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INTRODUCTION

A PURPOSE OF THE RESPONSES TO COMMENTS DOCUMENT

The purpose of this Responses to Comments (RTC) document is to present comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the proposed 800 Indiana Street Project, to respond in writing to comments on environmental issues, and to revise the Draft EIR as necessary to provide additional clarity. Pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements included in California Public Resources Code Sections 21091(d)(2)(A) and 21091(d)(2)(B), the City of San Francisco Planning Department (Planning Department) has considered the comments received on the Draft EIR and evaluated the issues raised, and is providing written responses that address the comments on the physical environmental issues raised by commenters. In accordance with CEQA, the responses to comments focus on clarifying the project description and addressing physical environmental issues associated with the proposed project. These issues include physical impacts or changes attributable to the project rather than any social or financial implications of the project. Therefore, this document provides limited responses to comments received during the public review period that are not relevant to the proposed project or its physical environmental effects.

The Draft EIR together with this RTC document constitute the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the proposed project in fulfillment of CEQA requirements and consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15132. The Final EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA, including the CEQA Guidelines\(^1\) and the San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 31. It is an informational document for use by (1) governmental agencies (in addition to the City and County of San Francisco [City]) and the public to aid in the planning and decision-making process, by disclosing the physical environmental effects of the project and identifying possible ways of reducing or avoiding the potentially significant impacts; and (2) the City and San Francisco Planning Commission (Planning Commission) before their decision to approve, disapprove, or modify the proposed project. If the Planning Commission approves the proposed project, it would be required to adopt CEQA findings and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to ensure that mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR are implemented.

B ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND COMMUNITY PLAN EXEMPTION CHECKLIST

The Planning Department, as lead agency responsible for administering the environmental review of projects within the City and County of San Francisco under CEQA, prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) with a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) Checklist under the Eastern Neighborhoods Program EIR (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR) on May 21, 2014. As described in the Draft EIR, the Planning Department sent the NOP and CPE Checklist to governmental agencies, organizations, and persons interested in the proposed project (see Appendix A in the Draft EIR). During the approximately 30-day public scoping period that ended on June 19,

\(^1\) Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3, Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act.
2014, the Planning Department accepted comments from agencies and interested parties identifying environmental issues that should be addressed in the EIR.

**DRAFT EIR PUBLIC REVIEW**

The Planning Department prepared the Draft EIR for the proposed project in accordance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The Draft EIR was published on August 13, 2014, and circulated to local, state, and federal agencies and to interested organizations and individuals. A public comment period was held from August 13, 2014, to September 29, 2014, to solicit public comments on the adequacy and accuracy of information presented in the Draft EIR. Oral comments were provided by two Planning Commissioners and one individual representing an organization at the public hearing held on September 11, 2014. One comment letter was received from the Historic Preservation Commission. No comments were made by other public agencies during the public review period or public hearing. A complete transcript of proceedings from the public hearing on the Draft EIR is included in its entirety as Attachment A to this document. The Draft EIR comment letter is provided as Attachment B to this document.

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS DOCUMENT AND FINAL EIR**

The comments received during the public review period are the subject of this RTC document, which addresses all substantive oral and written comments on the Draft EIR. After the public hearing, the Planning Department prepared and published this RTC document. In accordance with Administrative Code Section 31.15, the Planning Commission will hold a hearing on December 4, 2014 to consider the adequacy of the Final EIR. If the Planning Commission finds the Final EIR to be in compliance with CEQA requirements, it will certify the document as a Final EIR. The Final EIR will consist of the Draft EIR and this RTC document, which includes the comments received during the public review period, responses to comments on environmental issues, and any revisions to the Draft EIR that result from staff-initiated text changes.

The City decision-makers will consider the certified Final EIR, along with other information and the public process, to determine whether to approve, modify, or disapprove the proposed project and to specify any applicable environmental conditions as part of project approvals. If the City decides to approve the proposed project with any significant effects that are identified in the Final EIR, but that are not avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level, the City must indicate that any such unavoidable significant effects are acceptable because of overriding considerations as described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15093. This is known as a Statement of Overriding Considerations. In preparing this statement, the City must balance the benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks. If the benefits of a project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered acceptable (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093). If an agency makes a Statement of Overriding Considerations, the statement must be included in the record of project approval.
C DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

This RTC document consists of the following sections:

1. **Introduction** – This section discusses the purpose of the RTC document, the environmental review process, and the organization of the RTC document.

2. **List of Persons Commenting** – This section presents the names of persons who provided comments on the Draft EIR. The names of persons who spoke at the public hearing are presented first, in the order of speakers, followed by the submitted written comments. This list also shows the commenter code (further described in Section 2), the format, and date of the comments.

3. **Responses to Comments** – This section presents the substantive comments excerpted verbatim from the public hearing transcript and comment letter. The comments are organized by topic. Following each comment or group of comments on a topic are the City’s responses. The responses generally provide clarification of the Draft EIR text.

4. **Draft EIR Revisions** – This section presents staff-initiated text changes identified by Planning Department staff to update, correct, or clarify the Draft EIR text. These changes and minor errata do not result in significant new information with respect to the proposed project, including the level of significance of project impacts or any new significant impacts. Therefore, recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 is not required.

**Attachment A** – Draft EIR Public Hearing Transcript

**Attachment B** – Draft EIR Comment Letter
2 LIST OF PERSONS COMMENTING

The Planning Commission held a public hearing regarding the 800 Indiana Street Project Draft EIR on September 11, 2014. Two Commissioners and an individual representing a homeowners association made oral comments at that hearing. One comment letter was received from the Historic Preservation Commission. No other comments on the Draft EIR were received by the Planning Department during the public comment period. Commenters are listed below in Table 2-1, with the corresponding commenter code used in Section 3, Responses to Comments, to denote each set of comments.

Each comment begins with the commenter’s name and, if applicable, title and affiliation; a designation as to whether the comment is from the public hearing transcript or letter, the corresponding date; and a comment code. The comments made at the public hearing are designated by the abbreviation “CPC” (for City Planning Commission), a number assigned to the commenter based on the order of presentation at the hearing (for example the first speaker is numbered CPC-1), and a sequential comment number. The written comment letter is designated by the abbreviation “HPC” (for Historic Preservation Commission), and a sequential comment number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment Format</th>
<th>Comment Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPC-1</td>
<td>Sue Mortensen</td>
<td>Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>9/11/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC-2</td>
<td>Commissioner Christine Johnson</td>
<td>Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>9/11/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC-3</td>
<td>Commissioner Michael Antonini</td>
<td>Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>9/11/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC-1</td>
<td>Karl Hasz, Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>8/20/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

This section presents summaries of the substantive comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments. The comments and responses are organized by subject and are generally in the same order as presented in the Draft EIR, with miscellaneous comments at the end of this section. The order of the comments and responses in this section is shown below, along with the prefix to the topic codes (indicated in brackets):

- Cultural (Historic Architectural) Resource [CP]
- Transportation and Circulation [TR]
- Noise [NO]
- Air Quality [AQ]
- Alternatives [ALT]
- Other [OTH]

In each subsection under each topic area, comments are identified using the topic code prefix and sequential numbering for each subtopic. For example, Other [OTH] comments are listed as OTH-1 and OTH-2. Each topic code has a corresponding heading that introduces the comment subject; these subsections present quotes of comments and include the commenter’s name. However, the reader is referred to Attachments A and B for the full text and context of each comment.

Following each comment or group of comments, a comprehensive response is provided to address issues raised in the comment(s) and to clarify or augment information in the Draft EIR, as appropriate. Response numbers correspond to the topic code; for example, the response to comment OTH-1 is presented under Response OTH-1. The responses may clarify the Draft EIR text or revise or add text to the EIR. Revisions to the Draft EIR are shown as indented text. New or revised text is double underlined; deleted material is shown in strikethrough.

A CULTURAL (HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL) RESOURCES

Comment CP-1: Comment Regarding Mitigation Measure M-CP-1c

This response addresses the following comment:

- CPC-2.3

Commissioner Christine Johnson, Planning Commission, Public Hearing Transcript, September 11, 2014 [CPC-2.3]

“...The Mitigation Measure M-CP-1C, which is the interpretive program, would like to see some alternatives there for placement. It's currently anticipated it’s going to be placed in the lobby of the building in all three construction alternatives, but as a mitigation measure for the historical resource, I
don’t feel that the lobby of a 100 percent residential building is truly a public space. You know, just literally if you don’t live there, who is going to go into a lobby of some building that they don’t live in. So I’d like to see that placed in some of the open space. I think that there might be opportunities in all three of the open space variants for some sort of interpretive program.”

Response CP-1

The commenter requests an alternate location for the placement of the interpretive program as required by Historic Mitigation Measure M-CP-1c: Interpretive Program. The project sponsor has agreed to place the historic interpretive display in an outdoor, publicly-accessible area and has already initiated contact with the Planning Department’s Preservation Technical Specialist to determine the content of the display.

Mitigation Measure M-CP-1c has been revised as follows on pages S-6 and 4.B-13 of the Draft EIR:

M-CP-1c: Interpretive Program. The project sponsor shall install a permanent on-site interpretive display in a publicly-accessible outdoor location, such as in one of the plazas along Indiana Street or within the open space area of the variants in a main lobby or in an outdoor exhibit in a central courtyard. The display shall focus on the history of the 800 Indiana Street site, including the Ralston Iron Works and the A.M. Castle & Co. that were previously located on the site. The primary goal shall be to educate visitors about the property’s historic themes, associations, and lost character-defining features within broader historical, social, and physical landscape contexts. The project sponsor shall work with a historic preservation professional so that the historical information provided in the HRE and supporting documentation and in the HABS report are used as a basis for the interpretive display. The interpretive display shall be reviewed and approved by a Planning Department Preservation Technical Specialist.

B NOISE

Comment NO-1: Construction Noise

This response addresses the following comment:

- CPC-1.2

*Sue Mortensen, Public Hearing Transcript, September 11, 2014 [CPC-1.2]*

“Secondly, noise. I know this is a common concern, we do just seek assurance that the work will be limited to a five day, 8:00 to 5:00 schedule.”

Response NO-1

The commenter would like to know whether construction work would be limited to a 5 weekdays, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. schedule. The project sponsor has confirmed that construction hours would not be limited to 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., however construction of the project would comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance which limits construction to hours between 7 a.m. and 8 p.m. Construction noise impacts are analyzed on pages 72–74 of the CPE Checklist (Appendix A of the Draft EIR). The CPE Checklist (attached to the Draft EIR) acknowledges on
page 73 that construction noise may be considered an annoyance by occupants of nearby properties and that the
construction contractor would be subject to and would comply with the Noise Ordinance. The Noise Ordinance
establishes the daytime period for construction as the hours between 7 a.m. and 8 p.m., which extend past the
hours that the commenter requests. However, further restriction of construction hours beyond those required by
the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (7 a.m. to 8 p.m.) is not considered necessary to achieve the goals and intent of
the San Francisco Noise Ordinance, as long as the noise level standards of the ordinance are achieved. Nor is it
necessary to avoid a significant impact under CEQA.

As analyzed in the CPE Checklist, construction noise impacts would be less than significant with the
implementation of Project Mitigation Measures M-NO-1 and M-NO-2, which would ensure compliance with the
Noise Ordinance and may address some of the commenter’s concerns. Project Mitigation Measures M-NO-1 and
M-NO-2 involve restrictions to pile-driving activities and would require the project sponsor to prepare and
submit to the Department of Building Inspection, prior to construction, a plan to ensure that maximum feasible
noise attenuation will be achieved. Mitigation Measure M-NO-2 would also require regular monitoring of
construction noise levels for the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures. Signs posted on-site would contain
complaint procedures and the contact information for a designated project sponsor/construction contractor
representative in the event of a problem, thereby providing a process to respond to issues raised.

C AIR QUALITY

Comment AQ-1: Dirt and Dust

This response addresses the following comment:

- CPC-1.3

_Sue Mortensen, Public Hearing Transcript, September 11, 2014 [CPC-1.3]_

“Dirt and dust also, I’m sure a typical complaint. It is a real problem for our homeowners on the Indiana
side directly facing this construction site. We spend about $8,000 a year washing windows on that side
and unfortunately we’ll need to anticipate an increase of that because of the construction.”

Response AQ-1

The commenter is concerned about the need to increase the frequency of residential window washing for the
homeowners near the project site as a result of dirt and dust from the construction site. The commenter correctly
identifies a likely temporary increase in localized dust during construction operations. This is a common
construction-related concern, particularly within a dense urban environment. Construction dust is typically
addressed through the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008). As
described on page 87 of the CPE Checklist (Appendix A of the Draft EIR), implementation of the measures
required under the Construction Dust Control Ordinance would reduce the impact of construction-related
fugitive dust to a less-than-significant level through implementation of measures to control construction-generated particulate matter. The Construction Dust Control Ordinance applies to all sites in San Francisco that
have the potential to create dust or expose/disturb more than 10 cubic yards of soil. Dust suppression activities
may include the following: watering all active construction areas; wet sweeping or vacuuming the streets, sidewalks, paths, and intersections during excavation and dirt-moving activities; and covering or tarping inactive stockpiles. In addition, because the project site is more than one-half acre, the project sponsor is required to prepare and submit a site-specific Dust Control Plan for approval by the San Francisco Department of Public Health.

The site-specific Dust Control Plan would include measures to address the commenter’s concerns regarding dirt and dust: operating a hotline for community members who may be affected by project-related dust; installing dust curtains and windbreaks on the property line; sweeping affected streets with water sweepers at the end of the day; installing wheel washers to clean truck tires and prevent the track out of dirt; and designating a dust control monitor. The designated person(s) is required to be on the site or available by telephone or other means during all times that site preparation, demolition, or construction activities may be in progress. Compliance with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance and implementation of the Dust Control Plan would prevent dust resulting from construction of the 800 Indiana Street project from affecting buildings in the vicinity.

Comment AQ-2: Air Pollutant Exposure Zone

This response addresses the following comment:

- CPC-2.1

*Commissioner Christine Johnson, Planning Commission, Public Hearing Transcript, September 11, 2014 [CPC-2.1]*

“Thank you very much. I just have a couple questions about the EIR. The first one is about air quality control. So the EIR states that the site is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, but it looks – it’s right next to the highway, and if you look at the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone Map from DPH, the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone is blue, which indicates that it is a zone all along all of the freeways in San Francisco, so can you explain how that assessment was made?”

Response AQ-2

The commenter states that the project appears to be within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone and requests an explanation of how it was determined that the project site is not within this zone. This comment refers to the 2014 Air Pollutant Exposure Zone map developed by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH), in coordination with the Planning Department, pursuant to proposed amendments to Article 38 of the Health Code. The proposed amendments to Article 38 of the Health Code expand upon the definition of the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone that is utilized pursuant to CEQA, as elaborated upon below.

As mentioned on pages 85 and 86 of the CPE Checklist (Appendix A of the Draft EIR), in an effort to identify areas of San Francisco most adversely affected by sources of toxic air contaminants (TACs), the City partnered

---


3 San Francisco Board of Supervisors, File No. 140806. Note: this ordinance passed the first reading of the Board of Supervisors on October 21, 2014.
with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) to inventory and assess air pollution; particularly exposures from mobile, stationary, and area sources within San Francisco. This citywide modeling was completed in 2012. Areas with poor air quality were termed the “Air Pollutant Exposure Zone”. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone was defined based on two health-protective criteria: (1) excess cancer risk from the contribution of emissions from all modeled sources greater than 100 per 1 million population, and/or (2) cumulative fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$) concentrations greater than 10 micrograms per cubic meter.

As stated on page 86 of the CPE Checklist (Appendix A of the Draft EIR), “Land use projects within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone require special consideration to determine whether the project’s activities would expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations or add emissions to areas already adversely affected by poor air quality.” As stated on page 89 of the CPE Checklist (Appendix A of the Draft EIR), “based on current practices, the project site is not located within an identified Air Pollutant Exposure Zone.” The “current practices” refer to the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone as utilized pursuant to CEQA, and, as defined based on the two health-protective criteria mentioned above.

DPH, in partnership with the Planning Department, utilized the aforementioned modeling and health-protective criteria completed in 2012 for consideration in defining an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone for proposed amendments to Article 38 of the Health Code. Based on feedback conducted during community outreach in 2013 and 2014 for proposed amendments to Article 38 of the Health Code, an expanded definition of the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone was subsequently proposed. The expanded definition of the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone includes health vulnerable locations and locations within 500-feet of freeways, if the aforementioned modeling did not otherwise capture those locations. The project site is within 500 feet of a freeway and therefore is included in the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone as defined by proposed amendments to Article 38 of the Health Code. Given the proposed project would be subject to the existing Article 38 of the Health Code and the proposed amendments to Article 38 of the Health Code if implemented, Project Improvement Measure I-AQ-I, “Enhanced Ventilation System,” was recommended, agreed to by the project sponsor, and would be included as a condition of approval for the proposed project in compliance with the requirements in the ordinance.

**Comment AQ-3: Air Quality and Exposure to Pollutants**

This response addresses the following comment:

- CPC-2.4

*Commissioner Christine Johnson, Planning Commission, Public Hearing Transcript, September 11, 2014 [CPC-2.4]*

“...And then the final one is I would like, going back to air quality, I believe that there should be some comparative analysis of the air quality control mitigation measures across all three of the alternatives.

---

“In the proposed alternative, there is an open courtyard/roof deck, which I do not believe adequately mitigates potential for exposure to air pollutants, but I do think that the other two construction alternatives do actually adequately mitigate exposure to air pollutants, so I’d like to see – it would be great to see some sort of comparative analysis of the air quality control measures for all three project alternatives. Thank you.”

Response AQ-3

The commenter states that the open courtyard/roof deck included as part of the proposed project does not adequately mitigate the potential for occupants’ exposure to air pollutants, and further indicates that the two project alternatives; Alternative B: Full Preservation Alternative and Alternative C: Partial Preservation Alternative would perhaps have fewer impacts associated with exposure to air pollutants and suggests that a comparative analysis of the Alternatives B and C be done. An additional comparative analysis of the alternatives regarding exposure to air pollutants was not performed. These concerns are likely related to fact that with the proposed project, several open courtyards and a roof deck are proposed as part of the design, whereas under Alternatives B and C, the design of the open space is more limited, largely located at the ground level, and appears more shielded within the building footprint. As explained on page 6-1 of the Draft EIR, Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the project which would reduce, avoid, or eliminate one or more of the significant effects of the proposed project identified in the EIR while also meeting most of the project’s objectives. The EIR concludes on page 4.B-13 that the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to historic architectural resources. Thus, the alternatives chapter includes a Partial Preservation Alternative and a Full Preservation Alternative, which seek to avoid or lessen the proposed project’s significant and unavoidable impacts to historic architectural resources.

Other than the identified impact to historic architectural resources, the CPE Checklist concluded on pages 125 to 126 (Appendix A of the Draft EIR) that the proposed project would not result in new, significant environmental impacts or impacts of greater severity than analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Since air quality impacts related to the proposed project were determined to be less than significant on pages 82 to 93 of the CPE Checklist (Appendix A of the Draft EIR), further reduction of air quality impacts through additional analysis or the development of alternatives was not required in the Draft EIR.

As discussed in Response AQ-2 above, impacts related to proposed residents’ exposure to TACs from nearby sources of air pollutants (e.g., Interstate 280) was determined in the CPE Checklist to be less than significant.

The Draft EIR concludes on page 6-12 that for the Full Preservation Alternative (Alternative B), “this alternative would have similar or reduced potentially significant archeological, transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, and hazards and hazardous materials impacts, compared to the proposed project’s already less than significant impacts for these same resource topics.”

The Draft EIR concludes on page 6-21 that for the Full Preservation Alternative (Alternative C), “this alternative would have similar potentially significant archeological, transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, and hazards and hazardous materials impacts as the proposed project.”
To offer further clarification to the finding that air quality impacts would be less than significant, it is helpful to consider that the duration of exposure is a primary consideration. For residential projects, the exposure to outdoor air pollutants, while the residents inhabit their units is the main concern, particularly during early years of exposure (i.e., fetal development, early childhood), as this is the typical location where residents spend the majority of their time. Conversely, common open space is a location where residents would spend a small fraction of their time. The citywide modeling described previously in Response AQ-2 conservatively assumed continuous 70-year exposure to air pollutants, while taking into account age sensitivity factors for early years of exposure. This analysis does not assume a reduction in exposure concentration for interior building spaces, thus the analysis conservatively assumes all receptors are exposed to outdoor pollutant concentrations. As stated above, this analysis determined the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, although residents under the proposed project may be exposed to TACs while spending time in common open space, this exposure would be limited and not rise to a level of significance for the proposed project or alternatives and thus no further analysis pursuant to CEQA is warranted.

D TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Comment TR-1: Construction Traffic Control

This response addresses the following comment:

- CPC-1.1

*Sue Mortensen, Public Hearing Transcript, September 11, 2014* [CPC-1.1]

“Thank you, Commissioners for the opportunity to speak. My name is Sue Mortensen. I live at 808 Minnesota Street in the Esprit Park Condominiums. I am a member of the Board of Directors of our Association and I am the appointed Community Liaison. Our buildings contain 147 homes and approximately 300 residents.

We’ve raised no objections to this development to date; however, I am here to address environmental issues anticipated in the construction of the project that are not specifically mentioned in the EIR. That is, the impacts of this construction on our homeowners located directly across the street from the construction site.

Specifically, we are concerned with traffic control. We have one combined entrance and exit to the parking garage underneath the building. It sits about midway to the construction site. We cannot have this entrance blocked at any time. We are seeking assurances that this will not happen.”

Response TR-1

The commenter states that no objections to the project have been raised by Esprit Park Condominiums Homeowner’s Association, but expressed concern regarding the construction impacts. The commenter would like to know whether the combined entrance and exit to the Esprit Park Condominiums parking garage would be blocked during construction. Construction-related traffic impacts are described on page 6 of the CPE Checklist.
(Appendix A of the Draft EIR). Pages 56 to 80 of the CPE Checklist (Appendix A of the Draft EIR) summarize a detailed transportation impact study (TIS) conducted for the project, and concluded that construction-related traffic impacts would be less than significant. Separate from the CEQA process, the project sponsor met with the Esprit Park Homeowner’s Association in late September 2014 and provided details about the proposed project’s construction and what would be done to avoid traffic conflicts. Construction staging would take place underneath the 20th Street overpass and within the right-of-way on the west side of Indiana Street. Construction equipment or delivery trucks would not be allowed to park on the east side of Indiana Street. Therefore, the entrance and exit to parking garage would not be blocked on Indiana Street.

The TIS identified improvement measures that could be implemented to further reduce less-than-significant impacts. One of the improvement measures included construction management practices that would minimize construction-related disruption of the general traffic flow on adjacent streets during the AM and PM peak periods. This improvement measure was inadvertently omitted from the Draft EIR.

The following text has been added as a new row in Table S-2 after Improvement Measure I-TR-4 – Queue Abatement Condition of Approval on page S-10 of the Draft EIR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Measure I-TR-5: Construction Management</th>
<th>Proposed Project and All Variants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To minimize the construction-related disruption of the general traffic flow on adjacent streets during the AM and PM peak periods, truck movements and deliveries should be limited during peak hours (generally 7:00 to 9:00 AM and 4:00 to 6:00 PM, or other times, as determined by SFMTA and its Transportation Advisory Staff Committee [TASC]),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last paragraph on page 1-5 of the Draft EIR is revised as follows:

With implementation of the mitigation measures identified above, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR for the respective environmental topic areas. In addition, the project sponsor would implement Project Improvement Measure I-TR-1 Residential Transportation Demand Management Program, Improvement Measure I-TR-2 Transportation Demand Management Monitoring Program, Improvement Measure I-TR-3 Enhanced TDM Program – Car Share, and Improvement Measure I-TR-4 Queue Abatement Condition of Approval, and Improvement Measure I-TR-5 Construction Management to further reduce less than significant vehicle trip impacts.

The first paragraph on page 67 of the CPE Checklist (Appendix A of the Draft EIR) has been revised as follows:

Construction

The proposed project’s construction activities would last approximately 26 months and would include below-ground surface construction and building construction. Although construction activities would result in additional vehicle trips to and from the project site from workers and material and equipment deliveries, these activities would be limited in duration. Therefore, the proposed project’s construction

---

5 Fehr & Peers. 2013 (December). Transportation Impact Study 800 Indiana Street. This document is on file and available for review as part of Case No. 2011.1374E at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA.
would not result in significant impacts on transportation, either individually or cumulatively, that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. Improvement Measure I-TR-5 would further reduce the less-than-significant impacts to minimize construction-related disruption of the general traffic flow on adjacent streets during the AM and PM peak periods.

The following text has been added on page 126 of the CPE Checklist (Appendix A of the Draft EIR):

**Improvement Measure I-TR-5: Construction Management**

To minimize the construction-related disruption of the general traffic flow on adjacent streets during the AM and PM peak periods, truck movements and deliveries should be limited during peak hours (generally 7:00 to 9:00 AM and 4:00 to 6:00 PM, or other times, as determined by SFMTA and its Transportation Advisory Staff Committee [TASC]).

The addition of this improvement measure does not provide new information that identifies new significant environmental impacts or change the construction-related traffic impact conclusion in the CPE Checklist.

E ALTERNATIVES

**Comment ALT-1: General Comments Regarding Alternatives**

This response addresses the following comments:

- CPC-3.1
- HPC-1.1

**Commissioner Michael Antonini, Planning Commission, Public Hearing Transcript, September 11, 2014 [CPC-3.1]**

“And I note, of course, we have a partial preservation/preservation alternative and certainly that’s important to have in an EIR and it’s worthy of discussion as we move forward with approval of the project because nearby the Esprit Project did a preservation and, in addition to the preservation, it certainly makes for an adequate EIR, so I’m happy to see those in there.”

**Karl Hasz, Historic Preservation Commission, Letter, August 20, 2014 [HPC-1.1]**

“On August 20, 2014, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) held public hearings and took public comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed demolition of the existing building at 800 Indiana Street, and new construction of five-story residential complex with 338 dwelling units.

The HPC concurs with the analysis contained within the DEIR, and appreciate the efforts of the Project Sponsor in exploring preservation alternatives, which mitigate the impacts to the site’s historic resources.
The HPC appreciates the opportunity to participate in review of this environmental document."

Response ALT-1

These comments do not raise any specific issues regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR; rather, they are supportive of the discussion/analysis of the preservation alternatives in the Draft EIR. Therefore, these comments do not require further response in this RTC document; however, they are acknowledged and may be considered by the decision-makers as part of their deliberations on the proposed project.

F OTHER

The comments and corresponding responses in this section are general in nature and not CEQA-related. These comments do not raise specific issues on the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the analysis presented in the Draft EIR. However, the following responses are provided for informational purposes.

Comment OTH-1: General Comment Regarding Project

This response addresses the following comment:

- CPC-1.5

Sue Mortensen, Public Hearing Transcript, September 11, 2014 [CPC-1.5]

“And last but not least, a compliment is due. I have contacted Joe Kirchofer with Avalon and he has agreed to come and speak to our homeowners this month. We’re anxious to have a good system of communication in place for the developers and the construction foremen once this begins. Thank you very much.”

Response OTH-1

The commenter compliments the efforts of AvalonBay Communities for communicating with the Esprit Park Condominiums Homeowner’s Association regarding the project. The comment is noted. The comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the analysis in the Draft EIR. These comment does not require further response in this RTC document; however, it is acknowledged and may be considered by the decision-makers as part of their deliberations on the proposed project.

Comment OTH-2: Vermin

This response addresses the following comment:

- CPC-1.4

Sue Mortensen, Public Hearing Transcript, September 11, 2014 [CPC-1.4]

“I’m a dog owner and I walk past this site on a regular basis. That’s my authority in my next statement, which is pests. This site is home to an impressive population of vermin. They’re going to be looking for a
new home once the construction begins and we’d like to see that there were some kind of containment or control program for this issue. “

Response OTH-2

The commenter is concerned about the vermin population at the site and would like to know whether there would be a containment or control program once construction begins. The containment and control of vermin at the project site is addressed through established requirements and the following response is provided for informational purposes only. The construction contractor is required to adhere to California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) regulations and standards. Prior to initiation of construction, the contractor would be required to prepare a site-specific health and safety plan in accordance with Cal/OSHA regulations. The purpose of the health and safety plan is to address potential threats to the health and safety of both site construction workers and the public during the project’s construction activities. The handling of vermin would be addressed in this plan. In addition, AvalonBay has contacted the current owner of the site and confirmed that they have instituted an abatement program for vermin at the site. The project sponsor has also indicated that once AvalonBay Communities formally takes ownership of the building, the abatement program will continue with the goal to reduce the rodent and pest population to the extent possible prior to and after any demolition activity.

Comment OTH-3: Non-Renewable Resources

This response addresses the following comment:

- CPC-2.2

Commissioner Christine Johnson, Planning Commission, Public Hearing Transcript, September 11, 2014 [CPC-2.2]

“The other one is for the consumption of non-renewable resources. It would be – this program for the development in any of the alternatives includes alternative energy such as solar and other water efficiency methods. It would be great to see not only what the usage of that non-renewable resources is, but also what the energy production of the building system would be, to sort of what is the offset. So that would be great to see as part of the Draft EIR assessment.”

Response OTH-3

The commenter requests information related to the project’s consumption of non-renewable resources. Although a quantitative analysis is not required under CEQA, the proposed project’s alternative energy and use of non-renewable resources are qualitatively discussed on pages 5-2 and 5-3 of the Draft EIR, and in the Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Mineral and Energy Resources sections of the CPE Checklist (pages 94 to 96 and 117 to 118 in Appendix A of the Draft EIR). The CPE Checklist acknowledges on page 95 (Appendix A of the Draft EIR) that the proposed project would result in additional vehicle trips and an increase in energy use. This would be from an increase in overall water usage (with indirect emissions from the energy required to pump, treat, and convey water), increased vehicle trips, and operations associated with energy use, wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal.
However, the proposed project would contain features that would reduce the consumption of non-renewable resources. Solar panels are anticipated to be used on the roofs as stated on page 2-13 of the Draft EIR. The detailed design and inclusion of specific alternative energy is unknown at this stage; however, as stated on page 2-14 of the Draft EIR, “the proposed project would be constructed to the standards required, and at minimum would have a Leadership in Energy Efficient Design (LEED®) Silver rating.” In addition, the CPE Checklist also concludes on page 95 (Appendix A of the Draft EIR) that the proposed project is consistent with regulations adopted to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions as identified in San Francisco’s GHG Reduction Strategy.\(^6\) A GHG compliance checklist was prepared for the project, which includes a description and assessment of how the project would comply with regulations in the following sectors: transportation sector, energy efficiency sector, renewable energy sector, water reduction sector, and environment/conservation sector.\(^7\) The following are several examples of methods and features that the proposed project would include to reduce the consumption of non-renewable resources:

- Constructing the building to meet LEED® Gold certification requirements, which would exceed the required LEED® Silver certification. The new building would be at least 15 percent more energy efficient than Title 24 energy efficiency requirements.
- Installation of solar panels or electric photovoltaic panels are anticipated as part of the building design.
- Designing features on-site to decrease the volume of stormwater runoff from the 2-year, 24-hour design storm by 25 percent from existing conditions.
- Complying with standards required for indoor water efficiency, water efficient irrigation, and the Residential Water Conservation Ordinance. This would include installing low-flow plumbing fixtures and Energy Star rated appliances.
- Diverting approximately 75 percent of the materials generated from the demolition of the existing building to recycling.

\(^6\) Greenhouse Gas Analysis: Compliance Checklist, April 28, 2014. This document is on file and available for review as part of Case No. 2011.1374E at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA.

\(^7\) Ibid.
4 DRAFT EIR REVISIONS

The following changes to the text of the Draft EIR are made in response to comments on the Draft EIR or are staff-initiated to clarify the Draft EIR text. The revised text does not provide new information that would necessitate changes to any of the EIR’s conclusions, that would result in any new significant impact not already identified in the EIR, or that would amount to a substantial increase in the severity of an impact in the EIR. In these revisions, new text is underlined and deletions are shown in strikethrough. The changes are organized in the order of the Draft EIR table of contents.

Mitigation Measure M-CP-1c has been revised as follows on pages S-6 and 4.B-13 of the Draft EIR:

M-CP-1c: Interpretive Program. The project sponsor shall install a permanent on-site interpretive display in a publicly-accessible outdoor location, such as in one of the plazas along Indiana Street or within the open space area of the variants in a main lobby or in an outdoor exhibit in a central courtyard. The display shall focus on the history of the 800 Indiana Street site, including the Ralston Iron Works and the A.M. Castle & Co. that were previously located on the site. The primary goal shall be to educate visitors about the property’s historic themes, associations, and lost character-defining features within broader historical, social, and physical landscape contexts. The project sponsor shall work with a historic preservation professional so that the historical information provided in the HRE and supporting documentation and in the HABS report are used as a basis for the interpretive display. The interpretive display shall be reviewed and approved by a Planning Department Preservation Technical Specialist.

The following text has been added as a new row in Table S-2 after Improvement Measure I-TR-4 – Queue Abatement Condition of Approval on page S-10 of the Draft EIR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Measure I-TR-5: Construction Management</th>
<th>Proposed Project and All Variants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To minimize the construction-related disruption of the general traffic flow on adjacent streets during the AM and PM peak periods, truck movements and deliveries should be limited during peak hours (generally 7:00 to 9:00 AM and 4:00 to 6:00 PM, or other times, as determined by SFMTA and its Transportation Advisory Staff Committee [TASC]),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last paragraph on page 1-5 of the Draft EIR is revised as follows:

With implementation of the mitigation measures identified above, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR for the respective environmental topic areas. In addition, the project sponsor would implement Project Improvement Measure I-TR-1 Residential Transportation Demand Management Program, Improvement Measure I-TR-2 Transportation Demand Management Monitoring Program, Improvement Measure I-TR-3 Enhanced TDM Program – Car Share, and Improvement Measure I-TR-4 Queue Abatement Condition of Approval, and Improvement Measure I-TR-5 Construction Management to further reduce less than significant vehicle trip impacts.
The first paragraph on page 67 of the CPE Checklist (Appendix A of the Draft EIR) has been revised as follows:

**Construction**

The proposed project’s construction activities would last approximately 26 months and would include below-ground surface construction and building construction. Although construction activities would result in additional vehicle trips to and from the project site from workers and material and equipment deliveries, these activities would be limited in duration. Therefore, the proposed project’s construction would not result in significant impacts on transportation, either individually or cumulatively, that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. Improvement Measure I-TR-5 would further reduce the less-than-significant impacts to minimize construction-related disruption of the general traffic flow on adjacent streets during the AM and PM peak periods.

The following text has been added on page 126 of the CPE Checklist (Appendix A of the Draft EIR):

**Improvement Measure I-TR-5: Construction Management**

To minimize the construction-related disruption of the general traffic flow on adjacent streets during the AM and PM peak periods, truck movements and deliveries should be limited during peak hours (generally 7:00 to 9:00 AM and 4:00 to 6:00 PM, or other times, as determined by SFMTA and its Transportation Advisory Staff Committee [TASC]).
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PROCEDINGS

SEPTEMBER 11, 2014 12:29 P.M.

MR. IONIN: Case Number 2011.1374E for 800 Indiana Street, the Public Hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Report. Please note that written comments will be accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00 p.m. on Monday, September 29, 2014.

MS. SCHUETT: Good afternoon. I am Rachel Schuett, Planning Department Staff. The item before you is the Public Hearing to receive comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) on the 800 Indiana Street Project, Case No. 2011.1374E.

I am joined here today by my colleagues, Rich Sucre and current planner for the proposed project, Devyani Jain, Senior Environmental Planner, and members of the Project Sponsor Team are also present.

The project site is located at 800 Indiana Street, which is on the west side of Indiana Street between 20th and 22nd Streets, located in the southeast quadrant of the City.

The site is adjacent to the I-280 elevated freeway.
The site is currently developed within an approximately 78,000 square foot, 50-foot tall, steel frame historic industrial warehouse which was constructed in 1926. The warehouse is currently used for storage and costume and set design.

The proposed project would include demolition of the existing historic warehouse, construction of a five-story multi-family residential development comprised of three separate buildings, each designed by a different architectural firm. Building heights would be approximately 58 feet.

The proposed project would include up to 338 residential units, ground floor residential amenities, and would accommodate up to 230 parking spaces.

I would also like to note that the EIR also includes the analysis of two variants for the streetscape improvements along Indiana Street, as well as an optional dog park.

The existing warehouse was identified as a potential historic resource as part of the Central Waterfront, a subsequent historic resource evaluation and response concluded that
the warehouse is individually eligible for
listing in the California Register of Historic
Places. It is significant as a large warehouse
for metals use with an aesthetically designed
associated office. Its demolition would be
considered a significant impact.

The project site is not within both the
Dogpatch Landmark District and the eligible
Central Waterfront Third Street Industrial
Historic District. However, the historic
resource evaluation and response prepared for the
proposed project also found that, even though the
proposed project would result in a significant
unavoidable impact to a historic site warehouse,
the proposed project would not impair the
integrity of the adjacent districts; also, that
the proposed project is designed to address the
massing and scale of the surrounding context and
the streetscape and dog park variance would not
impact or affect any of the nearby historic
resources.

The following historic resource
mitigation measures were included in the draft
EIR. First, the complete Historic American
Building Surveyor (HABS) documentation prior to
demolition, a salvage program, and also
installation of a permanent onsite interpretive
exhibit. However, these mitigation measures
would not reduce the impact to historic
architectural resources to a less-than-
significant level. Thus, the impacts on historic
resources would remain significant and
unavoidable. No other significant and
unavoidable impacts were identified in the Draft
EIR.

A Community Plan Exemption (CPE), tiered
from the Eastern Neighborhood’s EIR was also
prepared for the proposed project. The CPE
identified four significant impacts related to
accidental discovery of archaeological resources,
interior and exterior noise and vibration, and
the handling of hazardous building materials.

Mitigations were identified to reduce
these potentially significant impacts to less
than significant levels.

A hearing to receive the Historic
Preservation Commission’s comments on the Draft
EIR was held on August 20, 2014. At the hearing,
the HPC stated that they appreciated the thorough
analysis of the preservation and partial
preservation alternatives contained within the
Draft EIR, and to date have not provided any
additional comments on the Draft EIR.

I would like to remind all speakers that
this is not a hearing to consider approval or
disapproval of the proposed project. Approval
hearings will follow final EIR certification, so
your comments today should be confined to the
adequacy and accuracy of the information and
analysis contained within the Draft EIR.

The comments will be transcribed by the
Court Reporter and responded to in the Responses
to Comments document. This document will respond
to all verbal and written comments received on
the Draft EIR and make revisions to the Draft EIR
as appropriate.

I would remind commenters to speak slowly
and clearly so that the Court Reporter can
produce an adequate transcript of today’s
hearing. Also, commenters should state their
name and address for the record so that they may
be properly identified and also so that we may
send them a copy of the Responses to Comments
document once it is completed. After hearing
comments from the general public, we will also
take any comments on the Draft EIR from the
Planning Commission.

I will note that the public review period
for this Draft EIR began on August 13th and will
continue until 5:00 p.m. on September 29th.

Comments that are not made verbally today
should be submitted in writing to the Planning
Department.

This concludes my presentation on this
matter and unless the Commissioners have any
questions, I would respectfully suggest that the
public hearing on this item be opened.

PRESIDENT WU: No questions, thank you.

Okay, let’s open for public comment. I have one
speaker card, Sue Mortensen.

MS. MORTENSEN: Thank you, Commissioners
for the opportunity to speak. My name is Sue
Mortensen. I live at 808 Minnesota Street in the
Esprit Park Condominiums. I am a member of the
Board of Directors of our Association and I am
the appointed Community Liaison. Our buildings
contain 147 homes and approximately 300
residents.

We’ve raised no objections to this
development to date; however, I am here to
address environmental issues anticipated in the
construction of the project that are not
specifically mentioned in the EIR. That is, the
impacts of this construction on our homeowners
located directly across the street from the
construction site.

Specifically, we are concerned with
traffic control. We have one combined entrance
and exit to the parking garage underneath the
building. It sits about midway to the
construction site. We cannot have this entrance
blocked at any time. We are seeking assurances
that this will not happen.

Secondly, noise. I know this is a common
concern, we do just seek assurance that the work
will be limited to a five day, 8:00 to 5:00
schedule.

Dirt and dust also, I’m sure a typical
complaint. It is a real problem for our
homeowners on the Indiana side directly facing
this construction site. We spend about $8,000 a
year washing windows on that side and
unfortunately we’ll need to anticipate an
increase of that because of the construction.

I’m a dog owner and I walk past this site

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC
52 Longwood Drive, San Rafael, California 94901 (415) 457-4417
on a regular basis. That’s my authority in my
next statement, which is pests. This site is home
to an impressive population of vermin. They’re
going to be looking for a new home once the
construction begins and we’d like to see that
there were some kind of containment or control
program for this issue.

And last but not least, a compliment is
due. I have contacted Joe Kirchofer with Avalon
and he has agreed to come and speak to our
homeowners this month. We’re anxious to have a
good system of communication in place for the
developers and the construction foremen once this
begins. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT WU: Thank you. Is there
additional public comment? Okay, seeing no
public comment, the public comment is closed.
Commissioners? Commissioner Johnson.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Thank you very
much. I just have a couple questions about the
EIR. The first one is about air quality control.
So the EIR states that the site is not within an
Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, but it looks -- it’s
right next to the highway, and if you look at the
Air Pollutant Exposure Zone Map from DPH, the Air
Pollutant Exposure Zone is blue, which indicates that it is a zone all along all of the freeways in San Francisco, so can you explain how that assessment was made?

MS. SCHUETT: So that’s actually a comment that we’ll be responding to in writing.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Okay, yes, explain, that would be one. So I’ll just go quickly through the other ones for public comment.

MS. SCHUETT: Please do.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: The other one is for the consumption of non-renewable resources. It would be -- this program for the development in any of the alternatives includes alternative energy such as solar and other water efficiency methods. It would be great to see not only what the usage of that non-renewable resources is, but also what the energy production of the building system would be, to sort of what is the offset. So that would be great to see as part of the Draft BIR assessment.

The Mitigation Measure M-CP-1C, which is the interpretive program, would like to see some alternatives there for placement. It’s currently
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anticipated it’s going to be placed in the lobby of the building in all three construction alternatives, but as a mitigation measure for the historical resource, I don’t feel that the lobby of a 100 percent residential building is truly a public space. You know, just literally if you don’t live there, who is going to go into a lobby of some building that they don’t live in. So I’d like to see that placed in some of the open space. I think that there might be opportunities in all three of the open space variants for some sort of interpretive program.

And then the final one is I would like, going back to air quality, I believe that there should be some comparative analysis of the air quality control mitigation measures across all three of the alternatives.

In the proposed alternative, there is an open courtyard/roof deck, which I do not believe adequately mitigates potential for exposure to air pollutants, but I do think that the other two construction alternatives do actually adequately mitigate exposure to air pollutants, so I’d like to see -- it would be great to see some sort of comparative analysis of the air quality control
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measures for all three project alternatives.

Thank you.

MS. SCHUETT: Thank you for your comments.

VICE PRESIDENT FONG: Commissioner Antonini.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: And I note, of course, we have a partial preservation/preservation alternative and certainly that’s important to have in an EIR and it’s worthy of discussion as we move forward with approval of the project because nearby the Esprit Project did a preservation and, in addition to the preservation, it certainly makes for an adequate EIR, so I’m happy to see those in there.

VICE PRESIDENT FONG: No further comments? Okay. Thank you, Commissioners.
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August 20, 2014

Sarah B. Jones
Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Ms. Jones,

On August 20, 2014, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) held public hearings and took public comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed demolition of the existing building at 800 Indiana Street, and new construction of five-story residential complex with 336 dwelling units.

The HPC concurs with the analysis contained within the DEIR, and appreciate the efforts of the Project Sponsor in exploring preservation alternatives, which mitigate the impacts to the site’s historic resources.

The HPC appreciates the opportunity to participate in review of this environmental document.

Sincerely

Karl Hasz, President
Historic Preservation Commission
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