SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Certificate of Determination
EXEMPTION FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Case No.:	**2010.0681E**
Project Title:	**245 Valencia Street**
Zoning/Plan Area:	NCT-3 (Moderate Scale Neighborhood Commercial Transit) Use District; 50-X Height and Bulk District; Market and Octavia Plan Area
Block/Lot:	3532/091
Lot Size:	46,557 square feet
Project Sponsor	Lori Perlman, Goldman Architects (415) 391-1339
Staff Contact:	Jeanie Poling – (415) 575-9072 jeanie.poling@sfgov.org

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located on the east side of Valencia Street on the block bounded by 14th Street, Stevenson Street, and Clinton Park in the Mission neighborhood. The project site contains a 36,600 sq. ft., two-story religious facility, including a chapel, a multi-purpose hall, and classrooms, and a 61-space surface parking lot south of the existing building. The project would replace the surface parking lot with a new 31,218 sq. ft. building containing 12,718 sq. ft. of assembly space and 18,530 sq. ft. of underground parking. (Continued on the following page.)

EXEMPT STATUS

Exempt per Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and California Public Resources Code Section 21083.3.

REMARKS

See next page.

DETERMINATION

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

Bill Wycko
Environmental Review Officer

September 2, 2011
Date

cc: Lori Perlman, Project Sponsor
Jeanie Poling, Environmental Planning Division
Erika Jackson, Current Planning Division
Supervisor Jane Kim, District 6
Virna Byrd, M.D.F.
Exclusion/Exemption Distribution List

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (continued)

The proposed two-story cathedral building would be 50 feet tall, with a dome extending to a height of 68 feet. The 58 below-ground parking spaces would be accessed from Valencia Street. The existing building on the northern half of the project site would continue to be used as worship, community, and classroom space by the property owner, the United Greek Orthodox Community of San Francisco. The project would involve approximately 6,660 cubic yards of excavation ranging from approximately 6.5 to 13.5 feet in depth.

REMARKS

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) State Guidelines Section 15183 provides an exemption from environmental review for projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was certified, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that (a) are peculiar to the project or parcel on which the project would be located, (b) were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan or community plan with which the project is consistent, (c) are potentially significant off-site and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the underlying EIR, and (d) are previously identified in the EIR, but which are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than that discussed in the underlying EIR. Section 15183(c) specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, then an EIR need not be prepared for that project solely on the basis of that impact.

This determination evaluates the potential project-specific environmental effects peculiar to the project at 245 Valencia Street described above, and incorporates by reference information contained within the Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan programmatic EIR (Market and Octavia PEIR).[1] Project-specific analysis summarized in this determination was prepared for the proposed project at 245 Valencia Street to determine if there would be significant impacts attributable to the proposed project.[2]

This determination assesses the proposed project's potential to cause environmental impacts and concludes that the proposed project would not result in new, peculiar environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already analyzed and disclosed in the Market and Octavia PEIR. This determination does not identify new or additional information that would alter the conclusions of the Market and Octavia PEIR. This determination also identifies mitigation measures contained in the Market and Octavia PEIR that would be applicable to the proposed project at 245 Valencia Street. Relevant information pertaining to prior environmental review conducted for the Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan is included below, as well as an evaluation of potential environmental effects.

---

[1] *Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan Final EIR* (Case No. 2003.0347E; State Clearinghouse No. 2004012118), certified by the San Francisco Planning Commission on April 5, 2007. The certification was appealed and upheld by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors on June 19, 2007.

[2] San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Exemption Checklist for 245 Valencia Street.* This document is attached.

Background

On April 5, 2007, San Francisco Planning Commission certified the PEIR for the Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan (Case No. 2003.0347E; State Clearinghouse No. 2004012118). The PEIR analyzed amendments to the Planning Code and Zoning Maps and to the Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan, an element of the San Francisco General Plan. The PEIR analysis was based upon an assumed development and activity that were anticipated to occur under the Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan.

Subsequent to the certification of the PEIR, in May 30, 2008, the Board of Supervisors approved, and the Mayor signed into law, revisions to the Planning Code, Zoning Maps, and General Plan that constituted the "project" analyzed in the Market and Octavia PEIR. The legislation created several new zoning controls which allows for flexible types of new housing to meet a broad range of needs, reduces parking requirements to encourage housing and services without adding cars, balances transportation by considering people movement over auto movement, and builds walkable "whole" neighborhoods meeting everyday needs. The Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan, as evaluated in the PEIR and as approved by the Board of Supervisors, accommodates the proposed use, design, and density of the proposed 245 Valencia Street project.

Individual projects that occur under the Neighborhood Plan will undergo project-level evaluation to determine if they would result in further impacts specific to the development proposal, the site, and the time of development, and to determine if additional environmental review is required. This determination concludes that the proposed project at 245 Valencia Street is consistent with and was encompassed within the analysis in the PEIR for the Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan. Further, this determination finds that the PEIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed 245 Valencia Street project, and identified the mitigation measures applicable to the proposed 245 Valencia Street project. The proposed project is also consistent with the zoning controls for the project site. Therefore, no further CEQA evaluation is necessary.

Potential Environmental Effects

Historic Architectural Resources

Historic resource surveys were conducted for the Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan area subsequent to the adoption of the Market and Octavia PEIR, with interim controls for evaluation and protection of historic resources during the survey period. On December 17, 2008, the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board endorsed the findings of the Market and Octavia Area Plan-level Historic Resource Survey, and on February 19, 2009, the San Francisco Planning Commission adopted the findings of the survey.

The project site itself does not contain any historic architectural resources. Nearby architectural resources include the Levi Strauss Factory Building at 250 Valencia, now occupied by the Friends School; the State Armory and Arsenal at 1800 Mission Street, now used for video production; and 260 Valencia, now occupied by Pauline's Pizza. The proposed design of the 245 Valencia Street project is sensitive to the historic resources in the area. The scale, form, massing, fenestration patterns, and materials of the

proposed building are appropriately designed to relate to nearby historic buildings. The proposed façade and fenestration is dynamic, and follows traditional building form for its proposed use. The design of the front façade and the overall form, bulk, massing, fenestration, and materials of the proposed new construction are compatible with nearby historical resources. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to have an adverse effect on off-site historical resources.[3]

Archeological Resources

Potential archeological impacts were identified in the PEIR. *Mitigation Measure 5.6.A2* applies to any project-disturbing soil deeper than 4 feet and for Plan Area properties for which no archeological assessment report has been prepared. This mitigation measure states that a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study should be prepared to determine whether an Archaeological Research Design/Treatment Plan (ARD/TP) shall be required. Pursuant to *Archeological Mitigation Measure 5.6.A2* of the PEIR, an archeological sensitivity evaluation was conducted and concludes that the proposed project could affect CEQA-significant archaeological resources and identifies additional mitigation measures applicable to the proposed project. Thus, Project Mitigation Measure 1 (PEIR *Mitigation Measure 5.6.A2) on* page 17 of this Certificate of Determinations applies to the proposed project.

A preliminary archeological review was conducted for the proposed project.[4] The project site is within the southeast corner of the former Woodward's Garden site (1866-1894), which was the first large-scale urban recreation area/park in San Francisco and covered the block bounded by Thirteenth, Fourteenth, Valencia, and Mission Streets and the northwest quadrant of the block to the south. The project site was located in the garden section of the park, just to the south of the pond and west of the Marine Museum. Furthermore, geotechnical boring results indicated below fill deposits, clayey sand with organics in the western part of the site extending to a depth of 28 ft. bgs, and in the southeast portion of the site, marsh deposits extending to a depth of 18 feet. Marsh edge-lands are sensitive for prehistoric deposits, and the low energy deposition characteristic of wetlands tends to be conservative of prehistoric remains. The San Francisco Bay Estuary Institute historical ecological mapping of this area indicates that in the mid-19th century the project site was transversed by the large willow grove that bounded the north side of Mission Creek and by a narrow willow thicket that followed a narrow drainage approximately along the southern face of the existing church edifice. So whether the upper reaches of the existing sand deposits within the project site are native or artificial fill, within the Holocene era, the project site extended into a large tidal marsh that was gradually buried beneath alluvial deposits over a long period of time. How much of the historic surface was worn away or eliminated by re-contouring of the site for construction of Woodward Gardens, reconstruction after the earthquake and fire of 1906, or for creation of a building pad for the structures present on the site after 1906 is not known. The potential of the project to adversely affect archeological resources would be avoided by implementation of the Planning Department's third standard archeological mitigation measure (archeological testing). This mitigation measure is consistent

---

3 Memo regarding 245 Valencia Street from Moses Corrette, Senior Preservation Planner, to Tina Tam and Jeanie Poling, March 14, 2011. This document is available for review as part of Case No. 2010.0681E.

4 Randall Dean/Don Lewis, San Francisco Planning Department, *Preliminary Archeological Review: Checklist, 245 Valencia Street*, August 22, 2011. This document is available for review as part of Case No. 2010.0681E.

with PEIR *Mitigation Measure 5.6.A2*, which requires that a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study be prepared.

Transportation and Circulation

Traffic: The PEIR assessed transportation impacts associated with the implementation of the Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan. The PEIR studied 32 intersections and provided data for existing conditions, and for projected 2025 conditions with and without Plan implementation. The PEIR concluded that three intersections will worsen to unsatisfactory conditions with implementation of the Plan (Hayes/Gough; Hayes/Franklin; and Laguna/Market/Hermann/Guerrero). The PEIR also concluded that implementation of the Plan will have cumulatively considerable impacts to future traffic growth at four additional intersections operating at LOS E or F for 2025 with Plan conditions (Hayes/Van Ness; Mission/Otis/South Van Ness; Market/Church/Fourteenth; and Market/Sanchez/Fifteenth). The San Francisco Planning Commission certified the Final EIR for the Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan with a finding that implementation of the Plan will have significant and unavoidable impacts at these intersections. The PEIR also identified seven traffic mitigation measures. A Statement of Overriding Considerations with CEQA findings including a mitigation monitoring and reporting program was adopted as part of Neighborhood Plan approval on April 5, 2007.

The proposed project would provide larger facilities for current users, who may remain on site for a longer period of time, but would not be expected to result in increased occupancy or expansion of use of the project site.[5] The proposed below-ground parking would be accessed from Valencia Street, the same as current access to the existing surface parking lot. No peculiar traffic impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the traffic mitigation measures identified in the PEIR are not applicable to the proposed project.

Transit: The Market and Octavia PEIR identified significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts relating to the degradation of transit service as a result of increase in delays at the following intersections in the PM peak hour: Hayes Street/Van Ness Avenue, Hayes Street/Franklin Street, and Hayes Street/Gough Street. Mitigation measures proposed in the PEIR to address these impacts related to changes to street configurations and traffic patterns. Even with mitigation, however, cumulative impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable and a Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted as part of the Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan approvals.

The project would not be expected to result in increased occupancy or expansion of use at the project site and thus would not generate additional transit trips. No peculiar transit impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project, and the transportation mitigation measures identified in the PEIR are not applicable to the proposed project.

Parking: The proposed project would replace a 61-space parking lot with a new building that includes 58 parking spaces – a loss of three parking spaces. The existing parking lot is generally underutilized on

[5] For example, a wedding reception could follow a wedding ceremony on site. For more discussion on why the project is not considered an expansion of use, see the project description and land use sections in Attachment A, *Community Plan Exemption Checklist, 245 Valencia Street*.

weekdays. During services and holidays, when the existing parking lot is at capacity, the church hires a valet service to park the cars in the spaces and aisles to maximize the area available onsite for cars. This practice would continue with the underground lot.[6] While there would be three fewer designated spaces in the proposed new structure, there would be more aisle space for the valet, so overall parking capacity would remain about the same.

During the 12- to 18-month project construction period, the project site's existing uses would continue. During weekend services, the church would engage its valet service to park cars in nearby lots. Existing lots in the project area are generally usually used for weekday daytime parking and would be available to serve the additional weekend demand for parking during project construction.

Loading: The loading needs at the project site are typical of community facilities, and the proposed project would not result in any additional loading demand. Loading would continue to occur at the Stevenson Street loading doors of the existing building, or delivery vehicles could park in the proposed garage and brought up by elevator.

The project sponsor proposes to add a passenger loading zone in front of the proposed building. The white zone would need to be approved by the SFMTA Department of Parking and Traffic at a public hearing.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Conditions: The PEIR notes that the Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan area contains several key bicycle corridors, and that the generally flat terrain combined with major thoroughfares that traverse the project area and the density and mix of uses in the project area provide for bicycle travel. Valencia Street is a designated bicycle route. The PEIR notes also that the Neighborhood Plan area contains several key pedestrian corridors, and the Plan includes new pedestrian facilities and amenities. The PEIR did not identify significant impacts related to bicycle and pedestrian conditions as a result of Plan implementation.

The ingress/egress to the on-site parking for the proposed project would remain in the same location as the existing ingress/egress point, and the number of vehicles would remain the same. Thus, the project would not result in impacts on bicycle and pedestrian conditions.

Conclusion: In summary, the project would not result in a significant effect with regard to transportation.

Air Quality

Project-related demolition, excavation, grading, and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. The Market and Octavia PEIR identified a significant impact related to construction air quality and determined that *Mitigation Measure E1 – Construction Mitigation Measure for Particulate Emissions* will reduce effects to a less-than-significant level. Subsequently, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes generally referred to as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance

[6] Letter from Rev. Stephen H. Kyriacou, Dean, Annunciation Cathedral, to Jeanie Poling, San Francisco Planning Department, regarding existing and proposed uses at 245 Valencia Street.

(Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008), with the intent of reducing the quantity of dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work, in order to protect the health of the general public and of onsite workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). These regulations and procedures set forth by the San Francisco Building Code ensure that potential dust-related air quality impacts will be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Since the project would comply with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance, the project would not result in a significant impact related to construction air quality, and PEIR Mitigation Measure 5.8.A would not be applicable to the proposed project.

The Market and Octavia PEIR identified a significant impact related to short-term exhaust emissions from construction equipment and determined that *Mitigation Measure 5.8B – Construction Mitigation Measure for Short-Term Exhaust Emissions* will reduce effects to a less-than-significant level. Since the proposed project includes construction activities, this mitigation measure would apply to the proposed project (see Project Mitigation Measure 2 on page 20 of this Certificate of Determination). Implementation of Mitigation Measure 2 would reduce the potential significant impact from project-level exhaust emissions from construction equipment to a less-than-significant level.

Air quality impacts from the proposed project were analyzed based on the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD's) *2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* and thresholds of significance.[7, 8] The proposed project would not introduce new sensitive receptors (e.g., residents) or any new sources of pollutants (e.g., boilers). Project operation and construction of the 31,786 sf place of worship would not exceed screening levels for criteria pollutants. The screening-level analysis identified the need for further analysis of the project's construction activities that emit PM2.5 emissions and other toxic air contaminants that may affect nearby sensitive receptors. As shown on Table 1, health risks from project construction were below project-level health risk thresholds.

Table 1 – Project Construction-related PM2.5 and Health Risk Emissions

	Excess Cancer Risk per One Million	PM2.5 (in micrograms per cubic meter)
245 Valencia Construction	2.3	0.2
BAAQMD Significance Thresholds for an Individual Sources	10	0.3

Source: BAAQMD, August 18, 2011.

To analyze cumulative health risks, the screening analysis identified stationary sources and roadways within 1,000 of the project site, and evaluated health risks to sensitive receptors. The proposed project, in combination with stationary and roadway sources, would not exceed cumulative thresholds of significance.

---

7 BAAQMD, *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines*, updated May 2011. Available at *http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/CEQA-GUIDELINES.aspx*.

8 San Francisco Planning Department, *Air Quality Screening Analysis,* August 31, 2011. This document is available for review as part of Case No. 2010.0681E.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

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

While the presence of the primary GHGs in the atmosphere are naturally occurring, carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), and nitrous oxide (N_2O) are largely emitted from human activities, accelerating the rate at which these compounds occur within earth's atmosphere. Emissions of carbon dioxide are largely by-products of fossil fuel combustion, whereas methane results from off-gassing associated with agricultural practices and landfills. Other GHGs include hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride, and are generated in certain industrial processes. Greenhouse gases are typically reported in "carbon dioxide-equivalent" measures (CO_2E).[9]

There is international scientific consensus that human-caused increases in GHGs have and will continue to contribute to global warming. Potential global warming impacts in California may include, but are not limited to, loss in snow pack, sea level rise, more extreme heat days per year, more high ozone days, more large forest fires, and more drought years. Secondary effects are likely to include a global rise in sea level, impacts to agriculture, changes in disease vectors, and changes in habitat and biodiversity.[10]

The Air Resources Board (ARB) estimated that in 2006 California produced about 484 million gross metric tons of CO_2E ($MMTCO_2E$), or about 535 million U.S. tons.[11] The ARB found that transportation is the source of 38 percent of the State's GHG emissions, followed by electricity generation (both in-state and out-of-state) at 22 percent and industrial sources at 20 percent. Commercial and residential fuel use (primarily for heating) accounted for 9 percent of GHG emissions.[12] In the Bay Area, fossil fuel consumption in the transportation sector (on-road motor vehicles, off-highway mobile sources, and aircraft) and the industrial and commercial sectors are the two largest sources of GHG emissions, each accounting for approximately 36 percent of the Bay Area's 95.8 $MMTCO_2E$ emitted in 2007.[13] Electricity

---

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

10 California Climate Change Portal. Frequently Asked Questions About Global Climate Change. Available online at: *http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/publications/faqs.html*. Accessed November 8, 2010.

11 California Air Resources Board (ARB), "California Greenhouse Gas Inventory for 2000-2006— by Category as Defined in the Scoping Plan." http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/tables/ghg_inventory_scopingplan_2009-03-13.pdf. Accessed March 2, 2010.

12 Ibid.

13 Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Source Inventory of Bay Area Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Base Year 2007, Updated: February 2010. Available at: *http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/Emission%20Inventory/regionalinventory2007_2_10.ashx*. Accessed March 2, 2010.

generation accounts for approximately 16 percent of the Bay Area's GHG emissions followed by residential fuel usage at 7 percent, off-road equipment at 3 percent and agriculture at 1 percent.[14]

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

Pursuant to AB 32, ARB adopted a Scoping Plan in December 2008, outlining measures to meet the 2020 GHG reduction limits. In order to meet these goals, California must reduce its GHG emissions by 30 percent below projected 2020 business as usual emissions levels, or about 15 percent from today's levels.[15] The Scoping Plan estimates a reduction of 174 million metric tons of CO_2E ($MMTCO_2E$) (about 191 million U.S. tons) from the transportation, energy, agriculture, forestry, and high global warming potential sectors (see Table 2). ARB has identified an implementation timeline for the GHG reduction strategies in the Scoping Plan.[16] Some measures may require new legislation to implement, some will require subsidies, some have already been developed, and some will require additional effort to evaluate and quantify. Additionally, some emissions reductions strategies may require their own environmental review under CEQA or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

AB 32 also anticipates that local government actions will result in reduced GHG emissions. ARB has identified a GHG reduction target of 15 percent from current levels for local governments themselves and notes that successful implementation of the plan relies on local governments' land use planning and urban growth decisions because local governments have primary authority to plan, zone, approve, and permit land development to accommodate population growth and the changing needs of their jurisdictions.

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

---

14 Ibid.

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

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

Table 2 – GHG Reductions from the AB 32 Scoping Plan Sectors

GHG Reduction Measures By Sector	GHG Reductions (MMT CO_2E)
Transportation Sector	62.3
Electricity and Natural Gas	49.7
Industry	1.4
Landfill Methane Control Measure (Discrete Early Action)	1
Forestry	5
High Global Warming Potential GHGs	20.2
Additional Reductions Needed to Achieve the GHG Cap	34.4
Total	**174**
Other Recommended Measures	
Government Operations	1-2
Agriculture- Methane Capture at Large Dairies	1
Methane Capture at Large Dairies	1
Additional GHG Reduction Measures	
Water	4.8
Green Buildings	26
High Recycling/ Zero Waste • Commercial Recycling • Composting • Anaerobic Digestion • Extended Producer Responsibility • Environmentally Preferable Purchasing	9
Total	**42.8-43.8**

Source: California Air Resources Board. AB 32 Scoping Plan.

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

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

BAAQMD's *2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* and thresholds of significance have been incorporated into this analysis accordingly.

Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The most common GHGs resulting from human activity are CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O.[17] State law defines GHGs to also include hydrofluorocarbons, Perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. These latter GHG compounds are usually emitted in industrial processes, and therefore not applicable to the proposed project. Individual projects contribute to the cumulative effects of climate change by directly or indirectly emitting GHGs during construction and operational phases. Direct operational emissions include GHG emissions from new vehicle trips and area sources (natural gas combustion). Indirect emissions include emissions from electricity providers, energy required to pump, treat, and convey water, and emissions associated with landfill operations.

The proposed project would increase the activity onsite by replacing a surface parking lot with a new 31,218 sq. ft. building containing 12,718 sq. ft. of assembly space and 18,530 sq. ft. of parking, which would serve an existing populace and would not induce additional use**.** The proposed project would not result in long-term increases in GHGs as a result of increased vehicle trips (mobile sources) or associated with energy use, water use and wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal; however, project construction activities would result in a small increase in GHG emissions.

As discussed above, the BAAQMD has adopted CEQA thresholds of significance for projects that emit GHGs, one of which is a determination of whether the proposed project is consistent with a Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, as defined in the *2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*. On August 12, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Department submitted a draft of the City and County of San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* to the BAAQMD.[18] This document presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco's Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy in compliance with the BAAQMD's *2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* and thresholds of significance.

San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy identifies a number of mandatory requirements and incentives that have measurably reduced greenhouse gas emissions including, but not limited to, increasing the energy efficiency of new and existing buildings, installation of solar panels on building roofs, implementation of a green building strategy, adoption of a zero waste strategy, a construction and demolition debris recovery ordinance, a solar energy generation subsidy, incorporation of alternative fuel vehicles in the City's transportation fleet (including buses and taxis), and a mandatory composting ordinance. The strategy also identifies 42 specific regulations for new development that would reduce a project's GHG emissions.

---

[17] Governor's Office of Planning and Research. *Technical Advisory- CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review*. June 19, 2008. Available at: *http://www.opr.ca.gov/ceqa/pdfs/june08-ceqa.pdf.* Accessed March 3, 2010.

[18] San Francisco Planning Department. *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions in San Francisco*. 2010. Available at: http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=1570.

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

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

The City's 2017 and 2025 GHG reduction goals are more aggressive than the State's GHG reduction goals as outlined in AB 32, and consistent with the State's long-term (2050) GHG reduction goals. San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* identifies the City's actions to pursue cleaner energy, energy conservation, alternative transportation, and solid waste policies, and concludes that San Francisco's policies have resulted in a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions below 1990 levels, meeting statewide AB 32 GHG reduction goals. As reported, San Francisco's 1990 GHG emissions were approximately 8.26 million metric tons (MMT) CO_2E and 2005 GHG emissions are estimated at 7.82 $MMTCO_2E$, representing an approximately 5.3 percent reduction in GHG emissions below 1990 levels.

The BAAQMD reviewed San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* and concluded that the strategy meets the criteria for a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy as outlined in BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines (2010) and stated that San Francisco's "aggressive GHG reduction targets and comprehensive strategies help the Bay Area move toward reaching the State's AB 32 goals, and also serve as a model from which other communities can learn."[19]

Based on the BAAQMD's 2010 *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* would result in a less than significant impact with respect to GHG emissions. Furthermore, because San Francisco's strategy is consistent with AB 32 goals, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's strategy would also not conflict with the State's plan for reducing GHG emissions. As discussed in San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, new development and renovations/alterations for private projects and municipal projects are required to comply with San Francisco's ordinances that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Applicable requirements are shown in Table 3.[20]

Depending on a proposed project's size, use, and location, a variety of controls are in place to ensure that a proposed project would not impair the State's ability to meet statewide GHG reduction targets outlined in AB 32, nor impact the City's ability to meet San Francisco's local GHG reduction targets. Given that: (1) San Francisco has implemented regulations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions specific to new construction and renovations of private developments and municipal projects; (2) San Francisco's

[19] Letter from Jean Roggenkamp, BAAQMD, to Bill Wycko, San Francisco Planning Department. October 28, 2010. Available at *http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2627*.

[20] San Francisco Planning Department, *Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist, 245 Valencia Street*, April 5, 2011. This document is available for review as part of Case No. 2010.0681E.

sustainable policies have resulted in the measured success of reduced greenhouse gas emissions levels; (3) San Francisco has met and exceeded AB 32 greenhouse gas reduction goals for the year 2020; (4) current and probable future state and local greenhouse gas reduction measures will continue to reduce a project's contribution to climate change; and (5) San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* meet BAAQMD's requirements for a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's regulations would not contribute significantly to global climate change. The proposed project would be required to comply with these requirements, and was determined to be consistent with San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions.*[21] As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with respect to GHG emissions.

Table 3 – Greenhouse Gas-related Regulations Applicable to the Proposed Project

Regulation	Requirements
Bicycle parking in parking garages (Planning Code, Section 155.2(A))	Every garage will supply a minimum of six bicycle parking spaces.
Parking requirements for San Francisco's Mixed-Use zoning districts (Planning Code Section 151.1)	The Planning Code has established parking maximums for many of San Francisco's Mixed-Use districts.
San Francisco Green Building Requirements for Stormwater Management (SF Building Code, Chapter 13C); and San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance (Public Works Code Article 4.2)	Requires all new development or redevelopment disturbing more than 5,000 square feet of ground surface to manage stormwater on-site using low impact design. Projects subject to the Green Building Ordinance Requirements must comply with either LEED® Sustainable Sites Credits 6.1 and 6.2, or with the City's Stormwater ordinance and stormwater design guidelines.
San Francisco Green Building Requirements for solid waste (SF Building Code, Chapter 13C)	Pursuant to Section 1304C.0.4 of the Green Building Ordinance, all new construction, renovation, and alterations subject to the ordinance are required to provide recycling, composting and trash storage, collection, and loading that is convenient for all users of the building.
Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance (Environment Code, Chapter 19)	The mandatory recycling and composting ordinance requires all persons in San Francisco to separate their refuse into recyclables, compostables and trash, and place each type of refuse in a separate container designated for disposal of that type of refuse.
San Francisco Green Building Requirements for construction and demolition debris recycling (SF Building Code, Chapter 13C)	These projects proposing demolition are required to divert at least 75% of the project's construction and demolition debris to recycling.
Street Tree Planting Requirements for New Construction (Planning Code Section 428)	Planning Code Section 143 requires new construction, significant alterations or relocation of buildings within many of San Francisco's zoning districts to plant on 24-inch box tree for every 20 feet along the property street frontage.

Wind and Shadow

Wind. Wind impacts are directly related to building design and articulation and the surrounding site conditions. The Market and Octavia PEIR identified a potential significant wind impact related to new construction and identified two mitigation measures to mitigate wind impacts. One measure applies to

[21] San Francisco Planning Department, *Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist, 245 Valencia Street*, April 5, 2011. This document is available for review as part of Case No. 2010.0681E.

buildings in excess of 85 feet in height and would not apply to the proposed project. The other measure applies to all new construction. Based upon the experience of San Francisco environmental planners in reviewing wind analyses and expert opinion letters on other projects, it is generally (but not always) the case that projects under 80 feet in height do not have the potential to generate significant wind impacts. The proposed 50-foot tall building (with dome extending to 68 feet) would be similar in height to existing buildings in the area and to the building under construction to the south of the project site. The proposed building's dome-shaped long axis is aligned along prevailing winds rather than across prevailing winds. For these reasons, the project is not anticipated to cause substantial changes to the wind environment in pedestrian areas adjacent to or near the site. Thus, the wind mitigation measures identified in the PEIR would not apply to the proposed project.

Shadow. Planning Code Section 295 generally prohibits new buildings that would cast new shadow on open space that is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, at any time of the year, unless that shadow would not result in a significant adverse effect on the use of the open space. No mitigation measures were included in the Market and Octavia PEIR for Parks and Open Space subject to Section 295, because no significant impacts were identified at the program level. For non-Section 295 parks and open space, the Market and Octavia Neighborhood PEIR identified potential significant impacts related to all new construction where the building height would exceed 50 feet in height and identified a shadow mitigation measure for parks and open space not subject to Section 295, which will reduce effects to a less-than-significant level.

Since the proposed would be 50 feet tall (with a dome extending to a height of 68 feet), a shadow fan analysis was conducted pursuant to Planning Code Section 295.[22] The analysis found that there would be no shadow impact from the proposed project on any property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Commission. The shadow fan for the proposed project also reveals that no plaza, public open space, parklet, park, or open space not subject to Section 295 other than sidewalks would be affected by the proposed project as designed. Thus the PEIR shadow mitigation measure would not apply to the proposed project.

The proposed project would shade portions of nearby streets and sidewalks at times within the project block. These new shadows would not exceed levels commonly expected in urban areas, and would be considered a less-than-significant effect under CEQA. The proposed building could cast shadow on nearby private property. The loss of sunlight for private property is rarely considered to be a significant impact on the environment under CEQA. Although occupants of nearby property may regard the increase in shadow as undesirable, the limited increase in shading as a result of the proposed project would not be considered a significant impact under CEQA.

In light of the above, the project would not result in a significant effect with regard to shadow, nor would the project contribute to any potential cumulative shading impacts.

22 San Francisco Planning Department, *Shadow Analysis, 275 Valencia Street*, December 15, 2010. This document is available for review as part of Case No. 2010.6681E.

Geology and Soils

The Market and Octavia PEIR identified a potential significant impact related to temporary construction on steeply sloping lots, and identified a mitigation measure that will reduce effects to a less-than-significant level. Since the project site is flat and construction would not alter the overall topography of the site, this mitigation measure would not apply to the proposed project.

A geotechnical investigation was performed for the proposed project.[23] The site is blanketed by approximately 8.5 to 13.5 feet of sand fill. The fill is generally loose to medium dense, although the fill encountered in one sample is dense to very dense to a depth of about 10 feet below ground surface (bgs). Variable soil conditions were encountered between the bottom of the fill and a depth of approximately 28 feet bgs. In the western portion of the site, the fill is underlain by loose to medium dense sand with silt interbedded with layers of loose clayey sand with organic material that extends to a depth of about 28 feet bgs. In the southeast portion of the site, a marsh deposit was encountered, consisting of very loose clayey sand and very soft sandy clay that extends to a depth of about 18 feet bgs. The marsh deposit is underlain by medium dense sand and sand with silt that becomes very dense at a depth of about 28.5 feet bgs. In the northeast corner of the site, the fill is underlain by medium dense sand interbedded with thin layers of medium stiff clay and loose clayey sand, including an approximately 3-foot-thick layer of medium stiff clay between depths of 14.5 and 17.5 feet.

The soil below a depth of approximately 28 feet bgs across the site consists of medium dense to very dense sand interbedded with occasional thin (i.e., less than one foot thick) layers or lenses of stiff clay that extends to depths ranging from about 47 to 50 feet bgs. Below the medium dense to very dense sand, medium stiff to very stiff clay with varying sand content was encountered that extends to depths ranging from about 62 to 73 feet bgs. The clay layer is underlain by layers of very dense sand, very dense clayey sand, and very stiff to hard clay that extend to the maximum depth explored of 75 feet bgs.

The geotechnical report concluded that to accommodate the proposed basement level and the building foundation, an excavation ranging from approximately 6.5 feet deep (assuming a foundation thickness of 2 feet) at the east end of the site to 13.5 feet deep at the west end would be required. This depth is 0 to 2 feet below the design groundwater level. A mat foundation was found to be the most appropriate foundation type for the proposed structure, provided the liquefaction potential of the soil below the mat foundation would be mitigated by compaction grouting. Supplemental ground improvement, such as jet grouting, would be required in the southeast corner of the site to transfer foundation loads below a weak marsh deposit.

The project is subject to a mandatory interdepartmental project review because the project site has been identified by the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, as a Seismic Hazard Zone. The Planning Department acts as the lead agency in collaboration with DBI, the Department of Public Works, and the San Francisco Fire Department. The project sponsor must request and participate in an interdepartmental project review prior to any application that requires a public

23 Rockridge Geotechnical, *Geotechnical Investigation: Proposed Annunciation Cathedral, 245 Valencia Street, San Francisco, California*. November 22, 2010.

hearing before the Planning Commission or new construction building permit. The interdepartmental meeting took place on June 1, 2011.

The final building plans would be reviewed by DBI. In reviewing building plans, DBI refers to a variety of information sources to determine existing hazards and assess requirements for mitigation. Sources reviewed include maps of Special Geologic Study Areas and known landslide areas in San Francisco as well as the building inspectors' working knowledge of areas of special geologic concern. Potential geologic hazards would be mitigated during the permit review process through these measures. To ensure compliance with all Building Code provisions regarding structure safety, when DBI reviews the geotechnical report and building plans for a proposed project, they will determine the adequacy of necessary engineering and design features. The above-referenced geotechnical investigation would be available for use by the DBI during its review of building permits for the site. Also, DBI could require that additional site-specific soils report(s) be prepared in conjunction with permit applications, as needed. Therefore, potential damage to structures from geologic hazards on the project site would be mitigated through the DBI requirement for a geotechnical report and review of the building permit application pursuant to DBI implementation of the Building Code.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan PEIR identified potentially significant impacts related to hazardous materials in the project area, including those related to petroleum hydrocarbons in the soil, serpentine rock, asbestos, lead based paint, and radon. The PEIR noted that soils investigations will be expected on a development-by-development basis, and includes *Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure 5.10.A*. The PEIR notes that implementation of required measures in compliance with applicable regulations and standards regarding underground storage tanks, buried debris, and unidentified contamination will reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. Project Mitigation Measure 3 (*Mitigation Measure 5.10.A* from the PEIR), on page 20 of this Certificate of Determination, would apply to the proposed project.

In addition, the project would comply with San Francisco Health Code Article 22, which provides for safe handling of hazardous wastes in the City. It authorizes the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) to implement the state hazardous waste regulations, including authority to conduct inspections and document compliance. Article 22A states that if more than 50 cubic yards of soil are to be disturbed, the reports must be submitted to the Department of Public Works and DPH. With compliance with hazardous materials regulations and Project Mitigation Measure 3, potential impacts of the proposed project related to exposure to hazardous materials would be less than significant.

Mineral/Energy Resources

No known minerals exist at the project site, and therefore the project would not contribute to any individual or cumulative impact on mineral resources. The California Energy Commission is currently considering applications for the development of new power-generating facilities in San Francisco, the Bay Area, and elsewhere in the state. These facilities could supply additional energy to the power supply grid within the next few years. These efforts, together with conservation, will be part of the statewide effort to achieve energy sufficiency. The project-generated demand for electricity would be negligible in

the context of overall demand within San Francisco and the State, and would not require a major expansion of power facilities. Therefore, the energy demand associated with the project would not contribute to an individual or cumulative impact on energy resources.

Agricultural and Forest Resources

The project site does not contain agricultural uses or forest resources and is not zoned for such uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to agricultural and forest resources.

Project Mitigation Measures

Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce impacts related to air quality to a less than significant level.

Project Mitigation Measure 1 (5.6.A2 in PEIR) – Archeological Mitigation Measure. Based on a reasonable presumption that archeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources. The project sponsor shall retain the services of an archaeological consultant from the pool of qualified archaeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist. The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this measure. The archeological consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Sect. 15064.5 (a)(c).

Consultation with Descendant Communities: On discovery of an archeological site[24] associated with descendant Native Americans or the Overseas Chinese an appropriate representative[25] of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to consult with ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any

[24] The term "archeological site" is intended here to minimally include any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

[25] An "appropriate representative" of the descendant group is here defined to mean, in the case of Native Americans, any individual listed in the current Native American Contact List for the City and County of San Francisco maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission and in the case of the Overseas Chinese, the Chinese Historical Society of America.

interpretative treatment of the associated archeological site. A copy of the Final Archaeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group.

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

At the completion of the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archeological testing program the archeological consultant finds that significant archeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archeological testing, archeological monitoring, and/or an archeological data recovery program. If the ERO determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:

A) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or

B) A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.

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

- The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils- disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context;
- The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource;
- The archeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with project archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits;

- The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis;
- If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving activity may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.

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

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

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

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

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

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

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

Project Mitigation Measure 2 (5.8.B in PEIR) – Construction Mitigation Measure for Short-Term Exhaust Emissions. To reduce program or project level short-term exhaust emissions from construction equipment, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented for construction activities in the Project Area:

- Confine idle time of combustion engine construction equipment at construction sites to five minutes.
- Maintain and properly tune construction equipment in accordance to manufacturer's specifications.
- Use alternative fueled or electrical construction equipment at the project site when feasible.
- Use the minimum practical engine size for construction equipment.
- Equip gasoline-powered construction equipment with catalytic converters when feasible.

Project Mitigation Measure 3 (5.10.A in PEIR) Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure. Program or project level mitigation measures would vary depending upon the type and extent of contamination

associated with each individual project. Mitigation measures to protect the community generally shall include:

- Airborne particulates shall be minimized by wetting exposed soils, as appropriate, containing runoff, and tarping over-night and weekends.
- Storage stockpiles shall be minimized, where practical, and properly labeled and secured.
- Vehicle speeds across unpaved areas shall not exceed 15 mph to reduce dust emissions.
- Activities shall be conducted so as not to track contaminants beyond the regulated area.
- Misting, fogging, or periodic dampening shall be utilized to minimize fugitive dust, as appropriate.
- Containments and regulated areas shall be properly maintained.

Public Notice and Comment

A "Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review" was sent out on December 9, 2010, to the owners of properties within 300 feet, adjacent occupants of the project site, and interested parties. No comments were received in response to the notice.

Conclusion

The Market and Octavia PEIR incorporated and adequately addressed all potential impacts of the proposed project at 245 Valencia Street. As described above, the 245 Valencia Street project would not have any additional or peculiar significant adverse effects not examined in the Market and Octavia PEIR, nor has any new or additional information come to light that would alter the conclusions of the Market and Octavia PEIR. Thus, the proposed project at 245 Valencia Street would not have any new significant or peculiar effects on the environment not previously identified in the Market and Octavia PEIR, nor would any environmental impacts be substantially greater than described in the PEIR. No mitigation measures previously found infeasible have been determined to be feasible, nor have any new mitigation measures or alternatives been identified but rejected by the project sponsor. Therefore, in addition to being exempt from environmental review under Section 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project is also exempt under Section 21083.3 of the California Public Resources Code.

This page is blank.

Attachment A
Community Plan Exemption Checklist

Case No.:	**2010.0681E**
Project Title:	245 Valencia Street – Annunciation Cathedral
Zoning:	NCT-3 (Moderate Scale Neighborhood Commercial Transit) Use District; 50-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot:	3532/091
Lot Size:	46,557 square feet
Plan Area:	Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan
Staff Contact:	Jeanie Poling – (415) 575-9072 jeanie.poling@sfgov.org

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Site

The 46,557-square-foot (sf) project site is located on the east side of Valencia Street on the block bounded by 14th Street, Stevenson Street, and Clinton Park in the Mission District and within the Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan Area. The project site, which is owned by the United Greek Orthodox Community of San Francisco, contains a 37,175 sf, approximately 35-foot-tall building constructed in 1995, and a 61-space surface parking lot south of the existing building. The existing U-shaped building surrounds an exterior courtyard that faces to the south toward the parking lot. The building contains a gymnasium/multi-purpose hall, classrooms, offices, a kitchen, storage, and a 2,254 sf temporary chapel. Annunciation Cathedral serves as the Cathedral Church for the Greek Orthodox Metropolis of San Francisco, which provides community, administrative, educational, and worship space to over 1,000 families.

Project Vicinity

The project block (surrounded by Valencia, 14th, Clinton Park, and Stevenson Streets) contains three parcels – the largest being the project site in the center of the block. To the north is a single-story building containing an auto service center, and to the south a 55-foot-tall, five-story, mixed-use (36 residences over retail) building is currently under construction. The immediate vicinity contains a wide range of buildings, from single-story industrial style to three- and four-story residential/commercial structures. The 40-foot-tall former Levi's manufacturing building, now a school, is directly across Valencia Street from the project site. The imposing 190,000 sf, 65-foot-tall, brick Armory building is less than one block from the project site on the southwest corner of 14th and Mission Streets.

Proposed Project

The project would construct a new 31,786 sf, 50-foot tall building with a dome extending to a height of 68 feet, on the existing 61-space surface parking lot. The new building would contain 13,256 sf of assembly space on two levels and 18,530 sf (58 spaces) of below-ground parking, accessed from Valencia Street. The main level of the proposed building would contain the nave, side aisles, foyers, a sacristy and vestry, restrooms, a vestibule, closets, and an elevator lobby. The second floor, primarily open to below, would contain the choir loft, a choir room, a hall, stairs, elevator, and restrooms. The project would involve 6,600 cubic yards of excavation ranging from approximately 6.5 to 13.5 feet in depth.

The proposed project is the second phase of the project sponsor's program to rebuild its facilities lost to the Loma Prieta earthquake of 1989. The existing temporary chapel allows seating for 322 congregants, which is too small for the project site's current uses; during services, congregants gather in the hallway outside the temporary chapel and in the courtyard. The proposed project would allow seating for 677 congregants, and thus would be able to seat all who attend services. The existing building on the northern half of the project site would continue to be used as community and classroom space by Annunciation Cathedral. The proposed church has been designed to be large enough to safely accommodate the congregation even on major holidays. While the proposed project would provide adequate facilities for current uses, it would not be expected to attract new people to the project site. It is intended to seat everyone currently attending services.[1]

Besides well-attended services during Easter and other holidays, the event that brings the most visitors to the site is an annual three-day Greek food festival, which is currently held on the existing parking lot. After project construction, the festival would continue, although it would occur primarily in interior spaces and would not be expected to add additional visitors to the festival.

The design for the proposed cathedral is inspired by Byzantine period church architecture in Istanbul, featuring a large dome over a central plan. The proposed two-story cathedral building would be 50 feet tall, with the dome, containing 24 dormer windows, extending to a height of 68 feet. The new cathedral is designed to interface with the existing building on the project site. Arched vestibules would connect the new building with the existing offices, hall, and chapel. The doors on the north side would open onto the existing courtyard.

Exterior walls would be white cement stucco, to match the walls of the existing building, with steel trowel finish and capped with cast stone. All window sills, columns, bases, capitals, paving, and steps would be gray cast stone. All windows, doors (except along Stevenson Street), trim, and eaves would be painted wood. The pitched roofs would be clay S-tiles, a color similar to the existing building on the project site.

---

[1] Letter from Rev. Stephen H. Kyriacou, Dean, Annunciation Cathedral, to Jeanie Poling, San Francisco Planning Department, regarding existing and proposed uses at 245 Valencia Street.

Project Approvals

The proposed project would require conditional use authorization from the San Francisco Planning Commission for nonresidential use of over 6,000 sf, pursuant to Section 121.1 of the Planning Code.[2]

New construction on the project site is subject to a mandatory interdepartmental project review because the project site has been identified by the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, as a Seismic Hazard Zone. The Planning Department acts as the lead agency in collaboration with the Department of Building Inspection, the Department of Public Works, and the San Francisco Fire Department. The project sponsor must request and participate in an interdepartmental project review prior to any application that requires a public hearing before the Planning Commission or new construction building permit. The interdepartmental project review meeting for the proposed project occurred on June 1, 2011.

The project sponsor proposes to add a passenger loading zone along Valencia Street in front of the proposed building. This zone would need to be approved by the SFMTA Department of Parking and Traffic at a public hearing.

Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project sponsor would be required to submit a Stormwater Control Plan and Operation and Management Plan to the San Francisco Public Utility Commission Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program, which demonstrates compliance with the requirements of the City's Stormwater Design Guidelines.

Project Construction

Project construction is estimated to last 12 to 18 months. Current uses would continue on site, and during weekend services the church would engage its valet service to park cars in nearby lots that are usually used for weekday daytime parking and have space available during weekends. The Cathedral would not hold its annual Greek food festival during the year or two while project construction would occur.

Consistency with Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan

This topic is discussed below under Section B.1, Land Use and Land Use Planning.

B. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

This Community Plan Exemption Checklist examines the potential environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project and indicates whether any such

[2] Kelley Amdur, San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Neighborhood Analysis, 245 Valencia Street*, April 21, 2011. These documents are available for review as part of Case File No. 2010.0681E at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400.

impacts are addressed in the applicable programmatic environmental impact report (PEIR) for the plan area. Items checked "Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR" identify topics for which a significant impact is identified in the PEIR. In such cases, the analysis considers whether the proposed project would result in impacts that would contribute to the impact identified in the PEIR. If the analysis concludes that the proposed project would contribute to a significant impact identified in the PEIR, the item is checked "Proj. Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR." Mitigation measures identified in the PEIR applicable to the proposed project are identified in the text for each topic area.

Items checked "Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact" identify topics for which the proposed project would result in a significant impact that is peculiar to the project, i.e., the impact is not identified as significant in the PEIR. Any impacts not identified in the PEIR will be addressed in a separate Focused Initial Study or EIR.

All items for which the PEIR identified a significant impact or for the project would have a significant peculiar impact are also checked "Addressed Below," and are discussed.

Topics:	*Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact*	*Addressed Below*
1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING— will the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan ("Market and Octavia Plan") is intended to change the land use character of the project area to a transit-oriented, high-density mixed-use neighborhood. The Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan PEIR ("Market and Octavia PEIR" or "the PEIR") analyzed the proposed land use changes and determined that the Market and Octavia Plan will not result in a significant adverse impact on land use character.

The project site was rezoned under the Market and Octavia Plan from C-M (Heavy Commercial) to NCT-3 (Moderate Scale Neighborhood Commercial Transit) Use District. The project site's 50-X height and bulk district designation did not change under the Market and Octavia Plan.

NCT-3 Districts are transit-oriented moderate- to high-density mixed-use neighborhoods of varying scale concentrated near transit services. These districts are well served by public transit and aim to maximize residential and commercial opportunities on or near major transit services.

Large institutions, including assembly uses, are permitted in NCT-3 Districts. The primary focus of the Market Octavia Plan is to maximize housing development near transit. The project would be subject to the Market and Octavia Community Impact Fee at the non-residential rate of $3.40 per gross square foot.[3]

Because the project site fronts Stevenson Street, which is less than 40 feet wide, the project would be subject to Section 261.1 of the Planning Code, which sets additional height limits for narrow streets and alleys in Eastern Neighborhoods Neighborhood Commercial Transit Districts.

The proposed project is consistent with the development density and zoning in the Market and Octavia Plan. In addition, the Long Range Planning and Current Planning divisions of the San Francisco Planning Department have determined that the proposed project is consistent with the Market and Octavia Plan and satisfies the requirements of the San Francisco General Plan and the Planning Code.[4] Therefore, the project is eligible for a Community Plan Exemption.

Topics:	*Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact*	*Addressed Below*
2. AESTHETICS—Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and other features of the built or natural environment which contribute to a scenic public setting?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or which would substantially impact other people or properties?	☐	☐	☐	☒

As stated previously, the Market and Octavia Plan is intended to change the existing land use character of the project area to a transit-oriented, high-density mixed-use neighborhood. The Market and Octavia PEIR found that while implementation of the Market and Octavia Plan will result in visual changes within the project area, these aesthetic changes will improve the overall

[3] See Planning Code Section 421.3.

[4] David Alumbaugh, San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 245 Valencia Street*, April 26, 2011; and Kelley Amdur, San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Neighborhood Analysis, 245 Valencia Street*, April 21, 2011. These documents are available for review as part of Case File No. 2010.0681E at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400.

visual quality of the plan area. The PEIR concluded that the Market and Octavia Plan will not result in a substantial, demonstrable negative aesthetic effect on the existing visual character or quality of the area and its surroundings, and therefore, will result in a less-than-significant impact.

The Market and Octavia PEIR noted that development pursuant to the Market and Octavia Plan will result in an intensification of both height and density in portions of the project area, and that some new development will obstruct portions of certain longer-range views; however, the PEIR concluded that the neighborhood plan will not result in a significant adverse impact with regard to views. While new construction in the project area will generate additional night lighting, it will not be in amounts unusual for a developed urban area. Thus, the PEIR concluded that light and glare impacts will be less than significant.

The proposed project would involve the construction of a 31,786 sf, 50-foot-tall cathedral building with a dome that extends to a height of 68 feet. There are no scenic vistas or resources in the project vicinity.

While the proposed project would change the visual appearance of the site, the new building would not be substantially taller than existing development in the project vicinity. The existing building on the site is approximately 35 feet tall, with a dome and tower that extends to approximately 50 feet in height. Across Valencia Street are mixed-use buildings that are 50 feet in height, and adjacent to the project site, at 299 Valencia, a 55-foot-tall mixed-use building is currently under construction. In addition, the large and imposing 190,000 sf Armory building, San Francisco Landmark No 108, is one block from the project site. Thus, the project would be compatible with the height and bulk of several buildings in the project vicinity, and the project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Furthermore, the project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare.

Topics:		*Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact*	*Addressed Below*
3.	**POPULATION AND HOUSING— Would the project:**				
a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Market and Octavia Plan encourages transit-oriented development by creating housing, jobs, and services near the existing transportation infrastructure, and is anticipated to result in a net increase of 7,620 residents by the year 2025. The Market and Octavia PEIR determined that while the neighborhood plan will generate household growth, it will not cause an adverse physical impact, as it will focus new housing development in San Francisco in an established urban area that has a high level of transportation and other public services that can accommodate the expected population increase.

The proposed project at 245 Valencia Street would not be expected to draw new users to the project site but would instead better accommodate existing site users. Although the new facilities could cause existing users to remain on site for longer periods of time (for example, a wedding reception could follow a wedding ceremony on site), the new facilities would not induce population growth or displace housing units or people. Therefore, impacts on population and housing would be less than significant.

Topics:		*Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact*	*Addressed Below*
4.	**CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:**				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5, including those resources listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the San Francisco *Planning Code*?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please see the Certificate of Determination for a discussion of this topic.

Topics:		Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
5.	**TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION—Would the project:**				
a)	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels, obstructions to flight, or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please see the Certificate of Determination for a discussion of this topic.

Topics:		Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
6.	**NOISE—Would the project:**				
a)	Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Topics:		Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
d)	Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, in an area within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	For a project located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g)	Be substantially affected by existing noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Market and Octavia PEIR noted that the key potential noise impacts associated with the Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan are from increasing thoroughfare traffic and construction-related impacts from building demolition, excavation, and new construction. Nonetheless, the PEIR concluded that while certain intersections will become noisier due to arterial changes, the increase in noise levels from mobile and stationary sources will result in a less-than-significant impact. The PEIR also noted that new development may introduce stationary sources of noise, such as electrical and mechanical air conditioning equipment located on rooftops, but that such increases in noise levels will be considered less than significant. The PEIR noted that construction noise will be subject to Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code, which limits the hours of construction and the decibel levels of individual pieces of construction equipment, thus construction noise impacts will be less than significant. The PEIR included no noise mitigation measures.

The proposed project would increase the size of existing facilities but would not be expected to generate substantially more use on the site, with the exception that users on site may stay for longer periods of time. The community and worship uses would not exceed normal noise levels. Noises generated by assembly uses are common and generally accepted in urban areas. Noise generated by the proposed project's mechanical systems and traffic would be consistent with the analysis in the Market and Octavia PEIR. During the 18-month project construction period, construction noise would be temporary, intermittent, and restricted in occurrence and level, as the contractor would be obliged to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance. Thus, the project would result in less-than-significant noise impacts.

Topics:		Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
7.	**AIR QUALITY** Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. **Would the project:**				
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please see the Certificate of Determination for a discussion of this topic.

Topics:		Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
8.	**GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS—Would the project:**				
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please see the Certificate of Determination for a discussion of this topic.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
9. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:				
a) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?	☒	☐	☐	☒

Please see the Certificate of Determination for a discussion of this topic.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
10. RECREATION—Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Physically degrade existing recreational resources?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Market and Octavia PEIR noted that the project area is relatively densely populated, and that the project area south of Market Street has no existing parks. The neighborhood plan included the creation of several parks and other measures aimed at improving the quality of residential streets and alleys as neighborhood open spaces or multi-use areas. Thus, the neighborhood plan was anticipated to have a beneficial impact on recreational facilities.

The project as proposed would not bring new residents, employees, or visitors to the site. Thus, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts, either individually or cumulatively, in regard to recreation facilities, nor require the construction or expansion of public recreation facilities.

Topics:		Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
11.	**UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:**				
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that would serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Market and Octavia PEIR noted that the water and wastewater systems in San Francisco are adequate to meet existing and projected demand, and that implementation of the neighborhood plan will not result in significant impacts to water or wastewater services in San Francisco. The PEIR also concluded that the neighborhood plan will not result in significant impacts to electricity or gas systems.

The proposed project would not result in an expansion of use that would require the construction of new wastewater/storm water treatment facilities or expansion of existing ones. The proposed project would have sufficient water supply available from existing entitlement, and solid waste generated by project construction and operation would not result in the landfill exceeding its permitted capacity, and the project would not result in a significant solid waste generation impact. Utilities and service systems would not be adversely affected by the project, individually or cumulatively, and no significant impact would ensue.

The project would comply with the City's Stormwater Management Ordinance, which requires the project to maintain or reduce the existing volume and rate of stormwater runoff discharged from the site. To achieve this, the project would implement and install appropriate stormwater management systems that retain runoff on site, promote stormwater reuse, and limit site

discharges entering the combined sewer collection system. This, in turn, would limit the incremental demand on both the collection system and wastewater facilities resulting from stormwater discharges, and minimize the potential need for expanding or constructing new facilities. Thus, the project would not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Topics:	*Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact*	*Addressed Below*
12. PUBLIC SERVICES— Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services such as fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other services?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Market and Octavia PEIR analyzed growth projections and determined that the neighborhood plan's impacts on public services will not be significant. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The proposed project would not expand use on the site; thus, the project would not increase demand for police or fire protection services and would not necessitate new school facilities in San Francisco. The proposed project would not result in a significant impact to public services.

Topics:	*Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact*	*Addressed Below*
13. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES— Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Topics:		Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Market and Octavia PEIR addressed biological resources and noted that the neighborhood plan area is a developed urban area that is completely covered by structures, impervious surfaces, and introduced landscaping. No known rare, threatened, or endangered animal or plant species are known to exist in the plan area, and the PEIR concluded that the proposed project will not have a significant impact on biological resources.

The project site is covered entirely by existing buildings and a paved parking lot. Similar to the rest of the neighborhood plan area, the project site does not support or provide habitat for any rare or endangered wildlife species, animal, or plant life or habitat. Accordingly, the proposed project would result in no impact on sensitive species, special status species, native or migratory fish species, or wildlife species.

There are no existing trees on the project site. There are 18 street trees bordering the project site along Valencia Street and Stevenson Streets. Two of the trees along Valencia Street would be relocated to accommodate the new curb cut location, and new street trees would be planted along Stevenson Street in compliance with Planning Code Section 138.1 and thus would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting trees.

The project would not result in any significant effect with regard to biological resources and would not contribute to any potential cumulative effects on biological resources.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
14. GEOLOGY AND SOILS— Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please see the Certificate of Determination for a discussion of this topic.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
15. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY— Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Topics:		Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion of siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Market and Octavia PEIR noted that most of the plan area is paved or covered by structures. Wastewater and stormwater flow to the City's combined sanitary and stormwater sewer system. The project site is completely covered by existing buildings and an impervious surface lot, and would be completely covered by the proposed cathedral building.

The City's Stormwater Management Ordinance became effective May 22, 2010. As addressed in Public Works Code Section 147.2, stormwater design guidelines have been instituted to minimize the disruption of natural hydrology. The project, which resides in a combined sewer area, would be required to achieve the performance requirements of LEED Sustainable Sites (SS) c6.1, "Stormwater Design: Quantity Control" and must implement a low impact design approach to stormwater management that reduces existing stormwater runoff flow rate and volume by 25

percent for a two-year 24-hour design storm. Low impact design approaches may include a reduction of impervious cover, stormwater reuse, and increased infiltration.

In compliance with the Stormwater Management Ordinance, the project would maintain or reduce the existing volume and rate of stormwater runoff discharged from the site by implementing and installing appropriate stormwater management systems that retain runoff onsite, promote stormwater reuse, and limit site discharges before they enter the combined sewer collection system. In addition, the stormwater management system would capture and treat stormwater runoff from 90 percent of the average rainfall, and mitigate stormwater quality effects by promoting treatment or infiltration of stormwater runoff prior to discharging to the separate sewer system and entering the bay or ocean. Compliance with these requirements would ensure that effects related to hydrology and water quality would not be significant, either individually or cumulatively.

Topics:	*Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR*	*Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact*	*Addressed Below*
16. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please see the Certificate of Determination for a discussion of this topic.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
17. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES— Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?	☐	☐	☐	☒

This topic was not addressed in the Market and Octavia PEIR; thus, the topic is addressed in the Certificate of Determination.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
18. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. – **Would the project:**				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

This topic was not addressed in the Market and Octavia PEIR; thus, the topic is addressed in the Certificate of Determination.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in PEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	Addressed Below
19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE—Would the project:				
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Have impacts that would be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☒	☐	☐	☒

The Market and Octavia PEIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts related to shadow, traffic, and transit. As discussed in this document and the Certificate of Determination, the proposed project would not contribute to the significant shadow, traffic, or transit impacts

identified in the Market and Octavia PEIR, and the proposed project would not result in new, peculiar environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already analyzed and disclosed in the Market and Octavia PEIR.