



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Mitigated Negative Declaration

*PMND Date:* June 20, 2012  
*Case No.:* **2011.1279E**  
*Project Title:* **626 Potrero Avenue**  
*Zoning:* PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution, and Repair, General) and  
UMU (Urban Mixed Use) Districts  
58-X and 40-X Height and Bulk Districts  
*Block/Lot:* 4025/001, 002, 013, and 014  
*Lot Size:* 25,000 square feet  
*Project Sponsor:* Peter Morris, AIA  
(949) 285-1903  
*Lead Agency:* San Francisco Planning Department  
*Staff Contact:* Jeanie Poling – (415) 575-9072  
jeanie.poling@sfgov.org

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project site is located along the full length of the south side of 18<sup>th</sup> Street between Potrero Avenue and Hampshire Street on the block surrounded by 18<sup>th</sup>, Hampshire, and 19<sup>th</sup> Streets and Potrero Avenue in San Francisco's Mission District. The site contains a 26-foot-tall, two-story, 15,000-square-foot (sf) vacant industrial building (also known as 2535 18th Street) that was constructed in 1946, and 32 parking spaces in two lots – a smaller lot accessed from Potrero Avenue and a larger lot accessed from Hampshire Street. The proposed project would remodel the existing building, increase its size by 200 sf to add an elevator tower, and convert its use to a dialysis clinic. The parking lots would be landscaped and reconfigured to add three parking spaces (for a total of 35 spaces) and one loading space; access to the lots would not change. The project would require Conditional Use Authorization by the Planning Commission under Planning Code Section 217(c).

### FINDING:

This project could not have a significant effect on the environment. This finding is based upon the criteria of the Guidelines of the State Secretary for Resources, Sections 15064 (Determining Significant Effect), 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance), and 15070 (Decision to prepare a Negative Declaration), and the following reasons as documented in the Initial Evaluation (Initial Study) for the project, which is attached. Mitigation measures are included in this project to avoid potentially significant effects. See pages 9–10.

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

*Bill Cooper, for*

\_\_\_\_\_  
BILL WYCKO  
Environmental Review Officer

*July 16, 2012*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Adoption of Final Mitigated  
Negative Declaration

cc: Peter Morris  
Tara Sullivan  
M.D.F



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Notice of Availability of and Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration

*Date:* June 20, 2012  
*Case No.:* 2011.1279E  
*Project Title:* 626 Potrero Avenue  
*Zoning/Plan Area:* PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution, and Repair, General) and UMU (Urban Mixed Use) Districts; 58-X and 40-X Height and Bulk Districts; Mission Subarea of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plan  
*Block/Lot:* 4025/001, 002, 013, and 014  
*Project Sponsor:* Peter Morris, Architect – (949) 285-1903  
*Staff Contact:* Jeanie Poling – (415) 575-9072  
jeanie.poling@sfgov.org

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

Reception:  
415.558.6378

Fax:  
415.558.6409

Planning  
Information:  
415.558.6377

### To Whom It May Concern:

This notice is to inform you of the availability of the environmental review document concerning the proposed project as described below. The document is a preliminary mitigated negative declaration (PMND), containing information about the possible environmental effects of the proposed project. The PMND documents the determination of the Planning Department that the proposed project could not have a significant adverse effect on the environment. Preparation of a mitigated negative declaration does not indicate a decision by the City to carry out or not to carry out the proposed project.

**Project Description:** The 25,000-square-foot (sf) project site is located along the full length of the south side of 18<sup>th</sup> Street between Potrero Avenue and Hampshire Street on the block surrounded by 18<sup>th</sup>, Hampshire, and 19<sup>th</sup> Streets and Potrero Avenue in San Francisco's Mission District. The site contains a 26-foot-tall, two-story, 15,000 (sf) vacant industrial building (also known as 2535 18th Street) that was constructed in 1946, and 32 parking spaces in two lots – a smaller lot accessed from Potrero Avenue and a larger lot accessed from Hampshire Street.

The proposed project would remodel a vacant industrial building, increase its size by 200 sf by adding an elevator tower, add a roof screen to hide the new and existing mechanical equipment, and convert the building's use to a dialysis clinic. The existing parking lots would be landscaped and reconfigured to add three parking spaces (for a total of 35 spaces) and one loading space. Vehicle access to the existing parking lots from would not change. The project would require Conditional Use Authorization by the Planning Commission under Planning Code Section 217(c).

The PMND is available to view or download from the Planning Department's Negative Declarations and EIRs web page: <http://tinyurl.com/sfceqadocs>. Paper copies are also available at the Planning Information Center (PIC) counter on the ground floor of 1660 Mission Street, San Francisco.

If you have questions concerning environmental review of the proposed project, contact the Planning Department staff contact listed above.

Within 20 calendar days following publication of the PMND (i.e., by 5:00 p.m. on July 10, 2012, any person may:

- 1) Review the PMND as an informational item and take no action;
- 2) Make recommendations for amending the text of the document. The text of the PMND may be amended to clarify or correct statements and may be expanded to include additional relevant issues or to cover issues in greater depth. This may be done **without** the appeal described below; **OR**
- 3) Appeal the determination of no significant effect on the environment to the Planning Commission in a letter that specifies the grounds for such appeal, accompanied by a \$510 check payable to the San Francisco Planning Department.<sup>1</sup> An appeal requires the Planning Commission to determine whether or not an environmental impact report must be prepared based upon whether or not the proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the environment. Send the appeal letter to the Planning Department, Attention: Bill Wycko, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103. **The letter must be accompanied by a check in the amount of \$510.00 payable to the San Francisco Planning Department, and must be received by 5:00 p.m. on July 10, 2012.** The appeal letter and check may also be presented in person at the PIC counter on the first floor of 1660 Mission Street, San Francisco.

In the absence of an appeal, the mitigated negative declaration shall be made final, subject to necessary modifications, after 20 days from the date of publication of the PMND.

---

<sup>1</sup> Upon review by the Planning Department, the appeal fee may be reimbursed for neighborhood organizations that have been in existence for a minimum of 24 months.



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration

*Date:* June 20, 2012  
*Case No.:* **2011.1279E**  
*Project Title:* **626 Potrero Avenue**  
*Zoning:* PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution, and Repair, General) and  
UMU (Urban Mixed Use) Districts  
58-X and 40-X Height and Bulk Districts  
*Block/Lot:* 4025/001, 002, 013, and 014  
*Lot Size:* 25,000 square feet  
*Project Sponsor:* Peter Morris, AIA  
(949) 285-1903  
*Lead Agency:* San Francisco Planning Department  
*Staff Contact:* Jeanie Poling – (415) 575-9072  
jeanie.poling@sfgov.org

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project site is located along the full length of the south side of 18<sup>th</sup> Street between Potrero Avenue and Hampshire Street on the block surrounded by 18<sup>th</sup>, Hampshire, and 19<sup>th</sup> Streets and Potrero Avenue in San Francisco's Mission District. The site contains a 26-foot-tall, two-story, 15,000-square-foot (sf) vacant industrial building (also known as 2535 18th Street) that was constructed in 1946, and 32 parking spaces in two lots – a smaller lot accessed from Potrero Avenue and a larger lot accessed from Hampshire Street. The proposed project would remodel the existing building, increase its size by 200 sf to add an elevator tower, and convert its use to a dialysis clinic. The parking lots would be landscaped and reconfigured to add three parking spaces (for a total of 35 spaces) and one loading space; access to the lots would not change. The project would require Conditional Use Authorization by the Planning Commission under Planning Code Section 217(c).

### FINDING:

This project could not have a significant effect on the environment. This finding is based upon the criteria of the Guidelines of the State Secretary for Resources, Sections 15064 (Determining the Significance of the Environmental Effects Caused by a Project), 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance), and 15070 (Decision to Prepare a Negative or Mitigated Declaration), and the following reasons as documented in the initial evaluation (initial study) for the project, which is attached.

Mitigation measures are included in this project to avoid potentially significant effects. See page 9.

cc: Peter Morris, Project Sponsor  
Supervisor Jane Kim, District 6

Tara Sullivan, Current Planning  
Virna Byrd, M.D.F.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	1
	Project Location and Site Characteristics .....	1
	Proposed Project .....	1
B.	PROJECT SETTING.....	1
C.	COMPATIBILITY WITH EXISTING ZONING AND PLANS.....	1
	Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area.....	2
	San Francisco Planning Code.....	2
	State Regulations .....	3
D.	SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS .....	3
E.	EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS .....	4
F.	MITIGATION MEASURES .....	9
G.	PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT .....	10
H.	DETERMINATION.....	10

Appendix A – Certificate of Determination, Exemption from Environmental Review

Appendix B – Community Plan Exemption Checklist

**INITIAL STUDY**  
**626 POTRERO AVENUE**  
**PLANNING DEPARTMENT CASE NO. 2011.1279E**

**A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

*Project Location and Site Characteristics*

The project site is located along the full length of the south side of 18<sup>th</sup> Street between Potrero Avenue and Hampshire Street on the block surrounded by 18<sup>th</sup>, Hampshire, and 19<sup>th</sup> Streets and Potrero Avenue in San Francisco’s Mission District. The project site slopes downhill from east to west, with the Potrero Avenue property line. The Bayshore Freeway is approximately 300 feet east of the project site and uphill – approximately 50 feet higher in elevation than the project site. The site contains a 26-foot-tall, two-story, 15,000-square-foot (sf) vacant industrial building (also known as 2535 18<sup>th</sup> Street) that was constructed in 1946, and 32 parking spaces in two lots – a smaller lot accessed from Potrero Avenue and a larger lot accessed from Hampshire Street.

*Proposed Project*

The proposed project would remodel the existing building, increase its size by 200 sf to add an elevator tower, and convert its use to a dialysis clinic. The parking lots would be landscaped and reconfigured to add three parking spaces (for a total of 35 spaces) and one loading space; access to the lots would not change. The project would require Conditional Use Authorization by the Planning Commission under Planning Code Section 217(c).

**B. PROJECT SETTING**

Directly south of the project site on Hampshire Street is a four-story, six-unit residential building; the rest of the project block on Hampshire and 19<sup>th</sup> Streets contains two- to three-story residences. Along Potrero Avenue, south of the project site on the project block, are two-story production, distribution, and repair uses, both vacant and occupied. Across 18<sup>th</sup> Street, to the north of the project site, are a three-store industrial building that currently contains a social service agency, and a two-story industrial building used for storage. At the northwest corner of 18<sup>th</sup> and Hampshire Streets is a 50-foot high, four-story building that contains 24 live/work units. The west side of Hampshire Street, across from the project block, contains two- and three-story residences. San Francisco General Hospital is two blocks south of the project site and across Potrero Avenue.

**C. COMPATIBILITY WITH EXISTING ZONING AND PLANS**

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

### ***Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area***

The project site is located within the Mission Area of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Plan Area, which was evaluated in an environmental impact report (EIR),<sup>1</sup> and on August 7, 2008, the Planning Commission certified the Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR by Motion 17659 and adopted the Preferred Project for final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.<sup>2</sup> The Eastern Neighborhoods was adopted in part to support housing development in some areas previously zoned to allow industrial uses, while preserving an adequate supply of space for existing and future production, distribution, and repair (PDR) employment and businesses. The Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning also included changes to existing height and bulk districts in some areas.

The Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR evaluated three rezoning alternatives, two community-proposed alternatives which focused largely on the Mission District, and a “No Project” alternative. The alternative selected, or the Preferred Project, represents a combination of Options B and C. The Planning Commission adopted the Preferred Project after fully considering the environmental effects of the Preferred Project and the various scenarios discussed in the Final EIR.

### ***San Francisco Planning Code***

Three of the four parcels on the project site are zoned Production, Distribution, and Repair, General (PDR-1-G) and are in the 58-foot height district. The fourth parcel, at the southwestern portion of the project site, is in the Urban Mixed Use (UMU) Zoning District and in the 40-foot height district. The project block contains parcels zoned PDR-1-G along Potrero Avenue, and UMU and Residential, Two-Family (RH-2) along Hampshire Street. The 58-foot height district extends north and south along Potrero Avenue, and the 40-foot height district extends south along and across Hampshire Street.

The Citywide and Current Planning Divisions of the San Francisco Planning Department have determined that the proposed project at 626 Potrero Avenue is consistent with density established with the Eastern Neighborhood Rezoning and Area Plans, satisfies the requirements of the General Plan and the Planning Code, and is eligible for a Community Plan Exemption.<sup>3,4</sup> The proposed project would be required to comply with the following sections of the Planning Code:

---

<sup>1</sup> *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report*, Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E, certified August 7, 2008. The FEIR is available for public review.

<sup>2</sup> San Francisco Planning Commission Motion 17659, August 7, 2008. This document is available for public review as part of Case File No. 2004.0160E.

<sup>3</sup> Jose Campos, San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 626 Potrero Avenue*, April 6, 2012. This document is available for review as part of Case File No. 2011.1279E.

<sup>4</sup> Kelley Amdur, San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning, 626 Potrero Avenue*, May 4, 2012. This document is available for review as part of Case File No. 2011.1279E.



- **Section 217.** Outpatient clinical uses are permitted as-of-right in the PDR-1-G Zoning District. However, Section 217 (Institutions) limits the allowable square footage of uses and use size per lot in this district. Any outpatient clinic that exceeds 5,000 gross square feet must obtain a Conditional Use Authorization from the Planning Commission. Because the proposed use for the outpatient clinic exceeds 5,000 sf, a Conditional Use Authorization is required.
- **Section 138.1(c)(1).** Projects that include the addition of new parking or the repaving more than 200 sf of the front setback must comply with street tree requirements. One tree must be provided for every 20 feet of street frontage along all three street frontages for the project.
- **Section 138.1(c)(2).** The project site is over one-half an acre and must meet all landscaping and street tree requirements.
- **Section 142** mandates that all off-street parking and vehicle use areas adjacent to the public right-of-way be screened. The off-street parking that faces all three street frontages must be screened.
- **Sections 155.3 and 155.4.** The project must include one shower, two clothes lockers, and three bicycle spaces.
- **Section 156(j).** Both parking lots must meet landscaping and permeability requirements.
- **Section 312.** Neighborhood notification will be required as part of the building permit application, since the project involves a change from one land use category to another.
- **Section 411.** The proposed project would be subject to the Transit Impact Development Fee.
- **Section 423.** The proposed project would be subject to the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee.

*State Regulations*

In compliance with California Health & Safety Code Section 1212-1220, chronic dialysis clinics must be annually licensed and certified by the California Department of Public Health. The application review process considers the applicant’s and associates’ (board members, LLC members, managers) past compliance history. The applicant and associates must demonstrate substantial compliance with state and federal requirements for all facilities that they operate.

**D. SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

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

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

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 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 (1) are peculiar to the project or parcel on which the project would be located, (2) 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, (3) are potentially significant off-site and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the underlying EIR, and (4) 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.

An initial analysis was conducted by the Planning Department to evaluate potential project-specific environmental effects peculiar to the 626 Potrero Avenue project, and incorporated by reference information contained within the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final EIR (Eastern Neighborhoods) (Case No. 2004.0160E; State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048).<sup>5</sup> This initial analysis assessed the proposed project's potential to cause environmental impacts and concluded that with the exception of hazardous materials, the proposed project would not result in new, peculiar environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already analyzed and disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR. Due to the peculiar impact found concerning hazardous materials, a focused initial study was conducted for this topic area only.

## E. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The proposed project is within the Mission Subarea of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans. The proposed project at 626 Potrero Avenue is an individual project occurring in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area and is undergoing project-level environmental evaluation to determine if it would result in further impacts specific to the development proposal, the site, and the time of development. The initial analysis that was conducted by the Planning Department (Appendices A and B to this initial study) concluded that the proposed project is consistent with and was encompassed within the analysis in the Eastern Neighborhoods with the exception of hazardous materials. Due to the peculiar impact found concerning hazardous materials, this focused initial study was conducted for this topic area only.

---

<sup>5</sup> Community Plan Exemption Checklist, 626 Potrero Avenue, Case No. 2011.1279E. This document is attached as Appendix A.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
<b>1. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>					
<b>Would the project:</b>					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing school, and therefore Topic 1c is not applicable to the proposed project. The project site is not included on the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 of hazardous materials sites in San Francisco, and therefore Topics 1d is not applicable to the proposed project. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, nor is it in the vicinity of a private airstrip, and therefore Topics 1e and 1f are not applicable to the proposed project.

**Impact HA-1: The proposed project would not create a significant hazard through routine transport, use, disposal, handling, or emission of hazardous materials. (Less than Significant)**

Dialysis is a process for removing waste and excess water from the blood and is used primarily to provide an artificial replacement for lost kidney function in people with renal failure. The process involves the handling of blood and other potentially infectious medical waste. No hazardous

materials would be stored on site; however, health facilities that handle biohazardous materials, including dialysis clinics, must be licensed and certified by the California Department of Public Health. In compliance with state licensing and certification requirements, the project sponsor would maintain a Risk Management Medical Waste Management Plan for the clinic. The plan covers assignment of responsibility, personal protective equipment, types of medical waste, segregation of medical waste, packaging and labeling of medical waste, on-site storage of medical waste, collection and disposal of medical waste, and an emergency action plan.<sup>6</sup> Because project operations would comply with state requirements, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the transport, use, disposal, handling, and emission of hazardous materials.

**Impact HA-2: The proposed project would result in handling and accidental release of contaminated soils and hazardous building materials associated with historic uses. (Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated)**

Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments of the project site were conducted in 2011.<sup>7</sup> The San Francisco Department of Public Health, Site Assessment and Mitigation (DPH) reviewed these documents, and a discussion of its findings and conclusions follows.<sup>8</sup>

The unoccupied 15,000 sf building on the project site was previously occupied by industrial uses, including Rose Exterminators business from 1941 to 1993, although chemical mixing did not occur on site after about 1970. The project site is a closed DPH leaking underground storage tank (UST) case. Five USTs were removed in 1990. Contamination was found, and groundwater monitoring wells were installed. Groundwater data showed low to not detected contaminant concentrations, and the case was approved for closure in 1998. The official closure documents were issued by DPH in 2005.

The currently proposed project includes interior construction of the existing building for use as a dialysis clinic. A new HVAC system would be installed, and nonstructural elements such as equipment, carpeting, and sheetrock may be removed and replaced. The building shell would remain unchanged, and the only exterior change would be the addition of an elevator tower.

An indoor air and subslab air sampling event was conducted in 2011. The samples were analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPHg), benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (BTEX), and pesticides. The analytical results showed measurable concentrations in TPHg and BTEX in at least one sample. The sample results showed no vapor sample exceeding the laboratory reporting limits for any pesticide measured. Subslab samples did not exceed the soil vapor TPHg Environmental Screening Level (ESL) of 10,000 micrograms per cubic meter. The

---

<sup>6</sup> Renal Advantage, Inc., *Risk Management Medical Waste Management Plan*, Policy RM-105, Revised October 2010.

<sup>7</sup> Rajiv Bhatia, MD, MPH, Director, Occupational and Environmental Health, San Francisco Department of Public Health, *Review of Environmental Documents, 626 Potrero, San Francisco, DPH SAM Project Number 877*, April 18, 2012, and *Review of Environmental Documents and Letter, 626 Potrero, San Francisco, DPH SAM Project Number 877*, May 3, 2012. These letters are available for review as part of Planning Department Case No. 2011.1279E.

<sup>8</sup> Hanover Environmental Services, Inc., *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 626 Potrero Avenue, San Francisco, CA*, December 22, 2011; and *Phase II Environmental Site Investigation, 626 Potrero Avenue, San Francisco, CA*, December 22, 2011. These reports are available for review as part of Planning Department Case No. 2011.1279E.

benzene concentration in each sample exceeded the residential California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSL) for benzene of 0.08 micrograms per cubic meter. Concentrations of ethylbenzene, toluene, and xylenes did not exceed ESL or CHHSL.

The following mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts of the proposed project to less than significant.

**Project Mitigation Measure M-HA-1 – Site Mitigation Plan.** The project sponsor shall submit a Site Mitigation Plan to the San Francisco Department of Public Health, Site Assessment and Mitigation, (DPH) that addresses the proposed construction work, including cleaning, materials to be removed, and materials to remain. In addition, the Site Mitigation Plan must demonstrate compliance with construction and safety procedures for handling and disposing of building materials containing asbestos and lead-based paint.

**Project Mitigation Measure M-HA-2 – Dust and Air Sampling Work Plan.** A work plan to collect supplemental surface, dust, and air sampling data after demolition must be submitted to DPH for concurrence at least four weeks prior to implementation. The work plan and final report must be signed and stamped by a Certified Industrial Hygienist.

**Project Mitigation Measure M-HA-3 – Building Ventilation System.** Designs and plans for the building ventilation system, stamped by a licensed mechanical/HVAC engineer, shall be submitted at least six weeks prior to beginning demolition. The plans or accompanying documents shall demonstrate that the ventilation system will reduce potential contaminant vapor concentrations to below California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSL) values.

**Project Mitigation Measure M-HA-4 – Dust, Noise, Runoff, and Health and Safety Plans.** Dust control, noise control, and runoff plans, as applicable, shall be submitted at least two weeks prior to the beginning of demolition. In addition, a site-specific Health and Safety Plan and Contingency Plan that address response actions if an unexpected hazard or hazardous material is encountered shall be submitted at least two weeks prior to beginning of demolition.

With implementation of these mitigation measures, project-related impacts related to hazardous materials would be less than significant.

**Impact HA-3: The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Less than Significant)**

San Francisco ensures fire safety and emergency accessibility within new and existing developments through provisions of its Building and Fire Codes. The project would conform to these standards, which may include development of an emergency procedures manual and an exit drill plan for the proposed clinic. Potential fire hazards would be addressed during the permit review process. Conformance with these standards would ensure appropriate life safety protections. Consequently, the project would not have a significant impact on fire hazards nor interfere with emergency access plans.

**Impact HA-4: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires. (Less than Significant)**

San Francisco ensures fire safety primarily through provisions of the Building and Fire Codes. The proposed project would conform to these standards, which may also include development of an emergency procedures manual and an exit drill plan. Therefore, the proposed project’s exposure of people or structures to the risk of fire would be an impact that is less than significant.

**Impact HA-5: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the site vicinity, would result in less-than-significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. (Less than Significant)**

Impacts from hazards are generally site-specific, and typically do not result in cumulative impacts. Any hazards present at surrounding sites would be subject to the same safety requirements discussed for the proposed project above, which would reduce any cumulative hazard effects to levels considered less than significant. Overall, with implementation of Project Mitigation Measures M-HA-1 through M-HA-5, described above, the project would not contribute to cumulatively considerable significant effects related to hazards and hazardous materials.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
<b>2. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE— Would the project:</b>					
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have impacts that would be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would remodel a vacant industrial building, increase its size by 200 sf by adding an elevator tower, add a roof screen to hide the new and existing mechanical equipment, and convert the building's use to a dialysis clinic. As previously discussed, an initial analysis was conducted and found that, with the exception of hazardous materials, the proposed project would not result in new, peculiar environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already analyzed and disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods Final EIR. Due to the peculiar impact found concerning hazardous materials, a Focused Initial Study was conducted for this topic area only.

The foregoing analysis identifies potentially significant impacts to hazardous materials, which would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measures M-HA-1 to M-HA-4, described below.

---

## F. MITIGATION MEASURES

**Project Mitigation Measure M-HA-1 – Site Mitigation Plan.** The project sponsor shall submit a Site Mitigation Plan to the Department of Public Health, Site Assessment and Mitigation, (DPH) that addresses the proposed construction work, including cleaning, materials to be removed, and materials to remain. In addition, the Site Mitigation Plan must demonstrate compliance with construction and safety procedures for handling and disposing of building materials containing asbestos and lead-based paint.

**Project Mitigation Measure M-HA-2 – Dust and Air Sampling Work Plan.** A work plan to collect supplemental surface, dust, and air sampling data after demolition must be submitted to DPH for concurrence at least four weeks prior to implementation. The work plan and final report must be signed and stamped by a Certified Industrial Hygienist.

**Project Mitigation Measure M-HA-3 – Building Ventilation System.** Designs and plans for the building ventilation system, stamped by a licensed mechanical/HVAC engineer, shall be submitted at least six weeks prior to beginning demolition. The plans or accompanying documents shall demonstrate that the ventilation system will reduce potential contaminant vapor concentrations to below California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSL) values.

**Project Mitigation Measure M-HA-4 – Dust, Noise, Runoff, and Health and Safety Plans.** Dust control, noise control, and runoff plans, as applicable, shall be submitted at least two weeks prior to the beginning of demolition. In addition, a site-specific Health and Safety Plan and Contingency Plan that address response actions if an unexpected hazard or hazardous material is encountered shall be submitted at least two weeks prior to beginning of demolition.

**Project Mitigation Measure M-HA-5 – Hazardous Building Materials ((Mitigation Measure L-1 of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR).** The project sponsor shall ensure that any equipment containing PCBs or DEPH, such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.

**Project Mitigation Measure M-NO-1 – Interior Noise Levels (Mitigation Measure F-3 of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR).** For new development including noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn), as shown in EIR Figure 18, where such development is not already subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the project sponsor shall conduct a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements. Such analysis shall be conducted by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering. Noise insulation features identified and recommended by the analysis shall be included in the design, as specified in the San Francisco General Plan Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise to reduce potential interior noise levels to the maximum extent feasible. As identified in the acoustical analysis, the following noise insulation features shall be included in the building design:

**Minimum Window and Door STC\* Ratings**

<b>Floor</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Door</b>	<b>Window</b>
1	West and north façades	Sound gasketed	28
	West façade	N/A	28
	North façade	N/A	32
2	<b>East façade (set back at parking lot)</b>	<b>Sound gasketed</b>	<b>32</b>
	North and east façade at break room	33	43

\*Sound Transmission Class (STC) — A single-number rating derived from the sound insulation properties of building elements such as walls, floors, and ceilings. Increasing STC ratings indicate more sound insulation and less transmitted sound.

**G. PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT**

Please see Appendix A, Certificate of Determination, Exemption from Environmental Review, page 16.

**H. DETERMINATION**

On the basis of this Initial Study:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.



- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
  
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, no further environmental documentation is required.



Bill Wycko  
Environmental Review Officer

for

John Rahaim  
Director of Planning

DATE June 19, 2012



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Appendix A – Certificate of Determination EXEMPTION FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

*Case No.:* 2011.1279E  
*Project Title:* 626 Potrero Avenue  
*Zoning/Plan Area:* PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution, and Repair, General) and UMU (Urban Mixed Use) Districts; 58-X and 40-X Height and Bulk Districts Mission Subarea of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plan  
*Block/Lot:* 4025/001, 002, 013, and 014  
*Lot Size:* 25,000 square feet  
*Project Sponsor:* Peter Morris – (949) 285-1903  
*Staff Contact:* Jeanie Poling – (415) 575-9072  
jeanie.poling@sfgov.org

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

Reception:  
415.558.6378

Fax:  
415.558.6409

Planning  
Information:  
415.558.6377

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project site is located along the full length of the south side of 18<sup>th</sup> Street between Potrero Avenue and Hampshire Street on the block surrounded by 18<sup>th</sup>, Hampshire, and 19<sup>th</sup> Streets and Potrero Avenue in San Francisco's Mission District. The site contains a 26-foot-tall, two-story, 15,000-square-foot (sf) vacant industrial building (also known as 2535 18th Street) that was constructed in 1946, and 32 parking spaces in two lots – a smaller lot accessed from Potrero Avenue and a larger lot accessed from Hampshire Street. The proposed project would remodel a vacant industrial building, increase its size by 200 sf by adding an elevator tower, add a roof screen to hide the new and existing mechanical equipment, and convert the building's use to a dialysis clinic. The existing parking lots would be landscaped and reconfigured to add three parking spaces (for a total of 35 spaces) and one loading space. Vehicle access to the existing parking lots from would not change.

The clinic would include 24 dialysis stations. The hours of operation would be Monday through Friday 6:00 am through 8:00 pm. Patients are expected to be present for treatment for approximately four to six hours at a time approximately two to three times per week. The 24 dialysis stations could serve up to three patients each per day, or 72 patients per day, who would stay on site for four to six hours for dialysis services. Thus, the clinic would generate an estimated 360 visits per week. The clinic would employ 15 employees.

Project construction is anticipated to occur weekdays between 6:00 am and 3:00 pm last approximately nine months. The majority of the work would be interior tenant improvements. The exterior work is limited to a new elevator tower and the installation of landscaping in the existing parking lots and new street trees.

### EXEMPT STATUS:

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

**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 626 Potrero Avenue described above, and incorporates by reference information contained within the programmatic Final EIR, *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final EIR* (Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR – Case No. 2004.0160E; State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048). The Community Plan Exemption Checklist (Appendix B) identifies the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project and indicates whether any such impacts are addressed in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR.

With the exception of impacts related to hazardous materials, which is discussed in the preliminary mitigated negative declaration to which this document is attached, 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 Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. This determination does not identify new or additional information that would alter the conclusions of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. This determination also identifies one mitigation measure contained in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR that would be applicable to the proposed project at 626 Potrero Avenue. Relevant information pertaining to prior environmental review conducted for the Eastern Neighborhoods is included below, as well as an evaluation of potential environmental effects.

***Background***

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR included analyses of the following environmental issues: land use; plans and policies; visual quality and urban design; population, housing, business activity, and employment (growth inducement); transportation; noise; air quality; parks, recreation and open space; shadow; archeological resources; historic architectural resources; hazards; and other issues not addressed in the previously issued initial study for the Eastern Neighborhoods project. The proposed project at 626 Potrero Avenue is in conformance with the height, use and density for the site described in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR and would represent a small part of the growth that was forecast for the Eastern Neighborhoods. The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR considered the incremental impacts of the proposed 626 Potrero Avenue project. With the exception of impacts related to hazardous materials, which is discussed in the preliminary mitigated negative declaration to which this document is attached, the

proposed project would not result in any other new or substantially more severe impacts than were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR.

### *Potential Environmental Effects*

The following discussion demonstrates that the 626 Potrero Avenue project would not result in significant impacts beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR, including project-specific impacts related to land use and planning, historic architectural resources, archeological resources, transportation, noise, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and shadow. Impacts related to hazardous materials are discussed below and in the initial study to which this document is attached.

### **Land Use and Planning**

**Eastern Neighborhoods.** The Eastern Neighborhoods project rezoned much of the city's industrially zoned land. Its goals were to reflect local values, increase housing, maintain some industrial land supply, and improve the quality of all existing areas with future development. A major issue discussed in the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning process was the degree to which existing industrially zoned land would be rezoned to primarily residential and mixed-use districts, thus reducing the availability of land traditionally used for PDR employment and businesses.

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR evaluated three land use alternatives. Option A retained the largest amount of existing land that accommodated PDR uses and converted the least amount of industrially zoned land to residential use. Option C converted the most existing land accommodating PDR uses to residential and mixed uses. Option B fell between Options A and C.

While all three options were determined to result in a decline in PDR employment, the loss of PDR jobs was determined to be greatest under Option C. The alternative ultimately selected – the 'Preferred Project' – represented a combination of Options B and C. Because the amount of PDR space to be lost with future development under all three options could not be precisely gauged, the FEIR determined that the Preferred Project would result in an unavoidable significant impact on land use due to the cumulative loss of PDR use in the Plan Area. This impact was addressed in a Statement of Overriding Considerations with CEQA Findings and adopted as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans approval on January 19, 2009.

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR included one mitigation measure for land use controls in Western SoMa that could incorporate, at a minimum, no net loss of land currently designated for PDR uses, restrict non-PDR uses on industrial (or other PDR-designated) land, and incorporate restrictions on potentially incompatible land uses proximate to PDR zones. The measure was judged to be infeasible, because the outcome of the community-based Western SoMa planning process could not be known at the time, and the measure was seen to conflict with other City policy goals, including the provision of affordable housing. This measure is not applicable to the proposed project, which is not in Western SoMa.

**Proposed Project.** The proposed project at 626 Potrero Avenue falls within the Mission Subarea of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area of the San Francisco General Plan. Three of the four lots are within the

PDR-1-G District, which is intended to retain and encourage existing production, distribution, and repair activities and promote new business formation. This district prohibits residential and office uses and limits retail and institutional uses. Generally, all other uses are permitted. One of the four lots, at the southwestern portion of the project site, is within the Urban Mixed Use (UMU) District, which is intended to serve as a buffer between residential districts and PDR Districts in the Eastern Neighborhoods. Allowed uses within the UMU District include PDR uses such as light manufacturing, home and business services, arts activities, warehouses, and wholesaling. Additional permitted uses within the UMU District include retail, educational facilities, and nighttime entertainment. The proposed project is consistent with uses permitted within the UMU District. The Citywide and Current Planning Divisions of the Planning Department have additionally determined that the proposed project falls within general use categories and height and bulk districts per the Mission Area Plan of the San Francisco General Plan.<sup>12</sup>

### Historic Architectural Resources

**Eastern Neighborhoods.** The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR anticipated that program implementation may result in demolition of buildings identified as historical resources, and found this impact to be significant and unavoidable. This impact was addressed in a Statement of Overriding Considerations with findings and adopted as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans approval on January 19, 2009.

Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR Mitigation Measure K-1, Interim Procedures for Permit Review in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area, required certain projects to be presented to the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (now the Historic Preservation Commission). This mitigation measure is no longer relevant, because the Showplace Square/Northeast Mission historic resource survey was completed and adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission on June 15, 2011. Mitigation Measures K-2 and K-3, which amended Article 10 of the Planning Code to reduce potential adverse effects to contributory structures within the South End Historic District (East SoMa) and the Dogpatch Historic District (Central Waterfront), do not apply the proposed project because it is not located within the South End or Dogpatch Historic Districts.

**Proposed Project.** The existing two-story L-shaped reinforced concrete industrial building at the 626 Potrero Avenue project site was constructed in 1949. The building was included in the South Mission Historic Resource Survey, which was conducted by Planning Department preservation staff and used to inform the implementation of the Mission Area Plan. The South Mission Survey resulted in documentation and assessment of approximately 3,800 individual buildings in the project area. Adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission on November 17, 2011, the South Mission Survey determined that the building at 626 Potrero Avenue (also known as 2535 18<sup>th</sup> Street) is ineligible for local listing or designation on the National Register or California Register through local government review process.

---

<sup>1</sup> Jose Campos, San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 626 Potrero Avenue*, April 6, 2012. This document is on file and available for review as part of Case File No. 2011.1279E.

<sup>2</sup> Kelley Amdur, San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning, 626 Potrero Avenue*, May 4, 2012. This document is on file and available for review as part of Case File No. 2011.1279E.

Thus, the building is not considered a historic resource for purposes of CEQA, and the proposed project would not result in impacts on a historical resource. Furthermore, exterior changes to the building on the project site, which include the addition of a 200 sf elevator shaft, replacement of a roll-up door with glazing, and screening of mechanical equipment on the roof, would not result in a significant impact on nearby historical resources.

### Archeological Resources

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

**Proposed Project.** The project site contains a vacant industrial building and two parking lots. The proposed project would remodel the existing building and change its use to a medical clinic. The maximum depth of excavation for the proposed elevator pit would be 6 feet. Due to this shallow depth of excavation, no expected archeological resources are expected to be within the affected soils.<sup>3</sup>

### Transportation

**Eastern Neighborhoods.** The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the Plan-related zoning changes could result in significant impacts on traffic and transit ridership. Thus, the FEIR identified 11 transportation mitigation measures, including implementation of traffic management strategies, transit corridor improvements, enhancement of transit funding, promotion of alternative means of travel, and parking management to discourage driving – all measures to be implemented by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), the San Francisco County Transportation Authority, and/or the San Francisco Planning Department. Even with mitigation, however, it was anticipated that the significant adverse impacts at certain local intersections and the cumulatively considerable impacts on certain transit lines intersections could not be fully mitigated. Thus, these impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable, and a Statement of Overriding Considerations with CEQA Findings was adopted as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods approval on January 19, 2009. The traffic and transit mitigation measures identified in the FEIR are not applicable to the proposed project because City agencies and not the sponsors of individual private development projects are responsible for the implementation of these measures.

---

<sup>3</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, *Environmental Planning Preliminary Archeological Review Checklist*, 626 Potrero Avenue, April 5, 2012. This document is available for review as part of Case No. 2011.1279E.

**Proposed Project Traffic and Transit.** The 24 dialysis stations could each serve up to three patients each per day, or 72 patients per day, who would stay on site for four to six hours for dialysis services. Treatment times would be staggered throughout the clinic’s 14 daily hours of operation. It is estimated that half of the patients would arrive and depart by van service that would each carry three patients. It is also estimated that 12 of the 15 employees would commute by single-occupancy private vehicle. The Muni 9 and 33 lines run along Potrero Avenue and stop in front of the project site. As shown in Table 1, the proposed project would result in an estimated 27 PM peak-hour vehicle trips and 3 PM peak-hour transit trips; this number of trips would result in less-than-significant impacts on traffic and transit.

**Proposed Project Bicycle and Pedestrian Conditions.** The proposed project would include three bicycle parking spaces, as required by the Planning Code. A dedicated bicycle lane runs along Potrero Avenue in front of the project site. Vehicles that access the 14-space parking lot from Potrero Avenue would have to cross the southbound bike lane; however the number of vehicles crossing the lane would not be considered a significant impact on the bicycle network. The streets surrounding the project site have 15-foot-wide sidewalks, which are adequate to serve existing and any increased project-related pedestrian use. In compliance with Planning Code Sections 155.3 and 155.4, the project would add three bicycle spaces, a shower, and two clothes lockers to the project site. Also, in compliance with Planning Code Section 138.1(c)(2), the project may add streetscape elements as identified in the Better Streets Plan, which would improve the pedestrian realm in front of the project site. Thus, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to bicycle and pedestrian conditions.

**Table 1 – Project Trips**

	<b>Weekday daily trips</b>	<b>PM peak-hour trips</b>
<b>Vehicle Trips</b>		
Private vehicle patient trips	36	12
Van service patient trips	12	6
Private vehicle employee trips	12	9
<b>Total Vehicle Trips</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Transit Trips</b>		
Employees arriving by transit	3	3
Visitors arriving by transit	0	0
<b>Total Transit Trips</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>

*Note:* Dialysis hours of operation would be Monday through Friday 6:00 AM–8:00 PM. It is assumed that approximately one-third of the patients would arrive or depart during the PM peak period and that no patients would use public transportation.

**Proposed Project Loading.** The proposed project includes one patient loading space, located next to the elevator entrance in the parking lot accessed from Hampshire Street. The existing parking lots would be adequate for any on-site loading of passengers and deliveries.

**Proposed Project Parking.** The parking lots would be used by both employees and visitors. The 35 parking spaces would be adequate to serve the clinic use, and employees and visitors to the clinic would not be expected to park on nearby streets. The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) is considering changes to parking policies in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area. Any changes to the City’s parking policies in the project area would not affect or be affected by the proposed project.

## Noise

**Eastern Neighborhoods.** The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified potential conflicts related to residences and other noise-sensitive uses in proximity to noisy uses such as PDR, retail, entertainment, cultural, institutional, educational, and office uses. In addition, the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR noted that the project would incrementally increase traffic-generated noise on some streets in the project area, and result in construction noise impacts from pile driving and other construction activities. With implementation of six noise mitigation measures cited in the FEIR, Plan-related noise impacts were found to be less than significant.

Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2, which require noise controls on the use of pile driving equipment and other construction equipment, are not applicable to the proposed project because project construction would not involve pile driving and would primarily occur within the existing building, which would not create noise levels that could affect any nearby sensitive receptors.<sup>4</sup>

Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-3 involves noise-reduction requirements for new development projects that include noise-sensitive uses along streets with elevated noise levels, and requires that development projects not already subject to noise insulation standards of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations be implemented to reduce potential interior noise levels to the maximum extent feasible. San Francisco traffic noise modeling indicates that the project site is exposed to noise levels between DNL 60 and 75 decibels.<sup>5</sup> Thus, this mitigation measure applies to the proposed project, and is discussed below, under "Proposed Project Operations."

Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measures F-4 requires a noise analysis for the siting of noise-sensitive uses to determine whether Title 24 standards must be met. Because the proposed project would be required to meet Title 24 standards as part of Mitigation Measure F-3, the additional noise analysis of this mitigation measure would not be required.

Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-5 applies to the siting of noise-generating uses. The proposed clinic use would not generate excessive noise; thus, this mitigation measure is not applicable to the proposed project. Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-6 requires that open space be protected, to the maximum feasible extent, from existing ambient noise levels. The immediate project vicinity contains no open space or parks; thus, Mitigation Measure F-6 is not applicable to the proposed project.

**Proposed Project Operations.** The proposed project at 626 Potrero Avenue involves the conversion of a vacant industrial building to a medical clinic use. In compliance with Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-3, an environmental noise study was conducted for the proposed project.<sup>6</sup> To meet the project indoor noise criterion, the report recommends that the noise insulation features identified in Table 2 be

---

<sup>4</sup> Sensitive receptors include residences, hospitals, nursing homes, senior citizen centers, schools, churches, and libraries.

<sup>5</sup> Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) is a 24-hour average noise level measurement established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

<sup>6</sup> Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc., *626 Potrero Dialysis Clinic Environmental Noise Study*, April 11, 2012. This report is available for review as part of Case No. 2011.1279E.



included in the building design. These recommendations are listed as Mitigation Measure, M-NO-1 on page 15 of this document.

**Table 2 – Minimum Window and Door STC\* Ratings**

Floor	Location	Door	Window
1	West and north façades	Sound gasketed	28
	West façade	N/A	28
	North façade	N/A	32
2	East façade (set back at parking lot)	Sound gasketed	32
	North and east façade at break room	33	43

\*Sound Transmission Class (STC) — A single-number rating derived from the sound insulation properties of building elements such as walls, floors, and ceilings. Increasing STC ratings indicate more sound insulation and less transmitted sound.

**Proposed Project Construction.** Construction noise is regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code), which requires that construction work be conducted in the following manner: (1) noise levels of construction equipment, other than impact tools, must not exceed 80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the source (the equipment generating the noise); (2) impact tools must have intake and exhaust mufflers that are approved by the Director of the Department of Public Works (DPW) to best accomplish maximum noise reduction; and (3) if the noise from the construction work would exceed the ambient noise levels at the site property line by 5 dBA, the work must not be conducted between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 am., unless the Director of DPW authorizes a special permit for conducting the work during that period.

The San Francisco Department of Building Inspection is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance for private construction projects during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.). The Police Department is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance during all other hours. Nonetheless, during the construction period for the proposed project of approximately nine months, occupants of the nearby properties could be disturbed by construction noise. There may be times when noise could interfere with indoor activities in nearby residences and may be considered an annoyance by occupants of nearby properties. The increase in noise in the project area during project construction would not be considered a significant impact of the proposed project, because the construction would occur primarily inside the building, noise would be temporary (approximately nine months), intermittent, and restricted in occurrence and level, as the contractor would be obliged to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance.

In conclusion, there are no noise impacts that would be peculiar to the proposed project. With implementation of Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-3 (Project Mitigation Measure M-NO-1 on page 15 of this document), noise impacts would be less than significant.

## Air Quality

**Eastern Neighborhoods.** The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified potentially significant air quality impacts related to construction activities that may cause wind-blown dust; roadway-related air quality impacts on sensitive land uses; and the siting of uses that emit diesel particulate matter (DPM) and toxic

air contaminants (TACs) as part of everyday operations. Four mitigation measures were identified that would reduce air quality impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure G-1 imposes construction dust control measures. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors subsequently approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes, generally referred to as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008). The intent of the Ordinance is to reduce the quantity of dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of on-site workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection. These regulations and procedures ensure that potential dust-related air quality impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. The proposed project at 626 Potrero Avenue would comply with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance as applicable.

For projects that introduce sensitive receptors to sites near high-volume roadways, Mitigation Measure G-2 requires an analysis of the exposure of occupants to particulate matter. If warranted by the analysis, the project must incorporate an upgraded ventilation system that includes high-efficiency filters meeting minimum efficiency reporting value (MERV) 13, per American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) Standard 52.2. The proposed ventilation system would adequately meet the requirements of this mitigation measure, as discussed below under "Proposed Project Operations."

Mitigation Measure G-3 minimizes potential exposure of sensitive receptors to DPM by requiring that uses generating substantial DPM emissions, including warehousing and distribution centers, commercial, industrial, or other uses that would be expected to be served by at least 100 trucks per day or 40 refrigerated trucks per day, be located no less than 1,000 feet from residential units and other sensitive receptors. The proposed project would convert a vacant industrial building into a medical clinic. This proposed use would not generate substantial DPM emissions or be served by 100 trucks per day or 40 refrigerator trucks per day. Thus, Mitigation Measure G-3 is not applicable to the proposed project.

Mitigation Measure G-4 involves the siting of commercial, industrial, or other uses that emit TACs. The proposed project would convert a vacant industrial building into a medical clinic use, and would not be expected to generate substantial levels of TACs. Thus, Mitigation Measure G-4 is not applicable to the proposed project.

**Proposed Project Operations.** The proposed project would introduce medical patients, considered sensitive receptors, to the project site. Medical facilities in California are regulated by the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD). This facility would be designed, approved, and constructed as an OSHPD 3 clinic. In compliance with OSHPD requirements, the proposed project's new air circulation system would include Carrier's Ultra High Efficiency Gas Heat/Electric Cooling packaged rooftop units that have a variable frequency drive controlled supply fan capable of 2.0" external static pressure. Each air conditioning system would have its own Farr Durafil MERV 13 filter rack. The air conditioning unit supply fan variable frequency drive would ramp up the supply air as the filters become dirty to maintain constant airflow, and the system would alarm when the filters are fully loaded. At that time the filters would be replaced. The ventilation system would be designed by an engineer certified by ASHRAE, and a complete report would be provided to the San Francisco Department of Building

Inspection (DBI) once the design is complete and prior to the project receiving a permit from DBI to operate. Compliance with OSHPD and DBI requirements for an OSHPD 3 facility would ensure that air quality impacts to occupants of the project facilities would be less than significant.

**Proposed Project Construction.** Project construction would primarily be interior renovation of the 15,000 sf building over a nine-month period and would not involve the use of any heavy equipment. As discussed in the initial study to which this document is attached, mitigation measures that would reduce potential hazardous materials impacts include the submittal of a dust control plan to the Department of Public Works as applicable. Compliance with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (discussed on the previous page, under Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure G-1), as applicable, would ensure that air quality impacts during project construction would be less than significant.

In conclusion, there are no air quality impacts that would be peculiar to the proposed project, and air quality impacts would be less than significant.

### Greenhouse Gas Emissions

**Regulatory Framework.** In 2006, California passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill No. 32; California Health and Safety Code Division 25.5, Sections 38500, et seq., or AB 32), which requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to design and implement emission limits, regulations, and other measures, such that feasible and cost-effective statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are reduced to 1990 levels by 2020 (representing a 25 percent reduction in emissions). Pursuant to AB 32, CARB 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 almost 30 percent below projected 2020 business as usual emissions levels.

In 2007, California Senate Bill 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. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5, lead agencies may analyze and mitigate the significant effects of GHG emissions at a programmatic level to reduce GHG emissions, and that later project-specific environmental documents may tier from that programmatic review.

In 2010, the San Francisco Planning Department published its *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, which presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy.<sup>7</sup> The San Francisco Planning Department developed a checklist of GHG reduction regulations that apply to new development projects. Individual projects that complete the checklist and demonstrate compliance with these regulations would result in a less-than-significant environmental impact with respect to GHG emissions.

---

<sup>7</sup> San Francisco Planning Department. *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions in San Francisco*. 2010. Available at: <http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=2627>.

**Eastern Neighborhoods.** The Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning EIR assessed the GHG emissions that could result from rezoning under three rezoning options. Rezoning Options A, B and C are anticipated to result in GHG emissions on the order of 4.2, 4.3, and 4.5 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>E)<sup>8</sup> per service population<sup>9</sup>, respectively.<sup>10</sup> The Eastern Neighborhoods EIR concluded that the resulting GHG emissions from the three options analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans would be less than significant. The Eastern Neighborhoods EIR adequately addressed greenhouse gas emissions and the resulting emissions were determined to be less than significant.

**Proposed Project.** The proposed project would convert the use of a vacant industrial building into a medical clinic employing 15 workers and accommodating approximately 360 patient visits per week. As noted in the transportation discussion on page 6, the change of use would generate approximately 60 new vehicle trips per weekday, which would be a minimal contribution to the cumulative effects of climate change by emitting GHG emissions during its operational phase. In addition, indirect emissions, such as from electricity providers, energy required to pump, treat, and convey water, and emissions associated with landfill operations, would minimally increase due to the proposed clinic use. The proposed project would contribute to the cumulative effects of climate change by emitting GHGs during construction, which is estimated to last approximately nine months.

As discussed on the previous page, under “Regulatory Framework,” the San Francisco Planning Department developed a checklist of GHG reduction regulations that apply to new development projects, and projects that demonstrate compliance with San Francisco’s GHG reduction strategy would result in a less-than-significant environmental impact with respect to GHG emissions. Table 3 identifies GHG-reducing regulations that apply to the proposed project.<sup>11</sup>

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

Regulation	Requirements
Emergency Ride Home Program	All persons employed in San Francisco are eligible for the emergency ride home program.
Transit Impact Development Fee (San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 38)	Establishes fees for all commercial developments. Fees are paid to the SFMTA to improve local transit services.
Bicycle Parking in New and Renovated Commercial Buildings (San Francisco Planning Code, Section 155.4)	Professional Services: Where the gross square footage of the floor area is between 10,000-20,000 feet, 3 bicycle spaces are required.

<sup>8</sup> Greenhouse gas emissions are typically measured in CO<sub>2</sub>E, or carbon dioxide equivalents. This common metric allows for the inclusion of the global warming potential of other greenhouse gases. Land use project’s, such as this, may also include emissions from methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), therefore greenhouse gas emissions are typically reported at CO<sub>2</sub>E.

<sup>9</sup> SP= Service Population. Service population is the equivalent of total number of residents + employees.

<sup>10</sup> *Greenhouse Gas Analyses for Community Plan Exemptions in Eastern Neighborhoods*. April 20, 2010. Memorandum from Jessica Range, MEA to MEA staff. This memorandum provides an overview of the GHG analysis conducted for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning EIR and provides an analysis of the emissions using a service population metric.

<sup>11</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, *Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist, 626 Potrero Avenue*, April 23, 2012. This document is available for review as part of Case No. 2011.1279E.

San Francisco Green Building Requirements (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C.106.5 and 13C.5.106.5)	Requires new large commercial projects, new high-rise residential projects, and commercial interior projects to provide designated parking for low-emitting, fuel efficient, and carpool/van pool vehicles. Mark 8 percent of parking stalls for such vehicles.
Parking requirements for San Francisco's Mixed-Use zoning districts (San Francisco Planning Code Section 151.1)	The Planning Code has established parking maximums for many of San Francisco's mixed-use districts.
Commissioning of Building Energy Systems (LEED prerequisite, EAp1)	Requires fundamental commissioning for new high-rise residential, commercial interior, commercial, and residential alteration projects
San Francisco Green Building Requirements for Energy Efficiency (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C)	Commercial buildings greater than 5,000 sf are required to be a minimum of 14 percent more energy efficient than Title 24 energy efficiency requirements. As of 2010, these large buildings are required to provide enhanced commissioning in compliance with LEED® Energy and Atmosphere Credit 3. Mid-sized commercial buildings were required to have their systems commissioned by 2009, with enhanced commissioning as of 2011.
San Francisco Green Building Requirements for water efficient landscaping (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C)	All new commercial buildings greater than 5,000 square feet are required to reduce the amount of potable water used for landscaping by 50 percent.
San Francisco Green Building Requirements for water use reduction (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C)	All new commercial buildings greater than 5,000 sf are required to reduce the amount of potable water used by 20 percent.
Indoor Water Efficiency (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C Sections 13C.5.103.1.2, 13C.4.103.2.2, 13C.303.2.)	Meeting a GreenPoint Rated Standard: Reduce overall use of potable water within the building by 20 percent for showerheads, lavatories, kitchen faucets, wash fountains, water closets, and urinals.
San Francisco Water Efficient Irrigation Ordinance	Projects that include 1,000 sf or more of new or modified landscape are subject to this ordinance, which requires that landscape projects be installed, constructed, operated, and maintained in accordance with rules adopted by the SFPUC that establish a water budget for outdoor water consumption. Tier 2 projects, where the landscape area is greater than or equal to 2,500 sf require the services of landscape professionals.
Commercial Water Conservation Ordinance (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13A)	Requires all existing commercial properties undergoing tenant improvements to achieve the following minimum standard: (1) all showerheads have a maximum flow of 2.5 gallons per minute (gpm), (2) all showers have no more than one showerhead per valve, (3) all faucets and faucet aerators have a maximum flow rate of 2.2 gpm, (4) all water closets (toilets) have a maximum rated water consumption of 1.6 gallons per flush (gpf), (5) all urinals have a maximum flow rate of 1.0 gpf, and (6) all water leaks have been repaired.
San Francisco Green Building Requirements for renewable energy (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C)	As of 2012, all new large commercial buildings are required to either generate 1 percent of energy on-site with renewables, or purchase renewable energy credits pursuant to LEED® Energy and Atmosphere Credits 2 or 6, or achieve an additional 10 percent beyond Title 24 2008. Credit 2 requires providing at least 2.5 percent of the building's energy use from on-site renewable sources. Credit 6 requires providing at least 35 percent of the building's electricity from renewable energy contracts.

<p>Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 19) and San Francisco Green Building Requirements for solid waste (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C)</p>	<p>All persons in San Francisco are required 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. 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.</p>
<p>San Francisco Green Building Requirements for construction and demolition debris recycling (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C)</p>	<p>Projects proposing demolition are required to divert at least 75 percent of the project's construction and demolition debris to recycling.</p>
<p>Street Tree Planting Requirements for New Construction (San Francisco Planning Code Section 138.1)</p>	<p>Requires new construction, significant alterations, or relocation of buildings within many of San Francisco's zoning districts to plant one 24-inch box tree for every 20 feet along the property street frontage.</p>
<p>Light Pollution Reduction (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C5.106.8)</p>	<p>For nonresidential projects, comply with lighting power requirements in CA Energy Code, CCR Part 6. Requires that lighting be contained within each source. No more than .01 horizontal lumen foot-candles 15 feet beyond site, or meet LEED credit SSc8.</p>
<p>Construction Site Runoff Pollution Prevention for New Construction (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C)</p>	<p>Construction site runoff pollution prevention requirements depend upon project size, occupancy, and the location in areas served by combined or separate sewer systems. Projects meeting a LEED® standard must prepare an erosion and sediment control plan (LEED® prerequisite SSP1). Other local requirements may apply regardless of whether or not LEED® is applied such as a stormwater soil loss prevention plan or a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). See the SFPUC Web site for more information: <a href="http://www.sfwater.org/CleanWater">www.sfwater.org/CleanWater</a></p>
<p>Enhanced Refrigerant Management (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C.5.508.1.2)</p>	<p>All new large commercial buildings must not install equipment that contains chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) or halons.</p>
<p>Low-emitting Adhesives, Sealants, and Caulks (San Francisco Building Code, Chapters 13C.5.103.1.9, 13C.5.103.4.2, 13C.5.103.3.2, 13C.5.103.2.2, 13C.504.2.1)</p>	<p>Meeting a GreenPoint Rated Standard: Adhesives and sealants (VOCs) must meet SCAQMD Rule 1168.</p>
<p>Low-emitting Paints and Coatings (San Francisco Building Code, Chapters 13C.5.103.1.9, 13C.5.103.4.2, 13C.5.103.3.2, 13C.5.103.2.2, 13C.504.2.2 through 2.4)</p>	<p>Meeting a GreenPoint Rated Standard: Interior wall and ceiling paints must meet &lt;50 grams per liter VOCs regardless of sheen. VOC coatings must meet SCAQMD Rule 1113.</p>
<p>Low-emitting Flooring, including carpet (San Francisco Building Code, Chapters 13C.5.103.1.9, 13C.5.103.4.2, 13C.5.103.3.2, 13C.5.103.2.2, 13C.504.3 and 13C.4.504.4)</p>	<p>Meeting a GreenPoint Rated Standard: All carpet systems, carpet cushions, carpet adhesives, and at least 50 percent of resilient flooring must be low-emitting.</p>

Low-emitting Composite Wood (San Francisco Building Code, Chapters 13C.5.103.1.9, 13C.5.103.4.2, 13C.5.103.3.2, 13C.5.103.2.2 and 13C.4.504.5)	Meeting a GreenPoint Rated Standard: Must meet applicable CARB Air Toxics Control Measure formaldehyde limits for composite wood.
Wood Burning Fireplace Ordinance (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 31, Section 3102.8)	Bans the installation of wood burning fireplaces

The proposed project would be comply with the regulations cited in Table 3, and thus would be consistent with San Francisco’s *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*.<sup>12</sup> The proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to GHG emissions. In addition, the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHGs and would not have any peculiar impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact with respect to GHG emissions.

**Shadow**

**Eastern Neighborhoods.** Under the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, sites surrounding parks could be redeveloped with taller buildings without triggering Section 295 of the Planning Code.<sup>13</sup> The potential for new shadow impacts and the feasibility of mitigation for potential new shadow impacts of unknown development proposals could not be determined in the FEIR; thus, the FEIR determined shadow impacts to be significant and unavoidable, and no mitigation measures were identified.

**Proposed Project.** The proposed project would not alter the height of the existing building but would add a new elevator shaft would be approximately 100 sf in area, no taller than the existing building, and built adjacent to and southwest of the existing building. Any additional shadow resulting from the elevator shaft and the new rooftop wind screen and would be minimal and primarily cast on the project site’s parking lot. Thus, shadow impacts would be less than significant.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

**Eastern Neighborhoods.** The Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning resulted in a reduction in the amount of previously zoned industrial (PDR) land. Some land previously zoned for industrial purposes no longer allows any PDR uses, and the number of nonconforming businesses would be expected to gradually decline, potentially replaced by residential, commercial, or open space uses. Development under the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning may involve demolition or renovation of existing structures that may contain hazardous building materials that were commonly used in older buildings, and which could present a public health risk if disturbed during an accident or during demolition or renovation. The

<sup>12</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, November 2010. Available at <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2627>.

<sup>13</sup> Section 295 of the Planning Code provides that new structures above 40 feet in height that would cast additional shadows on properties under the jurisdiction of or designated to be acquired by the Recreation and Parks Department can only be approved by the Planning Commission.

Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified a mitigation measure to reduce this impact to less than significant.

**Proposed Project.** The interior renovations that are proposed at 626 Potrero Avenue may involve the removal and/or disturbance of hazardous building materials such as asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint. Thus, Mitigation Measure L-1 of the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR (included below as Project Mitigation Measure M-HA-5) would apply to the proposed project. Impacts related to hazardous materials that are peculiar to the project site are discussed on pages 5–8 of the initial study to which this document is attached.

### *Project Mitigation Measures*

As discussed in the preliminary mitigated negative declaration to which this document is attached, Project Mitigation Measures M-HA-1 through M-HA-4 would reduce potentially significant project- and site-specific impacts related to hazardous materials to less than significant. In addition, the following mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR are applicable to the proposed project.

**Project Mitigation Measure M-HA-5 – Hazardous Building Materials ((Mitigation Measure L-1 of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR).** The project sponsor shall ensure that any equipment containing PCBs or DEPH, such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.

**Project Mitigation Measure M-NO-1 – Interior Noise Levels (Mitigation Measure F-3 of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR).** For new development including noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn), as shown in EIR Figure 18, where such development is not already subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the project sponsor shall conduct a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements. Such analysis shall be conducted by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering. Noise insulation features identified and recommended by the analysis shall be included in the design, as specified in the San Francisco General Plan Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise to reduce potential interior noise levels to the maximum extent feasible. As identified in the acoustical analysis, the following noise insulation features shall be included in the building design:

#### **Minimum Window and Door STC\* Ratings**

<b>Floor</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Door</b>	<b>Window</b>
1	West and north façades	Sound gasketed	28
	West façade	N/A	28
	North façade	N/A	32
2	<b>East façade (set back at parking lot)</b>	<b>Sound gasketed</b>	<b>32</b>
	North and east façade at break room	33	43

\*Sound Transmission Class (STC) — A single-number rating derived from the sound insulation



---

properties of building elements such as walls, floors, and ceilings. Increasing STC ratings indicate more sound insulation and less transmitted sound.

### *Public Notice and Comment*

A "Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review" was mailed on March 27, 2012 to community organizations, tenants of the affected property and properties adjacent to the project site, and those persons who own property within 300 feet of the project site. One neighbor expressed concern relating to views due to the height of the new elevator tower and rooftop mechanical screening. Another neighbor expressed concern over the increase in traffic and noise during clinic operation, and the potential loss of parking during project construction. A third neighbor was concerned about additional traffic in the neighborhood and questioned whether the existing parking lots on the project site would have enough spaces for employees and patients during clinic operation. These potential concerns have been addressed in the aesthetics, transportation, and noise discussions above.

### *Conclusion*

With the exception of impacts related to hazardous materials, discussed in the preliminary mitigated negative declaration to which this certificate is attached, the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR incorporated and adequately addressed all potential impacts of the proposed project at 626 Potrero Avenue. As described above, the 626 Potrero Avenue project would not have any additional or peculiar significant adverse effects not examined in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR, nor has any new or additional information come to light that would alter the conclusions of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. Thus, with the exception of impacts related to hazardous materials, discussed in the preliminary mitigated negative declaration to which this certificate is attached, the proposed project at 626 Potrero Avenue would not result in any environmental impacts substantially greater than described in the FEIR. 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. Due to the peculiar impacts found concerning hazardous materials, a focused mitigated negative declaration has been prepared for that topic area only.

## Appendix B Community Plan Exemption Checklist

*Case No.:*               **2011.1279E**  
*Project Title:*       **626 Potrero Avenue**  
*Zoning:*                PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution, and Repair, General) and  
                                UMU (Urban Mixed Use) Districts  
                                58-X and 40-X Height and Bulk Districts  
*Block/Lot:*            4025/001, 002, 013, and 014  
*Lot Size:*             25,000 square feet  
*Plan Area:*            Mission Subarea of the Eastern Neighborhoods  
*Staff Contact:*       Jeanie Poling – (415) 575-9072  
                                jeanie.poling@sfgov.org

### A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located along the full length of the south side of 18<sup>th</sup> Street between Potrero Avenue and Hampshire Street on the block surrounded by 18<sup>th</sup>, Hampshire, and 19<sup>th</sup> Streets and Potrero Avenue in San Francisco’s Mission District. The site contains a 26-foot-tall, two-story, 15,000-square-foot (sf) vacant industrial building (also known as 2535 18th Street) that was constructed in 1946, and 32 parking spaces in two lots – a smaller lot accessed from Potrero Avenue and a larger lot accessed from Hampshire Street. The proposed project would remodel the existing building, increase its size by 200 sf to add an elevator tower, and convert its use to a dialysis clinic. The parking lots would be landscaped and reconfigured to add three parking spaces (for a total of 35 spaces) and one loading space; access to the lots would not change.

The project would require Conditional Use Authorization by the Planning Commission under Planning Code Section 217(c).

### B. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

This Community Plan Exemption checklist identifies the potential environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project and indicates whether any such impacts are addressed in the applicable programmatic final EIR (FEIR) for the plan area (i.e., the *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans FEIR*).<sup>1</sup> Topics found to be less than significant (LTS) in both the FEIR and for the proposed project are checked “LTS/No Impact” and are discussed in this checklist. Topics for which a significant impact was identified in the FEIR are checked “Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR” and are discussed in the Certificate of Determination (Appendix A). The analysis in the Certificate considers whether the proposed project would contribute to the impact identified in the FEIR, and, if it would, the item is checked “Proj. Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR.”

---

<sup>1</sup> San Francisco Planning Department, *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report*, Case No. 2004.0160E, certified January 19, 2009. This document is available for review.

Items that were not addressed in the FEIR (e.g., greenhouse gases) are discussed in the Certificate of Determination (Appendix A).

As addressed in the preliminary mitigated negative declaration to which this checklist is attached, The proposed project would result in a significant impacts that are peculiar to the project and/or project site, i.e., the impacts were not identified as significant in the FEIR. These items are checked "Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact."

---

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</i>	<i>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</i>	<i>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</i>	<i>LTS/ No Impact</i>
<b>1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING— Would the project:</b>				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed change of use of an existing building would not physically divide an established community, and would be consistent with land use plans, policies and regulations. Please see the Certificate of Determination (Appendix A) for a discussion of Topic 1c.

---

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</i>	<i>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</i>	<i>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</i>	<i>LTS/ No Impact</i>
<b>2. AESTHETICS—Would the project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and other features of the built or natural environment which contribute to a scenic public setting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<u>Topics:</u>	<u>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</u>	<u>LTS/ No Impact</u>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or which would substantially impact other people or properties?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

***No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR***

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR determined that implementation of the design policies of the area plans would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the area, have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, substantially damage scenic resources that contribute to a scenic public setting, or create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or that would substantially impact other people or properties. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

***No Peculiar Impacts***

The proposed project would change the use within the existing on-site two story building. Changes to the building that would be visible from the public right-of-way would include a new elevator tower and windows along the Hampshire Street façade, new tinted glazing set in clear anodized aluminum frames to replace a roll-up door along the 18th Street façade, landscaping of both parking lots, and a 4-foot high ribbed metal roof screen that would shield new and existing mechanical equipment. The new elevator tower would not exceed the height of the existing building. The project would comply with Planning Code Section 141, which requires rooftop mechanical equipment to be screened so as not to be visible from any point at or below the roof level of the subject building. The roof screening may be visible from higher elevations but would be consistent with surrounding urban development and would not substantially obstruct views from nearby properties and the public right-of-way.

The proposed project would comply Planning Code Section 138.1(c)(2), which may require sidewalk landscaping and other streetscape elements as identified in the Better Streets Plan, if it finds that such improvements are necessary to meet the goals and objectives of the San Francisco General Plan. Such improvements may include benches, bicycle racks, curb ramps, corner curb extension, and site furnishings, as determined appropriate.

The proposed project would not have any impacts on scenic vistas or scenic resources, would not degrade the visual character of the neighborhood, and would not create a new source of light or glare. Thus, the project would have no peculiar impacts related to aesthetics.

<u>Topics:</u>	<u>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</u>	<u>LTS/ No Impact</u>
<b>3. POPULATION AND HOUSING— Would the project:</b>				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

***No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR***

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population and density would not result in significant adverse physical effects on the environment. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

***No Peculiar Impacts***

The project site does not contain residential use, and no residential use is proposed. The proposed medical clinic use is intended to serve an existing population. The proposed change of use from industrial to clinic use would change the type of businesses permitted on the project site. The change from vacancy to occupied use would introduce an estimated 15 employees to the project site. This minimal number of employees would not be expected to induce population growth, displace housing, or create a demand for housing.

<u>Topics:</u>	<u>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</u>	<u>LTS/ No Impact</u>
<b>4. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:</b>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5, including those resources listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<u>Topics:</u>	<u>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</u>	<u>LTS/ No Impact</u>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would include minimal excavation on a site that is not known to contain unique paleontological resources or geologic features; thus Topics 4c and 4d are not applicable to the proposed project. Please see the Certificate of Determination (Appendix A) for a discussion of Topics 4a and 4b.

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

Topics 5c and 5d are not applicable to the proposed project. All other transportation-related topics are discussed in the Certificate of Determination (Appendix A).

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

Topics 6e and 6f are not applicable to the proposed project. All other noise-related topics are discussed in the Certificate of Determination (Appendix A).

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</i>	<i>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</i>	<i>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</i>	<i>LTS/ No Impact</i>
<b>7. AIR QUALITY</b>				
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. <b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</i>	<i>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</i>	<i>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</i>	<i>LTS/ No Impact</i>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Please see the Certificate of Determination (Appendix A) for a discussion of this topic.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</i>	<i>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</i>	<i>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</i>	<i>LTS/ No Impact</i>
<b>8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS—Would the project:</b>				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

When the Eastern Neighborhoods project was initially analyzed in 2005, the initial study checklist did not contain a category concerning greenhouse gas emissions. Please see the Certificate of Determination (Appendix A) for a discussion of this topic.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</i>	<i>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</i>	<i>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</i>	<i>LTS/ No Impact</i>
<b>9. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:</b>				
a) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Topic 9b is discussed in the Certificate of Determination (Appendix A).

Wind impacts are judged to be less-than-significant at a plan level of analysis and for cumulative development. Specific projects within Eastern Neighborhoods require analysis of wind impacts where deemed necessary. Thus, wind impacts were determined not to be significant in the Eastern Neighborhoods Initial Study and were not analyzed in the FEIR. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.



The proposed project would not alter the height of the existing building and thus would not result in wind impacts. The new elevator shaft would be approximately 100 sf in area, no taller than the existing building, and built adjacent to and southwest of the existing building. Any additional shadow resulting from the elevator shaft and the new rooftop wind screen and would be minimal and primarily cast on the project site's parking lot.

<u>Topics:</u>	<u>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</u>	<u>LTS/ No Impact</u>
<b>10. RECREATION—Would the project:</b>				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Physically degrade existing recreational resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

***No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR***

The FEIR concluded that the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plan would not result in substantial or accelerated deterioration of existing recreational resources or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may have an adverse effect on the environment. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

***No Peculiar Impacts***

The nearest park facilities to the project site are Fallen Bridge Mini-Park at Utah and 18<sup>th</sup> Streets (550 feet from the project site), Franklin Square at 17<sup>th</sup> and Hampshire Streets (1,100 feet from the project site) and McKinley Square at 20<sup>th</sup> and San Bruno Streets (1,400 feet from the project site). The proposed project would convert a vacant industrial building to an outpatient clinic. The proposed project would not introduce new residents, but would introduce an estimated 15 employees to the project site. The employees and patients may visit nearby parks before, during, or after clinic hours of operation, but any such additional use would be minimal and would not degrade or require the expansion of existing recreational facilities.

<u>Topics:</u>	<u>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</u>	<u>LTS/ No Impact</u>
<b>11. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:</b>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<u>Topics:</u>	<u>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</u>	<u>LTS/ No Impact</u>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that would serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

***No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR***

The Eastern Neighborhoods Initial Study analyzed growth projections and determined that the program's impacts on the provision of water, wastewater collection and treatment, and solid waste collection and disposal would not be significant. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

***No Peculiar Impacts***

The project would convert a vacant industrial building to outpatient clinic use. The proposed project would not result in new, peculiar environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<u>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</u>	<u>LTS/ No Impact</u>
<b>12. PUBLIC SERVICES— Would the project:</b>				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services such as fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

***No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR***

The Eastern Neighborhoods Initial Study analyzed growth projections and determined that the program’s impacts on public services such as fire protection, police protection, and public schools would not be significant. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR. Impacts on parks are discussed under Questions 9 and 10.

***No Peculiar Impacts***

The project would convert a vacant industrial building to outpatient clinic use. The proposed project would not result in new, peculiar environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR, associated with public services.

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

***No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR***

The Eastern Neighborhoods project area is fully developed with buildings and other improvements such as streets and parking lots. Most of the project area consists of structures that

have been in industrial use for many years. As a result, there is little in the way of landscaping or other vegetation, with the exception of the relatively few parks that exist. Because future development projects in the Eastern Neighborhoods would largely consist of new construction of housing in these heavily built-out former industrial neighborhoods, there would be little in the way of loss of vegetation or disturbance of wildlife other than common urban species. Therefore, the Eastern Neighborhoods Initial Study concluded that the project would not result in any significant effects related to biological resources. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

### *No Peculiar Impacts*

The 25,000 sf (0.75 acre) project site is completely developed with an existing building and 17,300 sf (0.36 acre) of paved parking lots. There is no vegetation on the project site.

The proposed project would comply with landscaping and permeability requirements of Planning Code Section 156(j), which requires that the project sponsor comply with the water use requirements of the San Water Efficient Irrigation Ordinance (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C), which requires a minimum of 20 percent permeable surface, and trees that result in canopy coverage of 50 percent of the parking lots' hardscape within 15 years of the installation of these trees. Permeable surfaces and grading must be coordinated so that stormwater can infiltrate the surface in areas with less than 5 percent slope. Landscape projects must be installed, constructed, operated, and maintained in accordance with rules adopted by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) that establish a water budget for outdoor water consumption. The project falls under Tier 2, in that the site's landscape area is greater than 2,500 sf. Tier 2 projects require the use a landscape professional. In addition, because the project site is over 5,000 sf, separate irrigation water service must be installed. The Landscape Documentation Package must be submitted to the SFPUC not more than 100 days after the issuance of the first construction document and must include the following: (1) a project information sheet, (2) landscape, irrigation, and grading plans, (3) a soil management report, and (4) a water efficient landscape worksheet. After installation, the project sponsor must submit the following to the SFPUC: (1) a certificate of completion, (2) an irrigation schedule, (3) a landscape and irrigation maintenance schedule, and (4) an audit report completed by an SFPUC inspector or a certified landscape irrigation auditor.

The proposed project would also comply with landscaping and street tree requirements of Planning Code Section 138.1(c)(2), which may require sidewalk landscaping and other streetscape elements as identified in the Better Streets Plan, if it finds that such improvements are necessary to meet the goals and objectives of the San Francisco General Plan.

Given the conditions present on the project site, and compliance with current City regulations regarding landscaping, the proposed project would not result in potentially significant biological resource impacts.

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

***No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR***

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

## No Peculiar Impacts

The project would involve interior modifications and minimal soil-disturbing activities that would be conducted in compliance with state and local building codes and regulations; thus impacts related to geology and soils would be less than significant.

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

***No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR***

The Eastern Neighborhoods Initial Study evaluated population increases on the combined sewer system and the potential for combined sewer outflows, and concluded that programmatic effects related to hydrology and water quality would not be significant. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

***No Peculiar Impacts***

The project site is completely covered by a building and parking lots. The proposed project would include landscaping on the existing parking lots, which would reduce the amount of impervious surface area on the site, thus allowing for greater groundwater infiltration on the project site. Thus, the proposed project would not result in significant effects related to water resources.

<b>Topics:</b>	<b>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</b>	<b>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</b>	<b>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</b>	<b>LTS/ No Impact</b>
<b>16. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>				
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

For a discussion of these topics, please see the preliminary mitigated negative declaration to which this document is attached, and the Certificate of Determination (Appendix A).

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</i>	<i>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</i>	<i>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</i>	<i>LTS/ No Impact</i>
<b>17. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES— Would the project:</b>				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

***No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR***

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR determined that the program would facilitate the construction of both new residential units and commercial buildings. Development of these uses would not result in use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy in the context of energy use throughout the City and region. The energy demand for individual buildings would be typical for such projects and would meet, or exceed, current state and local codes and standards concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations enforced by the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection. The project area does not include any natural resources routinely extracted, and the proposed rezoning does not result in any natural resource extraction program. For these reasons, the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR concluded that the program would not cause a wasteful use of energy, and would have a less-than-significant impact on energy and mineral resources. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

***No Peculiar Impacts***

The energy demand for the proposed project would be typical for such projects and would meet, or exceed, current state and local codes and standards concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations enforced by the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any impacts to energy resources.



<u>Topics:</u>	<u>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</u>	<u>LTS/ No Impact</u>
<p><b>18. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:</b> 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. – <b>Would the project:</b></p>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

***No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR***

When the Eastern Neighborhoods project was initially analyzed in 2005, the initial study checklist did not contain a category concerning agricultural and forest resources. Nonetheless, all of San Francisco is identified by the California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program as "Urban and Built-up Land" (Department of Conservation, 2002). In addition, no part of San Francisco falls under the State Public Resource Code definitions of forest land or timberland; therefore, these topics are not applicable to any project in San Francisco.

***No Peculiar Impacts***

These topics are not applicable to the proposed project.

<u>Topics:</u>	<u>Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR</u>	<u>Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact</u>	<u>LTS/ No Impact</u>
<b>19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE— Would the project:</b>				
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have impacts that would be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

***Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR***

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified significant impacts related to land use, transportation, cultural resources, shadow, noise, air quality, and hazardous materials. Mitigation measures reduced all impacts to less than significant, with the exception of those related to land use (cumulative impacts on PDR use), transportation (traffic impacts at nine intersections, and transit impacts), cultural (demolition of historical resources), and shadow (impacts on parks).

***Peculiar Impacts***

The proposed project would remodel a vacant industrial building and convert it to outpatient clinic use, increase the building’s size by 200 sf to add an elevator tower, and add landscaping to existing parking lots. The proposed project would result in potential impacts related to hazardous materials, which is addressed in the preliminary mitigated negative declaration to which this checklist is attached. As discussed in this document, the proposed project would not result in any other new, peculiar environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already and disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR.