally, it is noted that the mitigation measures presented in the DEIR are those available and appropriate at this programmatic stage of the Eastern Neighborhoods planning process. Strategies for transportation improvements are continuing to be developed and, as noted, more detailed improvements will likely be proposed as the area plans are implemented, with specific proposals to be analyzed, as appropriate, as they come forward.

Transit

Comment [T2]

"S-19: Because additional riders can increase the need for additional buses, what are the assumptions being made as to how many new buses and operators will be needed once a bus line has increased ridership. Because mitigations in the EIR call for additional exactions for Muni, a discussion of these assumptions is important to test their accuracy."

"S-19: Why is it that this EIR does not take into account the additional money that would be provided from the General Fund to Muni were the proposed November 2007/February 2008 Muni initiative to pass?" (*M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

The transit analysis, as is typically the case, compares anticipated ridership (demand) to existing capacity on Muni, with the only changes or increases in service being those that can reasonably be anticipated to occur because they are already planned and funded. As stated in the main body of the DEIR text on p. 269, "Muni plans to extend either the 30-Stockton or 45-Union bus line from the Caltrain station to a new terminal in Mission Bay, in the vicinity of 20th and Third Streets via Potrero Hill, and also plans to re-route the 22-Fillmore line to continue along 16th Street rather than traveling over Potrero Hill (service over the hill would be replaced by the 30 or 45 line)." Therefore, these proposed improvements—affecting primarily Showplace Square/Potrero Hill and the Central Waterfront, as well as the Mission and the nearby Mission Bay area—are assumed in the analysis of future transit conditions. Passage of Proposition A on the November 2007 ballot was not a certainty when the DEIR analysis was prepared. Moreover, it is not clear how the additional funding provided by Proposition A would be applied to the Muni system. Consequently, it would be speculative to analyze any changes that may occur.

Comment [T3]

I did not see [the DEIR] address of the possibility of … the positive, I guess, effects … in terms of pollution and in terms of traffic easing in as much as we're anticipating somewhere between 73 and 88,000 new residents depending on the No-Project alternative and then project A, B and C options. And presumably many of these new residents would be previous commuters that are now living in San Francisco. And while this is hard for this document to address this type of thing because it's in not really a nexus study, per se, one would assume that we would perhaps see an easing of traffic in as much as some of these people previously have lived in … outlying areas and now would be able to walk or take public transit to their jobs in San Francisco. *(Planning Commissioner Michael Antonini)*

Response

As explained in the response to Comment T1, above, the transportation analysis was based upon forecasts developed from the San Francisco County Transportation Authority travel demand model. The model does, at a macro level, take into account such factors as changing land use patterns such as those noted by the commenter. At the individual street or intersection level, however, an increase in population in a particular district or neighborhood San Francisco is likely to result in some increase in traffic, even if the overall impact in a regional sense might be to incrementally increase transit ridership or walking or bicycling, compared to the same population increase if it were to occur in an area where transit or other alternative travel modes are less feasible options. The same is true for the analysis of transportation air quality impacts, which are indirectly based upon travel demand.

Parking

Comment [T4]

"Page S-22…: 'However, parking supply is not considered to be a part of the permanent physical environment in San Francisco, as parking conditions are changeable. Parking deficits are considered to be social effects, rather than impacts on the physical environment as defined by CEQA. Therefore, that anticipated parking shortfall would be a less-than-significant effect' 'The EIR has triggered a Socio Economic study that has already been prepared, so why are parking deficits not being taken into account in this EIR? It seems inconsistent to state that parking is a social effect, and at the same time the City has done a Socio Economic report in connection with the EIR." (*M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

As explained on DEIR p. I-5, the Socioeconomics Impacts was prepared separately from, and not as part of, the EIR. In Section IV.A, Land Use, on p. 65, the DEIR explains that while economic or social effects of a project "shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment," pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15131(a), such economic or social effects may nevertheless "may be used to determine the significance of physical changes caused by the project," in accordance with CEQA Guidelines, Sec. 15131(b). In the analysis of the supply of land for PDR uses, the DEIR traces a sequence of effect from indirect physical changes in the City's building stock and in the potential to physically accommodate PDR uses, and concludes that the physical changes that would occur with implementation of the proposed project would be significant, under Option A and the No-Project scenario, because of the adverse social and economic effects that the physical changes would generate.

Concerning parking, the text quoted from the summary is a summary of the text on DEIR p. 266, where it is stated more fully,

> Parking deficits are considered to be social effects, rather than impacts on the physical environment as defined by CEQA. Under CEQA, a project's social impacts need not be treated as significant impacts on the environment. Environmental documents should, however, address the secondary physical impacts that could be triggered by a social impact. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15131(a).) The social inconvenience of parking deficits, such as having to hunt for scarce parking spaces, is not an environmental impact, but there may be secondary physical environmental impacts, such as increased traffic congestion at intersections, air quality impacts, safety impacts, or noise impacts caused by congestion. In the experience of San Francisco transportation planners, however, the absence of a ready supply of parking spaces, combined with available alternatives to auto travel (e.g., transit service, taxis, bicycles or travel by foot) and a relatively dense pattern of urban development, induces many drivers to seek and find alternative parking facilities, shift to other modes of travel, or change their overall travel habits. Any such resulting shifts to transit service in particular, would be in keeping with the City's "Transit First" policy. The City's Transit First Policy, established in the City's Charter Section 16.102 provides that "parking policies for areas well served by public transit shall be designed to encourage travel by public transportation and alternative transportation."

Therefore, the City has determined that parking impacts are not physical effects that must be analyzed under, for the reasons stated in the DEIR on p. 266.[24] Moreover, based on City policy, as outlined on DEIR p. 266, a potential shortage of parking does not rise to the level of importance that such an effect need be analyzed in an EIR.

Pedestrian Safety

Comment [T5]

"Pedestrians account for approximately half of the City's traffic deaths. In 2005, there were 699 non-fatal and 14 fatal pedestrian injuries. San Francisco's non-fatal pedestrian injury rate is among the highest of metropolitan areas nationally. The fatal injury rate is nearly twice the U.S. D.H.H.S. Healthy People 2010 national objective. The causes of vehicle-pedestrian collisions are largely environmental and can be prevented by careful planning. Traffic volume is a significant determinant of pedestrian collisions while severity of pedestrian injuries is largely determined by

[24] This interpretation of CEQA has been upheld by the California Court of Appeal in *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. San Francisco*, 102 Cal. App. 4th 656 (2002), which concerned the expansion of the Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Project to encompass the site of the former Emporium department store.

vehicle speed. We therefore advocate for measures in the Plan to limit traffic volumes and speeds in the Plan areas." *(Manish Champsee, Walk San Francisco)*

The DEIR attributes the City's higher than average rate of pedestrian injuries in accidents to the level of population pedestrian activity. However, the evidence, including evidence in the DEIR, does not support as much of a discrepancy as exists between the San Francisco and statewide injury rates. *(Rajiv Bhatia, M.D., Ph.D., San Francisco Department of Public Health)*

The DEIR should reference the 2003 "San Francisco PedSafe" report prepared by the San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic (now part of the Municipal Transportation Agency) and the Traffic Safety Center at UC Berkeley, including the pedestrian-safety countermeasures evaluated in the report as potential means to reduce pedestrian injuries. *(Rajiv Bhatia, M.D., Ph.D., San Francisco Department of Public Health; Manish Champsee, Walk San Francisco)* [T5]

Response

Concerning the discrepancy between San Francisco and California rates of pedestrian collisions, the DEIR states (p. 289), based on information provided by the Department of Public Health, that while pedestrian activity in San Francisco could be expected to account for 60 percent more collisions per resident, "the degree of pedestrian activity does not fully account for the high rate of collisions in parts of the City, particularly in the Eastern Neighborhoods." This statement is based on analysis of data from 68 California cities demonstrating that, as reported on DEIR p. 289, "the relative pedestrian injury rate can be estimated by the relationship that the number of pedestrian collisions increases at approximately 0.4 power of the number of people walking to work." While the DEIR does state that the relatively greater number of pedestrian collisions can be largely attributed to the fact that "there is much more pedestrian activity than most comparably-sized cities," it is noted that the report cited in the DEIR (footnote 121, p. 289) for the above-noted mathematical relationship between pedestrian collisions and walking to work relied upon the percentage of residents walking or bicycling to work as a surrogate for overall pedestrian activity. Further, a City that experiences "a 50 percent increase in its daytime population relative to its resident population due to an influx of commuters into its job centers" (DEIR, p. 299) could be anticipated to have a relatively greater number of pedestrian accidents than a city that does not share San Francisco's large daily in-migration of workers. It is noted that the overall conclusion of the study that identified a relationship between pedestrian collisions and walking to work is, "A motorist is less likely to collide with a person walking and bicycling if more people walk or bicycle. Policies that increase the numbers of people

walking and bicycling appear to be an effective route to improving the safety of people walking and bicycling."[25]

Concerning the *San Francisco PedSafe* report, this report was completed under a federal grant in December 2003 by the Department of Parking and Traffic and the Traffic Safety Center at UC Berkeley, with the intention of developing, implementing, and evaluating "the effectiveness of a comprehensive program to reduce pedestrian fatalities and other injuries."[26] The *PedSafe* report employed a methodology called zone analysis to identify higher-risk zones—based on high "injury density" (i.e. areas in which a large proportion of pedestrian injury collisions are concentrated in a relatively small geographic area or street segment), potential benefit from modest pedestrian-injury countermeasures, and the absence of other major pedestrian safety programs. The analysis reviewed more than 12,500 pedestrian-injury collisions that occurred between 1990 and 2001.

The *PedSafe* analysis identified 20 areas of the city, both street segments and geographic areas, that had high densities of pedestrian-injury collisions. Injuries were highly concentrated in (i) the greater downtown area and (ii) along major arterials in the rest of the City. The report identified a number of specific neighborhoods or planning areas as having relatively higher densities of pedestrian injuries, including several parts of the Eastern Neighborhoods project area: the northern portion of South-of-Market neighborhood (north of the I-80 freeway), and three sub-areas of the Mission, all of which had an "injury density" of 3.9 or greater, meaning that in each area, the percentage of the City's pedestrian-injury accidents that occurred in the area was at least 3.9 times its percentage of the City's land area. (For example the SoMa subarea accounted for 5.7% of the City's pedestrian injuries but less than 1 percent of the City's area, for an injury density rating of 6.2.) In *PedSafe* analysis, injury density appeared to be associated with pedestrian and traffic volumes. Vehicle speeds did not appear to be strongly related to injury density. The report selected seven areas for intensive evaluation, including the SoMa subarea (referred to in *PedSafe* as "SOMA West") and the North Mission, and identified a series of "countermeasures" for future implementation and evaluation as potential means of reducing pedestrian-injury collisions.

The Healthy People objectives noted by one commenter are taken from a U.S. Department of Health and Human Services program entitled "Healthy People 2010," which sets for a number of health indicators to measure progress against two overarching

25 Jacobsen, P.L., "Safety in Numbers: More Walkers and Bicyclists, Safer Walking and Bicycling." *Injury Prevention* 2003; 9: 205 – 209.

26 San Francisco Department of Parking and Traffic and University of California Traffic Safety Center, *Pedestrian Safety Engineering and Intelligent Transportation System-Based Countermeasures Program for Reduced Pedestrian Fatalities, Injuries, Conflicts and Other Surrogate Measures—SAN FRANCISCO PedSafe: Assessing and Deploying Innovative Means to Enhance Pedestrian Safety*. Phase I Final Report, December 15, 2003; p. 8. This report is available for review by appointment at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File no. 2004.0160E.

goals: helping individuals of all ages increase life expectancy and improve their quality of life, and eliminating health disparities among different segments of the population. The 2010 target for pedestrian roadway deaths is 1.0 per 100,000 population. In 1998, when the target was established, the national rate was 1.9 pedestrian accident deaths per 100,000 population, which is essentially the same as San Francisco's rate for 2005 (14 pedestrian deaths in a population of 757,000 is a rate of 1.85 per 100,000 population), whereas by 2001, the national rate had declined to 1.7 per 100,000 population.[27]

Comment [T6]

"The section on Pedestrian Impacts (page 290, paragraph 1) relates the projected increase in pedestrian collisions to the increase in residential population in the project area. WalkSF believes that the Plan should strive to eliminate vehicle-pedestrian collisions entirely and that all of the pedestrian safety elements in the mitigation measures should be captured in the Plan. The number of pedestrian injuries in the City is already alarming, so the Plan should remediate both the effects of projected residential growth and existing conditions."

"WalkSF advocates that in keeping with CEQA, San Francisco should adopt a standard for pedestrian safety—one that is significantly below the current rate of collisions in the Plan area—that sets a benchmark for reducing pedestrian injuries well below national levels. Subsequently, the number of pedestrian-vehicular collisions in the Plan area should be deemed a significant impact, and any increase in pedestrian collisions due to the implementation of the Plan, as is predicted in the DEIR, would be deemed a significant impact. By adopting these standards and implementing all feasible measures to attain them, we will be able to achieve the City's and WalkSF's goals of increasing pedestrian mode share. *(Manish Champsee, Walk San Francisco)*

"Comparing the proportional increase of pedestrian collisions to the proportional increase in population in the project area is potentially misleading. In the context of any hazardous environmental condition, changes in the incidence of an injury or illness are expected to change relative to the population exposed. Incidence may increase out of proportion with population if the new exposed population is more susceptible to the effects of the hazard than the existing population. These well-known relationships do not, however, make a condition less or more hazardous when increases in injury and population are similar. Given that vehicle-pedestrian collisions are not 'natural' events (and are therefore 100% preventable), evaluating net changes (i.e., the number of additional expected collisions) in pedestrian collisions is most appropriate from a public health perspective.

"Further, changes in population-based collision incidence over time are best evaluated at the City level. In the application of the Pedestrian Injury model to the Eastern Neighborhoods, the increase in collisions is proportionally greater than the increase in population at the city level, reflected in an estimated increase in the rate of pedestrian injuries from 104 to 106 collisions per 100,000 per year. Supporting data from the application of the pedestrian injury model is provided below. This

[27] U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, "Health People 2010: Midcourse Review." Reviewed on the internet at: http://www.healthypeople.gov/data/midcourse/html/default.htm#FocusAreas.

is a particularly salient issue in the evaluation of the Eastern Neighborhoods, as some of the most dangerous areas in the city for pedestrians are areas of the Eastern Neighborhoods (these conditions are further detailed in this section of the DEIR), with some census tracts with rates upwards of five times the city rate (as illustrated in the map on the previous page). Using these neighborhoods as their own standard to assess change in pedestrian injury rates accepts conditions resulting in high numbers and rates of pedestrian injury collisions as a standard—which is inconsistent with protecting the public's health.

"The relationship between pedestrian volume and injury risk reflected in 'safety in numbers' are already reflected in the DPH model and outcomes predicted by the DPH model do not require further adjustment for this phenomenon. Specifically, the outcomes already take into account non-linear relationships between pedestrian volume and pedestrian collisions by including pedestrian behavior variables in a multi-variate pedestrian injury model. Further adjustment of the outcomes would not be appropriate. The final parameters of the DPH pedestrian injury model include (log) traffic volume, population, land area, proportion of arterial streets, proportion of population without access to automobiles, and (log) proportion commuting via walking or public transit.

"Additionally, while there is demonstrated evidence of the effect of 'safety in numbers,' this effect is independent of land use and transportation system environmental mitigations to ensure safe environments for pedestrians." *(Rajiv Bhatia, M.D., Ph.D., San Francisco Department of Public Health)*

The DEIR shows that cumulative traffic conditions will increase pedestrian accidents and fatalities, with a 20 percent increase in pedestrian injury collisions. East SoMa's pedestrian injury collision rate is already four times the citywide rate. *(Chris Durazo, South of Market Community Action Network [SOMCAN])* [T13]

Response

The significance criterion used in the DEIR, as indicated on p. 267, is whether the project "would result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks, create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians, or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the site and adjoining areas." No quantitative criterion has been established relative to the number of accidents or injuries, although such a criterion could be adopted in accordance with the requirements of the San Francisco Administration Code Chapter 31 and California Public Resources Code Section 21082 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15067.4.

The DEIR discusses the Department of Public Health's Pedestrian Injury Model on pp. 288 – 291, and discusses pedestrian impacts generally on pp. 286 – 295. Following its initial review of the Pedestrian Injury Model, the Planning Department has concluded that the model is not necessarily an accurate predictor of the change in pedestrian accidents with injury. However, the Planning Department will continue to work with the

Department of Public Health to determine if a generally accepted quantitative methodology for the analysis of pedestrian injury can be developed.

Given the above, the DEIR concluded that the proposed project would not result in a significant effect with regard to pedestrian conditions.

Comment [T7]

"It is incumbent on the Plan to mitigate the conflict between projected growth in the number of pedestrians in the Plan area and existing dangerous conditions. Given that some census tracts in the Plan area currently feature rates of pedestrian injury collisions upwards of five times the city rate, WalkSF strongly recommends the Plan eliminate wide, one-way streets in favor of traffic-calmed two-way streets. We also ask that timed traffic signals be synchronized for speeds no higher than the residential speed limit of 25 mph." *(Manish Champsee, Walk San Francisco)*

Response

The comment is noted. The proposed Eastern Neighborhood Rezoning and Area Plans project does not include specific changes in the street network, such as conversion of one-way streets to two-way operation, but it does set the stage for consideration of such changes through policy language that call for considering changes to streets such as Second, Third, and Fourth Streets in East SoMa; Howard, Folsom, and Harrison Streets in East SoMa (and Western SoMa); Sixteenth, Folsom, and Guerrero Streets and Potrero and South Van Ness Avenues in the Mission; Potrero Avenue, Sixteenth and Eighteenth Streets in Showplace Square/Potrero Hill; Seventh and Eighth Streets in Showplace Square/Potrero Hill (and Western SoMa); and Sixteenth and Eighteenth Streets in the Central Waterfront. As is noted in the DEIR, specific physical improvements to the street network would require review under CEQA prior to implementation.

Comment [T8]

Regarding paragraph 3 on p. 290, "it is appropriate to also discuss collisions along a road facility and in an area in addition to collisions at an intersection. Pedestrian collisions do not happen exclusively or primarily at intersections. Intersection-level 'black spots' with high numbers of pedestrian injury collisions, often used by the traditional traffic engineering approach to identify high risk intersections and described in the DEIR, account for a relatively low proportion of the total number of pedestrian injury collisions. For example, the five intersections cited on p. 289 with 10 or more vehicle-pedestrian collisions from 2001-2005 accounted for a total of 57 collisions, less than 2% of the vehicle-pedestrian collisions in San Francisco during that period (n=3,765, based on data presented in the 2005 DPT report). Finally, there are area-level patterns of pedestrian injury collisions in San Francisco … that are predicted by environmental and demographic characteristics." *(Rajiv Bhatia, M.D., Ph.D., San Francisco Department of Public Health)*

Response

The comment is noted. The fact that five intersections account for fewer than 2 percent of all vehicle-pedestrian injury collisions does not necessarily indicate that most collisions occur at non-intersection locations, as there are thousands of intersections in San Francisco. Nevertheless, it is true that a sizable number of collisions occur at locations other than intersections. However, the *PedSafe* report discussed above, which examined nearly 4,800 pedestrian injury collisions over a five-year period in the City, found that most such collisions in which the motor vehicle driver was at fault (58 percent of all collisions) occurred at intersections (34.5 percent of all collisions, and 60 percent of driver-fault collisions, involved the driver failing to yield to a pedestrian in a crosswalk, while another 3 percent of all collisions involved red-light running). Other causes, such as unsafe speed (7 percent), unsafe starting or backing (4 percent), other hazardous movement (2 percent) and driver under the influence (2 percent) could have been, but were not necessarily, at intersections. Of pedestrian-fault collisions (41 percent of the total), most occurred away from intersections, with the two leading causes involving pedestrians in the roadway at mid-block locations (13 percent of all collisions, and 31 percent of pedestrian-fault collisions) and jaywalking between signalized intersections (9 percent of all collisions). The *PedSafe* study found that 21 intersections (three in each of seven zones studied intensively) accounted for 162 pedestrian-injury collisions, about 3.4 percent of the total number of collisions studied, indicating if nothing else that there is a wide distribution of such injury collisions by location.

Comment [T9]

Paragraph 4 on p. 287 "could note that areawide strategies to reduce vehicle volume, including traffic reduction strategies proposed as mitigations in the DEIR, also would have beneficial effects on pedestrian hazards." *(Rajiv Bhatia, M.D., Ph.D., San Francisco Department of Public Health)*

Response

The requested revision to the DEIR text is made on DEIR p. 288, following the third bullet, where the following is added as new text:

> In addition, strategies to reduce traffic volumes, including trip-reduction strategies proposed as mitigation measures in Chapter V, would be expected to have beneficial effects in regard to pedestrian hazards.

Comment [T10]

Concerning the Department of Public Health (DPH) Pedestrian Injury Model, it should be noted that DPH examined the number of workers in each census tract and found that this variable "did not significantly contribute to the model's predictive ability." *(Rajiv Bhatia, M.D., Ph.D., San Francisco Department of Public Health)*

Response

The comment is noted. The last partial paragraph on DEIR p. 288, continuing to p. 289, is revised as follows to reflect this comment (new text is double-underlined):

> San Francisco's relatively high rate of collisions may also be influenced by the increased exposure associated with a 50 percent increase in its daytime population relative to its resident population due to an influx of commuters into its job centers, although the injury model identified no statistically significant correlation between injuries and the number of workers per census tract.

Rail Crossings

Comment [T11]

Development adjacent to or near rail corridors should be planned and undertaken with the safety of the rail corridor in mind, because development may increase traffic crossing both Caltrain and Muni light rail at-grade rights-of-way. Safety factors to consider include, but are not limited to, the planning for grade separations for major thoroughfares, improvements to existing at-grade highway-rail crossings, and fencing to limit trespassing. New driveways should be located as far as possible from at-grade rail crossings. In addition, new development should pay its fair share for rail safety mitigations improvements, and every project adjacent to the rail corridor should be required to install vandal-resistant fencing to prevent trespassing. School expansions where children must cross the tracks should provide for pedestrian improvements at rail crossings, *(Kevin Boles, California Public Utilities Commission)*

Response

Excluding Muni light-rail operations, there is only one at-grade rail crossing in the project area—on 16th Street where it passes beneath the elevated Interstate 280 freeway (near the intersection of 16th, Seventh, and Mississippi Streets). At this location, Caltrain railroad tracks cross 16th Street after emerging from a tunnel beneath Potrero Hill. Other than this location, Caltrain tracks are in a separate right-of-way and do not intersect City streets. Because of the presence of the freeway overhead, grade separation at this location would be difficult to achieve. However, in connection with development in the adjacent Mission Bay (South) Redevelopment Area, the City recently added a traffic signal at the intersection of 16th, Seventh, and Mississippi Streets, which was previously controlled only by stop signs. Because this is the only at-grade "heavy rail" crossing in the project area, and because of the traffic signal, no substantial adverse safety effect is anticipated due to increased traffic at this location. The April 2008 draft for adoption Showplace Square Plan, in the text that accompanies Objective 4.1, recognizes the increasing desirability, moving forward, of eliminating the at-grade Caltrain crossing. The plan states, "Doing so would improve transit function and increase accessibility for all modes

including pedestrians and bicyclists. However, this would be a very expensive project, best implemented as part of plans for future California High Speed Rail."[28]

In terms of Muni Metro service on the T-Third line, the Planning Department and the Municipal Transportation Agency (including Muni and the Department of Parking and Traffic) currently review transit-related effects, including potential auto-transit vehicle conflicts, as part of the environmental review process for new projects, and this review would continue. It is anticipated that such CEQA review, along with Planning and Department of Building Inspection plan review, would ensure that adequate safety features are incorporated into development near Muni Metro tracks, including avoidance of new driveways proximate to rail tracks that could create safety issues.

Comment [T12]

"Many of the transportation policies and mitigation measures in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans that are directed at reducing the number of vehicle trips in the project area would also significantly help to reduce vehicle-pedestrian collisions. WalkSF supports the Plan's use of traffic calming, implementation of the Better Streets Plan, parking pricing policies, congestion pricing, and transportation impact fees to combat increasing vehicle-pedestrian collisions. WalkSF encourages the implementation of these measures to the greatest extent feasible. In light of the recent four pedestrian fatalities in the City and this year's 23 pedestrian fatalities to date, compared to 13 last year, it is imperative that the City take much more aggressive steps to safeguard pedestrians." *(Manish Champsee, Walk San Francisco)*

Response

This comment, in support of aspects of the proposed Eastern Neighborhood Rezoning and Area Plans, is noted, and no response in required.

Noise

Comment [N1]

East SoMa's noise levels range from higher than 70 dBA near the freeway ramps to virtually no area falling below 60 dBA. Constant exposure to these high levels of sound are debilitating, resulting in chronic health problems, such as heart disease and hypertension and the loss of hearing and cognitive skills. *(Chris Durazo, South of Market Community Action Network [SOMCAN])*

[28] It is noted that the Transportation analysis in the Supplemental EIR for the Mission Bay project includes the following language: "A fence is proposed to be constructed adjacent to Seventh Street contiguous with the rail right-of-way between King Street and Mariposa Street to provide for pedestrian safety. There would be signalized, controlled crossings of the tracks along Seven Street at Berry Street, at the intersection of The Common and at 16th Street" (Mission Bay SEIR, Case No. 96.771E, Final SEIR certified September 17, 1998; p. V.E.104).

Response

The comment is noted. The DEIR discusses existing and projected future noise levels in Section IV.F, Noise. Noise levels are compared to San Francisco noise guidelines and potential noise compatibility problems are identified for the project area in general and also by neighborhood. Mitigation Measures F-3 through F-6 on DEIR pp. 508 – 509 would reduce identified potential noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Comment [N2]

"Mitigation F-5 would benefit from more explicit description of the threshold for the required analysis. The current threshold, 'noise levels in excess of ambient noise,' is potentially subject to varying interpretations because it does not specify the time frames of noise measurement. For example, a noise generating use that produces levels of noise sufficient to disturb sleep at night may not generate sufficient noise to trigger this mitigation requirement if comparisons are made with regards to 24 hour averages. We suggest the following revision to make this mitigation more effective: '…noise levels in excess of ambient noise, either short term, at nighttime, or as a 24-hour average.'" *(Rajiv Bhatia, M.D., Ph.D., San Francisco Department of Public Health)*

Response

The requested change has been made to Mitigation Measure F-5, as is indicated in Section D of this Comments and Responses document.

Comment [N3]

"Mitigation F-3, F-4, F-5, and F-6, if implemented, would be effective steps to reduce noise exposure. We suggest that Mitigation F-3 explicitly require the acoustical analysis triggered by ambient noise threshold to be conducted by licensed acoustic engineer to be consistent with mitigations F-4 and F-5." *(Rajiv Bhatia, M.D., Ph.D., San Francisco Department of Public Health)*

Response

To achieve consistency with Mitigation Measures F-4, F-5, and F-6, Mitigation Measure F-3 (DEIR p. 508 and p. S-41 in the Summary) is revised as follows (new text is double-underlined; deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~):

> For new development including noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn), as shown in Figure 18, where such development is not already subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the project sponsor shall conduct a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements. Such analysis shall be conducted by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering. Noise insulation features identified and recommended by the analysis shall be included in the design, as specified in the San Francisco General Plan Land Use

Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise to reduce potential interior noise levels to the maximum extent feasible.

Comment [N4]

The DEIR does not discuss potential noise effects of a proposed helipad at San Francisco General Hospital. *(Leora Vestel, Rolph Playground Neighbors)*

Response

The proposed helipad at San Francisco General Hospital is the subject of a separate project-specific EIR that is currently being prepared by the Planning Department. Such a project is more properly analyzed in a site-specific, project-specific document than in a plan-level programmatic EIR such as the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR. Single-event noise, from activities such as periodic emergency medical helicopter flights, cannot adequately be captured in a cumulative area-wide noise analysis that is appropriate for, and included in, the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR. It is noted that the DEIR includes Mitigation Measure E-5, which calls for site-specific analysis of "new development including commercial, industrial or other uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise in the proposed project site vicinity." While this measure primarily intended to address new development in proximity to residences and other sensitive uses, it is also the case that the ongoing project-specific environmental review of the proposed San Francisco General helipad would implement this measure.

Comment [N5]

"S.23: What are the current Title 24 noise requirements and how to they compare to the current conditions?" *(M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association)*

Response

As stated on DEIR p. S-23 and explained further on p. 309, the California Noise Insulation Standards are found in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. "For limiting noise from exterior sources, the noise insulation standards set forth an interior standard of 45 dBA (Ldn) in any habitable room and, where such units are proposed in areas subject to noise levels greater than 60 dBA (Ldn), demonstration of how dwelling units have been designed to meet this interior standard. If the interior noise level depends upon windows being closed, the design for the structure must also specify a ventilation or air-conditioning system to provide a habitable interior environment" (DEIR pp. 309 – 310). In areas with exterior noise levels up to 60 dBA (Ldn), normal conventional construction in new development is typically sufficient to achieve an interior noise level of 45 dBA (Ldn) and no special noise insulation is required. In areas with exterior noise levels up to 70 dBA (Ldn), conventional construction in new development but with a

ventilation or air-conditioning system is normally sufficient to achieve an interior noise level of 45 dBA (Ldn). Where noise levels exceed 70 dBA (Ldn), new construction should only proceed after a detailed analysis of noise reductions requirements is made and needed noise insulation features are included in the design. It is safe to assume that at least some older dwelling units in the project area, as well as elsewhere in San Francisco and, indeed, throughout the state, do not meet current Title 24 noise standards. Because the standards apply to new dwelling units, this does not imply a violation of the standards, although it may mean that some residents of noisier neighborhoods are subject to greater noise levels than considered acceptable by the State of California.

Comment [N6]

"Page S-25: Residential Development Summary – 'Moreover, the interior noise protections required by Title 24 will not protect the entire population from the health effects (e.g. sleep disturbance) of short-term exceedances of ambient noise levels, because Title 24 standards are based on 24-hour noise levels and short-term noise sources often have little effect on these day-night average noise levels.' Explain the incremental amount of health effect, such as sleep disturbance, that would occur in addition to existing levels from the implementation of the re-zoning, because the existing statement only reflects that the all San Franciscans generally are subject to health effects of noise on a day-to-day basis under existing conditions. This text should also contain a statement that PDR will increase noise levels and also a statement that, because PDR may include some high-tech businesses that may not generate any noise, the fact is that the health effects may not reach the kind of levels that are mentioned in the studies attached this EIR." *(M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association)*

Response

It is not readily feasible to quantify or otherwise describe in detail the effect of existing noise levels in an area as large as the Eastern Neighborhoods project area. (Baseline information on existing traffic-generated noise levels, depicted in DEIR Figures 17 and 18, pp. 306 and 307, is based on modeling conducted by the Department of Public Health.) Additional information regarding health effects, generally, can be found in the main body of the DEIR text on pp. 304 – 305.

The DEIR describes potential noise effects related to the compatibility of future development with future noise levels on DEIR pp. 316 – 322, and identifies mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measure F-3 would require that residential development not subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards would undergo appropriate noise analysis prior to approval and construction, thereby avoiding the potential significant impact of exposure to noise levels in excess of *General Plan* recommendations. Mitigation Measure F-4 would reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors by requiring

evaluation of the noise environment around any site where a noise-sensitive use is proposed, in advance of the first approval of such use. Mitigation Measure F-5 would similarly reduce potential conflicts between new noise-generating uses and existing noise-sensitive uses. Finally, Mitigation Measure F-6 would reduce, to the extent feasible, noise impacts associated with open space areas of residential units and other noise-sensitive uses.

Comment [N7]

"Page S-26: Please provide noise studies which support the idea that light, medium, or heavy industry or high-tech PDR uses would have to be as far as 1,000 ft. from residential units in order to reduce noise to a less than significant impact, given the fact that technology exists to mitigate noise impacts almost completely. Noise mitigation has been done throughout the South of Market Area including night clubs that have been made to provide noise insulation next to housing, such as at the housing project next to the club known as 1050 Folsom."

"Page S-26: Explain why there cannot be noise mitigation measures used on Residential and PDR projects that are constructed within 1,000 ft. of industrial businesses." *(M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association)*

Response

Although referring to a page in the DEIR summary that discusses air quality and parks, the comments incorrectly suggest that the DEIR includes mitigation that would require a specific physical separation between certain uses to mitigate noise impacts. Instead, the DEIR includes such mitigation for potential air quality impacts: Mitigation Measure G-3 would require that certain new development (e.g., warehousing and distribution centers) that would generate substantial truck traffic (100 trucks per day or 40 refrigerated trucks per day) to be located no less than 1,000 feet from residential units and other sensitive receptors to reduce potential exposure to diesel particulate emissions. As discussed in the previous response, mitigation measures for noise impacts would require evaluation of potential noise conflicts and appropriate insulation for indoor noise levels, but no specific physical separation.

Air Quality

Traffic-Generated Particulate Emissions

Comment [AQ1]

"We support the inclusion of Mitigation G-2 which aims to mitigate land use-air quality conflicts due to roadway related air-quality health effects. However, as written, we are concerned that Mitigation G-2 would not consistently prevent adverse environmental health impacts related to non-diesel mobile source emissions because the mitigation is triggered only by analysis of diesel

particulate matter (DPM). Based on the best available scientific evidence, diesel particulate matter is not the appropriate environmental measure for the health relevant exposures from roadway proximity. Changing the exposure trigger from DPM to an equivalent but more general exposure signal for roadway related health impacts (e.g., modeled PM 2.5 or Oxides of Nitrogen) is both achievable and necessary to ensure Mitigation G-2 is effective with regards to its intent. We provide the following detailed rationale to support this change.

"a. All motor vehicles, not exclusively diesel vehicles, are the important exposure sources with regards to roadway proximity health impacts. As stated in the DEIR on p.333, "…it is not possible at this time to attribute roadway related health effects to a single type of roadway, vehicle, or type of fuel." In children, exposures to PM 2.5 and nitrogen dioxide are correlated with roadway proximity and adverse health outcomes such as asthma prevalence, asthma symptoms and hospitalization, and impaired lung growth.

"b. Diesel exhaust, while important as a toxic air contaminant and carcinogen, represents a variable fraction of roadway air pollutant emissions and the relationship between diesel particulate matter and total fine particulate matter cannot be assumed to be described by the 15% fixed fraction cited by the DEIR. According to the reference cited, the 15% figure represents diesel as a fraction of PM 2.5 mobile source at the citywide level based on source apportionment estimates from several western cities (not including San Francisco). There is a large degree of regional variation in the share of road traffic represented by diesel trucks and vehicles. For example, in Oakland, trucks represent about 10% of the daily vehicle volume along I-880 while in San Francisco along US 101, trucks compromise 1-2% of vehicle volume. Within the City of San Francisco, some streets will have higher and lower shares of diesel vehicles as well.

"c. Furthermore, as described in the DEIR on page 336, stricter regulatory controls aim to reduce diesel exposure by 85% by 2020, meaning that the fraction of PM attributed to diesel engines relative to gasoline engines will likely decline significantly and rapidly in the medium term. Over time, exposure assessment based on DPM as a fixed fraction of total PM will tend to underestimate total PM exposure.

"d. As stated in the DEIR on page 335, there are no standard tools designed specifically for measuring or modeling diesel particulate matter. The analysis of DPM exposure in the Rincon Hill Plan EIR, cited in the DEIR, used a modeling tool designed to predict particulate matter and estimated Diesel PM exposure based on emission factors for certain diesel vehicles

"e. Both PM2.5 and Oxides of Nitrogen provides signals for near source motor vehicle exhaust emissions and thus would be more appropriate measures for evaluating land use-roadway conflicts. Standard modeling tools, such as, EMFAC 2007, CALINE 4 and CAL3QHCR dispersion models exist to assess human exposures PM 2.5 and NOx associated with traffic.

"We would like to ensure that the exposure analysis requirements in Mitigation G-2 be triggered where daily cumulative traffic volume is >100,000 within a 500 feet radius of a potential project.

As written, the screening trigger in the first sentence of mitigation G-2 might be interpreted so as to not consider such cumulative traffic conditions and only consider proximity to a high volume roadway. We recommend the screening trigger for analysis be revised to be "…or locations where daily cumulative traffic volumes of 100,000 exist within 500 feet radius or where proximity to traffic volume and vehicle type results in an equivalent exposure." This change is necessary to ensure an effective, consistently interpretable mitigation requirement.

"Based on the DEIR we understand that the exposure threshold for required ventilation mitigation has been set to be equivalent to 0.2 ug /m3 PM 2.5 in Mitigation G-2. This exposure threshold corresponds to an approximately 0.3% increase in non-injury mortality or an increase of approximate twenty excess deaths per 1,000,000 populations per year, based on a recent study by Michael Jerrett and colleagues in Los Angeles. We do believe this is a reasonable threshold for requiring health protective action in an urban area such as San Francisco; however, we also want to recognize that we would prefer that such a threshold be ultimately reviewed through an open public process, and that it may be reasonable to adjust such a threshold in either direction to take into account sensitive populations and competing environmental health interests."

"**Section on Roadway Related Health Effects, P. 356.** Trigger levels for minimizing adverse effects due to PM 2.5 can not be assumed to be similar to those for avoiding diesel particulate matter exposure because the relationship between DPM and PM 2.5 varies from road to road within the region and within the project area and will vary significantly over the timeframe of the project's implementation as a result of diesel engine regulations. A detailed rational for using a more general surrogate exposure measure for roadway related health effects is provided in the comments on Mitigation G-2 above." *(Rajiv Bhatia, MD, Ph.D., San Francisco Department of Public Health)*

Response

Revisions recommended by the commenter have been incorporated into the EIR as presented in Section D of this Comments and Responses document. Please see that section for the revisions to DEIR p. 351, pp. 352 – 356, p. 508, and p. 511.

It is noted that, on May 22, 2008, the California Air Resources Board (ARB) released a draft staff report entitled, "Methodology for Estimating Premature Deaths Associated with Long-term Exposures to Fine Airborne Particulate Matter in California."[29] The ARB report identifies a "relative risk factor" of a 10 percent increase in premature death per 10 micrograms per cubic meter increase in $PM_{2.5}$ exposures. Although somewhat different than the 14 percent increase in premature death per 10 micrograms per cubic meter increase in $PM_{2.5}$ concentration put forth by the Department of Public Health, the two relative risk values are of the same order of magnitude, and tend to support one another.

[29] This report is available for review by appointment at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2004.0160E. It is also available on the internet at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/health/pm-mort/pm-mortdraft.pdf.

Comment [AQ2]

"**Section on Environmental Setting.** We recommend the following data from the San Francisco Electric Reliability Project Focused Particulate Monitoring Study be included in the section on environmental setting. This study provides relevant high-quality long term monitoring data descriptive of the area variation in particulate matter in the project area. The San Francisco Electric Reliability Project Focused Particulate Monitoring Study aimed to compare the air quality measurements for PM 10 and PM 2.5 from several community stations with the measurements from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (Bay Area AQMD) permanent monitoring station at Arkansas Street and determine whether the Arkansas Street station is collecting data that is representative of community exposure. Monitoring started in early July 2005 and continued through late March 2006. Monitoring took place at two locations in Bayview/Hunters Point and two locations in Potrero at sites were chosen to be representative of community exposures. The study also monitored at the Bay Area AQMD's Arkansas Street monitoring station so that we could directly compare the Bay Area AQMD's measurements with those from our program. Monitoring demonstrated that particulate matter measures (as an annual average) ranged from 16.9 to 20 ug / m3 for PM10 and from 7.6 to 9.3 ug/m3 for PM2.5. In general, lower levels correlated with areas with predominant residential uses." *(Rajiv Bhatia, MD, Ph.D., San Francisco Department of Public Health)*

"**Section on Diesel Particulate Matter P. 335.** The last paragraph incorrectly attributes the particulate matter study San Francisco Electricity Reliability Project to SFDPH and incorrectly describes this study as a short term study using portable monitoring equipment. The SFDPH efforts did occur but we have not published or reported the results because of their inconclusive nature. The SFERP effort is a long term monitoring effort and should be considered a reliable source of within city variation of particulate matter exposure. The SFERP study, however, did not measure diesel particulate matter, and we suggest the results of this study be presented in a different section of the DEIR." *(Rajiv Bhatia, MD, Ph.D., San Francisco Department of Public Health)*

Response

To add a reference to the San Francisco Electric Reliability Project monitoring results, the following is added as a new paragraph at the end of DEIR p. 325:

> Results of particulate monitoring in the Eastern Neighborhoods conducted for the City in connection with the San Francisco Electric Reliability Project are discussed on pp. 335 – 336.

Additionally, to correct the reference to the above-noted monitoring results, the last (partial) paragraph on DEIR p. 335, continuing to p. 336, and the first full paragraph on DEIR p. 336, are revised as follows (new text is double-underlined; deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~):

> The inconclusive nature of the above monitoring study is consistent with recent micro-environmental air quality assessments of particulate matter

in the Eastern Neighborhoods conducted by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) ~~Department of Public Health (DPH)~~ using portable particulate matter measurement devices. This ~~DPH~~ second monitoring study was undertaken for the City in connection with the San Francisco Electric Reliability Project, a proposal for a new power plant in the Central Waterfront that is anticipated to result in eventual closure of the existing Potrero Power Plant. It aimed to compare the air quality measurements for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ from several community stations with the measurements from the BAAQMD's permanent monitoring station at Arkansas Street (near Showplace Square) and determine whether the Arkansas Street station is collecting data that is representative of community exposure. Monitoring began in early July 2005 and continued through late March 2006. Monitoring took place at two locations in Bayview/Hunters Point and two locations in the Central Waterfront at sites that were chosen to be representative of community exposures. Monitoring demonstrated that particulate matter measures (as an annual average) ranged from 16.9 to 20 micrograms per cubic meter for PM_{10} and from 7.6 to 9.3 micrograms per cubic meter for $PM_{2.5}$. As noted in Table 45, the state standard for annual average $PM_{2.5}$ concentration is 12 micrograms per cubic meter; the comparable standard for PM_{10} is 20 micrograms per cubic meter.

According to the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH), these findings indicate ~~relatively high~~ statistically significant and health-relevant variations in fine particulate matter levels in the Eastern Neighborhoods irrespective of freeway proximity. (However, the results do not exceed state standards.) DPH attributes such results to factors such as (1) heavily trafficked urban roadways, (2) "urban canyon" effects,[footnote in original] and (3) variations in seasons and weather.

Comment [AQ3]

"**Section on Sensitive Receptors P.331.** While recreational uses do subject persons to ambient air, the DEIR should note that exposure durations for these uses are much less than for school, work, or home environments." *(Rajiv Bhatia, MD, Ph.D., San Francisco Department of Public Health)*

Response

The following is added as a parenthetical statement following the first sentence in the first full paragraph on DEIR p. 331:

> (Exposure duration, and therefore overall exposure, at recreational uses is typically much shorter than for the other uses noted, but children are frequent users.)

Comment [AQ4]

The DEIR's conclusions regarding particulate emissions from freeway traffic do not preclude new residential development near freeways. *(Gregg Miller, Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman)*

Response

The comment is noted. The DEIR identifies potential air quality impacts from residential development adjacent to freeways and other high-volume roadways on pp. 352 – 356. Mitigation Measure G-2, on DEIR p. 511 (as amended in this Comments and Responses document) would reduce the potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Greenhouse Gases

Comment [AQ5]

The DEIR mentions climate change and sea level rise in the Environmental Settings and Impact chapter, particularly in the Air Quality section. Although much of the shoreline in the project area is hardened and not currently subject to flooding, the DEIR should discuss potential impacts on shoreline development and existing and future public access to the Bay in the project area that may occur as a result of sea level rise." *(Sahrye Cohen, Bay Conservation and Development Commission)*

Response

Maps published in 2007 by the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC; represented by the commenter) indicate that, with a potential sea level rise of 3 feet—generally accepted as the higher bound of the range of anticipated rise in sea level by 2100 due to global warming—areas of San Francisco along the Bay shoreline could be inundated. In the Eastern Neighborhoods, these areas are limited to relatively small portions of the Central Waterfront, including parts of the Pier 70 complex and small areas at Pier 80 and adjacent to Islais Creek. Other areas anticipated to be flooded by a 3-foot rise in sea level are portions of Mission Bay on either side of the Mission Creek channel, parts of the shoreline between Piers 90 and 96 and Heron's Head Park (former Pier 98), and parts of the former Hunters Point shipyard and the Candlestick Park parking lot, along with an area at Crissy Field in the Presidio.[30] The areas of potential inundation indicated on the BCDC maps are relatively small and, in and of itself, such inundation would not substantially affect, in a direct manner, either shoreline development or access to the Bay shoreline. However, growing evidence indicates, as described in the DEIR on pp. 329 – 330, that continued emissions of greenhouse gases and the associated increase in global warming can be expected to have serious consequences for San Francisco, the Bay Area, California, and beyond.

[30] Bay Conservation and Development Commission, "San Francisco Bay Scenarios for Sea Level Rise: San Francisco," 2007. Available on the internet at: http://www.bcdc.ca.gov/index.php?cat=56.

Apart from the potential for sea level rise, San Francisco does not currently participate in the National Flood Insurance Program, administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). However, in September 2007, after publication of the DEIR, FEMA issued a series of preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) and the City is currently considering whether to join the federal flood insurance program, which would provide for homeowners in flood-prone areas (including both areas subject to coastal flooding and areas subject to flooding from stormwater overflowing from the combined sewer-storm drain system) to purchase federally backed flood insurance. The Office of the City Administrator is coordinating City review of the preliminary FIRMs, and the Board of Supervisors is expected to consider joining the flood insurance program in 2008. If the City were to join the flood insurance program, it would have to adopt a Floodplain Management Ordinance that would require that structures in Special Flood Hazard Areas be protected against flood damage at the time of initial construction. The ordinance would also prohibit uses that would increase flood hazards. In general, the first floor of structures in flood zones must be constructed above the base flood elevation or flood-proofed. The Floodplain Management Ordinance could provide for variances for exceptional circumstances, including historic preservation and extraordinary hardship.[31]

Other

Comment [AQ6]

"Page S-26: Clarify what the initials D.P.M., G.H.G., and T.A.C. mean." *(M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association)*

Response

The three abbreviations, each of which abbreviations is defined in the main body of the DEIR text (on pages 334, 329 and 326), stand for "diesel particulate matter," "greenhouse gases," "and "toxic air contaminants," respectively.

Comment [AQ7]

"Page S-26: Define 'sensitive receptor.'" *(M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association)*

Response

As stated in the main body of the DEIR text on p. 331, "Land uses such as schools, children's day care centers, parks and playgrounds, hospitals, and nursing and convalescent homes are considered to be more sensitive than the general public to poor

[31] Office of the City Administrator, "National Flood Insurance Program Fact Sheet," October 22, 2007. Available on the internet at: http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/risk_management/factsheet.pdf.

air quality because the population groups associated with these uses have increased susceptibility to respiratory distress."

Parks, Recreation and Open Space

Existing Parks and Open Space

Comment [R1]

"The report fails to examine the state of the existing facilities that are already frequently below standard." Several parks and their service areas included in the DEIR examination of existing recreational resources do not effectively serve the neighborhoods in or near which they are located. The commenters cite issues with limited, restricted or extensive programming; safety and perception of safety; accessibility and perception of accessibility due to existing freeways, industrial areas or topography; and existing need for capital improvements. In particular, East SoMa is not adequately served by Yerba Buena Gardens (extensive event programming, use by convention-goers at Moscone Center, and use restrictions), South Beach Park (limited programming due to location and Public Trust restrictions), or South Park and South of Market Recreation Center (in need of capital improvements); the Mission is not adequately served by McKinley Square (separated by the U.S. 101 freeway), Franklin Square (considered unsafe), or Bernal Hill Park (topographically isolated). Showplace Square/Potrero Hill is not adequately served by Jackson Playground (devoted primarily to softball); McKinley Square (hilltop location limits access and is need of improvements), Potrero Hill Playground (streets and topography limit access), or Potrero del Sol Park (across the U.S. 101 freeway); the Central Waterfront is not adequately served by Warm Water Cove Park (isolated and considered unsafe) or Tulare Park (trash- and vandal-infested). Moreover, parks in the Mission Bay Redevelopment Area "will barely serve the 6,000 residential units which are being built in Mission Bay, and will not relieve the lack of useable public open space in the Central Waterfront, Showplace Square/Potrero or East SoMa neighborhoods." The commenters request the DEIR be amended to include corrections to the "existing inventory." *(Isabel Wade, PhD., and Corinne W. Woods, Neighborhood Parks Council)*

The DEIR does not contain sufficient acknowledgment of existing shortfalls in park area. The DEIR contains errors in its inventory of parks. *(Meredith Thomas, Neighborhood Parks Council)*

Response

The Recreation and Open Space Element of the *General Plan* states that a wide variety of open spaces act as neighborhood serving sites. These include sites that may accommodate any age range of user groups and sites that may contain playground areas playfields and/or athletic facilities. Neighborhood serving sites also include some squares, plazas, hilltop and shoreline open spaces. These areas, which serve to provide a wide choice in recreational activities, are considered a vital part of San Francisco's recreation and open space system. Therefore, in accordance with the *General Plan,* all publicly accessible

open spaces with service areas in the project area are included in the DEIR Open Space and Facilities inventory and are considered existing recreational resources.

The *General Plan* also identifies a publicly accessible park land's ability to serve a neighborhood by its size and location. As is stated in footnote 178 on p. 364 of the DEIR, "The Recreation and Open Space Element of the *General Plan* establishes open space services area as "acceptable walking distance" from a recreational resource boundary. They are defined by varying radii from a park's edge depending on the size and type of open space as well as the surrounding topography. These are ½ mile (approximate ten minute walk) for city-serving open spaces, 3/8 mile (seven and a half minute walk) for district-serving open spaces, ¼ mile (five minute walk) for neighborhood-serving open spaces and 1/8 mile for subneighborhood-serving open spaces."

As stated in the *General Plan,* the DEIR and by the commenter, access to these sites is critical to their usability. Measures to improve sidewalk deficiencies and pedestrian infrastructure are included as part of the proposed Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans project. The draft area plans promote walking and bicycle use through policies calling for more bicycle parking, alleys to break up large developments and to allow for pedestrian access, improvement of bicycle routes and connections, promoting active building streetfronts to encourage pedestrian activity, and introduction of traffic-calming measures. Other policies call for consideration and evaluation of specific improvements that could be undertaken in the future, such as installing mid-block crosswalks on long South-of-Market blocks; physical improvements to certain streets that might include converting one-way traffic to two-way flow to slow vehicular traffic and provide for safer and more attractive bicycle and pedestrian travel; and potential additional bicycle lanes.[32] The draft area plans contain urban design policies designed to improve neighborhood walkability including measures to soften the otherwise uninviting character of areas underneath freeway overpasses. Together these measures would enhance the actual and perceived accessibility to existing recreational resources.

The commenters' legitimate concerns regarding park programming, safety, accessibility, and existing physical condition notwithstanding, it would be inappropriate to discount the availability and usability of the large number of parks and open spaces cited by the commenters.

Concerning "existing shortfalls in park area" alleged by one commenter, the DEIR clearly identifies the fact that each of the four subareas is identified by the Recreation and Park Department as having deficiencies in parkland, at least within certain specific locales. For example, on p. 366, the DEIR states that, according to a "gap analysis"

[32] Some of these physical improvements would be required to undergo separate environmental review under CEQA prior to implementation.

conducted for the 2006 Recreation and Park Acquisition Policy, East SoMa requires additional facilities and open space, with an underserved area "north of Bryant Street from approximately Beale Street to approximately Fifth Street" (although the gap analysis did not consider Yerba Buena Gardens, a Redevelopment Agency property). On p. 368, the DEIR notes that the gap analysis identified deficiencies within the Mission, particularly north of 15th Street between Guerrero and Folsom Streets, as well as in an area between Alabama and Hampshire Streets along 23rd Street and an area between Guerrero Street and South Van Ness Avenue and 22nd and 25th Streets. Showplace Square/Potrero Hill is relatively well served, according to the gap analysis, except in the northern portion in the neighborhood between U.S. 101, 15th, Channel, and Seventh Streets (DEIR p. 368). And, as described on DEIR p. 369, the Central Waterfront has the smallest amount of park area and the greatest geographic extent of the underserved areas, including most of the southern edge of the neighborhood and most the eastern area of the Central Waterfront (although large portions of this area near the Bay are inaccessible because of Port and other industrial activities).

Regarding the open space and facilities inventory, footnote number 177 on DEIR p. 364 reads, "The majority of the park and open space acreages in this Section were taken from Green Envy: Achieving Equity in Open Space published in December of 2003 by the Neighborhood Parks Council and cross-checked with the Recreation and Parks Department: http://www.sfneighborhoodparks.org/publications/greenenvy.html. Other sources of acreages include the Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan and various project status reports published by the Recreation and Park Department: http://www.sfgov.org/site/recpark_index.asp." More specific information from the commenter would be needed to address noted errors in the inventory.

Comment [R2]

"The DEIR fails to convincingly support the following statement, 'More important than raw acreage is accessibility and whether the facility provides needed services to the population in question.'" (DEIR p. 372) *(Isabel Wade, PhD., and Corinne W. Woods, Neighborhood Parks Council)*

Response

An analysis considering citywide acreage of parkland in isolation of location would neglect the more specific needs of Eastern Neighborhoods residents. The statement above (which on DEIR p. 372 qualifies "accessibility" with the terms "location" and "walking distance") is not intended to disregard the importance of park size to the analysis but rather to highlight the need to consider location and walking distance in conjunction with citywide acreage. This idea is supported in the National Recreation and Park

Association's 1996 *Park, Recreation, Open Space and Greenway Guidelines*[33] as well as in the Open Space Element of the *General Plan.* As discussed on DEIR p. 364 and listed on DEIR p. 96, policies within the Recreation and Open Space Element of the *General Plan* confirm accessibility as a key factor in park utilization and establish the need for equitable distribution of these resources.

Comment [R3]

"Assuming that residents of eastern neighborhoods should and do use the larger spaces in the west and south, is a flawed assumption." *(Isabel Wade, PhD., and Corinne W. Woods, Neighborhood Parks Council)*

Response

No city-serving open space exists in or is planned for the project area. However, for reasons described in response to Comment R1 and on DEIR p. 373, city-serving parks and open spaces are considered to serve the entire population of San Francisco and need not be located within a project area to function as a destination available for residents in the Eastern Neighborhoods. The analysis in the Parks, Recreation and Opens Space section of the DEIR does not include a survey or assumption of specific recreational use patterns of existing Eastern Neighborhoods residents.

Project Impacts

Comment [R4]

The commenter seeks clarification regarding the underlying analysis used to support the determination that project would not generate an accelerated deterioration of existing recreational resources and the conclusion that the proposed rezoning options would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an effect on the environment. *(Dawn Kamalanathan, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department)*

"The Neighborhood Parks Council disputes the conclusions of the draft Environmental Impact Report on the eastern neighborhoods in regards to open space. … Open Space deficiency in the eastern neighborhoods has only become more pronounced in recent years since the General Plan Open Space Element identified these areas as 'high need,' due to the extensive residential 'live-work' development in industrial areas with no corresponding requirement for public open space. A projected tripling of residential density in the Eastern Neighborhoods will result in complete overuse of existing spaces. Furthermore, projects already in the planning, design or conception phases will add approximately 3,000 residential units in Showplace Square and the Central Waterfront alone, even before rezoning." *(Isabel Wade, PhD., and Corinne W. Woods, Neighborhood Parks Council)*

[33] National Recreation and Park Association and the American Academy for Park and Recreation Administration. *Park, Recreation, Open Space and Greenway Guideline*, 1996.

"The DEIR fails to convincingly support the statement, 'The need for parks and open space is currently met under existing conditions and would continue to be met under each of the three rezoning options.'" (DEIR p. S-27) *(Isabel Wade, PhD., and Corinne W. Woods, Neighborhood Parks Council)*

Increased use of existing parks will lead to degradation of those facilities. *(Meredith Thomas, Neighborhood Parks Council)*

"We agree with the position of the SF Neighborhood Parks [Council] that not enough land is designated in the plan for parks/open space." *(Leora Vestel, Rolph Playground Neighbors)*

"The DEIR makes a false assertion that the new plan will not create substantial deterioration of Park and Open Space in the East SoMa. East SoMa is currently underserved by parks and open spaces. The DEIR identifies less than 5 acres of existing open space, and projects over 8,000 units (16,000+ residents) of new housing. The General Plan recommends a number of 1 acre/every 1,000 residents. The existing housing stock in East SoMa has significantly less open space requirements onsite than elsewhere in the city. The no density limits and increased heights will only increase the numbers of people dependant on existing open space." *(Chris Durazo, South of Market Community Action Network [SOMCAN])*

Response

The Recreation and Park Department does not identify specific capacity limits or acceptable levels of service related to population density in terms of district-, neighborhood- and subneighborhood-serving parks or provision of recreational facilities (see DEIR p. 373). To determine significance with respect to these recreational resources, the DEIR methodology employs a review of the Neighborhood Recreation and Open Space Improvement Priority Plan Maps (see DEIR Figure 21, p. 371). These maps use a combination of demographic statistics (high residential, senior, and children densities and low household incomes relative to the city median household income) and neighborhood service areas to display the nexus between areas of highest need and areas underserved by existing resources. Although an unmet demand for parks and recreational resources would not, in and of itself, be considered a significant impact on the environment, the potential for secondary effects related to physical deterioration resulting from population increases attributable to the project's rezoning options is assessed and discussed in the DEIR. Given the extensive service area gaps in the Eastern Neighborhoods, the analysis found "increases in the number of permanent residents without development of additional recreational resources could result in proportionately greater use of parks and recreational facilities in and near portions of the Eastern Neighborhoods, which may result in physical deterioration. In particular, the Mission District, with an existing shortfall in both neighborhood parks and recreational facilities, some physical degradation of both parks and recreational facilities may occur due to the cumulative demands on those facilities," (DEIR p. 374).

The project includes both rezoning and associated draft area plans with objectives and policies geared toward creating livable and walkable neighborhoods with adequate distribution of recreational resources. Each of the four draft area plans, which were developed by the Planning Department for inclusion in the *General Plan*, addresses the potential for secondary effects related to physical deterioration through a set of objectives and policies including a combination of new park acquisition goals, generation of non-traditional open space, regulatory amendments for new development, ecological standards for public and private open space design, and creation of an open space network. Because these draft area plans and the policies within are included as a part of the proposed project, they are not identified as mitigation measures in the DEIR.

As described in DEIR Chapter I, Introduction (pp. I-5 – I-6) and summarized on DEIR p. 379, a Public Benefits Analysis was conducted to both assess and provide potential methods to resolve existing deficiencies and projected needs for certain services in the project area including recreational resources. Methods identified in the Public Benefits Analysis include planning policies, zoning requirements, taxes and impact fees, establishment of service and/or assessment districts, and direct provision of facilities by developers. The final product of this effort, which is part of the proposal for adoption to be considered by the Planning Commission, includes an Implementation Document containing a Public Improvements Program and Funding Strategy for identified improvements (see discussion of Project Implementation, p. C&R-35).

The goals set forth in the Eastern Neighborhoods draft area plans along with implementation and funding mechanisms identified in the Public Benefits Analysis would serve to augment the existing objectives in the *General Plan* and existing bond measures supporting the Recreation and Park Department Capital Improvement Plan (see DEIR p. 370). In addition, and in response to comments received from the Recreation and Park Department, the following additional improvement measures are added to the EIR on p. 525, following a new heading, “Parks, Recreation and Open Space”:

Improvement Measure H-1: Support for Upgrades to Existing Recreation Facilities

> To help offset the potential for an accelerated deterioration of existing park and recreation facilities in Eastern Neighborhoods due to projected increases in population, the City should undertake measures to implement funding mechanisms for an ongoing program to repair, upgrade and adequately maintain park and recreation facilities to ensure the safety of the users.

Improvement Measure H-2: Support for New Open Space

> To avoid the effects of overcrowding, overuse, and conflicts in recreational uses to existing park and recreation facilities in Eastern Neighborhoods, the City should set concrete goals for the purchase of sufficient land for public open space use in Eastern Neighborhoods. The City should set a goal of purchasing one neighborhood park in each Eastern Neighborhood.

These improvement measures, along with the draft area plan policies and the implementation and funding mechanisms identified in the Public Benefits Analysis, would establish the controls necessary to ensure the proposed rezoning options and the No-Project scenario would not result in substantial or accelerated deterioration of existing recreational resources. Although these measures would call for and require construction and/or expansion of recreational facilities, no site-specific plans were analyzed as a part of the EIR. Subsequent specific proposals for the development of park space and recreation facilities would be subject to subsequent project-level environmental review.

The area plan drafts released for citizen review in December 2007 and updated through April 2008 as part of the proposal for adoption set forth several specific park and open space improvements. In East SoMa, the draft plan identifies the Brannan Street Wharf, proposed (by the Port of San Francisco) proposed to replace Pier 36 and former Pier 34 and marginal wharf. The April 2008 draft for adoption East SoMa Plan also includes Policy 5.1.1, "Identify opportunities to create new public parks and open spaces and provide at least one new public park or open space serving the East SoMa." The draft for adoption Mission Plan likewise includes the same Policy 5.1.1.

In Showplace Square/Potrero Hill, the citizen draft area plan proposes two new public plazas, one in the area surrounding the traffic circle where Eighth, Townsend, and Division Streets come together, and a second at the triangular intersection of 16th, Wisconsin, and Irwin Streets. The April 2008 draft for adoption Showplace Square/Potrero Hill Plan also includes the same Policy 5.1.1 calling for provision of at least one new public park or open space in the neighborhood.

The April 2008 draft for adoption Central Waterfront Plan identifies several potential park sites, including the area behind the I.M. Scott School site on Tennessee Street (currently used for parking), expansion of Warm Water Cove, and development of "Crane Cove Park," at 19th and Illinois Streets. As with the other draft plans, the citizen draft Central Waterfront Plan also includes the same Policy 5.1.1 calling for provision of at least one new public park or open space in the neighborhood.

Each draft area plan also calls for a network of "green streets" to connect open spaces, and to improve the pedestrian atmosphere and aesthetic environment of each

neighborhood. In addition, proposed zoning amendments would generally require a minimum of 80 square feet of private open space per residential unit, whereas the *Planning Code* currently requires as little as 36 square feet in higher-density residential districts and does not require private open space at all in most non-residential districts.

In terms of projects already in the development "pipeline" (i.e., those for which applications are currently on file with the Planning Department) and those in the "planning, design or conception phases," such projects would not be approved absent the appropriate level of environmental review, pursuant to CEQA. Many such projects are included in the DEIR analysis because the growth forecasts on which the DEIR analysis was based include a number of major proposed developments that have been either on file with the Department or at least in discussion since the *Rezoning Options Workbook* was published in 2003. At least 3,750 housing units are anticipated due to the project in Showplace Square and the Central Waterfront. Moreover, many other projects that are at some stage of planning are included in the No-Project scenario growth assumptions for 2025, which, as noted in DEIR Table 2 (p. 34), assume nearly 2,900 more new housing units in the project area (including almost 900 in Showplace Square and the Central Waterfront) without implementation of the proposed Eastern Neighborhoods project. Finally, there is no assurance that any project in the pipeline, and particularly any project in an earlier stage of the planning process, will be approved as proposed. Therefore, the impacts of the 3,000 dwelling units in Showplace Square and the Central Waterfront cited as in one comment as being "already in the planning, design or conception phases" are accounted for in the DEIR analysis at a level of detail appropriate to an areawide rezoning proposal.

As described above, the DEIR analysis found existing shortfalls in recreational resources in the Eastern Neighborhoods. However, the analysis also found that none of the project options, nor the No-Project scenario, would cause the ratio of *citywide* recreational acres to residents to go below the ratio stated in the *General Plan.* Footnote 183 on DEIR p. 373 reads, "As described in Section IV, Analysis Assumptions, this EIR assumes a baseline (year 2000) citywide population of 756,967 and estimated citywide population of 836,490 under Option A, 834,448 under Option B, 834,750 under Option C and 799,217 under a future No-Project Option. The existing 4,772 acres of parks would yield a ratio of roughly 5.72 acres per 1,000 residents in each of the three Options." The existing shortfall of neighborhood open space and recreational facilities (non-city-serving) in the Eastern Neighborhoods is discussed on DEIR pp. 365 – 369. The means to avoid substantial or accelerated deterioration of existing recreational resources in the Eastern Neighborhoods is discussed above and on DEIR pp. 373 – 379.

Concerning parks and open space in East SoMa, DEIR Table 52 on p. 365 shows approximately 4.55 acres of existing open space in East SoMa. However, as is indicated

on DEIR Table 35 on p. 232, new household estimates for East SoMa by the year 2025 are 2,294 for Option A, 2,508 for Option B and 3,083 for Option C. Project related population increases in East SoMa and the project area are detailed on DEIR pp. 231 – 233. As stated on DEIR p. 373, under baseline (year 2000) conditions, the existing ratio of neighborhood park acres (excluding city-serving parks) per 1000 residents is approximately 0.75 for the Eastern Neighborhoods and 1.1 for the city as a whole.[34] However, the Recreation and Open Space Element of the *General Plan* does not institute specific capacity limits or acceptable levels of service related to population density in terms of district-, neighborhood- and subneighborhood-serving parks or provision of recreational facilities (see DEIR p.373).

Comment [R5]

"Page: S-27: 'An unmet demand for parks and recreational recourses, in itself would not be considered a significant impact on the environment,' – Was the year 2000 population census used for this Study? Were new developments, such as Rincon Hill, taken into consideration when using the figure of 67,000 residents?" (*M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

DEIR Table 19 on p. 181 lists the population estimates used for the DEIR baseline year (2000). The data concerning population and households by neighborhood in this table are based on the 2000 Census, using data at the Census block level, which is the smallest unit at which Census data are available. The Planning Department provided the correspondence between Census block and neighborhood boundaries.

New developments such as Rincon Hill and Mission Bay were assumed in residential growth projections for the year 2025 assigned to each of the proposed rezoning options that were the basis of the DEIR's impact analysis (see DEIR p. 230). Please see also the preceding response in relation to Citywide growth forecasts and the supply of open space.

Cumulative Impacts

Comment [R6]

"The report entirely ignores the impact of planned development on the capacity of existing spaces of any size to continue to serve thousands of new residents: Rincon Point/South Beach, TransBay Terminal, Rincon Hill and Mission Bay will contribute major wear and tear to facilities, requiring additional financial resources for upgrading and maintaining some of the existing parks, particularly those managed by the Port—and these funds are not readily available. *(Isabel Wade, PhD., and Corinne W. Woods, Neighborhood Parks Council)*

[34] Calculation includes Recreation and Park Department parks and open spaces, as well as open spaces under the jurisdiction of other City, state, and federal agencies, but excludes "city-serving" parks of 30 acres or more.

Response

Residential growth projections assigned to each of the proposed rezoning options assume implementation of a number of programmed areas including Mission Bay and Rincon Hill, as well as the adopted Transbay Redevelopment Area (see DEIR pp. 30 – 32). In addition, the potential for project related or cumulative impact of these programs on recreational resources has undergone independent CEQA review.

Mitigation Measures

Comment [R7]

The commenter requests the DEIR "include enforceable mitigation requirements that will ensure that adequate publicly accessible parks and recreational facilities are included as a condition of increased residential density in all the Eastern Neighborhoods." *(Isabel Wade, PhD., and Corinne W. Woods, Neighborhood Parks Council)*

Response

The draft area plan transportation and urban design policies discussed above and the draft open space policies are included as a part of the proposed project and therefore need not be identified as mitigation measures in the DEIR. Additional measures to address existing and future need for new resources, existing resource upgrades and increased maintenance are discussed on pp. 378-379 of the DEIR. And, as stated above an in Section D of this Comments and Responses document, additional improvement measures have been added to the EIR to further reduce potential project effects on parks, recreation and open space. Moreover, separate from the CEQA process, the Planning Department expects to include a parks and open space component as part of the public benefits fee package that is anticipated to be advanced along with the proposed area plans and rezoning.

Comment [R8]

"We also think that developers of larger construction projects that are in close proximity to EXISTING parks should be required to fund a benefits package for those parks. This could include money for trees, plants, benches, and capital improvements." *(Leora Vestel, Rolph Playground Neighbors)*

Response

As discussed above, a Public Benefits Analysis (see DEIR pp. I-5 – I-6, 379), was conducted to both assess and provide potential methods to resolve existing deficiencies and projected needs for certain services in the project area including recreational resources. The tools for implementation identified in the analysis include zoning requirements, taxes and impact fees, and direct provision of facilities by developers.

Comment [R9]

"Page S-28: Concern over the proposed increase in on-site Open Space requirements from 36 sq. ft. to 80 sq. ft. per residential unit. Why does the Open Space requirement not apply for PDR and commercial/office uses?" *(M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association)*

Response

Under existing conditions, the Planning Code establishes different open space requirements for residential and non-residential uses, with the requirements varying by use district and, for non-residential uses, by categories of use depending on the assumed employment density. Existing requirements are described in the main body of the DEIR text on p. 372, where it is noted that the residential requirement varies from 36 to 300 square feet per unit and the non-residential requirement (in the South of Market and C-3, Downtown districts only) ranging from 1 square foot per 90 square feet of occupied office floor area to 1 square foot of open space per 250 square feet of occupied retail/wholesale/ institutional floor area and the like. (Open space is not generally required for non-residential uses outside the South of Market districts and C-3 districts).

The April 2008 draft area plans encourage enhanced requirements for new development including the provision of publicly accessible open space, with each draft plan including a policy that requires new residential and commercial development to contribute to the creation of (or in some cases, provide) publicly accessible open space (April 2008 draft area plans for adoption, Policy 5.1.2 in each plan). The proposed Implementation Program for the project, included in the proposal for adoption to be considered by the Planning Commission, includes an impact fee to be applied towards, among other things, the provision of public open space.[35]

As stated on DEIR p. 3, "The City's overriding goal as sponsor is to develop new zoning controls for the industrially zoned Eastern Neighborhoods to create housing opportunities while protecting an adequate supply of land for PDR businesses (and, thereby, PDR jobs)." To encourage the development of new PDR space in the project area, no specific new requirements were placed on PDR projects in the draft area plans.

In the draft zoning controls released by the Planning Department in September 2007, and as revised for inclusion in the April 2008 proposal for adoption, both residential and non-residential uses would be required to provide on-site open space (or in some instances for non-residential uses, pay an in-lieu fee) in mixed-use zoning districts; in PDR, RTO, and Neighborhood Commercial districts, no open space requirement would apply to non-

[35] The complete Implementation Document is available for review at the Planning Department offices, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, and may also be viewed on the Planning Department's Eastern Neighborhoods website at: http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/planning/Citywide/Eastern_Neighborhoods/VOL3_Implementation.pdf.

residential uses. Open space has not historically been required for non-residential uses, except in the C-3 (downtown) districts and in the mixed-use districts, with adoption of the South of Market Plan in 1990, in the mixed-use districts in the South of Market area. The proposed project would extend this non-residential open space requirement to mixed-use districts in the Eastern Neighborhoods.

Comment [R10]

"Page S-29: Landscaping – Expand on 'public benefits analysis' regarding the landscaping requirements." *(M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association)*

Response

The comment apparently refers to discussion on DEIR p. S-29 and p. 378, under Parks, Recreation, and Open Space, stating, "The draft area plans include policies which would 'require minimum ecological standards for urban landscaping for all new development and provide incentives for existing development to meet these standards….'" (Although discussed on the same page as the Public Benefits Analysis, this policy language is not directly related to that separate analysis.) In its current form (Policy 3.3.1 of each of the four draft area plans in the April 2008 proposal for adoption), the language reads, "Require new development to adhere to a new performance-based ecological evaluation tool to improve the amount and quality of green landscaping." The plan text that follows explains:

"The San Francisco Planning Department, in consultation with the Public Utilities Commission, is in the process of developing a green factor. The green factor will be a performance-based planning tool that requires all new development to meet a defined standard for on-site water infiltration, and offers developers substantial flexibility in meeting the standard. A similar green factor has been implemented in Seattle, WA, as well as in numerous European cities, and has proven to be a cost-effective tool, both to strengthen the environmental sustainability of each site, and to improve the aesthetic quality of the neighborhood. The Planning Department will provide a worksheet to calculate a proposed development's green factor score."

Shadow

Comment [S1]

"We'd like to see height limitations for buildings around parks such as Rolph Playground IF projects would increase shade on those parks." *(Leora Vestel, Rolph Playground Neighbors)*

Response

As stated on DEIR pp. 529 – 530, development in the Eastern Neighborhoods would be subject to the Planning Code Section 295 (the Sunlight Ordinance). Under this process, potential shadow impacts would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, and the Planning Commission could not approve a project determined to have significant shadow impacts under Section 295. However, it cannot be stated with certainty that compliance with Section 295 would mitigate *all* potential significant shadow effects under CEQA, because while Section 295 compliance is generally deemed to result in a project having a less-than-significant CEQA impact, there could be instances when this were not true, given that the meaning of "significant" is somewhat different under the two statutes. Section 295 compliance means that, if a building more than 40 feet tall would shade a protected park, the Planning Commission must determine that such shade would not have "any adverse impact on the use of the property." Alternatively, the Planning Commission, following review and comment by the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission, must determine that the impact "would be insignificant." Where CEQA is concerned, the criterion of significance is more general; that is, "Would a project create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?" Moreover, buildings 40 feet or less in height are not subject to Section 295, and such structures, if taller than existing buildings, could result in new shadow impacts without requiring Section 295 review. While shadow impacts from future development could generally be limited through project-specific design alterations, the potential for new shadow in various parks and open spaces remains and it cannot be concluded, at a programmatic level of analysis, that full mitigation for potential new shadow impacts would be feasible. Therefore, the DEIR concluded that potential shadow impacts would be significant and unavoidable for all three rezoning options and for the No-Project Alternative.

Concerning Rolph Playground, at César Chávez Street and Potrero Avenue, as described on DEIR p. 410, under each of the three re-zoning options, the existing 40-foot height limits surrounding this park would be maintained, except for a 15-foot increase to 55 feet on the west side of Potrero Avenue adjacent to the north side of the park. Because the park is directly south of the parcels along Potrero Avenue where this height increase would occur, and because the sun is to the south and shadows are thus cast to the north (except in the early morning and late afternoon in summer), the change would not substantially increase the extent or duration of shadow on the park during the hours subject to Section 295. If construction were to occur to 55 feet on the southernmost parcels along Potrero Avenue, additional shadow could fall on a children's playground that occupies the northernmost tip of Rolph Playground. However, it seems likely that substantial shading of this playground would be precluded by application of Section 295.

Historic Architectural Resources

Comment [HAR1]

The Board commented on whether there is an explanation in the Draft EIR of the differences between the Plan Alternatives A, B, and C—what are these plan alternatives trying to accomplish? *(M. Bridget Maley, San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board)*

Response

The description of the rezoning options analyzed in the DEIR is presented in Chapter III, Project Description. The project is intended to promote housing and mixed-use development in some areas currently zoned for industrial use while protecting an adequate supply of land and buildings for PDR employment and businesses. The proposed rezoning would be carried out within the context of the City's objectives (DEIR, pp. 3 – 4), which seek to: reflect local values; increase housing; maintain some land supply; and improve the quality of all existing areas with future development.

The DEIR examined three rezoning scenarios at an equal level of detail, plus two project variants in the Mission and a No Project scenario as required by CEQA. The rezoning scenarios, referred to in the DEIR as Options A, B, and C, relate to the amount of land that could be converted from industrial use to residential or mixed use residential districts. As discussed on DEIR p. 31, "Of the three rezoning options, Option A would retain the largest amount of existing land that accommodates PDR uses in East SoMa, Mission, and Showplace Square/Potrero Hill and would also convert the least amount of industrially zoned land to residential use…. Conversely, under Option C, which would convert the most existing land accommodating PDR uses to residential and mixed uses, the Eastern Neighborhoods (excluding the Central Waterfront) would experience the greatest residential growth, compared to Option A." Specific forecasts regarding the potential amounts of land that would be converted as part of the rezoning, as well as the potential residential growth by rezoning option, is presented in Table 2, DEIR p. 34.

Comment [HAR2]

In general, the Board inquired about the status of the historic resource surveys in the planning areas. *(M. Bridget Maley, San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board)*

Response

The DEIR (pp. 446 – 452) describes the surveys that apply to the Eastern Neighborhoods planning area. The Eastern Neighborhoods survey program consists of four areas: Central Waterfront, Mission, Showplace Square and SoMa. The survey for the Central Waterfront was largely accomplished in 2001 through the combined efforts of the

Department and the Dogpatch Neighborhood Association. The survey was updated and completed in 2007.

The Mission Area Plan is covered by three surveys: (1) The Inner Mission North survey by the Department covering the areas between Duboce and 20th Street, and Dolores to Folsom; (2) The northeast Mission industrial area between Folsom and Potrero, from Duboce to 20th Street, which is grouped with the Showplace Square survey; and (3) areas south of 20th Street to Cesar Chavez, between Guerrero and Potrero Avenue. The Mission survey contract area is scheduled to be completed in the fourth quarter of 2008. The Mission survey contract area covers a vast portion of the Mission and contains thousands of properties. Current analysis estimates that the existing contract will assess approximately 30 percent of the potentially historic building stock in the area.

The Showplace Square area plan survey also includes the northeast industrial portion of the Mission, as noted above. This survey is scheduled to be completed in the second quarter of 2008. The survey contract is expected to give substantial coverage for the Showplace Square and northeast Mission industrial areas.

The South of Market survey is a single survey that serves both the East SoMa area plan, and the Western SoMa Citizens' Planning Task Force area. This survey work is scheduled to be complete in the fourth quarter of 2008 and is expected to give substantial coverage for the South of Market area.

Comment [HAR3]

The Board indicated that some of the historic resource surveys are complete or nearing completion. However, it does not appear that surveys informed plan options. As a mitigation measure, the Board would like to see the surveys inform the plan in terms of height limits and use designations. The results of the surveys could result in revisions to plan options. *(M. Bridget Maley, San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board)*

Response

The Planning Department is committed to the goal of historical resource identification and protection as one of the main objectives of the Eastern Neighborhoods planning effort. As described in the preceding response, the Department expects that the historical resource surveys presently underway within the Eastern Neighborhoods sub-areas will be completed mid- to late 2008. It is anticipated that those historical resource surveys will be completed after the Final EIR for this project is certified, and after the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan and zoning programs are brought before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for adoption. Nevertheless, the Planning Department believes that through the EIR with its existing mitigation measures, together with the anticipated

Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan adoption process, the City will accomplish the objectives desired by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board.

The EIR includes up-to-date information on all of the historical resource survey work within the plan area. The EIR also includes Mitigation Measure K-1, which indicates that once the historical resource surveys for the various plan sub-areas are completed, the survey results will be endorsed and amended into the area plans. Similarly, the draft area plans for the Eastern Neighborhoods, which are included in the April 2008 proposal for adoption to be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, each contains six objectives specifically calling out historical resource identification, evaluation and preservation as objectives of the Eastern Neighborhoods planning effort.

Hence, through the Eastern Neighborhoods environmental review and adoption process, the Department will complete historical resource surveys for the project area, identify all potential historical resources (individual resources as well as districts) and amend the area plans to include and identify those resources. That will serve first to notify the City and the public at large as to all identified historical resources within the plan area, and will also subsequently provide protection of identified historical resources through subsequent CEQA analysis, documentation, and mitigation, where feasible, of any potential adverse change to those resources (e.g., alteration, demolition) in the future.

While the completion of the ongoing historical resource survey work is expected to follow initial plan adoption and therefore require amendment of the adopted plans, the Department believes that the contemplated process will nevertheless provide strong protection to the historical resources identified, while also satisfying other key objectives of the Eastern Neighborhoods to stabilize industrial lands and provide affordable housing in the plan area. Furthermore, if at some future date it is determined that the zoning controls themselves need to be amended to better accomplish the historical resource preservation objectives in the plan, the City can so amend the zoning. Such efforts could take the form as described in EIR Mitigation Measures K-2 and K-3, providing further guidance to the treatment of proposed projects within identified historic districts, through changes to height and use designations, as suggested by the comment, or through other means.

Comment [HAR4]

In that vein, the Board further commented that the relationship of potential historic districts should inform the substance of plan. It does not seem that height limits should be raised in potential historic districts. Or, in other potential districts, there should be consideration to lower height limits (e.g., along 24th Street). *(M. Bridget Maley, San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board)*

Response

Changes to height limits that could occur under the rezoning options were presented on DEIR Figure 5 for the three rezoning options; the currently proposed height limits, which are included in the April 2008 proposal for adoption that will be considered by the Planning Commission, and ultimately by the Board of Supervisors, are depicted this Comments and Responses document, on Figure C&R-2, p. C&R-7. The analysis of potential changes to urban form is discussed at the neighborhood subarea level on DEIR pp. 152 – 174. These potential changes were one factor that was considered in the assessment of potential impacts to extant or potential historic architectural resources (including districts) analyzed in Chapter III.K of the DEIR.

Objective 8.3 of the April 2008 draft for adoption Mission Area Plan, "Ensure that historic preservation concerns continue to be an integral part of the ongoing planning processes for the Mission Plan area as they evolve over time," was developed to ensure that historic preservation concerns continue to be an integral part of the ongoing planning processes over time. Specifically, Policy 8.3.6 states, "Adopt and revise land use, design and other relevant policies, guidelines, and standards, as needed to further preservation objectives," and Implementation Item 8.3.6.1, in Exhibit VI-3, Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Implementation Matrices (within the Implementation Document),[36] states that the Planning Department "will revise the Mission Area Plan upon completion of the historic surveys to include official designation of historic resources and/or districts as appropriate, and may also include the adoption of historic design guidelines that are specific to an area or property type." Each of the other April 2008 draft area plans contain the same policy language, except the Central Waterfront, where more extensive historical resources surveys have already been completed, and the Implementation Matrices include the same implementation action for each area, again, except in the Central Waterfront. Thus, the area plans and related controls will be amended upon the completion of the surveys now under way within the Eastern Neighborhood Plan Areas.

In regard to height limits, as potential historical resources are identified through the historic surveys, the Planning Department would evaluate all proposals for consistency with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Policy 8.2.2 in each April 2008 draft area plan). Proposals for demolition and vertical additions would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for their impact on the subject building and any potential impacts to adjacent off-site resources.

It is also important to note that for vertical additions, common practice in interpreting the Standards states that any new additions to an existing building should respect the general

[36] The complete Implementation Document is available for review at the Planning Department offices, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, and may also be viewed on the Planning Department's Eastern Neighborhoods website at: http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/planning/Citywide/Eastern_Neighborhoods/VOL3_Implementation.pdf.

size, shape, and scale of the features associated with the property and, if applicable, the district in which the property is located. The structure should be connected to the property in a manner that does not alter, change, obscure, damage, or destroy any of the character-defining features of the property and the district. The design should respect the general historic and architectural characteristics associated with the property and the district without replicating historic styles or elements that will result in creating a false sense of history. The materials should be compatible with the property or district in general character, color and texture. These interpretations shall be applied in evaluating any project that proposes to take advantage of the new building heights.

Comment [HAR5]

The Board would like to see recognition in Mitigation Measure K-1 that demolition of individual buildings, one at a time, could result in potential impacts to potential historic districts. The Board suggested adding the following language: Demolition of individual buildings could possibly have a cumulative impact on potential historic districts. *(M. Bridget Maley, San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board)*

Response

The DEIR finds that the three rezoning proposals, as well as the No Project scenario, could result in significant direct and cumulative impacts to historic resources, including existing and potential historic districts, which is the impetus for Mitigation Measures K-1 through K-3. The DEIR identifies potential impacts on historic districts through demolition of individual buildings on pp. 460, 465 – 466, 468 – 470, and 473. Mitigation Measure K-1, as written would apply equally to historic districts as to individual historical resources, because districts, once identified, are considered historical resources for CEQA purposes, (even before they are formally listed on a local, state, or national register of historical resources).

Comment [HAR6]

Regarding Mitigation Measure K-1.c, the Board would like clarification of the types of modifications that may be approved in an over the counter building permit. How is this determined? *(M. Bridget Maley, San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board)*

Response

A Planning Department Preservation Technical Specialist may approve any application related to maintenance or repair permits as defined in Planning Code Section 1005(e)(3), meaning: “any work, the sole purpose and effect of which is to correct deterioration, decay or damage, including repair of damage caused by fire or other disaster.” This also includes re-roofing, or replacement of front stairs. Other permit applications that may be approved at the Planning Information Counter may include any project that complies with

the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and does not require any additional entitlements or neighborhood notification.

Comment [HAR7]

Regarding Mitigation Measure K-l.d, the Board would like to know whether the Preservation Technical Specialist would have the ability to require an Historic Resource Evaluation for properties subject to this measure? *(M. Bridget Maley, San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board)*

Response

In coordination with the MEA Planner, the Preservation Technical Specialist shall exercise his/her discretion as to whether an Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) is required for major alterations to buildings constructed prior to 1963 in order to determine whether the undertaking could adversely affect a potential resource.

Comment [HAR8]

The Board questions whether properties subject to Mitigation Measures K-2 and K-3 would be brought before LPAB for review and comment. If so, language to this effect should be included in these measures for clarity. *(M. Bridget Maley, San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board)*

Response

The Planning Code amendments identified in Mitigation Measures K-2 and K-3 would be included in the respective appendices of the South End and Dogpatch Historic Districts and would relate to exterior alterations to buildings within Article 10 of the Planning Code. As these types of projects would require a Certificate of Appropriateness, Section 1006 of the Planning Code would apply, including review by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board.

Comment [HAR9]

The Board noted that the terminology "radical change" in Mitigation Measures K-2 and K-3 should be amended to "substantial change." *(M. Bridget Maley, San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board)*

Response

The comment is acknowledged. The first sentence in the second full paragraphs in both Mitigation Measures K-2 and K-3, DEIR pp. 520 and 521, is revised to read:

> Additions will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and any proposed addition should be located in an inconspicuous location and not result in

a ~~radical~~ substantial change to the form or character of the historic building.

Comment [HAR10]

The Board stated that the character-defining features of properties - referred to in Mitigation Measures K-2 and K-3 should refer back to the language describing the character-defining features of the districts as stated in Planning Code Article 10, Appendices I and L. *(M. Bridget Maley, San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board)*

Response

In response to the above comment, the last sentence in the fourth full paragraph of Mitigation Measure K-2 (DEIR, p. 521) has been amended as follows:

> "The design respects the general historic and architectural characteristics associated with the property and the district without replicating historic styles or elements that will result in creating a false sense of history. For more information regarding the ~~characteristics~~ character-defining features of the South End historic District, refer to Appendix I of Article 10, Section 6 (Features) of the Planning Code."

Additionally, the last sentence of the fourth full paragraph in Mitigation Measure K-3 (DEIR, p. 522) has been amended as follows:

> "The design respects the general historic and architectural characteristics associated with the property and the district without replicating historic styles or elements that will result in creating a false sense of history. For more information regarding the ~~characteristics~~ character-defining features of the Dogpatch Historic District, refer to Appendix L of Article 10, Section 6 (Features) of the Planning Code."

Comment [HAR11]

In Mitigation Measure K-3, the Board indicated that language describing materials as being "compatible with the district" should instead be described as "in kind." *(M. Bridget Maley, San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board)*

Response

Planning Code amendments in Mitigation Measures K-2 and K-3 relate to infill construction and vertical additions within historic districts protected by Article 10 of the Planning Code. With respect to new construction, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards state: "The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment." The Standards also state: "Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken." The Department

believes that retaining the phrase "compatible with the district" is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and allows for contemporary intervention within the subject districts without creating a false sense of history.

Comment [HAR12]

The Board expressed concern related to the high degree of potentially significant adverse impacts reported in the DEIR, and stated that this is a situation where creative mitigation may be useful to address impacts, such as a commitment to designate districts as well as preparation of design guidelines for potential districts. For example, Asian Neighborhood Design is working on guidelines for the reuse of industrial buildings [in West SoMa], and the Board should encourage the adoption of guidelines for the adaptive reuse of certain kinds of buildings, for vertical additions to certain kinds of buildings, as well as guidelines that address window treatments. *(M. Bridget Maley, San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board)*

Response

The historic preservation polices outlined within each of the draft Eastern Neighborhood Area Plans that are included in the April 2008 proposal for adoption to be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors state a commitment to address the above-cited concerns. The policies are as follows:

> Policy 8.1.2: Pursue formal designation of the [Neighborhood]'s historic and cultural resources, as appropriate.
>
> Policy 8.3.6: Adopt and revise land use, design and other relevant policies, guidelines, and standards, as needed to further preservation objectives.[37]
>
> Implementation 8.1.2.1: The Planning Department, when appropriate, will support nominations for listing of resources on the National Register or California Register, as well as nominations for local designation under Article 10 of the Planning Code in conformance with the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board's annual work plan and based on the results of the historic resource surveys within the [Neighborhood] Plan area.
>
> Implementation 8.3.1: The Planning Department will revise the [Neighborhood] Area Plan upon completion of the historic surveys to include official designation of historic resources and/or districts as appropriate, and may also include the adoption of historic design guidelines that are specific to an area or property type.

Comment [HAR13]

"The UCSF-owned properties at 1900 Third Street and 1830 Third Street within the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Area are incorrectly identified in the Draft EIR as 'Designated Historical Resources' (see Figure 30 - Historic Resources in the Eastern Neighborhoods, on page 443 of the

[37] This policy is not included in the Central Waterfront Plan draft for adoption, because more extensive historical resources surveys have been completed for this area.

Draft EIR). These properties are not historical resources and are outside the rezoning area boundary." *(Lori Yamauchi, University of California, San Francisco)*

Response

The comment correctly notes that both 1830 Third Street (Viaduct Café) and 1900 Third Street (Bethlehem Steel Warehouse) are outside the project area, being within the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Area. The buildings are included on DEIR Figure 30 because, as is stated on DEIR p. 442, the analysis for the DEIR included "known and potential historical resources within one block of the identified Eastern Neighborhoods project boundary." This is because subsequent future projects adjacent to historical resources could adversely affect such resources.

Both 1830 and 1900 Third Street were surveyed as part of the Planning Department's 2001 Cultural Resources Survey of the Central Waterfront. In that survey, each building was given a National Register of Historic Places status code of "4D2," meaning that the buildings "may become eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. This property is a contributor to a fully documented historic district that may become eligible for listing in the National Register when more historical or architectural research is performed on the district."[38] These ratings were accepted by the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) in 2002. As noted in the DEIR on p. 445, the State of California adopted its own status codes in 2003. With adoption of California Register of Historical Resources status codes, resources with a status code of "4" were to be re-designated "7," meaning these resources need to be re-evaluated.[39]

In 2008, the Planning Department completed an update of the 2001 Cultural Resources Survey of the Central Waterfront. This update included a re-analysis of the building at 1830 Third Street, which confirmed this building's status as a historical resource under CEQA. Planning Department preservation staff has determined that this building has a California historical resources status code of 5S3, indicating that the building appears to be "individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation." Although outside of a recently identified "Third Street Industrial District," which extends from approximately 18th Street south to 24th Street, the building at 1830 Third Street—a restaurant originally known as the Viaduct Café and most recently as the Sno-Drift Lounge—was found to have "played a significant role in the development of the Central Waterfront area" and to have been associated with a business "that served the daily needs

38 December 2002 Draft for Public Review of the Central Waterfront Plan, pp. 70 and 74.
39 California Office of Historic Preservation, Technical Assistance Bulletin #8, *User's Guide to the California Historical Resource Status Codes & Historic Resources Inventory Directory*; November 2004. Available on the internet at: http://www.ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1069/files/tab8.pdf.

of workers in the area," according to the Planning Department's most recent evaluation.[40] Therefore, 1830 Third Street is considered a historical resource under CEQA.

The building at 1900 Third Street is currently designated "7N1" (Needs to be re-evaluated [Formerly National Register Status Code 4]—may become eligible for NR w/restoration or when meets other specific conditions) by OHP. This building was not re-evaluated as part of the recent update of the Central Waterfront Cultural Resources Survey. It is acknowledged that The University of California, San Francisco (UCSF), as lead agency for its own development projects, conducted additional evaluation of the building at 1900 Third Street beyond that undertaken in 2001, as part of its 2005 Long-Range Development Plan Amendment #2 EIR (and summarized in UCSF's recent Medical Center at Mission Bay Draft EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2008012075), and that with this more specific and current information, UCSF concluded that the building at 1900 Third Street is not a historical resource.

Hazards

Comment [H1]

"According to the draft EIR, compliance with existing laws and site-specific review with appropriate regulatory oversight will protect human health and the environment. The draft EIR also states that where conversion of land use leads to a more sensitive use, stricter cleanup levels may be required if previous closure left contamination in place.

"The draft EIR should also state that each site-specific review will require a thorough investigation of all historical uses of each property and nearby facilities in addition to an assessment of previous regulatory involvement. Without this information, DTSC will be unable to determine whether hazardous substances may have been released at the site. Based on that information, samples should be collected to determine whether additional issues need to be addressed at each specific site. If hazardous substances have been released to the soil, ground water, or surface water, this contamination will need to be addressed as part of the project.

"For example, if the proposed project includes soil excavation and remediation, the site-specific CEQA document should include: (1) an assessment of air impacts and health impacts associated with soil excavation activities; (2) identification of applicable local standards, which may be exceeded by the excavation activities, including dust levels and noise; (3) transportation impacts from the removal or remedial activities; and (4) risk of upset if an accident occurs at the Site." *(Denise M. Tsuji, California Department of Toxic Substances Control)*

[40] California Department of Parks and Recreation Form 523L for 1830 Third Street (draft), March 19, 2008. and N. Moses Corrette, preservation planner, San Francisco Planning Department, e-mail communication, March 26, 2008. Available for review, by appointment, at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2004.0160E.

Response

As stated in the Introduction to Section IV.L, Hazardous Materials, the DEIR analysis "is based on general parameters concerning the growth assumed" and "[no] site-specific development is contemplated as part of the proposed rezoning and area plans project, and therefore no such proposals are analyzed here." On pp. 488 – 489, the DEIR sets forth the procedures anticipated to be followed for subsequent development projects that are proposed within the Eastern Neighborhoods study area. Among these procedures is completion of a site-specific Phase I environmental site assessment, including "visual inspection of the property, review of historical documents, and review of environmental databases to assess the potential for contamination from sources such as underground storage tanks, current and historical site operations, and migration from off-site sources." If necessary, based on the results of the Phase I investigation, a Phase II investigation, including "sampling and laboratory analysis of the soil and groundwater for the suspected chemicals to identify the nature and extent of contamination" could be required. The Phase I site assessment is typically reviewed by the San Francisco Department of Public Health; this and other documents may also be reviewed by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (represented by the commenter) and/or the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.

As a result, the DEIR properly concluded that compliance with established laws, regulations, and procedures, including the City's own environmental review process pursuant to CEQA for subsequent site-specific development projects, would ensure that potential impacts from contaminated soil or groundwater, as well as hazardous building materials, would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. As appropriate, the site-specific CEQA document for a subsequent development project could include an assessment of air impacts and health impacts associated with soil excavation activities, identification of applicable local standards that may be exceeded by the excavation activities (including dust levels and noise), transportation impacts related to removal or remedial activities, and an analysis of the risk of upset if an accident occurs at the Site.

Mitigation Measures

The following comments concern mitigation measures for various impacts identified in the DEIR. Additional comments that discuss mitigation measures but that are more focused on the impacts themselves may be found in the appropriate topic areas of this Comments and Responses document.

Land Use

Comment [MM1]

"Page S-35: Mitigation Measures – Because the Western SoMa area is to be designated for the preservation of PDR space, why is the potential PDR space there not included in the total amount of PDR space that the EIR analyzes as available for PDR in the future?" (*M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

PDR land in Western SoMa was part of the EIR analysis. As noted in the main body of the DEIR text on p. 62, "The future supply of PDR land included the assumptions in Option B for both Western SoMa and Bayview-Hunters Point, neither of which is part of the Eastern Neighborhoods planning process, although both were originally included." The DEIR continued, "because Option B originally assumed that Western SoMa would remain a key location for PDR businesses and employment, the EPS projections for future PDR land supply are contingent on future zoning ultimately being adopted for Western SoMa that retains a substantial PDR presence." Mitigation Measure A-1, referred to by the commenter, which would result in retention of substantial PDR land in Western SoMa, was judged not to be feasible, because it was not possible to state with certainty the outcome of the Western SoMa rezoning process, which is proceeding independently of the Eastern Neighborhoods project, as explained on DEIR p. S-35. While such a measure is deemed to be infeasible at this time as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods planning effort, it should be noted that the separate Western SoMa rezoning process could result in a zoning scheme similar to this, but it is speculative to come to that conclusion at this time.

Transportation

Comment [MM2]

"Mitigation Measures E-3, E-4, E-5, E-6, E-10, and E-11 along with numerous transportation policies of the Eastern Neighborhoods area Plans, if implemented, would support the reduction of vehicle related air pollution and collision hazards by reducing the number of vehicle trips in the project area. Traffic calming, implementation of the Better Streets Plan, parking pricing policies, a congestion pricing scheme, and transportation impact fees seem particularly promising approaches. We encourage the implementation of these measures to the greatest extent feasible and the development of a coordinated implementation timeline for land use development and transportation facilities improvements." *(Rajiv Bhatia, M.D., Ph.D., San Francisco Department of Public Health)*

Response

The comment expresses support for implementation of mitigation measures and draft policies aimed at reducing automobile travel. No response is required.

Comment [MM3]

"Page S-37: Define 'Parking Benefits District" and give examples."

"Page S-37: Explain why there is no discussion of bonds, and Community Benefit Districts that could be created to take into account the existing deficiencies caused by existing conditions, often caused by neglect of existing property owners in these districts, particularly non-occupying landlords." (*M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

The comments are in regard to Mitigation Measure E-5, Enhanced Transit Funding. A parking benefit district is a type of community benefit district in which enhanced parking revenue (from parking meters and/or parking garages and lots) is channeled to specific improvements in the district. Often, such improvements involve streetscape enhancements, but the revenue could also be directed to transit improvements. (In San Francisco, a substantial share of revenue from City-owned parking garages is already directed to Municipal Railway operations.) More generally, a community benefit district involves a new revenue stream generated by an assessment on property owners in the district, with the funds going to special-purpose needs deemed important to the property owners, who have to approve the assessment. Such districts exist at a several locations in San Francisco, including Union Square, Fisherman's Wharf, the Tenderloin, the Castro, Noe Valley, and—in the Eastern Neighborhoods—a block-long stretch of Mission Street, between 20th and 21st Streets. These districts use their funds for sidewalk cleaning and trash removal, graffiti abatement, tree planting, landscaping and other streetscape improvements, signage, planning and special event promotions, and security patrols for the area covered by the district. Bond funding, on the other hand, would involve citywide revenue generation and expenditures would be more likely to be expended on programs benefiting the entire City.

Comment [MM4]

"Page S-38: This should state that, because smaller sites have restricted access and limited frontage, discouraging the location of these accesses from this frontage could discourage and restrict the ability to produce the amount of PDR and housing that is necessary." (*M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

The comment refers to Mitigation Measure E-7, which calls for enhancing transit accessibility by, among other things, promoting "primary access to buildings from transit stops and pedestrian areas," rather than through auto-oriented entryways. This mitigation strategy is intended to be generally applicable, where feasible, and would not serve as a prohibition on other types of building access, particularly where special circumstances (e.g., limited site area or other constraints) might dictate otherwise.

Comment [MM5]

Page S-40: In Mitigation Measure E-12, Increase Transit Usage, define and clarify a parking cash-out policy. The term 'near transit centers' should be clarified. California's Department of Real Estate will not approve and accept a policy that forces the association to pay for and provide Muni fast-passes for the occupants. This should be stated here, or this comment should be eliminated. Why does the mitigation measure identify subsidized transit passes for only office employees, and not PDR employees? (*M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

Mitigation Measure E-12 calls for increasing transit usage, and the measure identifies various means by which transit usage might be enhanced. However, Mitigation Measure E-12, read by itself, might be seen to impose specific requirements on individual projects that are more appropriately incorporated into an areawide Transportation Demand Management program and/or implemented through legislative action. Accordingly, Mitigation Measure E-12 is deleted and three of the four bulleted paragraphs from that measure are incorporated into a revised Mitigation Measure E-11, pp. 506 – 507, and p. S-4 (in Chapter II, Summary) as follows:

Mitigation Measure E-11: Transportation Demand Management

As a mitigation measure to minimize delays to transit vehicles due to projected traffic congestion and to encourage use of alternative modes <u>of travel, including transit</u>, implement collaborative management of workplace facilities, work hours, and transportation resources. Mitigation may be achieved through some or all of the following measures:

- Establish a Transportation Demand Management <u>(TDM)</u> program in the Eastern Neighborhoods that could be designed to expand citywide, and that would coordinate programs promoting alternative means of transportation and reducing dependence on the automobile. <u>Such a TDM program could support growth in transit usage where capacity is available and/or existing service appears to be underused, such as in the Folsom Street, Valencia Street, and South Van Ness Avenue corridors, and in the Mission Bay North area. A TDM program could include one or more of the following strategies:</u>

  - Require cash-out policies for all employers who are providing on-site parking or subscribe to a parking facility to provide employee parking.
  - Require car-sharing and bike-sharing in developments near transit centers as a means of increasing incentives for residents and employees not to own or depend on automobiles.
- Promote the creation of on-site Transportation Management Associations at work sites to restrict employee parking, facilitate and encourage the use of transit passes, emergency-ride-home policies, and other promotions for alternative mans of commuting, and to promote alternative work schedules for drivers that focus on making better use of off-peak roadway capacity.

Under a parking cash-out policy, an employer who provides free or subsidized parking also provides a comparable financial benefit to employees who do not use parking. "Near" transit centers is not intended to specify an absolute distance; however, the term is normally taken to mean within walking distance of transit, which commonly means one-quarter mile (and sometimes is interpreted as one-half mile in the case of rail service). The bullet calling for office employers to provide free or subsidized transit passes is included in recognition of "the predominance of office employment in San Francisco [that] is evident in that office occupations—both high-wage management occupations and lower-wage office and administrative support occupations—are ranked among the top three in each neighborhood, including Western SoMa" (DEIR p. 208).

The bullet in Mitigation Measure E-12 stating, "Require that all new residential development larger than 50 units provide transit passes to all residents as part of rent or homeowners association fees" is hereby deleted. The above changes do not fundamentally alter the concept behind the remaining bulleted paragraphs, which is to encourage increased transit use. The other bulleted items remain applicable, at the program level of analysis used in the DEIR, and other approaches could also be employed.

Noise

Comment [MM6]

Page S-41: In Mitigation Measure F-2, Construction Noise, define "noise control blankets." These could cause safety hazards for construction workers, including forklift and operators, and could reduce passage of light and air. They might also cause a wind-related safety hazard, causing scaffolding to topple. The items in Mitigation Measure F-2 could create economic hardship for development of both residential and non-residential construction, and should be reserved for controlling after-hours construction noise only. (*M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

Construction noise barriers are commonly used on construction projects to limit noise emanating from the construction site and reaching nearby residential units and other sensitive receptors, such as schools and hospitals. Noise blankets can be employed as a shield around particularly noisy construction equipment, such as compressors, and can also be installed on portions of a building wall. These and other methods of limiting the external effects of construction noise (e.g., plywood, plastic, or metal acoustic panels) are routinely used on construction projects and there is no reason to suspect that the safety hazards postulated by the commenter would come to pass. Typically, these temporary barriers are placed on the side of a project's structural framework that abuts an adjacent building, and are not mounted on all sides of the structural framework. Concerning the applicability of the features in Mitigation Measure F-2, DEIR p. S-41, the measure does not state that these features automatically apply to any projects. Rather, the measure begins, "Where environmental review of a development project undertaken subsequent to the adoption of the proposed zoning controls determines that construction noise controls are necessary due to the nature of planned construction practices and the sensitivity of proximate uses, the Planning Director shall require that the sponsors of the subsequent development project develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant." The measure states that listed attenuation measures shall be applied as feasible. Thus, each project would be evaluated on an individual basis, by a qualified expert, prior to any determination about what noise-control strategies need be employed, and when.

Comment [MM7]

Page S-42: In Mitigation Measure F-4, Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses, using "two blocks" as the area around a project site that would be evaluated for noise-generating uses is unscientific. Instead, a distance of 150 feet to 300 feet should be used. Noise measurements should be made at the project site, which would eliminate the need for an area survey. (*M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

The purpose of the survey of nearby land uses in Mitigation Measure F-4 is to evaluate the potential for noise generation prior to approving a residential project or other new use at which excessive noise levels could be annoying. While the mitigation measure calls for noise measurements to be undertaken, without a survey of nearby uses, it could be difficult to identify the source(s) of noise levels recorded over a 24-hour period. The notion that the survey should be undertaken within two blocks of a project was intended to simplify this effort and encompass those uses directly adjacent to a project (presumably on the same city block) as well as those across the street (presumably the next city block). Since adjacent buildings can serve as noise barriers, the appropriate

distance could vary depending on the heights of adjacent buildings. An important indicator of potential noise impact in a developed, urbanized noise environment is whether or not there is a direct line-of-sight between source and receptor (which would determine whether there are intervening buildings that would serve as noise barriers). As the commenter implies, two blocks can be a substantially different distance depending on the neighborhood in which a project is located. Accordingly, Mitigation Measures F-4 (Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses) and F-5 (Siting of Noise-Generating Uses) is each revised so that the reference to "… uses within two blocks of the project site …" is revised to read, "… uses within 900 feet ~~two blocks~~ of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, …." The 900-foot distance is derived from the approximate distance needed for a noise level of 85 decibels (dBA; this level is equivalent to a noisy factory at 50 feet, as indicated in DEIR Table 43) to be reduced to about 60 dBA (the level at which an interior noise level of 45 dBA can generally be achieved by closing windows, without special noise reduction features or insulation, per the General Plan noise compatibility guidelines in DEIR Figure 19), assuming typically assumed attenuation of 6 dBA per doubling of distance.

Likewise, Air Quality Mitigation Measure G-4 (Siting of Uses that Emit Other TACs) is revised to replace "two blocks" with "1,000 feet," which is the distance that the California Air Resources Board recommends as an appropriate separation between sensitive land uses and certain TAC-emitting uses.

Comment [MM8]

Page S-42: Mitigation Measure F-6. Mitigation regarding Code-required open space should apply only to "the most extreme cases, perhaps only when building next to heavy industrial uses." It should not apply to rooftop open space, including decks; noise barriers should not exceed 7 feet in height. "This policy could present many conflicts with the Design Review Guidelines and limit one's ability to provide outdoor open space. (*Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

Mitigation Measure F-6 recognizes that outdoor open spaces—which the Planning Code generally requires be provided for new residential development—cannot always meet what might be considered an ideal noise standard. As a result, the measure calls for such spaces to be protected from annoying or disruptive noise levels "to the maximum feasible extent," and "consistent with other principles of urban design." The measure simply requires that noise be one of the factors considered in the design of outdoor open space.

Air Quality

Comment [MM9]

"We strongly support the inclusion of G-1, which recognizes that construction related particulate matter can be a public health nuisance and irritant. It would be useful to explicitly designate a public agency (e.g. Department of Building Inspection) to review, approve, and monitor compliance of the required dust abatement plans." *(Rajiv Bhatia, M.D., Ph.D., San Francisco Department of Public Health)*

Response

The comment expresses support for implementation of mitigation measures and draft policies aimed at reducing automobile travel. No response is required.

Comment [MM10]

The DEIR Summary, on p. S-26, states that mitigation would require that a number of uses be located at least 1,000 feet from residential units and other sensitive receptors. This appears impractical. *(Victor Vitlin, John Vitlin Trust)*

Response

Because of an editorial error, the Summary description cited by the commenter incorrectly characterized the intent of the proposed mitigation by conflating Mitigation Measures G-3 and G-4. Mitigation Measure G-3 would require that "new development including warehousing and distribution centers, commercial, industrial, or other uses that would be expected to be served by at least 100 trucks per day or 40 refrigerated trucks per day … be located no less than 1,000 feet from residential units and other sensitive receptors, including schools, children's day care centers, parks and playgrounds, hospitals, nursing and convalescent homes, and like uses" to reduce potential exposure to diesel particulate emissions. Mitigation Measure G-4 would require an analysis identifying nearby sensitive receptors before permitting new uses that would be expected to generate toxic air contaminants, including such uses as "dry cleaners; drive-through restaurants; gas dispensing facilities; auto body shops; metal plating shops; photographic processing shops; textiles; apparel and furniture upholstery; leather and leather products; appliance repair shops; mechanical assembly cleaning; printing shops; hospitals and medical clinics; biotechnology research facilities; warehousing and distribution centers; and any use served by at least 100 trucks per day." However, depending on the results of the analysis, such uses (other than trucking facilities) would not necessarily have to be located a minimum of 1,000 feet from sensitive uses. These two measures are correctly characterized on DEIR p. 353, in the Air Quality section.

To correct the editorial error, the second full paragraph on DEIR p. S-26 is revised as follows (new text is double-underlined; deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~):

> Certain other uses that could locate in the project area could result in emissions of DPM and other TACs. These include, for DPM, warehousing and distribution centers and commercial, industrial, or other uses that generate substantial truck traffic. For other TACs, uses would include, among others, dry cleaners, drive-through restaurants, gas stations, auto body shops, metal plating shops; photo processing, furniture upholstery, appliance repair, printing, hospitals and clinics, biotechnology research, warehousing and distribution centers, and processing of textiles and leather. Mitigation identified in this EIR would require that ~~such~~ uses generating substantial DPM emissions be located no less than 1,000 feet from residential units and other sensitive receptors, and would require a site survey to identify existing residential or other sensitive uses where other new TAC-generating uses are proposed. This mitigation would reduce impacts of uses generating DPM and other TACs to a less-than-significant level.

Comment [MM11]

Page S-44: In Mitigation Measure G-2, Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses, how was the distance of 500 feet from a freeway and a traffic volume of 100,000 daily vehicles determined to be appropriate for this measure? What is a "high-efficiency filter system." (*M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

As explained in the main body of the DEIR, on p. 333, the 500-foot distance and 100,000 daily vehicles thresholds are based on the 2005 California Air Resources Board publication entitled, *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective.* A high-efficiency filter system, as stated in Mitigation Measure G-2, in this context means that the filters meet a minimum efficiency reporting value (MERV) 13, per American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) Standard 52.2. Such filters typically capture more than 90 percent of particles 1 micron or greater in diameter, and less than 75 percent of smaller particles 0.3 to 1 micron in size. This filtration is comparable to a Dust Spot 85% rating in the prior ASHRAE Standard 52.1. According to research by Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, a MERV 13 filter in conjunction with a central forced air system can reduce indoor levels of fine soot particulates generated outdoors by 45 to 80 percent.[41]

[41] Sherman, Max H., and Nance E. Matson, "Reducing Indoor Residential Exposures to Outdoor Pollutants," Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory Report Number 51758. Berkeley, California, July 2003. This report is available for review by appointment at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2004.0160E.

Archeological Resources

Comment [MM12]

Page S-44: Mitigation Measure J-1 should be required only for project on "native" soils because fill is not likely to be the location of an archeological site. (*Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

Mitigation Measure J-1 applies only the sites "for which a final archeological research design and treatment plan (ARDTP) is on file" with the state and the Planning Department. The fact that an ARDTP had previously been prepared for a site indicates that there was at least some degree of presumed archeological sensitivity attributed to the site. Moreover, while historic-period sites are less likely to be present where there is fill (depending on the depth of fill), prehistoric sites may be present beneath fill place during the historic era. For instance, one of the most important archeological discoveries in San Francisco was a fragmentary human skeleton from a nearly 5,000-year-old burial site that was discovered during excavation for the Powell Street BART station in 1969. These remains were discovered at a depth of 75 feet below street grade in an area that had been graded and filled extensively during the 19th century. Additionally, in some instances "fill" itself has been determined to be archeologically significant if the fill material can be associated with a specific episode, source, or historic phenomenon. Examples of archeologically significant fill include the Quartermaster dump at the San Francisco Presidio and "Dumpville," an area along the northern shore of Mission Bay (adjacent to East SoMa) where poor residents—mostly men—built makeshift housing and searched for items of value in the refuse deposited in Mission Bay. Furthermore, archeological features such as prehistoric midden or buried storeships, wharves, buildings, marine ways, and the like often occur within landfill matrices.

Comment [MM13]

Page S-47 – S-48 – Mitigation Measure J-2, Properties with No Previous [Archeological] Studies: "Please explain what is wrong with the existing standards and substantiate the need to implement each of these 5 conditions." (*M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

The requirements for the archeological sensitivity study to be required for properties for which no prior archeological assessment has been completed simply formalizes the procedures already used by the Planning Department. For sites where no previous research has been conducted regarding the potential existence of subsurface cultural resources, Department staff typically reviews the case file, including existing reports for

properties near the site in question—essentially conducting its own "sensitivity study" to determine whether further research is warranted. If so, the Department typically requires preparation of an Archeological Research Design and Treatment Plan, as is also called for, where warranted, under Mitigation Measure J-2. The Sensitivity Study that is set forth as a first step under this measure is akin to Planning Department procedures for potential historical resources for which no specific research has been conducted. In such instances, the Department typically requires submittal of a "Supplemental Information Form for Historical Resource Evaluation," on which is provided information on the property description, history, and existing ratings, as well as the architect. Additional details, such as the historic name of the property, are also provided, if applicable., Department preservation planning staff sometimes bypass the Supplemental Information Form when it is already likely that a property will be determined to be a historical resource; in such cases, a Historic Resources Evaluation Report is required to assess the impacts of the proposed project. In practice, it is anticipated that there may be similar instances with regard to properties subject to Mitigation Measure J-2; that is, Department staff will sometimes bypass the Sensitivity Study and simply require a Archeological Research Design and Treatment Plan in the case of the known or likely presence of archeological resources.

Historical Resources

Comment [MM14]

Page S-52: Regarding Mitigation Measure K-1, buildings 50 years or more in age that are proposed for demolition should not be reviewed by the Landmarks Preservation Board, unless Planning preservation staff feels the building is exceptionally worthy of such review. This review is not required by any City code. Why would a building 50 feet tall or 10 feet taller than adjacent buildings be likely to adversely affect historic buildings, when such a development pattern downtown "has never been considered a negative environmental effect?" (*Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

Under existing Planning Department policy, when a building that is more than 50 years of age that is not already designated as or known to be a historical resource is proposed for demolition or major alternation, the Department requires that research be undertaken to determine whether the building meets criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources or otherwise qualifies as a "historical resources" for the purposes of CEQA review.[42] (Fifty years is commonly used as the cutoff age because resources less than 50 years of age are not commonly listed in the California Register unless "it can be

[42] San Francisco Planning Department, "Preservation Bulletin 16: CEQA Review Procedures for Historic Resources," March 31, 2008. Available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400. Also available on the internet at: http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/planning/projects_reports/PresBulletin16CEQA.pdf.

demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance" (California Public Resources Code Sec. 4852(d)(2)). The requirement in Mitigation Measure K-1 that projects involving demolition or major alteration of such buildings in the project area be reviewed by the Landmarks Board is identified as an interim permit review procedure until historical resources surveys of the Eastern Neighborhoods have been completed. Once the surveys are complete, Department staff will be able to quickly and accurately identify historical resources that may be affected by subsequent development projects, and automatic Landmarks Board review would not necessarily be required.

Regarding buildings above specified heights, these aspects of Mitigation Measure K-1 are intended, again as an interim permit review procedure, to allow for thorough review of subsequent development projects that could alter the setting or feeling of an existing or potential historical resource. These are among the seven aspects of integrity that are incorporated into guidance for identification of eligibility for the California Register (as well as the National Register of Historic Places); to be eligible for these registers, a resource must have historic importance *and* maintain sufficient integrity to convey that importance. (The other seven aspects of integrity are location, design, materials, workmanship, and association.)

Setting refers to, among other things, "Relationships between buildings and other features or open space." Feeling is "a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time."[43] In particular, the setting of a historical resource can be adversely affected by changes in relationships between the resource and nearby properties, especially adjacent buildings. For example, if a historic building that defines the visual gateway to a neighborhood is rendered substantially less visually important by a newer, much larger building, the historic building could have diminished integrity. While such a change would not necessarily result in a significant adverse change in the historic significance of the resource (and, therefore, a significant impact under CEQA), the impact must be evaluated. The reason for referring such projects to the Landmarks Board pending completion of historic survey work in the Eastern Neighborhoods is to ensure that such evaluation is not overlooked.

Comment [MM15]

Page S-53: Why does Mitigation Measure K-1, Interim Procedures for [Historical-Resources–Related] include an additional 10-day review period? Cannot this review occur within the existing 30-day neighborhood notification time period or before the notice required under Planning Code Section 311 is distributed? (*M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

[43] National Park Service, "National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation," 1995 (revised). Available on the internet at: http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins.htm.

Response

Planning Code Section 311 requires that a notice be posted and mailed to neighborhoods regarding building permit applications in residential (RH and RM) use districts, and that the permit not be acted upon for 30 days to allow review by residents, owners, and neighborhood groups. For projects in RH and RM districts, it is likely that the 10-day review called for under Mitigation Measure K-1.E would be completed within the 30-day Section 311 period. Certain other use districts also required neighborhood review of building permits. The 10-day neighborhood review of potential historical resources impacts identified in Mitigation Measure K-1.E would apply, however, even in the absence of such existing review requirements. As with other measures discussed above, this would be an interim permit review procedure until historical resources surveys of the Eastern Neighborhoods have been completed.

Comment [MM16]

"Page S-55, Fourth (4th) full paragraph from the bottom of the page:

"a. This paragraph seems to imply that new buildings built next to or near historical buildings would be evaluated on how their height compares with the height of historical buildings, though very tall buildings have been successfully built next to low and tall historical buildings throughout the City, mostly downtown and in neighborhood commercial districts. Please explain why there needs to be any criteria discouraging construction or additions creating buildings taller than adjacent historical buildings.

"b. Please explain how the addition of criteria for infill construction stated at the bottom of S-55 might or might not impair the construction of the Eastern neighborhoods goal of 9,000 units." (*M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

This comment concerns Mitigation Measure K-3, which addresses alterations and infill within the existing Dogpatch Historic District. In a historic district, the district itself is a historical resource under CEQA, along with the individual contributing resources within the district, which are also normally considered historical resources. As such, environmental review under CEQA already requires that the analysis evaluate whether a project would "cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource," as stated on DEIR p. 455. The DEIR explains, on p. 456, that a "substantial adverse change" is defined in the CEQA Guidelines as "physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired," and that such material impairment would occur when a project demolishes or materially alters, in an adverse manner, those physical characteristics of the resource that, among other things,

account for the property's inclusion in a local register of historical resources, such as Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code, which lists locally designated historic districts. Accordingly, evaluation of the effects of new construction within a historic district, such as the Dogpatch Historic District, already requires evaluation of effects both on the district itself and on adjacent and nearby contributing resources. In terms of project design and approval by the City, the Planning Code requirement for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction in a historic district (including Dogpatch) is that the project "be compatible with the character of the historic district" (Planning Code Sec. 1006.6(c)).

As to the above criteria's potential to affect the number of dwelling units produced under the project, the Planning Department growth projections on which the DEIR analysis was based do not anticipate substantial new housing development within the Dogpatch Historic District; instead, housing development projected in the Central Waterfront is anticipated to occur primarily outside the historic district. Moreover, the relatively small area occupied by the Dogpatch Historic District within the Eastern Neighborhoods project area would diminish any potential dampening effect that Mitigation Measure K-3 might have on future development.

Improvement Measures

Comment [MM17]

Page S-57: Concerning Improvement Measure D-2, does the second paragraph (which describes "additional efforts to contend with potential residential displacement [by focusing] on increasing the housing supply for those such as larger families and families whose needs are not adequately met by the private market) refer to a proposed "inclusionary housing overlay," or to something in addition to the proposed overlay? (*M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

Improvement Measure D-2, Affordable Housing Production and Retention, is included in the DEIR to partially address the project's less-than-significant physical effects of potential displacement of residents who suffer employment loss as a secondary effect of the proposed project, which is discussed on DEIR pp. 238 – 239. This improvement measure is general in nature, providing a list of potential approaches to assisting in the provision of additional affordable housing for families that could indirectly be displaced from their existing housing as a result of the loss of PDR employment that may be a primary source of wages for these families. No specific program proposed as part of the project is specified in this measure.

It is also noted that, on February 28, 2008, Supervisor Dufty introduced legislation before the Board of Supervisors (File 080273) that would amend the Residential Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program (contained in Planning Code Sec. 315 *et. seq.*) to allow for density bonuses to be granted to project applicants who develop "affordable family-sized units" (generally, two and three bedroom units, subject to certain limitations).

Comment [MM18]

Page S-57: Concerning Improvement Measure D-3, affordable housing sites should be mapped by the City as part of the proposed Eastern Neighborhoods area plans before the plans are adopted "so that people will know what sites are likely to be designated for Affordable Housing before they pursue purchasing them…." (*Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

Improvement Measure D-3 calls for the City to maintain and regularly update an inventory of potential affordable housing sites, to avoid the potential for conflict between a developer of market-rate housing and an affordable-housing developer. If this measure were implemented, it would effectively resolve the commenter's concern. Including such a map in the proposed area plans would neither be practical nor particularly useful, because it would reflect conditions a single moment in time and would not provide for updating of the inventory.

Comment [MM19]

Page S-58: Concerning Improvement Measure F-1, "Please explain why, even without updating or revising the existing Noise Ordinance, the EIR is implying that the threshold decibel level above which noise shall be considered a nuisance under the Police Code will be studied for reduction." (*M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates; Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association*)

Response

As explained in the main body of the DEIR, the Noise Ordinance is out of date. "The Noise Ordinance has not been amended since 1973 and Section 2909 does not currently correspond to many existing zoning districts. For example, the ordinance makes no reference to existing mixed-use districts in the South of Market or to neighborhood commercial districts, which exist citywide, and the residential districts identified in the ordinance do not match the current array of residential districts in the Planning Code. Thus, enforcement of the ordinance involves a degree of interpretation as to its applicability in various use districts" (footnote 133, DEIR p. 312). Under the Noise Ordinance, relatively higher noise levels are permitted in commercial, heavy commercial, and industrial use districts, compared to residential districts: the permitted noise level in the M-2 (Heavy Industrial) use district is 75 dBA, or 25 dBA higher than the maximum

permitted nighttime noise level in existing low-density residential districts. Under the proposed Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans project, it is likely that new mixed-use districts that permit dwelling units alongside commercial (and, in some cases, PDR) uses, would be subject to lower (residential-based) noise levels than the industrial and heavy commercial districts that the new districts would replace. As stated on DEIR p. 322, "While this would not, in itself, create a adverse physical effect … it would potentially create new violations of the Police Code, as businesses currently in compliance with the noise ordinance limits for industrial zones might not comply with the lower limits for mixed-use zones." Accordingly, the DEIR identifies Improvement Measure F-1 as a means of achieving consistency between the Police Code and the Planning Code use districts, and to develop appropriate noise standards for mixed-use districts. Improvement Measure F-1 does not call for reducing, for example, the existing noise level that is allowable in residential districts.

Significant, Unavoidable Impacts

Comment [SU1]

The DEIR identifies 26 out of 39 impacts that need more discussion. Of these include Land Use, Visual Quality, Population, Transportation and Circulation, Noise, Air Quality, Hazards and Cultural Resources. This number is too large and significant to not be addressed in more detail. A stronger list of mitigation measures, to include a readjustment of the East SoMa Area Plan goals, must be incorporated immediately to ensure that this neighborhood continues to be healthy, viable and diverse. *(Chris Durazo, South of Market Community Action Network [SOMCAN])*

Response

The comment is noted. The DEIR identifies significant effects than cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level only under the topics of Land Use (Option C and the No-Project scenario would result in a significant adverse effect on the supply of land for PDR uses); Transportation (Options A, B, and C, as well as the No-Project scenario would result in significant adverse effects on traffic and transit); Historical Resources (all options and the No-Project scenario would result in significant adverse effects because it is unlikely that no future development proposal in the Eastern Neighborhoods would result in demolition, alteration, or other changes to one or more historical resources such that the historical significance of those resources would be "materially impaired"); and Shadow (all options and the No-Project scenario could add new shadow to protected parks the feasibility of complete mitigation for potential new shadow impacts of currently unknown development proposals cannot be determined at this time). The information in the DEIR concerning these significant, unavoidable impacts will be considered by the decision-makers as part of their decision whether to approve the propose project. The EIR does contain extensive discussion of these potential impacts, and the potential for

mitigation or reduction of impacts. While feasible mitigation measures were not identified for all impacts, the residual significant impacts do not necessarily lead to a conclusion that certain neighborhoods would be unhealthy.

Comments on the Proposed Rezoning and Area Plans

Comment [PR1]

"The transportation section of the DEIR is very thorough in detailing the current traffic and transportation nightmare in the Mission and analyzing the proposed future nightmare which will remain. The glaring omission is the development and utilization of 16th Street. People drive, walk, bike, bus and BART along 16th Street through the Mission and Potrero in droves every day. Why not develop this as a safe and viable route? People use this street anyway. Let them do so safely and productively by allowing appropriate development along this route." *(Richard F. Koch, Alabama Street Partners)*

Response

The comment appears to support increased intensity of development along 16h Street. As shown in Figure 2 on DEIR p. 8, 16th Street between South Van Ness Avenue and Seventh Street is primarily zoned for industrial uses (M-1 and M-2 districts); east of Seventh Street, 16th Street enters the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Area. The proposed rezoning options depicted in Figure 3 on DEIR p. 15 include areas of Mixed-Use Residential, Urban Mixed-Use, and Residential, Transit Oriented districts of varying sizes and at varying locations along this same portion of 16th Street. Thus, depending on the rezoning option selected, permitted land uses could change to varying degrees in both Showplace Square/Potrero Hill and in the NEMIZ.

Comment [PR2]

[T]he summary here that talks in our calendar that talks about the different districts is probably a little clearer definition than some of the terms. I mean we're talking about a district where PDR … is allowed, where PDR can be mixed with residential/commercial, where there should be residential and commercial, presumably no PDR and then residential only. And I think that's … perhaps a little easier concept to understand than some of the—the transit terms that are used with some of these districts…. *(Planning Commissioner Michael Antonini)*

Response

Some of the names of the proposed use districts have been revised since the publication of the Draft EIR, which may address some of the Commissioner's concerns. The use district names ultimately adopted if the rezoning proposed is adopted will be those approved by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Comments

A number of comments were directed at the proposed rezoning and area plans, and do not address the adequacy or accuracy of the EIR. The following are some of the issues raised in regard to the proposed project itself, or in support of or opposition to various rezoning options, rather than the DEIR. (A number of the comments concern the draft proposed zoning map and use district designations released for public review on September 6, 2007, during the DEIR public comment period.) Because these comments do not address the adequacy or accuracy of the EIR, no responses are required. However, in some instances, additional information is provided for clarification. These and other comments that concern the proposed project (proposed rezoning and area plans) will be considered by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in their consideration of the proposed zoning changes and draft Area Plans.

- Height limits along the north side of 16th Street [on Blocks 3833 and 3834] should be increased to 65 feet, not the 45 feet indicated in the DEIR for Option B or the 50 to 55 feet indicated for Options A and C. *(Steven L. Vettel, Farella, Braun + Martel) [PR3]*
- Parcels on the west side of Indiana Street between 20th and 22nd Streets should be designated for Mixed Use Residential uses rather than PDR uses. *(George Hume and David Gockley, San Francisco Opera) [PR4]*
- The project should permit greater height limits—up to 500 feet—along Harrison Street between Second and Fourth Streets and on Fourth Street south of the I-80 freeway. *(Joseph Ferrucci, Luce, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps) [PR5]*
- The proposed UMU and PDR use districts would impose unreasonable restrictions on office use, particularly in the case of larger multi-tenant buildings that have a mix of tenant uses and have had occupancy of well in excess of 5,000 square feet of office use for many years. In the Northeast Mission, office use has coexisted with PDR, both within buildings and between adjacent and nearby buildings, for many years. Traditional PDR use (i.e., manufacturing) has essentially moved offshore and is generally no longer economically viable in the United States. Thus, "the concept of a 'Production' and 'Distribution' business is not a static one and PDR businesses have been forced to change their business model, their operations, and their use of space…." *(Victor Vitlin, John Vitlin Trust; M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates) [PR6]*
- Architects, engineers, and design professionals should be included in a separate use category, as they use office-like facilities but often cannot afford traditional office space . *(Victor Vitlin, John Vitlin Trust) [PR7]*
- What is the difference between Office – Multimedia/Digital Media Office" and Industrial/PDR – Multimedia/Digital Media Production Facility?" *(Victor Vitlin, John Vitlin Trust) [PR8]*
- Life science research and development should be permitted in PDR districts in the NEMIZ. *(Victor Vitlin, John Vitlin Trust; M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates) [PR9]*
- Housing should be a permitted use on the 16th Street corridor in the NEMIZ. Concerning, housing, the proposed requirements that a share of new residential units be larger (two-bedroom and three-bedroom) units is unrealistic. *(Victor Vitlin, John Vitlin Trust; M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates) [PR10]*

- Limiting the amount of retail space in buildings in PDR and UMU districts is unrealistic, particularly for buildings that have substantial amounts of existing retail. *(Victor Vitlin, John Vitlin Trust; M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates) [PR11]*
- As an alternative to the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning, why not consider rezoning for PDR use in the Bayshore and Bayview neighborhoods and on Port of San Francisco land, which are more physically separated from residential use and have better truck access? *(Victor Vitlin, John Vitlin Trust) [PR12]*
- "The City is mistaken in thinking that it can bring industry to the City using zoning as the main tool, by setting aside an area where industry will have to compete with few of the highest and best uses for a limited amount of land. … The City does not consider the real problems of some of the traditional PDR businesses—a lack of revenue or falling revenue coupled with increases in expenses…. Many older, traditional PDR businesses are losing revenue due to technological and other changes in their business which zoning cannot address and which cannot be reversed, e.g., production moving offshore. … Many 'Repair' businesses have been eliminated or seen dramatic loss of business. It is no longer cost-effective to repair many products." *(Victor Vitlin, John Vitlin Trust) [PR13]*
- Will a startup business be required to move if it becomes successful and outgrows the size restrictions on certain types of uses proposed in the rezoning? Can such a business occupy adjoining space in the immediate neighborhood even if it exceeds the size limit, such as a sales office in one space and manufacturing in another? *(Victor Vitlin, John Vitlin Trust) [PR14]*
- Many buildings in proposed PDR zones in the NEMIZ, particularly larger buildings, are in multi-tenant use with much of their upper stories devoted to office-type uses and not to PDR. Should these buildings be subject to the same restrictions as buildings in PDR use? PDR tenants are increasingly demanding more flexible space and may be able to co-exist with non-PDR uses in such buildings. *(Richard F. Koch, Alabama Street Partners) [PR15]*
- The NEMIZ should not bear an undue share of the burden of attempting to meet the City's need for more affordable housing. *(Richard F. Koch, Alabama Street Partners; M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates) [PR16]*
- Use controls for the proposed Urban Mixed-Use (UMU) use district should be more permissive than currently proposed and should permit general office use, medical offices without regard to size and with "realistic" amounts of parking, and retail uses in excess of 7,500 square feet, and affordable housing requirements should be "realistic." *(Josh Smith, Walden Development LLC) [PR17]*
- Sixteenth Street should be designated a "transit corridor" with a height limit of 65 feet near Mission Bay and Interstate 280. Seventh Street should have a height limit of 55 feet. *(Josh Smith, Walden Development LLC; M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates) [PR18]*
- "The DEIR is deficient in identifying appropriate land use opportunities to support and encourage more families to the East SoMa area. The DEIR and East SoMa area plan should include a family infrastructure component: Explore a Youth and Family Zone between the 4th and 7th Streets along both sides Folsom and Bryant Street. The zone should include the two campus Bessie Carmichael Elementary and Middle School, Vicky Manalo Draves Park, the Rec Center and the youth-serving organizations. Family-housing, services and a youth center should be prioritized uses in this area." *(Chris Durazo, South of Market Community Action Network [SOMCAN]) [PR19]*

- Child care and self storage should be permitted uses in PDR and UMU districts. *(M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates) [PR20]*
- The proposed rezoning should allow for office use in City Landmarks and other historic buildings in PDR and UMU districts, if that use can be shown to be necessary for preservation of the building. *(M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates) [PR21]*
- Industrial uses should not be subject to limitations on lot coverage. *(M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates) [PR22]*
- PDR districts should permit non-PDR uses when a building owner can demonstrate an inability to lease space to PDR tenants. *(M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates) [PR23]*
- Non-PDR uses in existing M-1 districts proposed for PDR-only rezoning should be allowed to remain as legal nonconforming uses even if they have not obtained required building permits and/or planning approval for alterations to their leased space. *(M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates) [PR24]*
- Why does the proposed rezoning include a greater open space requirement per dwelling unit than is currently required. *(M. Brett Gladstone, Gladstone & Associates) [PR25]*
- One-to-one parking should be permitted as of right. *(Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association) [PR26]*
- There is sufficient land for PDR uses citywide. "Light and medium PDR uses can co-exists with housing," and affordable housing should be encouraged atop such PDR uses. *(Grace Shanahan, Residential Builders Association) [PR27]*

Response

As stated above, comments on the proposed project that do not address the adequacy of the EIR need not be responded to. The following responses, however, are provided for the reader's information.

Concerning the comments from San Francisco Opera representatives in regard to parcels on the west side of Indiana Street between 20th and 22nd Streets, the comments state that these parcels were not included in the February 2003 *Rezoning Options Workbook* for the Eastern Neighborhoods. This is correct. The parcels in question are within the Central Waterfront neighborhood and, as explained on p. 1 of the DEIR, the project includes "all or part of three 'Eastern Neighborhoods' included in the Department's February 2003 draft *Rezoning Options Workbook* … [as well as] the Central Waterfront, which was the subject of the draft Central Waterfront Neighborhood Plan, published in December 2002 as part of the Better Neighborhoods planning process, because the Central Waterfront is adjacent to the Eastern Neighborhoods planning area and shares similar land use issues." More importantly, under the Preferred Project as of April 2008 (see p. C&R-5), the proposed zoning for these parcels has been changed from Employment and Business Development (EBD; now referred to as PDR zoning), which would generally permit only PDR uses, to Urban Mixed-Use (UMU), which would allow residential and commercial uses.

Concerning the comment regarding rezoning for PDR use in the Bayshore and Bayview neighborhoods and on Port land, it is noted that the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan was approved in 2006 with the intent of retaining large areas of industrially zoned land. Rezoning of that neighborhood, which includes the Bayshore Boulevard corridor, is proceeding in accordance with the adopted redevelopment plan: as noted on p. 62 of the DEIR, the adopted plan generally mirrors Option B analyzed in the DEIR, which anticipates substantial growth in PDR and other industrial uses in Bayview-Hunters Point, as well as on Port land in the Bayview. Moreover, as stated on DEIR p. 62, both Bayview-Hunters Point and Western SoMa were considered in the PDR study by Economic and Planning Systems, because those neighborhoods were within the original 2003 boundaries of the Eastern Neighborhoods.

As stated in the DEIR on p. 13, most industrial land under Port jurisdiction in the Central Waterfront is intended to remain in industrial and maritime use. However, as also noted in the DEIR (p. 110), there are limitations on non-maritime industrial use of Port lands under the State of California Public Trust Doctrine.

Concerning the comment regarding expanding businesses potentially being prohibited if they exceed a particular size limit on the use in question, it is conceivable that this situation could arise, as it possible that the same situation could arise in many locations in San Francisco today. For example, many neighborhood commercial districts restrict the size of individual retail stores such that expansion beyond a certain floor area is prohibited under the Planning Code. Likewise, many such districts limit certain uses to certain floors of a building (for example, office space may be permitted at the ground floor and second story, but not above). It would be speculative to try to predict the outcome of the proposed size restrictions on future uses in the project area.

Regarding the comment about the EIR not adequately identifying "appropriate land use opportunities to support and encourage more families to the East SoMa area," the DEIR evaluates the project as proposed, which in this case is the series of draft area plans and conceptual rezoning put forward by the Planning Department. It is not the EIR's function to alter the project as proposed.

E. Staff-Initiated Text Changes

The following changes to the text of the Draft EIR are made in response to comments on the DEIR or are included to clarify the DEIR text. In each change, new language is double underlined, while deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~, except where the text is indicated as entirely new, in which case no underlining is used for easier reading.

On page S-26, the second full paragraph is revised as follows to correct an editorial error:

> Certain other uses that could locate in the project area could result in emissions of DPM and other TACs. These include, for DPM, warehousing and distribution centers and commercial, industrial, or other uses that generate substantial truck traffic. For other TACs, uses would include, among others, dry cleaners, drive-through restaurants, gas stations, auto body shops, metal plating shops; photo processing, furniture upholstery, appliance repair, printing, hospitals and clinics, biotechnology research, warehousing and distribution centers, and processing of textiles and leather. Mitigation identified in this EIR would require that ~~such~~ uses generating substantial DPM emissions be located no less than 1,000 feet from residential units and other sensitive receptors, and would require a site survey to identify existing residential or other sensitive uses where other new TAC-generating uses are proposed. This mitigation would reduce impacts of uses generating DPM and other TACs to a less-than-significant level.

On page S-40, Mitigation Measure E-11 is revised to incorporate aspects of Mitigation Measure E-12 into a more holistic concept of Transportation Demand Management, and Mitigation Measure E-12 is deleted as a separate measure (see text change for p. 506 – 507 for revisions).

On page S-41, Mitigation Measure F-3 is revised to achieve consistency with Measures F-4, F-5, and F-6. (See text change for p. 508 for revisions.)

On page S-42, Mitigation Measure F-4 is revised to provide a more specific distance for application of the measure and to clarify qualifications necessary for the analyst. (See text change for p. 508 for revisions.)

On page S-42, Mitigation Measure F-5 is revised to clarify the time periods during which noise in excess of ambient levels would require further analysis and to provide a more specific distance for application of the measure. (See text change for p. 508 for revisions.)

On pages S-44 – 45, Mitigation Measure G-2 is revised to include in the discussion of roadway-related risk from vehicle emissions non-cancer risk as well as cancer risk. (See text change for p. 511 for revisions.)

On page S-45, Mitigation Measure G-3 is revised to provide a more specific distance for application of the measure. (See text change for p. 512 for revisions.)

On pages S-53 – 54, Mitigation Measure K-2 is revised in response to a comment from the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board. (See text changes for pp. 520 – 521 for revisions.)

On page S-55, Mitigation Measure K-3 is revised in response to a comment from the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board. (See text changes for pp. 521 – 522 for revisions.)

On page S-56, Mitigation Measure K-1: Hazardous Building Materials is renumbered as follows to correct an editorial error:

Mitigation Measure ~~K~~ L-1: Hazardous Building Materials

On page 91, the text under the heading "Housing Element" is revised as follows to describe the status of the *San Francisco General Plan* Housing Element, which was the subject of a lawsuit decided at approximately the same time that the DEIR was published:

> In May 2004, the Planning Commission adopted an updated and amended Housing Element of the *General Plan* to replace the existing Residence Element adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 1990. The updated Housing Element was ~~approved by the Board of Supervisors in September~~ adopted in May 2004, and certified by the State Department of Housing and Community Development in October 2004 for compliance with State law regarding the content and scope of *General Plan* housing elements. The updated 2004 Housing Element contains objectives and policies that would expand land capacity necessary to increase housing production; direct new housing to appropriate locations, especially in areas well served by transit and other urban amenities; and emphasize design and density controls that enhance existing neighborhood character. These objectives and policies are instructed by the two *General Plan* Priority Policies: that the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced and that existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of San Francisco's neighborhoods.
>
> Subsequent to adoption of the Housing Element, the district appeals court found the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the element to be inadequate, invalidating the 2004 Housing Element. Therefore, the Planning Department is initiating preparation of an EIR assessing the environmental effects of the changes from the 1990 Residence Element. The EIR is scheduled to be certified by June 30, 2009. Until an EIR has been completed and certified for the 2004 Housing Element, the 1990 Residence Element represents to most current adopted General Plan language.
>
> The following is a comparison between the 1990 Residence Element and the objectives and policies of the Housing Element ~~are~~ relative to the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans project.
> 1990 Residence Element Objective 1: Provide new housing, especially permanently affordable housing, in appropriate locations which meets

identified housing needs and takes into account the demand for affordable housing created by employment demand.

2004 Housing Element Objective 1: Identify and maximize opportunities to increase the potential supply of housing in appropriate locations citywide.

~~Policy 1.1: Encourage higher residential density in areas adjacent to downtown, in underutilized commercial and industrial areas proposed for conversion to housing, and in neighborhood commercial districts where higher density will not have harmful effects, especially if the higher density provides a significant number of units that are affordable to lower income households. Set allowable densities in established residential areas at levels which will promote compatibility with prevailing neighborhood scale and character where there is neighborhoods support.~~

1990 Residence Element Policy 1.1: Promote the development of permanently affordable housing on surplus, underused and vacant public lands.

2004 Housing Element Policy 1.5: Support development of affordable housing on surplus public lands.

2004 Housing Element Policy 1.2 (new): Encourage housing development, particularly affordable housing, in neighborhood commercial areas without displacing existing jobs, particularly blue-collar jobs or discouraging new employment opportunities.

1990 Residence Element Policy 1.2: Facilitate the conversion of underused industrial and commercial areas to residential use giving preference to permanently affordable housing uses.

2004 Housing Element Policy 1.3: Identify opportunities for housing and mixed-use districts near downtown and former industrial portions of the City.

1990 Residence Element Policy 1.3: Create incentives for the inclusion of housing, particularly permanently affordable housing, in new commercial development projects.

2004 Housing Element Policy 1.6 (no change): Create incentives for the inclusion of housing, particularly permanently affordable housing, in new commercial development projects.

1990 Residence Element Policy 1.4: Locate in-fill housing on appropriate sites in established residential neighborhoods.

2004 Housing Element Policy 1.4 (no change): Locate in-fill housing on appropriate sites in established residential neighborhoods.

2004 Housing Element Policy 1.7 (new): Encourage and support the construction of quality, new family housing.

1990 Residence Element Policy 1.5: Allow new secondary units in areas where their effects can be dealt with and there is neighborhood support,

especially if that housing is made permanently affordable to lower-income households.

2004 Housing Element Policy 1.8 (no change): Allow new secondary units in areas where their effects can be dealt with and there is neighborhood support, especially if that housing is made permanently affordable to lower-income households.

1990 Residence Element Policy 1.7: Obtain assistance from office developments and higher educational institutions in meeting the housing demand they generate, particularly the need for affordable housing for lower income workers and students.

2004 Housing Element Policy 1.9: Require new commercial developments and higher educational institutions to meet the housing demand they generate, particularly the need for affordable housing for lower income workers and students.

1990 Residence Element Policy 2.1: Set allowable densities in established residential areas at levels which will promote compatibility with prevailing neighborhood scale and character.

2004 Housing Element Policy 11.9: Set allowable densities and parking standards in residential areas at levels that promote the City's overall housing objectives while respecting neighborhood scale and character.

1990 Residence Element Objective 3: Retain the existing supply of housing.

2004 Housing Element Objective 2 (no change): Retain the existing supply of housing.

1990 Residence Element Policy 3.1: Discourage the demolition of sound existing housing.

2004 Housing Element Policy 2.1 (no change): Discourage the demolition of sound existing housing.

1990 Residence Element Policy 2.2: Encourage higher residential density in areas adjacent to downtown, in underutilized commercial and industrial areas proposed for conversion to housing, and in neighborhood commercial districts where higher density will not have harmful effects, especially if the higher density provides a significant number of units that are permanently affordable to lower income households.

2004 Housing Element Policy 1.1: Establish higher residential densities in appropriate areas near Downtown, and near certain transit corridors and neighborhood commercial districts, where dependence on cars could be reduced because of proximity to neighborhood services and access to sufficient and reliable transit service.

1990 Residence Element Policy 2.3: Allow flexibility in the number and size of units within permitted volumes of larger multi unit structures, especially if

the flexibility results in creation of a significant number of dwelling units that are permanently affordable to lower income households.

2004 Housing Element Policy 4.5: Allow greater flexibility in the number and size of units within established building envelopes, potentially increasing the number of affordable units in multi-family structures.

1990 Residence Element Policy 3.6: Retain sound existing housing in commercial and industrial areas.

2004 Housing Element Policy 2.4 (no change): Retain sound existing housing in commercial and industrial areas.

1990 Residence Element Policy 3.7: Preserve the existing stock of residential hotels.

2004 Housing Element Policy 2.5 (no change): Preserve the existing stock of residential hotels.

1990 Residence Element Policy 5.5: Preserve the existing stock of residential hotels.

2004 Housing Element Policy 3.6 (no change): Preserve landmark and historic residential buildings.

1990 Residence Element Objective 6: To protect the existing affordability of housing.

2004 Housing Element Objective 6: Protect the affordability of existing housing.

1990 Residence Element Objective 7: To increase land and improve building resources for permanently affordable housing.

2004 Housing Element Objective 4: Support affordable housing production by increasing site availability and capacity.

1990 Residence Element Policy 7.1: Create more housing opportunities for permanently affordable housing.

2004 Housing Element Policy 4.1: Actively identify and pursue opportunity sites for permanently affordable housing.

1990 Residence Element Policy 7.2: Include affordable units in larger housing projects.

2004 Housing Element Policy 4.2 (no change): Include affordable units in larger housing projects.

1990 Residence Element Policy 7.3: Grant density bonuses for construction of affordable or senior housing.

2004 Housing Element Policy 4.4: ~~Consider~~ Grant~~ing~~ density bonuses and parking requirement exemptions for the construction of affordable housing or senior housing.

1990 Residence Element Policy 7.4: Promote more economical housing construction to achieve affordable housing.

1990 Residence Element Policy 7.5: Encourage energy efficiency in new residential development and weatherization in existing housing to reduce overall housing cost.

1990 Residence Element Policy 7.6: Encourage industrialized housing production techniques where such techniques result in compatible quality of design at lower cost.

2004 Housing Element Policy 4.6: Support a greater range of housing types and building techniques to promote more economical housing construction and potentially achieve greater affordable housing production.

1990 Residence Element Policy 8.1: Enhance existing revenue sources for permanently affordable housing.

2004 Housing Element Policy 7.1 (no change): Enhance existing revenue sources for permanently affordable housing.

1990 Residence Element Policy 8.2: Create new sources of revenue for permanently affordable housing

2004 Housing Element Policy 7.2: Create new sources of revenue for permanently affordable housing, including dedicated long-term financing for housing programs.

1990 Residence Element Policy 9.2: Make affordable housing permanently affordable.

2004 Housing Element Policy 6.2: Ensure that housing developed to be affordable is kept affordable.

1990 Residence Element Policy 11.1: Encourage non-profit and limited equity ownership and management of housing.

2004 Housing Element Policy 6.4: Achieve permanent affordability through community land trusts and limited equity housing ownership and management.

1990 Residence Element Objective 12: To provide a quality living environment.

2004 Housing Element Objective 11: In increasing the supply of housing, pursue place making and neighborhood building principles and practices to maintain San Francisco's desirable urban fabric and enhance livability in all neighborhoods.

1990 Residence Element Policy 12.1: Assure housing is provided with adequate public improvements, services and amenities.

2004 Housing Element Policy 11.2: Ensure housing is provided with adequate public improvements, services, and amenities.

1990 Residence Element Policy 12.2: Allow appropriate neighborhood-serving commercial activities in residential area.

2004 Housing Element Policy 11.3: Encourage appropriate neighborhood-serving commercial activities in residential areas, without causing affordable housing displacement.

1990 Residence Element Policy 12.4: Promote the construction of well-designed housing that conserves existing neighborhood character.

2004 Housing Element Policy 11.5: Promote the construction of well-designed housing that enhances existing neighborhood character.

1990 Residence Element Policy 12.5: Relate land use controls to the appropriate scale for new and existing residential area.

2004 Housing Element Policy 11.6: Employ flexible land use controls in residential areas that can regulate inappropriately sized development in new neighborhoods, in downtown areas and in other areas through a Better Neighborhoods type planning process while maximizing the opportunity for housing near transit.

1990 Residence Element Policy 13.6: Provide adequate rental housing opportunities.

2004 Housing Element Policy 8.1: Encourage sufficient and suitable rental housing opportunities and emphasize permanently affordable rental units wherever possible.

2004 Housing Element Policy 11.1 (new): Use new housing development as a means to enhance neighborhood vitality and diversity.

2004 Housing Element Policy 11.7 (new): Where there is neighborhood support, reduce or remove minimum parking requirements for housing, increasing the amount of lot area available for housing units.

2004 Housing Element Policy 11.8 (new): Strongly encourage housing project sponsors to take full advantage of allowable building densities in their housing developments while remaining consistent with neighborhood character.

On page 111, the following text is added prior to the heading “Central Subway Planning” to incorporate information about recently initiated planning efforts:

Transit Center District Plan and Fourth and King Rail Yards Study

The Transbay Transit Center will build upon the City’s 1985 Downtown Plan, which envisioned the area around Transbay as a local and regional multi-modal transit core. The proposed Transit Center District area covers approximately 40 acres, and encompasses portions of East SoMa and the Financial District. The Transit Center District Plan area is generally bounded to the north by Market Street, to the south by

Folsom Street, to the west by a line between Third and New Montgomery Streets, and to the east by Main Street. Adopted by the City of San Francisco in June 2005, the existing Transbay Redevelopment Plan is anticipated to facilitate the development of nearly 3,400 new homes (35 percent of which will be affordable), 1.2 million square feet of new office, hotel, and commercial space and 60,000 square feet of retail, not including retail in the Transit Center itself. The area will host a temporary, on-street transit terminal that will serve as the Downtown Transit center between 2009 and 2014 when the new Transbay Terminal will be built.

In addition to serving the current regional bus services, the new terminal will also include a tunnel that will potentially extend the Caltrain commuter rail line from its current terminus at Fourth and Townsend/King Streets to the new Transbay Terminal. Additionally, the heavy rail portion of the terminal will be designed to accommodate the planned California High Speed Rail Project. Through its integration of transportation modes, its land use, and intensity of uses, the Transit center Area aspires to improve the region's transportation connectivity and provide a confluence of public transit, jobs and retail uses. In a related planning effort, the Planning Department will study a plan for air-rights development of the Fourth and King rail yard. The study will explore how increased development value can help fund public improvements, including additional funding for completing the Caltrain Extension to downtown

On page 111, the text below the heading "Central Subway Planning" is revised as follows to update this discussion:

San Francisco's Municipal Transportation Authority (MTA) is currently conducting a feasibility study on the proposed Central Subway Project, which is the second phase of the Third Street Light Rail project. The proposed Central Subway project, which aims to reduce travel times and gridlock, increase service reliability and improve access to the heart of Chinatown, would extend the new Muni Third Street Light Rail line north from King Street to a terminus at Stockton and Clay Streets. One surface and three ~~Four~~ new underground stations would be developed as part of the project.

On page 111, the text under the heading "Transit Effectiveness Project" is revised as follows to update the discussion:

The Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) is an 18-month project being undertaken by the Municipal Transportation Authority (MTA) and the San Francisco Controller's Office to review, evaluate, and make recommendations on the Municipal Railway system. A draft study was released for public review and comment on March 17, 2008.

The TEP ~~is anticipated to~~ makes recommendations to improve service, attract more riders, and increase efficiency. The TEP presents a framework that would add more transit service to the most heavily used routes, which are the same routes that tend to suffer the most overcrowding, on-time performance problems, and service delays.

TEP participants include a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC); a Policy Advisory Group that includes representatives from the Mayor's office, Board of Supervisors, transit unions, the CAC, MTA Citizens Advisory Council, San Francisco County Transportation Authority, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission; and a

Technical/Regional Advisory Committee that includes representatives from various City departments and local and regional transit agencies will provide technical review and comment. In early summer 2008, TEP proposals will be submitted to the MTA Board of Directors, reflecting any revisions that are developed as a result of internal and external stakeholder input. After the Board's review, the service change proposals will undergo environmental assessment, and, based on that analysis, the City's decision makers may make further changes to the actual projects that come out of the TEP. The environmental assessment is expected to require approximately 12 months, so the first Muni service and route changes may happen as early as July 2009. In the meantime, the SFMTA will continue to work to improve Muni reliability. ~~The MTA Board of Directors will be responsible for review and approval of findings and recommendations from the TEP, which has a goal of developing a service plan for Muni's future by late 2007.~~

On page 111, the text under the heading "San Francisco Bicycle Plan" is revised as follows to update the discussion:

An environmental impact report is currently under way to analyze the City's draft Bicycle Plan, an update to the City's existing 1997 San Francisco Bicycle Plan. The Bicycle Plan would include a citywide bicycle transportation plan (comprised of a "Policy Framework" and a "Network Improvement" document) and phased implementation of 60 near-term ~~specific bicycle~~ improvement~~s~~ projects, as well as long-term projects and other improvement to the existing bicycle network ~~identified within the plan~~. The draft Plan includes objectives and identifies policy changes that would enhance the City's bikeability. It also describes the existing bicycle route network (a series of interconnected streets in which bicycling is encouraged), and identifies gaps within the citywide bicycle route network that require improvement. The draft Plan, if adopted, would update the existing 1997 San Francisco Bicycle Plan. Environmental review could be complete and the Plan considered for adoption as early as spring 2009 ~~2008~~.

On page 113, the following text is added at the end of the discussion under the heading "UCSF Mission Bay Area Planning" to update the discussion:

A draft EIR was published for the UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay in April 2008.

On page 116, the following text is added prior to the heading "Planning in the Project Area Vicinity" to incorporate information about other planning efforts:

Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan (proposed)

Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island are in San Francisco Bay, about halfway between the San Francisco mainland and Oakland. The islands are the site of the former Naval Station Treasure Island, which was owned by the United States Navy. The Navy base was closed on September 20, 1997, as part of the Base Realignment and Closure III program. The islands also include a U.S. Coast Guard Station and land occupied by the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge and tunnel structures.

The proposed *Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Redevelopment Plan* would provide the basis for redevelopment of most of the former Navy lands from a

primarily low-density residential area with vacant and underutilized nonresidential structures to a new mixed-use community with a retail center, a variety of open space and recreation opportunities, on-site infrastructure, and public and community services. The proposed Redevelopment Plan and other planning documents would establish general land use controls and design standards for the project site. The Redevelopment Plan includes supporting studies that address project design concepts, transportation, infrastructure, community services, affordable housing, jobs, and other aspects of the development. A major component of the proposed Redevelopment Plan is the Sustainability Plan (discussed on DEIR p. 113), which includes goals, strategies, and targets for the sustainable redevelopment of the islands.

The proposed Redevelopment Plan would result in development of approximately 6,000 residential units, 235,000 square feet of commercial and retail space, 400 to 500 hotel rooms, 300 acres of parks and open space, transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, a ferry terminal/transit hub, public and community services, and utilities. Other components of the proposed redevelopment project include supplemental remediation to allow the proposed uses, geotechnical stabilization, and renovation and adaptive re-use of existing historic structures. The Redevelopment Plan would be implemented in four phases from approximately 2009 through 2018.

San Francisco General Hospital Planning

In compliance with Senate Bill (SB) 1953, San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) commissioned a seismic evaluation study for the San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH) Campus in 2000. The seismic evaluation study indicated that SFGH poses a substantial risk of collapse and a danger to the public after a strong earthquake. Therefore in January 2001, the San Francisco Health Commission passed Resolution #1-01 in support of replacement of this acute care facility. Subsequently, the DPH published a Seismic Safety Compliance report for SFGH, which recommended construction of a new acute care hospital on the existing SFGH campus by 2013, among several alternatives considered to achieve compliance with SB 1953. A Long-Range Service Delivery Plan for the hospital was initiated in January 2002 and provided recommendations for hospital size and bed configurations, location options, collaboration opportu-nities, and specific program recommendations. Through this comprehensive planning process, strategic recommendations were developed for SFGH and required an update to the 1987 SFGH Institutional Master Plan (IMP), which was initiated in September 2002 and culminated in the SFGH IMP Update (September 2006, revised February 2007). In May 2005, Mayor Newsom created the “Blue Ribbon Committee on San Francisco General Hospital’s Future Location,” which recommended the existing SFGH campus as the site for the acute care hospital rebuild for reasons of feasibility, long-term financing, site acquisition, logistical planning, and issues of efficiencies.

The proposed SFGH Seismic Compliance Hospital Replacement Program, involving the construction of a new acute care hospital on the SFGH Campus, is one of the projects proposed under the 2007 SFGH IMP Update. (Other IMP Update projects include the medical helipad proposed on the rooftop of the existing Main Hospital (Wing C), and the proposed installation of emergency generators for backup power supply to the entire SFGH Campus.) Specifically, the DPH proposes to construct a new approximately 422,000 gross-square-foot, seven-story (plus 2 basement levels), 284-bed, acute care hospital on the SFGH Campus, located at 1001 Potrero Avenue, to comply with the seismic safety requirements of SB 1953. The new hospital would

be located on the west lawn of the campus along Potrero Avenue between Buildings 20 and 30. Acute care services currently located in the existing Main Hospital would be relocated to the new hospital, and the vacated space in the existing Main Hospital would be reused for non-acute care medical uses and administrative offices. Under SB 1661, the DPH intends to apply for an extension to the 2013 deadline for the construction of a new seismically compliant acute care hospital up to January 1, 2015. This would allow SFGH to continue to provide acute care services on campus during the planning and construction phases for the proposed new acute care hospital, if the SFGH Hospital Replacement Program were to be approved.

On page 211, Table 29 is revised as follows to correct the location of shading in the table (no change is made in the numerical data presented in the table):

TABLE 29
TOP FOUR INDUSTRY SECTORS FOR WORKERS LIVING IN SAN FRANCISCO, THE EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS AND WESTERN SOMA (IN TERMS OF NUMBERS EMPLOYED)

		Eastern Neighborhoods					
Industries	**San Francisco**	**All Eastern Neighbor-hoods**	**East SoMa**	**Mission**	**Showplace Square/ Potrero Hill**	**Central Waterfront**	**Western SoMa**
Professional, scientific, management, administrative services	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Educational, health and social services	2	2	4	3	2	3	
Retail trade	3			4	4	2	3
Finance, insurance, and real estate	4	4	2				4
Accommodation and food services		3	3	2			2
Manufacturing						4	
Information					3		
Percent of residents employed in top four industry sectors	56%	55%	61%	55%	58%	61%	57%

NOTE: Industry sectors are ranked in terms of the number of workers employed from 1 to 4, with number 1 employing the most workers. A shaded cell means the industry did not rank in the top four among workers living in this area.

SOURCES: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census 2000* and Hausrath Economics Group.

On page 270, the following text is added prior to the heading "Traffic Impacts" to include discussion of additional analysis of and potential funding for future transportation improvements in the Eastern Neighborhoods:

The San Francisco Planning Department, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) have submitted a grant request to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Station Area Planning Program to help fund the Eastern Neighborhoods Transportation Implementation Planning (EN TRIPS) Study. The EN TRIPS Study would allow these agencies to conduct the further planning, design and environmental review work necessary to advance plan-identified transportation improvements towards on-street implementation. This work is anticipated to lead to

> the delivery of key infrastructure projects needed to serve new housing (affordable and market rate) and mixed-use development.
>
> Specifically, the EN TRIPS Study would: review and document existing conditions in the Eastern Neighborhoods; evaluate future year land use and transportation conditions (2008-2025); define street functions and designs; develop and design key transportation and public realm improvement projects; conduct outreach to ensure the transportation needs of residents and businesses are clearly understood; create a funding and implementation strategy as well as draft and final reports; and, fund environmental assessment of select projects consistent with EN TRIPS goals.

On page 288, following the third bullet, the following is added as new text to acknowledge that reducing vehicle travel can potentially reduce vehicle-pedestrian injuries.

> In addition, strategies to reduce traffic volumes, including trip-reduction strategies proposed as mitigation measures in Chapter V, would be expected to have beneficial effects in regard to pedestrian hazards.

On page 288, the last partial paragraph, continuing to p. 289, is revised as follows to correct a reference to the statewide percentage of workers to walk to work and indicate that the Department of Public Health Pedestrian Injury Model did not identify a strong correlation between workers per census tract and pedestrian injury volume:

> San Francisco as a whole has a substantially greater number of pedestrian injury accidents on a population-weighted basis than the national average, largely because there is much more pedestrian activity than most comparably-sized cities. The average rate of pedestrian injuries and fatalities in California as a whole is 40 per 100,000 based on 2005 data from the California Highway Patrol. In part, the city's pedestrian injury rate of 104 per 100,000 residents reflects a higher level of pedestrian activity than most comparably sized cities; however, DPH and other research s indicate that this explains only a part of the difference. Based on analysis of data from 68 California cities, the effect of pedestrian activity in San Francisco on the relative pedestrian injury rate can be estimated by the relationship that the number of pedestrian collisions increases at approximately 0.4 power of the number of people walking to work.[44] Using this empirically derived relationship and publicly-available data from the U.S. Census on the proportion of workers walking to work in the ~~United States~~ California (2.9 percent) and in San Francisco (9.4 percent), one would expect San Francisco to have about 1.6 times more pedestrian collisions than comparable cities (i.e., $((9.4/2.9)^{0.4}$=160 percent). This adjustment also shows that while 60 percent more collisions per resident (a rate of 64 per 100,000) may be expected based on greater pedestrian activity, the degree of pedestrian activity does not fully account for the high rate of collisions in parts of the City, particularly in the Eastern Neighborhoods. San Francisco's relatively high rate of collisions may also be influenced by the increased exposure associated with a 50 percent increase in its daytime population relative to its resident population due to an influx of commuters into its job centers, although the injury model identified no statistically significant correlation between injuries and the number of workers per census tract.

[44] Jacobsen PL. Safety in numbers: more walkers and bicyclists, safer walking and bicycling. Injury Prevention Sep;9(3):205-9. This relationship between injuries and the proportion walking to work can be summarized with the following equation: % change in injury = $(\%\text{ change in walking})^{0.4.}$

On page 289, the ninth line is revised to read as follows to correct an editorial error:

> … workers walking to work in the ~~United States~~ California (2.9 percent) and in San Francisco (9.4 percent), …

On page 325, the following is added as a new paragraph at the end of the page to add a reference to the San Francisco Electric Reliability Project monitoring results:

> Results of particulate monitoring in the Eastern Neighborhoods conducted for the City in connection with the San Francisco Electric Reliability Project are discussed on pp. 335 – 336.

On page 331, the first full paragraph is revised as follows to acknowledge that exposure to air pollutants is typically for much less time at recreational facilities:

> Land uses such as schools, children's day care centers, parks and playgrounds, hospitals, and nursing and convalescent homes are considered to be more sensitive than the general public to poor air quality because the population groups associated with these uses have increased susceptibility to respiratory distress. (Exposure duration, and therefore overall exposure, at recreational uses is typically much shorter than for the other uses noted, but children are frequent users.) Persons engaged in strenuous work or exercise also have increased sensitivity to poor air quality. Residential areas are considered more sensitive to air quality conditions compared to commercial and industrial areas because people generally spend longer periods of time at their residences, with associated greater exposure to ambient air quality conditions. Residential uses occur in all the Eastern Neighborhoods and comprise a broad proportion of the total area: East SoMa (19% of land is in residential use or residential mixed-use), Mission (56%), Showplace Square/Potrero Hill (44%), and Central Waterfront (2%). Recreational uses would also be considered sensitive compared to commercial and industrial areas due to the greater exposure to ambient air quality conditions. Parks and open spaces uses occur in all four Eastern Neighborhoods but comprise only a very small proportion of the total area: East SoMa (6% of land is in park and open space use), Mission (3%), Showplace Square/Potrero Hill (5%), and Central Waterfront (1%).

On page 335, the last (partial) paragraph, continuing to p. 336, and the first full paragraph on DEIR p. 336, are revised as follows to correct the reference to the above-noted monitoring results:

> The inconclusive nature of the above monitoring study is consistent with recent micro-environmental air quality assessments of particulate matter in the Eastern Neighborhoods conducted ~~by~~ the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) ~~Department of Public Health (DPH)~~ using portable particulate matter measurement devices. This ~~DPH~~ second monitoring study was undertaken for the City in connection with the San Francisco Electric Reliability Project, a proposal for a new power plant in the Central Waterfront that is anticipated to result in eventual closure of the existing Potrero Power Plant. It aimed to compare the air quality measurements for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ from several community stations with the measurements from the BAAQMD's permanent monitoring station at Arkansas