Community Plan Exemption Checklist

Case No.: 2013.0698E  
Project Address: 1301 16th Street  
Zoning: Urban Mixed Use (UMU) District  
68-X Height and Bulk District  
Block/Lot: 3954/016  
Lot Size: 38,600 square feet (0.89 acres)  
Plan Area: Showplace Square/Potrero Hill Plan Area of the Eastern Neighborhoods  
Area Plan  
Project Sponsor: Will Mollard, Workshop 1, (415) 523-0304  
Staff Contact: Tania Sheyner, (415) 575-9127, Tania.Sheyner@sfgov.org

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location

The project site is located on a block bounded by 16th Street to the north, Wisconsin Street to the east, 17th Street to the south, and Carolina Street to the west, in San Francisco’s Potrero Hill neighborhood. The project site (Assessor’s Block 3954, Lot 016), which is roughly square in shape, has frontages along three streets – a 200-foot-long frontage along 16th Street to the north and 193-foot-long frontages along Carolina and Wisconsin Streets, to the west and east, respectively. The site spans approximately 38,600 square feet of total space and currently contains a one-story industrial building (constructed in 1971) that covers the entire parcel. Since 2007, when the current property owner purchased the site, it has been operating as a warehouse.

There are two existing curb cuts along the project’s Wisconsin Street façade, and one existing curb cut along the project’s 16th Street façade, all of which correspond to garage entries. Carolina Street is not currently improved with a public sidewalk, but there is one garage entry and a loading dock along the existing building’s Carolina Street façade as well. Pedestrian access to the existing industrial building is provided through entrances along all three frontages. No trees or landscaping currently exist on the project site or along the adjacent sidewalks. The project site is relatively flat.

To the south, the project site is bordered by a two-story industrial building, which contains automotive repair uses. Other land uses on the project block (along 17th and Carolina Streets) include industrial and commercial uses. Additional information regarding surrounding uses is provided in the Project Setting section, below.

Project Characteristics

The proposed project would demolish the existing structure and construct a mixed-use residential project, encompassing a total of approximately 184,700 gsf, which would include approximately 137,900 gsf of residential uses (176 dwelling units), approximately 3,300 gsf of production, distribution and repair (PDR) space, approximately 3,600 gsf of retail space, approximately 15,600 gsf of space dedicated to vehicle parking (111 parking spaces), approximately 3,000 gsf dedicated to bicycle parking (244 Class I
bicycle parking spaces and 20 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces), and approximately 4,800 gsfcf of ground floor circulation and mechanical space (consisting of mechanical equipment rooms, a gas room, electrical and telecom equipment, a trash room, and a mail room).

The building would be in a C-shape, with an internal courtyard providing a south-facing mid-block open space. It would extend six stories and 68 feet in height, with an additional approximately 12 feet to the top of rooftop elements. The proposed building would occupy the entire parcel and would contain articulation along its three street-facing facades (Carolina, 16th, and Wisconsin Streets).

On the ground level, the project would contain 12 one-bedroom and 4 two-bedroom, bi-level townhomes along each of the Carolina and the Wisconsin Street frontages. The bedrooms would be located in the upper levels, with living space on the ground floor. All 16 of these units would be designated as “flexible occupancy,” which would permit limited commercial accessory use on the ground level of the units (limited to 25 percent of the floor area, as allowed by the Planning Code). The lower level of these units would be set back 6 feet from the sidewalks and the lower level of the two-bedroom units would be set back 12 feet from the sidewalk, providing each unit with a private outdoor open space and a street facing entry.

The ground floor would also contain a residential lobby on 16th Street in the middle of the block. Secondary residential entrances would also be provided on Carolina and Wisconsin Streets, with two additional residential entrances along each street, two of them adjacent to the commercial and PDR spaces and two adjacent to the southern boundary.

The ground level would also contain an approximately 3,300-square-foot PDR space at the corner or 16th and Wisconsin Streets and an approximately 3,600-square-foot commercial (retail) space at the corner of 16th and Carolina Streets. Both of these spaces would be double height, containing approximately 18-foot-tall ceilings. The proposed commercial and PDR uses would be accessible via 16th Street entrances.

On levels two through seven, the proposed structure would contain residential units in a double-loaded corridor arrangement, with units located along both sides of a linear hallway. Elevators, stairs, and utilities such as laundry rooms, would be located in the portion of the building along 16th Street.

Automobile parking would be provided in a ground-level garage, which would be approximately 15,600 gsfcf in size and would be able to accommodate 111 parking spaces, with 108 of these parking spaces relying on mechanical parking systems (3 of the parking spaces would be handicapped accessible). Bicycle parking would be located adjacent to the automobile parking stackers, with one row of bicycle parking on either side of the automobile parking area (directly east and west of it). The garage would be for residential uses only and would be accessible via two entries/ exits – one on the north side of the Carolina Street frontage (accessible via a new 12-foot-wide curb cut) and one on the north side of the Wisconsin Street frontage (accessible via a new 12-foot-wide curb cut). The existing curb cuts along 16th and Wisconsin Streets would be abandoned as part of the proposed project and the curbs would be leveled out to the existing sidewalk elevation.
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FIGURE 2. EXISTING SITE PLAN
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FIGURE 3. PROPOSED SITE PLAN
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FIGURE 4. PROPOSED FIRST LEVEL FLOOR PLAN
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Note: Subsequent to preparation of these figures, the commercial space on the corner of 16th and Wisconsin Streets was revised to PDR uses.
FIGURE 5. PROPOSED MEZZANINE LEVEL FLOOR PLAN
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Note: Subsequent to preparation of these figures, the commercial space on the corner of 16th and Wisconsin Streets was revised to PDR uses.
FIGURE 6. PROPOSED TYPICAL SECOND THROUGH FIFTH LEVEL FLOOR PLAN
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FIGURE 7. PROPOSED SIXTH LEVEL FLOOR PLAN
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FIGURE 8. PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION (16TH STREET)
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FIGURE 9. PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION (CAROLINA STREET)
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FIGURE 10. PROPOSED EAST ELEVATION (WISCONSIN STREET)
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FIGURE 11. PROPOSED SOUTH ELEVATION (PROPERTY LINE)
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The proposed open space would be provided both privately, for 86 units in total, and commonly, in the form of a second floor courtyard and a roof deck. The 7,600 square foot rear yard on the second level would consist of 4,300 square feet of common landscaped courtyard space and 3,300 square feet of private open space for 16 dwelling units on the second floor. The project would also provide an additional approximately 9,200 square feet of common open space on the roof deck. It total, the project would provide approximately 13,500 square feet of commonly-accessible open space and approximately 8,700 square feet of private open space.

Wisconsin Street has an existing 12-foot wide sidewalk for the public right-of-way. The project sponsor proposes six new street trees spaced across the length of the property along Wisconsin Street. Carolina Street has no existing sidewalk for the public right-of-way. The project sponsor proposes creating a new sidewalk and six new street trees spaced across the length of the property along Carolina Street. Sixteenth Street has an existing 12-foot wide sidewalk for the public right-of-way. The project sponsor proposes eight new street trees spaced across the length of the property along Sixteenth Street.

**Project Construction**

Construction phases would consist of demolition, foundation construction, superstructure construction, exterior wall construction and glazing, and building interior and finishes. Project construction is anticipated to begin in approximately fall 2016 and is expected to last approximately 24 months.

Demolition of the existing building and its foundation on the project site would be completed in approximately 4 to 8 weeks. Following demolition, the existing foundation would be removed. The project design would require little or no soil to be excavated or removed from the project site.

The building would be made of concrete; Type I-A, fully-sprinklered construction, and a foundation type that is to be determined. The foundation design currently being considered employs a relatively thin foundation and the use of torque down piles. Approximately 3,500 cubic yards of soil would be excavated, to a depth of approximately 2.5 feet. The final foundation design will be determined by the project engineers during project permitting. For the purposes on this environmental review, it is assumed that pile driving would not be required to accommodate the proposed project. Foundation work is estimated to last two months.

The building superstructure would be constructed over 12 to 18 months and would consist of conventional metal frame, post tensioned concrete slab and concrete shear walls. Construction equipment to be used during this phase would include a tower crane, concrete pump trucks, and concrete/rebar/framing delivery trucks. Installation of the building exterior skin will start towards the 10th month of superstructure and be completed in about two months. The anticipated date of occupancy is the third quarter of 2018.

**Project Approvals**

The proposed 1301 16th Street project would require the following approvals:

**Actions by the Planning Commission**

- The approval of a Large Project Authorization by the Planning Commission (per Planning Code Section 329) is the Approval Action for the proposed project. The Approval Action date establishes the start of the 30-day appeal period for this CEQA exemption determination pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
Actions by other City Departments

- Approval of site permit (*Planning Department, Department of Building Inspection*)
- Approval of grading and building permits (*Planning Department, Department of Building Inspection*)
- Approval of a stormwater control plan (*San Francisco Public Utilities Commission*)
- Approval of project compliance with the Stormwater Control Guidelines (*Department of Public Works*)

PROJECT SETTING

As noted above, the project site is located on a block bounded by 16th Street to the north, Wisconsin Street to the east, 17th Street to the south, and Carolina Street to the west, in San Francisco’s Potrero Hill neighborhood. Sixteenth Street is a four-lane, two-way street (three west-bound lanes and one east-bound lane) with a parking lane on each side and an east-bound bicycle lane. Wisconsin Street is a two-lane, two-way street, with a parallel parking lane on the west side of the street and a perpendicular parking lane on the east side of the street. Carolina Street is a two-lane, two-way street, with a perpendicular parking lane on each side of the street. As noted above, Carolina Street adjacent to the project site is not currently improved with a public sidewalk. No trees or landscaping currently exist on the project site or along the adjacent sidewalks. In terms of topography, the project site is generally flat.

To the south, the project site is bordered by a two-story industrial building, which contains automotive repair uses and extends from Wisconsin Street to Carolina Street. To the north (across 16th Street) and west (across Carolina Street) the project site is bordered by light industrial/warehouse uses and a vacant lot. The industrial uses are housed in low-rise one- to two-story buildings. To the east (across Wisconsin Street), the site is bordered by retail uses (a one-story hardware store). Other uses in the project vicinity (within an approximately one block radius) are primarily commercial and light industrial but also include entertainment venues (Thee Parkside) and open space (Jackson Playground). Buildings in the project vicinity generally range from one to four stories in height and are a combination of early Twentieth Century and more contemporary architectural styles. Most structures are built to the property line. An elevated segment of the U.S. 101 freeway is located five blocks west of the project site and an elevated segment of the I-280 freeway is located five blocks east of the project site. Both freeways run in a north-south direction.

The project block, as well as blocks to the east and west, are zoned Urban Mixed Use (UMU) (same as the project site), and contain a variety of uses, including residential, retail, PDR, entertainment, and office. Blocks to the north are zoned Production, Distribution and Repair-1-Design (PDR-1-D) and contain light industrial and commercial uses, with a focus on design-related businesses. These uses are interspersed with vacant lots. Blocks to the south include the Jackson Playground (zoned Public or P), additional UMU- and P-zoned blocks, a cluster of Production, Distribution and Repair-1-General (PDR-1-G) blocks and large swaths of RH-2 and RH-3 districts, which contain primarily residential development. The Mission Bay Redevelopment Area (currently under the jurisdiction of the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure), which contains the UCSF Mission Bay campus and hospital, is located about one-quarter mile to the northeast of the project site. Other projects that have been either proposed or approved in vicinity of the project site include a five-story mixed-used residential project at 88 Arkansas Street, a four-story mixed-use residential project at 1601 Mariposa Street, a four-story
residential project at 901 Tennessee Street, a six story mixed-used residential project at 888 Tennessee Street and a six-story mixed-use residential project at 901 16th Street.

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

This Community Plan Exemption (CPE) Checklist evaluates whether the environmental impacts of the proposed project are addressed in the Programmatic Environmental Impact Report for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR). The CPE Checklist indicates whether the proposed project would result in significant impacts that: (1) are peculiar to the project or project site; (2) were not identified as significant project-level, cumulative, or off-site effects in the PEIR; or (3) are previously identified significant effects, which as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the PEIR. Such impacts, if any, will be evaluated in a project-specific Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report. If no such impacts are identified, the proposed project is exempt from further environmental review in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.

Mitigation measures identified in the PEIR are discussed under each topic area, and measures that are applicable to the proposed project are provided under the Mitigation Measures Section at the end of this checklist.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified significant impacts related to land use, transportation, cultural resources, shadow, noise, air quality, and hazardous materials. Additionally, the PEIR identified significant cumulative impacts related to land use, transportation, and cultural resources. Mitigation measures were identified for the above impacts and reduced all impacts to less-than-significant except for those related to land use (cumulative impacts on Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) use), transportation (program-level and cumulative traffic impacts at nine intersections; program-level and cumulative transit impacts on seven Muni lines), cultural resources (cumulative impacts from demolition of historical resources), and shadow (program-level impacts on parks).

The proposed project would include demolition of the existing building on the site and construction of a mixed-use residential project, encompassing a total of approximately 184,700 gsf of space. The new building would include 176 dwelling units, approximately 3,300 gsf of PDR space, approximately 3,600 gsf of retail space, 111 parking spaces, 244 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and 20 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces, and additional space dedicated to circulation and mechanical space. As discussed below in this checklist, the proposed project would not result in new, significant environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already analyzed and disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

**CHANGES IN THE REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT**

Since the certification of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR in 2008, several new policies, regulations, statutes, and funding measures have been adopted, passed, or are underway that affect the physical environment and/or environmental review methodology for projects in the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas. As discussed in each topic area referenced below, these policies, regulations, statutes, and funding

---

measures have or will implement mitigation measures or further reduce less-than-significant impacts identified in the PEIR. These include:

- State statute regarding Aesthetics, Parking Impacts, effective January 2014, and state statute and Planning Commission resolution regarding automobile delay, and vehicle miles traveled, (VMT) effective March 2016 (see “CEQA Section 21099” heading below);

- The adoption of interim controls requiring additional design standards for large project authorizations within the Showplace Square/Potrero Hill and Central Waterfront plan areas of the Eastern Neighborhoods effective February 2016 through August 2017;

- San Francisco Bicycle Plan update adoption in June 2009, Better Streets Plan adoption in 2010, Transit Effectiveness Project (aka “Muni Forward”) adoption in March 2014, Vision Zero adoption by various City agencies in 2014, Proposition A and B passage in November 2014, the Transportation Sustainability Program process, and state statute and Planning Commission resolution regarding automobile delay, and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) effective March 2016 (see Checklist section “Transportation”);

- San Francisco ordinance establishing Noise Regulations Related to Residential Uses Near Places of Entertainment effective June 2015 (see Checklist section “Noise”);

- San Francisco ordinances establishing Construction Dust Control, effective July 2008, and Enhanced Ventilation Required for Urban Infill Sensitive Use Developments, amended December 2014 (see Checklist section “Air Quality”);

- San Francisco Clean and Safe Parks Bond passage in November 2012 and San Francisco Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan adoption in April 2014 (see Checklist section “Recreation”);

- Urban Water Management Plan adoption in 2011 and Sewer System Improvement Program process (see Checklist section “Utilities and Service Systems”); and


CHANGES IN THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Since the certification of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR in 2008, as evidenced by the volume of development applications submitted to the Planning Department since 2012, the pace of development activity has increased in the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR projected that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan could result in a substantial amount of growth within the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas, resulting in an increase of approximately 7,400 to 9,900 net dwelling units and 3,200,000 to 6,600,000 square feet of net non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) throughout the lifetime of the Plan (year 2025). The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR projected

2 Tables 12 through 16 of the Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR and Table C&R-2 in the Comments and Responses show projected net growth based on proposed rezoning scenarios. A baseline for existing conditions in the year 2000 was included to provide context for the scenario figures for parcels affected by the rezoning, not projected growth totals from a baseline of the year 2000. Estimates of projected growth were based on parcels that were to be rezoned and did not include parcels that were recently developed (i.e., parcels with projects completed between 2000 and March 2006) or have proposed projects in the pipeline (i.e., projects under construction, projects approved or entitled by the Planning Department, or projects under review by the Planning Department or Department of Building Inspection). Development pipeline figures for each Plan Area were presented
that this level of development would result in a total population increase of approximately 23,900 to 33,000 people throughout the lifetime of the plan. Growth projected in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was based on a soft site analysis (i.e., assumptions regarding the potential for a site to be developed through the year 2025) and not based upon the created capacity of the rezoning options (i.e., the total potential for development that would be created indefinitely). 

As of February 23, 2016, projects containing 9,749 dwelling units and 2,807,952 square feet of non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) have completed or are proposed to complete environmental review within the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas. This level of development corresponds to an overall population increase of approximately 23,758 to 25,332 persons. Of the 5,647 dwelling units that have completed environmental review, building permits have been issued for 4,531 dwelling units, or approximately 80 percent of those units (information is not available regarding building permit non-residential square footage).

Within the Showplace Square/Potrero Hill subarea, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR projected that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan could result in an increase of 2,300 to 3,900 net dwelling units and 1,500,000 to 1,700,000 non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) through the year 2025. This level of development corresponds to an overall population increase of approximately 7,864 to 9,886 persons. As of February 23, 2016, projects containing 3,315 dwelling units and 1,138,920 square feet of non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) have completed or are proposed to complete environmental review within the Showplace Square/Potrero Hill subarea. This level of development corresponds to an overall population increase of 6,908 to 7,758 persons. Of the 2,379 dwelling units that have completed environmental review, building permits have been issued for 1,530 dwelling units, or approximately 64 percent of those units. Therefore, anticipated growth from the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans is within the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR growth projections.

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

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


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

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

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

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

**SENATE BILL 743**

**Aesthetics and Parking**

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

a) The project is in a transit priority area;

b) The project is on an infill site; and

c) The project is residential, mixed-use residential, or an employment center.

The proposed project meets each of the above three criteria and thus, this checklist does not consider aesthetics or parking in determining the significance of project impacts under CEQA. Project elevations are included in the project description.

In addition, approvals for a Large Project Authorization under Planning Code 329 in the Showplace Square, Potrero Hill, or Central Waterfront Area Plans must conform to the provisions of the Planning Code and must also demonstrate the following:

1) An awareness of urban patterns that harmonizes visual and physical relationships between existing buildings, streets, open space, natural features, and view corridors;

2) An awareness of neighborhood scale and materials, and renders building facades with texture, detail, and depth; and

3) A modulation of buildings vertically and horizontally, with rooftops and facades designed to be seen from multiple vantage points.

The case report for the proposed project would demonstrate compliance with the above design requirements, as applicable.

---

8 San Francisco Planning Department. Eligibility Checklist: CEQA Section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for 1301 16th Street, April 2016. This document (and all other documents cited in this report, unless otherwise noted) is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 as part of Case File No. 2013.0698E.
Automobile Delay and Vehicle Miles Traveled

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

In January 2016, OPR published for public review and comment a Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA9 recommending that transportation impacts for projects be measured using a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) metric. On March 3, 2016, in anticipation of the future certification of the revised CEQA Guidelines, the San Francisco Planning Commission adopted OPR’s recommendation to use the VMT metric instead of automobile delay to evaluate the transportation impacts of projects (Resolution 19579). (Note: the VMT metric does not apply to the analysis of project impacts on non-automobile modes of travel such as riding transit, walking, and bicycling.) Therefore, impacts and mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR associated with automobile delay are not discussed in this checklist, including PEIR Mitigation Measures E-1: Traffic Signal Installation, E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management, E-3: Enhanced Funding, and E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management. Instead, a VMT analysis is provided in the Transportation section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING—Would the project:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzed a range of potential rezoning options and considered the effects of losing between approximately 520,000 to 4,930,000 square feet of PDR space in the Plan Area throughout the lifetime of the Plan (year 2025). This was compared to an estimated loss of approximately 4,620,000 square feet of PDR space in the Plan Area under the No Project scenario. Within the Showplace Square/Potrero Hill subarea, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR considered the effects of losing up to approximately 990,000 square feet of PDR space through the year 2025. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that adoption of the Area Plans would result in an unavoidable significant impact on land use due to the cumulative loss of PDR space. This impact was addressed in a Statement of Overriding

---

9 This document is available online at: [https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_sb743.php](https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_sb743.php).
Considerations with CEQA Findings and adopted as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Areas Plans approval on January 19, 2009.

As of February 23, 2016, projects containing the removal of 1,715,001 net square feet of PDR space have been completed or are proposed to complete environmental review within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area. These estimates include projects that have completed environmental review (1,172,032 square feet of PDR space loss) and foreseeable projects, including the proposed project (542,969 square feet of PDR space loss). Foreseeable projects are those projects for which environmental evaluation applications have been submitted to the San Francisco Planning Department. As of February 23, 2016, projects containing the removal of approximately 823,670 net square feet of PDR space have completed or are proposed to complete environmental review within the Showplace Square/Potrero Hill subarea. These estimates include projects that have completed environmental review (417,383 square feet of PDR space loss) and foreseeable projects, including the proposed project (406,287 square feet of PDR space loss).

Development of the proposed project would result in the net loss of approximately 35,300 square feet of PDR building space (of the 38,600 square feet of PDR that would be lost, 3,300 square feet would be replaced by the project) and this would contribute considerably to the significant cumulative land use impact related to loss of PDR uses that was identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The project site is located in the UMU Use District, where residential development mixed with remaining PDR uses is encouraged and expected to serve as a buffer between PDR districts and residential districts, and the proposed project is within the development density as envisioned for the site under the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The proposed loss of 35,300 square feet of existing PDR uses represents a considerable contribution to the cumulative loss of PDR space analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, but would not result in significant impacts that were previously not identified or a more severe adverse impact than analyzed in the PEIR.

The proposed project would convert existing on-site PDR space (the project site contains warehouse uses, which is identified as list type of use(s) in the PEIR) to mostly non-PDR space. Hence, the proposed project would preclude an opportunity for development of greater amount of PDR space given that PDR uses are allowed in the UMU Use District (as they were in the previous zoning for the project site, which was Heavy Industrial [M-2]). The incremental loss of PDR opportunity is considerable due to the size of the project site (0.89 acres) and its ability to potentially accommodate a greater amount of PDR uses than proposed by the project. The preclusion of development of 0.89 acres of PDR space represents a considerable contribution to the loss of PDR space analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, but would not result in significant impacts that were not identified or a more severe adverse impact than analyzed in the PEIR.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the Area Plans would not create any new physical barriers in the Eastern Neighborhoods because the rezoning and Area Plans do not provide for any new major roadways, such as freeways that would disrupt or divide the plan area or individual neighborhoods or subareas.

The Citywide Planning and Current Planning Divisions of the Planning Department have determined that the proposed project is permitted in the UMU District and is consistent with height, bulk, density and land uses envisioned in Showplace Square/Potrero Hill Area Plan. The project falls within the 16–

---

10 Adam Varat, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 1301 16th Street, February 19, 2015.
11 Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 1301 16th Street, February 6, 2015.
17th Street Corridor generalized zoning district, which encourages a mix of existing PDR uses with new, higher density residential uses and small retail uses in acknowledgement of the 16th Street transit corridor. The plan also calls for transportation improvements and reduced parking to encourage alternatives to automobile travel. As a residential project with small retail and PDR uses and limited vehicle parking, the proposed project is consistent with this designation. Moreover, the project would not exceed the applicable 68-foot height limit, except for certain permitted rooftop features.

Because the proposed project is consistent with the development density established in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and area Plans, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to land use and land use planning, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

| Topics: 2. POPULATION AND HOUSING— Would the project: |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | ☐ Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site | ☐ Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR | ☐ Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information | ☒ No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

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

The proposed project would replace existing warehouse uses on the site with residential, commercial and PDR uses. This has the potential to introduce a residential population of approximately 400 people and a daytime worker population of approximately 20 employees to the project site. The proposed commercial and PDR components of the project are not anticipated to create a substantial demand for increased housing as these uses would not be sufficient in size and scale to generate such demand. Moreover, the proposed project would not displace any housing, as none currently exists on the project site. Any increase in population facilitated by the project would be within the scope of the Eastern Neighborhoods
PEIR analysis and would not be considered substantial. Moreover, since no housing exists on the project site, no housing or people would be displaced by the project. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to population and housing. As stated in the “Changes in the Physical Environment” section above, these direct effects of the proposed project on population and housing are within the scope of the population growth anticipated under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans and evaluated in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historic Architectural Resources**

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

The existing structure on the project site has been identified as “Not a Historic Resource” by the Planning Department Preservation staff (Historic Resource Status C). Moreover, the project site is not located within any established or eligible historic district. For this reason, the demolition of the existing building on the site and the construction of the proposed project would not result in an impact to a historic
resource or a district. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to the significant historic resource impact identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and no historic resource mitigation measures would apply to the proposed project.

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

Archeological Resources

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

The project design would require little or no soil to be excavated or removed from the project site. Nevertheless, the proposed project was determined to be subject to Mitigation Measure J-2, since no archeological assessment report has been prepared for it in the past. In accordance with Mitigation Measure J-2, a Preliminary Archaeological Review (PAR) was conducted by Planning Department staff archaeologists. Based on the PAR, the Planning Department’s standard Archeological Mitigation Measure I (Accidental Discovery) would apply to the proposed project. The PAR and its mitigation requirements are consistent with Mitigation Measure J-2 of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. With implementation of an archeological accidental discovery mitigation measure, impacts related to archeological resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. In accordance with the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR requirements, the project sponsor has agreed to implement the archeological testing and monitoring program as Project Mitigation Measure 1, as discussed on page 51.

With implementation of Project Mitigation 1, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on archeological resources that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

---

### Topics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy establishing measures of effectiveness for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the performance of the circulation system, taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>into account all modes of transportation including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mass transit and non-motorized travel and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevant components of the circulation system,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including but not limited to intersections, streets,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes would not result in significant impacts related to pedestrians, bicyclists, loading, emergency access, or construction. As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on pedestrians, bicyclists, loading, emergency access, or construction beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR did not evaluate VMT or the potential for induced automobile travel. The VMT Analysis presented below evaluates the project’s transportation effects using the VMT metric.

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

**Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis**

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

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

The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Transportation Authority) uses the San Francisco
Chained Activity Model Process (SF-CHAMP) to estimate VMT by private automobiles and taxis for
different land use types. Travel behavior in SF-CHAMP is calibrated based on observed behavior from
the California Household Travel Survey 2010-2012, Census data regarding automobile ownership rates
and county-to-county worker flows, and observed vehicle counts and transit boardings. SF-CHAMP uses
a synthetic population, which is a set of individual actors that represents the Bay Area’s actual
population, who make simulated travel decisions for a complete day. The Transportation Authority uses
tour-based analysis for office and residential uses, which examines the entire chain of trips over the
course of a day, not just trips to and from the project. For retail uses, the Transportation Authority uses
trip-based analysis, which counts VMT from individual trips to and from the project (as opposed to entire
chain of trips). A trip-based approach, as opposed to a tour-based approach, is necessary for retail
projects because a tour is likely to consist of trips stopping in multiple locations, and the summarizing of
tour VMT to each location would over-estimate VMT.\textsuperscript{12,13}

For residential development, the regional average daily VMT per capita is 17.2.\textsuperscript{14} For retail development,
the regional average daily work-related VMT per employee is 14.9. For PDR development (which uses the
same VMT rates as those for office uses), the regional average daily work-related VMT per employee is
19.1. Refer to Table 1: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled, which includes the transportation analysis zone in
which the project site is located, 572.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th>TAZ 572</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Average</td>
<td>Regional Average minus 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households (Residential)</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (Retail)</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (PDR)</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{12} To state another way: a tour-based assessment of VMT at a retail site would consider the VMT for all trips in the tour, for any
tour with a stop at the retail site. If a single tour stops at two retail locations, for example, a coffee shop on the way to work and
a restaurant on the way back home, then both retail locations would be allotted the total tour VMT. A trip-based approach
allows us to apportion all retail-related VMT to retail sites without double-counting.

\textsuperscript{13} San Francisco Planning Department, Executive Summary: Resolution Modifying Transportation Impact Analysis, Appendix F,

\textsuperscript{14} Includes the VMT generated by the households in the development.
A project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would cause substantial additional VMT. The State Office of Planning and Research’s (OPR) Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (“proposed transportation impact guidelines”) recommends screening criteria to identify types, characteristics, or locations of projects that would not result in significant impacts to VMT. If a project meets screening criteria, then it is presumed that VMT impacts would be less than significant for the project and a detailed VMT analysis is not required.

**Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis - Residential**

As mentioned above, existing average daily VMT per capita is 6.5 for the transportation analysis zone the project site is located in, 572. This is 62 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per capita of 17.2. Given the project site is located in an area where existing VMT is more than 15 percent below the existing regional average, the proposed project’s residential uses would not result in substantial additional VMT and impacts would be less-than-significant. Furthermore, the project site meets the Proximity to Transit Stations screening criterion, which also indicates the proposed project’s residential uses would not cause substantial additional VMT.

San Francisco 2040 cumulative conditions were projected using a SF-CHAMP model run, using the same methodology as outlined for existing conditions, but includes residential and job growth estimates and reasonably foreseeable transportation investments through 2040. Projected 2040 average daily VMT per capita is 4.2 for the transportation analysis zone the project site is located in, 572. This is 74 percent below the projected 2040 regional average daily VMT per capita of 16.1. Given the project site is located in an area where VMT is greater than 15 percent below the projected 2040 regional average, the proposed project’s residential uses would not result in substantial additional VMT. Therefore, the proposed project’s residential uses would not contribute considerably to any substantial cumulative increase in VMT.

**Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis - Retail**

As mentioned above, existing average daily VMT per capita is 10.5 for the transportation analysis zone the project site is located in, 572. This is 30 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per capita of 14.9. Given the project site is located in an area where existing VMT is more than 15 percent below the existing regional average, the proposed project’s retail uses would not result in substantial additional VMT and impacts would be less-than-significant. Furthermore, the project site meets the Proximity to Transit Stations screening criterion, which also indicates the proposed project’s retail uses would not cause substantial additional VMT.

Projected 2040 average daily VMT per capita is 10.4 for the transportation analysis zone the project site is located in, 572. This is 29 percent below the projected 2040 regional average daily VMT per capita of 14.6. Given the project site is located in an area where VMT is greater than 15 percent below the projected 2040 regional average, the proposed project’s retail uses would not result in substantial additional VMT. Therefore, the proposed project’s retail uses would not contribute considerably to any substantial cumulative increase in VMT.

---

15 Ibid.
16 Ibid.
Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis - PDR

As mentioned above, existing average daily VMT per capita is 11.7 for the transportation analysis zone the project site is located in, 572. This is 39 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per capita of 19.1. Given the project site is located in an area where existing VMT is more than 15 percent below the existing regional average, the proposed project’s PDR uses would not result in substantial additional VMT and impacts would be less-than-significant. Furthermore, the project site meets the Proximity to Transit Stations screening criterion, which also indicates the proposed project’s PDR uses would not cause substantial additional VMT.

Projected 2040 average daily VMT per capita is 9.2 for the transportation analysis zone the project site is located in, 572. This is 46 percent below the projected 2040 regional average daily VMT per capita of 17.0.\(^{17}\) Given the project site is located in an area where VMT is greater than 15 percent below the projected 2040 regional average, the proposed project’s PDR uses would not result in substantial additional VMT. Therefore, the proposed project’s PDR uses would not contribute considerably to any substantial cumulative increase in VMT.

Trip Generation

The proposed project would include demolition of the existing building on the site and construction of a mixed-use residential project, encompassing a total of approximately 184,700 gsf of space. The new building would include 176 dwelling units, approximately 3,300 gsf of PDR space, approximately 3,600 gsf of retail space, 111 parking spaces, 264 bicycle spaces, and additional space dedicated to circulation and mechanical space.

Localized trip generation of the proposed project was calculated using a trip-based analysis and information in the 2002 Transportation Impacts Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review (SF Guidelines) developed by the San Francisco Planning Department.\(^{18}\) The proposed project would generate an estimated 2,479 person trips (inbound and outbound) on a weekday daily basis, consisting of 973 person trips by auto, 754 transit trips, 503 walk trips and 248 trips by other modes. During the p.m. peak hour, the proposed project would generate an estimated 390 person trips, consisting of 143 person trips by auto, 126 transit trips, 78 walk trips and 43 trips by other modes.

Transit

Mitigation Measures E-5 through E-11 in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR were adopted as part of the Plan with uncertain feasibility to address significant transit impacts. These measures are not applicable to the proposed project, as they are plan-level mitigations to be implemented by City and County agencies. In compliance with a portion of Mitigation Measure E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding, the City adopted impact fees for development in Eastern Neighborhoods that goes towards funding transit and complete streets. In addition, San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code, referred to as the Transportation Sustainability Fee (Ordinance 200-154, effective December 25, 2015).\(^{19}\) The fee, updated, expanded, and replaced the prior Transit Impact Development Fee, which is in compliance with portions of Mitigation Measure E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding. The proposed project would be subject to the fee. The City is also currently conducting outreach regarding

\(^{17}\) Ibid.

\(^{18}\) San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Calculations for project address, date of trip generation report.

\(^{19}\) Two additional files were created at the Board of Supervisors for TSF regarding hospitals and health services, grandfathering, and additional fees for larger projects: see Board file nos. 151121 and 151257.
Mitigation Measures E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding and Mitigation Measure E-11: Transportation Demand Management. Both the Transportation Sustainability Fee and the transportation demand management efforts are part of the Transportation Sustainability Program. In compliance with all or portions of Mitigation Measure E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements, Mitigation Measure E-7: Transit Accessibility, Mitigation Measure E-9: Rider Improvements, and Mitigation Measure E-10: Transit Enhancement, the SFMTA is implementing the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP), which was approved by the SFMTA Board of Directors in March 2014. The TEP (now called Muni Forward) includes system-wide review, evaluation, and recommendations to improve service and increase transportation efficiency. Examples of transit priority and pedestrian safety improvements within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area as part of Muni Forward include the 14 Mission Rapid Transit Project, the 22 Fillmore Extension along 16th Street to Mission Bay (expected construction between 2017 and 2020), and the Travel Time Reduction Project on Route 9 San Bruno (initiation in 2015). In addition, Muni Forward includes service improvements to various routes with the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area; for instance the implemented new Route 55 on 16th Street.

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

The project site is located within a quarter mile to one half-mile of several local transit lines including Muni lines 9-San Bruno, 9L-San Bruno Limited, 10-Townsend, 19-Polk, 22-Fillmore, 33-Stanyan, 55-16th Street Temporary Route, and K/T-Ingleside/Third Street light rail. The proposed project would be expected to generate 754 daily transit trips, including 126 during the p.m. peak hour. Given the wide availability of nearby transit, the addition of 126 p.m. peak hour transit trips would be accommodated by existing capacity. As such, the proposed project would not result in unacceptable levels of transit service or cause a substantial increase in delays or operating costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service could result.

Each of the rezoning options in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts relating to increases in transit ridership on Muni lines, with the Preferred Project having significant impacts on seven lines. Of those lines, the project site is located within a quarter-mile of Muni lines 9-San Bruno, 22-Fillmore, and 33-Stanyan. The proposed project would not contribute considerably to these conditions as its minor contribution of 126 p.m. peak hour transit trips would not be a substantial proportion of the overall additional transit volume generated by Eastern Neighborhood

http://tsp.sfplanning.org
projects. The proposed project would also not contribute considerably to 2025 cumulative transit conditions and thus would not result in any significant cumulative transit impacts.

**Conclusion**

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

Although the proposed project would have less-than-significant traffic impacts, the transportation study identified four improvement measures that could be implemented to lessen the effects of project-related vehicular traffic in the project vicinity. Project Improvement Measure 1 would implement project-specific travel demand strategies to reduce single occupancy vehicle trips. Project Improvement Measure 2 would implement queue abatement methods to ensure that recurring vehicle queues do not occur in the public right-of-way. Project Improvement Measure 3 would implement pedestrian safety enhancements to improve the Carolina Street frontage, which currently lacks a sidewalk. Lastly, Project Improvement Measure 4 would develop and implement a Construction Management Plan to address transportation-related circulation, access, worker parking, staging, and hours for work and deliveries. The recommended improvement measures are described in full in the Improvement Measures section, on page 55 of this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. NOISE—Would the project:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Be substantially affected by existing noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would result in significant noise impacts during construction activities and due to conflicts between noise-sensitive uses in proximity to noisy uses such as PDR, retail, entertainment, cultural/institutional/educational uses, and office uses. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also determined that incremental increases in traffic-related noise attributable to implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would be less than significant. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified six noise mitigation measures, three of which may be applicable to subsequent development projects. These mitigation measures would reduce noise impacts from construction and noisy land uses to less-than-significant levels.

Construction Noise

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 relate to construction noise. Mitigation Measure F-1 addresses individual projects that include pile-driving, and Mitigation Measure F-2 addresses individual projects that include particularly noisy construction procedures (including pile-driving). Based on the Geotechnical Investigation and communication with project sponsor, with respect to the proposed foundation, the proposed project would use torque-down piles, which have minimal vibration and noise (as compared to driven piles, for example). Furthermore, no other particularly noisy construction methods would be anticipated. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 would not be applicable to the proposed project.

In addition, all construction activities for the proposed project (approximately 24 months) would be subject to and would comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code). Construction noise is regulated by the Noise Ordinance. The Noise Ordinance 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 Public Works or the Director of the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) 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 a.m. unless the Director of Public Works authorizes a special permit for conducting the work during that period.

DBI is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance for private construction projects during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.). The Police Department is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance during all other hours. Nonetheless, during the construction period for the proposed project of approximately 24 months, occupants of the nearby properties could be disturbed by construction noise. Times may occur when noise could interfere with indoor activities in nearby residences and other

---

21 Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-3, F-4, and F-6 address the citing of sensitive land uses in noisy environments. In a decision issued on December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require an agency to consider the effects of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project’s future users or residents except where a project or its residents may exacerbate existing environmental hazards (California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, December 17, 2015, Case No. S213478. Available at http://www.courts.ca.gov/opinions/documents/S213478.PDF). As noted above, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that incremental increases in traffic-related noise attributable to implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would be less than significant, and thus would not exacerbate the existing noise environment. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measures F-3, F-4, and F-6 are not applicable. Nonetheless, for all noise sensitive uses, the general requirements for adequate interior noise levels of Mitigation Measures F-3 and F-4 are met by compliance with the acoustical standards required under the California Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations Title 24).
businesses near the project site. The increase in noise in the project area during project construction would not be considered a significant impact of the proposed project, because the construction noise would be temporary, intermittent, and restricted in occurrence and level, as the contractor would be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance and Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-1 and/or F-2, which would reduce construction noise impacts to a less than significant level.

Operational Noise

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5 addresses impacts related to individual projects that include uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise in the project vicinity. Ambient noise levels in San Francisco are largely influenced by traffic-related noise. The proposed project would be located along 16th Street, which is identified as having noise levels above 65 Ldn. An approximate doubling in traffic volumes in the area would be necessary to produce an increase in ambient noise levels barely perceptible to most people (3 decibel increase). The proposed project would not double traffic volumes because the proposed project would generate approximately 973 daily person trips by auto, with approximately 121 vehicle trips during the p.m. peak-hour. In addition, operation of the proposed project would not include any other constant or short-term noise sources (e.g., diesel generator) that would be perceptible in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, and thus Mitigation Measure F-5 does not apply.

The proposed project would be subject to the following interior noise standards, which are described for informational purposes. The California Building Standards Code (Title 24) establishes uniform noise insulation standards. The Title 24 acoustical requirement for residential structures is incorporated into Section 1207 of the San Francisco Building Code and requires these structures be designed to prevent the intrusion of exterior noise so that the noise level with windows closed, attributable to exterior sources, shall not exceed 45 dBA in any habitable room. The acoustical requirements of Title 24 are incorporated into the San Francisco Green Building Code. Title 24 allows the project sponsor to choose between a prescriptive or performance-based acoustical requirement for non-residential uses. Both compliance methods require wall, floor/ceiling, and window assemblies to meet certain sound transmission class or outdoor-indoor sound transmission class ratings to ensure that adequate interior noise standards are achieved. In compliance with Title 24, DBI would review the final building plans to ensure that the building wall, floor/ceiling, and window assemblies meet Title 24 acoustical requirements. If determined necessary by DBI, a detailed acoustical analysis of the exterior wall and window assemblies may be required.

Additionally, the proposed project would be subject to the Noise Regulations Relating to Residential Uses Near Places of Entertainment (Ordinance 70-15, effective June 19, 2015). The intent of these regulations is to address noise conflicts between residential uses in noise critical areas, such as in proximity to highways and other high-volume roadways, railroads, rapid transit lines, airports, nighttime entertainment venues or industrial areas. In accordance with the adopted regulations, residential structures to be located where the day-night average sound level (Ldn) or community noise equivalent level (CNEL) exceeds 60 decibels shall require an acoustical analysis with the application of a building permit showing that the proposed design would limit exterior noise to 45 decibels in any habitable room. Furthermore, the regulations require the Planning Department and Planning Commission to consider the

22 The Noise Model layer is in Ldn (level day night) and is based on San Francisco traffic as determined by the San Francisco Metropolitan Transportation agency’s SFCHAMP model. Traffic noise emissions were modeled using the FHWA Stamina model.
compatibility of uses when approving residential uses adjacent to or near existing permitted places of entertainment and take all reasonably available means through the City’s design review and approval processes to ensure that the design of new residential development projects take into account the needs and interests of both the places of entertainment and the future residents of the new development.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. AIR QUALITY—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 addresses air quality impacts during construction, PEIR Mitigation Measure G-2 addresses the siting of sensitive land uses near sources of TACs and PEIR Mitigation Measures G-3 and G-4 address proposed uses that would emit DPM and other TACs.

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

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

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

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

Criteria Air Pollutants

While the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that at a program-level the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in significant regional air quality impacts, the PEIR states that “Individual development projects undertaken in the future pursuant to the new zoning and area plans would be subject to a significance determination based on the BAAQMD’s quantitative thresholds for individual projects.”24 The BAAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (Air Quality Guidelines) provide screening criteria25 for determining whether a project’s criteria air pollutant emissions would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. Pursuant to the Air Quality Guidelines, projects that meet the screening criteria do not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants.

Criteria air pollutant emissions during construction and operation of the proposed project would meet the Air Quality Guidelines screening criteria. At 176 proposed dwelling units, in addition to approximately 3,300 gsf of PDR space and approximately 3,600 gsf of retail space, the proposed project meets the Air Quality Guidelines screening criteria for both construction and operations (494 dwelling units for operational and 240 dwelling units for construction under the category of “Apartment, mid-rise”; 8,000 sf for operational and 277,000 sf for construction under the category of “Fast food restaurant

25 Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, updated May 2011. See pp. 3-2 to 3-3.
without a drive-thru,” which is one of the most restrictive uses for a small commercial space, such as one being proposed; and 541,000 sf for operational and 259,000 sf for construction under the category of “general light industry”). In addition, approximately 3,500 cubic yards of soil would be excavated and exported off site, which is below the BAAQMD’s screening criteria that states that construction-related activities should not include extensive material transport (e.g., greater than 10,000 cubic yards of soil import/export) requiring a considerable amount of haul truck activity. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants, and a detailed air quality assessment is not required.

Health Risk

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

Construction

The project site is located within an identified Air Pollutant Exposure Zone; therefore, the ambient health risk to sensitive receptors from air pollutants is considered substantial. The proposed project would require heavy-duty off-road diesel vehicles and equipment during approximately two to three months of the anticipated 24-month construction period. Thus, Project Mitigation Measure 2 (Construction Air Quality) has been identified to implement the portions of Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 related to emissions exhaust by requiring engines with higher emissions standards on construction equipment. Project Mitigation Measure 2 (Construction Air Quality) would reduce DPM exhaust from construction equipment by 89 to 94 percent compared to uncontrolled construction equipment.26 Therefore, impacts related to construction health risks would be less than significant through implementation of Project Mitigation Measure 2 (Construction Air Quality). The full text of Project Mitigation Measure 2 (Construction Air Quality) is provided in the Mitigation Measures Section below.

26 PM emissions benefits are estimated by comparing off-road PM emission standards for Tier 2 with Tier 1 and 0. Tier 0 off-road engines do not have PM emission standards, but the United States Environmental Protection Agency’s Exhaust and Crankcase Emissions Factors for Nonroad Engine Modeling – Compression Ignition has estimated Tier 0 engines between 50 hp and 100 hp to have a PM emission factor of 0.72 g/hp-hr and greater than 100 hp to have a PM emission factor of 0.40 g/hp-hr. Therefore, requiring off-road equipment to have at least a Tier 2 engine would result in between a 25 percent and 63 percent reduction in PM emissions, as compared to off-road equipment with Tier 0 or Tier 1 engines. The 25 percent reduction comes from comparing the PM emission standards for off-road engines between 25 hp and 50 hp for Tier 1 (0.45 g/bhp-hr) and Tier 1 (0.60 g/bhp-hr). The 63 percent reduction comes from comparing the PM emission standards for off-road engines above 175 hp for Tier 1 (0.15 g/bhp-hr) and Tier 0 (0.40 g/bhp-hr). In addition to the Tier 2 requirement, ARB Level 3 VDECs are required and would reduce PM by an additional 85 percent. Therefore, the mitigation measure would result in between an 89 percent (0.0675 g/bhp-hr) and 94 percent (0.0225 g/bhp-hr) reduction in PM emissions, as compared to equipment with Tier 1 (0.60 g/bhp-hr) or Tier 0 engines (0.40 g/bhp-hr).
Siting Sensitive Land Uses

For sensitive use projects within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone as defined by Article 38, such as the proposed project, the Ordinance requires that the project sponsor submit an Enhanced Ventilation Proposal for approval by the Department of Public Health (DPH) that achieves protection from PM2.5 (fine particulate matter) equivalent to that associated with a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value 13 filtration. DBI will not issue a building permit without written notification from the Director of Public Health that the applicant has an approved Enhanced Ventilation Proposal.

In compliance with Article 38, the project sponsor has submitted an initial application to DPH.\(^27\) The regulations and procedures set forth by Article 38 would ensure that exposure to sensitive receptors would not be significant. These requirements supersede the provisions of Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-2. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-2 Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses is no longer applicable to the proposed project, and impacts related to siting new sensitive land uses would be less than significant through compliance with Article 38.

Siting New Sources

The proposed project would not be expected to generate 100 trucks per day or 40 refrigerated trucks per day. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-3 is not applicable. Moreover, the proposed project would not include any sources that would emit DPM or other TACs. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-4 is not applicable and impacts related to siting new sources of pollutants would be less than significant.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, with incorporation of Project Mitigation Measure 2, Construction Air Quality, during the construction phase, the project would not result in significant air quality impacts that were not identified in the PEIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR assessed the GHG emissions that could result from rezoning of the Showplace Square/Potrero Hill Area Plan under the three rezoning options. The Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning Options A, B, and C are anticipated to result in GHG emissions on the order of 4.2, 4.3 and 4.5 metric tons of CO₂E\(^28\) per service population,\(^29\) respectively. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded

---

\(^{27}\) Application for Article 38 Compliance Assessment, May 29, 2014.

\(^{28}\) CO₂E, defined as equivalent Carbon Dioxide, is a quantity that describes other greenhouse gases in terms of the amount of Carbon Dioxide that would have an equal global warming potential.
that the resulting GHG emissions from the three options analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans would be less than significant. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The BAAQMD has prepared guidelines and methodologies for analyzing GHGs. These guidelines are consistent with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.4 and 15183.5 which address the analysis and determination of significant impacts from a proposed project’s GHG emissions and allow for projects that are consistent with an adopted GHG reduction strategy to conclude that the project’s GHG impact is less than significant. San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco’s GHG reduction strategy in compliance with the BAAQMD and CEQA guidelines. These GHG reduction actions have resulted in a 23.3 percent reduction in GHG emissions in 2012 compared to 1990 levels, exceeding the year 2020 reduction goals outlined in the BAAQMD’s 2010 Clean Air Plan, Executive Order S-3-05, and Assembly Bill 32 (also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act). In addition, San Francisco’s GHG reduction goals are consistent with, or more aggressive than, the long-term goals established under Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-30-15. Therefore, projects that are consistent with San Francisco’s GHG Reduction Strategy would not result in GHG emissions that would have a significant effect on the environment and would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations.

The proposed project would increase the intensity of use of the site by replacing existing warehouse uses with 176 residential units and approximately 6,900 sf of retail uses. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to annual long-term increases in GHGs as a result of increased vehicle trips (mobile sources) and residential and commercial, and PDR operations that result in an increase in energy use, water use, wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal. Construction activities would also result in temporary increases in GHG emissions.

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


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

36 Executive Order S-3-05 sets forth a series of target dates by which statewide emissions of GHGs need to be progressively reduced, as follows: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels (approximately 457 million MTCO2E); by 2020, reduce emissions to 1990 levels (approximately 427 million MTCO2E); and by 2050 reduce emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels (approximately 85 million MTCO2E).


38 San Francisco’s GHG reduction goals are codified in Section 902 of the Environment Code and include: (i) by 2008, determine City GHG emissions for year 1990; (ii) by 2017, reduce GHG emissions by 25 percent below 1990 levels; (iii) by 2025, reduce GHG emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels; and by 2050, reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels.
The proposed project would be subject to regulations adopted to reduce GHG emissions as identified in the GHG reduction strategy. As discussed below, compliance with the applicable regulations would reduce the project’s GHG emissions related to transportation, energy use, waste disposal, wood burning, and use of refrigerants.

Compliance with the transportation management programs, Transportation Sustainability Fee, bicycle parking requirements, low-emission car parking requirements, and car sharing requirements would reduce the proposed project’s transportation-related emissions. These regulations reduce GHG emissions from single-occupancy vehicles by promoting the use of alternative transportation modes with zero or lower GHG emissions on a per capita basis.

The proposed project would be required to comply with the energy efficiency requirements of the City’s Green Building Code, Stormwater Management Ordinance, Water Conservation and Irrigation ordinances, and Energy Conservation Ordinance, which would promote energy and water efficiency, thereby reducing the proposed project’s energy-related GHG emissions.39

The proposed project’s waste-related emissions would be reduced through compliance with the City’s Recycling and Compositing Ordinance, Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Ordinance, and Green Building Code requirements. These regulations reduce the amount of materials sent to a landfill, reducing GHGs emitted by landfill operations. These regulations also promote reuse of materials, conserving their embodied energy40 and reducing the energy required to produce new materials.

Compliance with the City’s Street Tree Planting requirements would serve to increase carbon sequestration. Other regulations, including those limiting refrigerant emissions and the Wood Burning Fireplace Ordinance would reduce emissions of GHGs and black carbon, respectively. Regulations requiring low-emitting finishes would reduce volatile organic compounds (VOCs).41 Thus, the proposed project was determined to be consistent with San Francisco’s GHG reduction strategy.42

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **WIND AND SHADOW**—Would the project:

a) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?

|   |   |   |   | ☒ |

---

39 Compliance with water conservation measures reduce the energy (and GHG emissions) required to convey, pump and treat water required for the project.

40 Embodied energy is the total energy required for the extraction, processing, manufacture and delivery of building materials to the building site.

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

b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?

Wind

Based upon experience of the Planning Department in reviewing wind analyses and expert opinion on other projects, it is generally (but not always) the case that projects under 80 feet in height do not have the potential to generate significant wind impacts. The proposed building would be six stories and would extend 68 feet in height, with an additional approximately 12 feet to the top of rooftop elements. Since the rooftop elements would take up a fairly minor portion of the roof and would not extend across the entirety of any of the façade(s), they would not be expected to contribute to channeling of winds downward to the pedestrian level. Although the proposed 68-foot-tall building would be taller than the immediately adjacent buildings, it would not be sufficiently large so as to direct winds to the pedestrian level in a way that would be expected to exceed the pedestrian wind hazard criteria. Hence, the proposed project is not anticipated to cause significant impacts related to wind that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Shadow

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

The proposed project would construct a 68-foot-tall building (with an additional approximately 12 feet to the top of rooftop elements); therefore, the Planning Department prepared a preliminary shadow fan analysis a shadow analysis to determine whether the project would have the potential to cast new shadow on nearby parks. The shadow fan extrapolated the entire project site to the height of 80 feet to account for the proposed rooftop features that are allowed under the Planning Code. Based on the shadow fan, the project would not result in any new shadow on any public park or open space.

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

---

43 Preliminary Shadow Analysis, 1301 16th Street, July 20, 2015.
shading of private properties as a result of the proposed project would not be considered a significant impact under CEQA.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. RECREATION—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Physically degrade existing recreational resources?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

Furthermore, the Planning Code requires a specified amount of new usable open space (either private or common) for each new residential unit. Some developments are also required to provide privately owned, publicly accessible open spaces. The Planning Code open space requirements would help offset some of the additional open space needs generated by increased residential population to the project area.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact to the provision of water, wastewater collection and treatment, and solid waste collection and disposal. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. PUBLIC SERVICES—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

No street trees currently exist on sidewalks along any of the project site’s facades. The project sponsor proposes six new street trees spaced across the length of the property along Wisconsin Street, six new street trees spaced across the length of the property along Carolina Street and eight new street trees spaced across the length of the property along Sixteenth Street.
13. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
   i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)
   ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
   iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
   iv) Landslides?

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

c) Be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

f) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?

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

A geotechnical investigation was prepared for the proposed project. According to the geotechnical investigation, based on two test borings and three cone penetration tests, as well as laboratory testing on

---

44 Rockridge Geotechnical, Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Mixed-Use Building, 1301 16th Street, San Francisco, California, December 9, 2013.
selected soil samples, the site in underlain by approximately 15 to 17 feet of artificial fill that consists of very loose to medium dense sand and clayey sand with variable amounts of gravel and construction debris. Beneath the fill is Bay Mud, a weak and highly compressible marine clay deposit, which extends to a depth of between 25 and 30 feet below ground surface (bgs). The Bay Mud is underlain by Older Bay and alluvial deposits consisting of stiff to very stiff clay with variable amounts of sand and medium dense to very dense sand with variable amounts of silt and clay. The Old Bay and alluvial deposits extend to the maximum depths explored of 50 to 60 feet bgs. Groundwater was encountered between 8.5 feet and 13 feet bgs among all borings and samples, and is expected to vary several feet annually, depending on rainfall amounts. While the report noted that the primary geotechnical concern at the project site is the presence of up to 30 feet of loose/weak soil underlying the site, it concluded that the proposed project can be developed as planned, provided the recommendations presented in the report are incorporated into the project plans and specifications and property implemented during construction. It is also noted that, based on review of Planning Department records, the project site is located in an area subject to liquefaction. The geotechnical investigation recommended the proposed structure be supported on either torque-down piles or auger cast-in-place piles, both of which have relatively minimal noise and vibration effects. Based on communication with the project sponsor, the most likely foundation type for the proposed project is torque-down piles.45

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45 Email from Bailey Randall, Workshop 1 to Tania Sheyner, Planning Department, July 24, 2015.
The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact on hydrology and water quality, including the combined sewer system and the potential for combined sewer outflows. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The project site is fully developed and currently contains a one-story warehouse that covers the entire parcel. The site’s topography is generally flat. The proposed project would also cover the entire project site; however, given the existing extent of impervious surfaces on the project site, it would not be expected to result in a net increase in impervious surfaces on-site. The project would provide an approximately 7,800 square foot open space on the second level, of which approximately 4,800 would be a landscaped common space. While some of the common and most of the private open space would not be covered with vegetation (and would therefore be imperious), the landscaping proposed as part of the project would nevertheless incrementally reduce surface stormwater runoff from the project site. Overall, it is expected that the proposed project would result in similar or a slight net decrease in impervious surfaces, as compared to the existing on-site conditions. Moreover, the proposed project is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans. The EN PEIR found that the rezoning and community plans could slightly decrease the volume of stormwater runoff discharged to the combined sewer system since, on the whole, the plans would result in a net increase in pervious surfaces through the addition of open space in individual projects. While any increase in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pervious surfaces at the project site would be incremental, the proposed project would nevertheless not be expected to result in any increases in stormwater runoff. Hence, the proposed project would not increase stormwater runoff.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Hazardous Building Materials

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that future development in the Plan Area may involve demolition or renovation of existing structures containing hazardous building materials. Some building materials commonly used in older buildings could present a public health risk if disturbed during an accident or during demolition or renovation of an existing building. Hazardous building materials addressed in the PEIR include asbestos, electrical equipment such as transformers and fluorescent light ballasts that contain PCBs or di (2 ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), fluorescent lights containing mercury vapors, and lead-based paints. Asbestos and lead based paint may also present a health risk to existing building occupants if they are in a deteriorated condition. If removed during demolition of a building, these materials would also require special disposal procedures. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified a significant impact associated with hazardous building materials including PCBs, DEHP, and mercury and determined that that Mitigation Measure L-1 (Hazardous Building Materials) would reduce effects to a less-than-significant level. Because the proposed development includes demolition of an existing building, Mitigation Measure L-1 would apply to the proposed project and is incorporated into the proposed project as Project Mitigation Measure 3 (see full text on page 55).

Soil and Groundwater Contamination

Since certification of the PEIR, Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance, was expanded to include properties throughout the City where there is potential to encounter hazardous materials, primarily industrial zoning districts, sites with industrial uses or underground storage tanks, sites with historic bay fill, and sites in close proximity to freeways or underground storage tanks. The over-arching goal of the Maher Ordinance is to protect public health and safety by requiring appropriate handling, treatment, disposal and when necessary, remediation of contaminated soils that are encountered in the building construction process. Projects that disturb 50 cubic yards or more of soil that are located on sites with potentially hazardous soil or groundwater within Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area are subject to this ordinance.

The proposed project would include excavation of approximately 3,500 cubic yards of fill. Based on a Phase I report prepared for the project (which summarized information contained in a 2005 Phase II Environmental Site Assessment) as well as various communications between the project sponsor and the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH), the project site contained a tannery and a glue factory in the late 1800’s and early 1900’s and a bulk fuel storage facility from approximately 1930 to 1966. During its use as a bulk fuel storage facility, the site contained numerous petroleum tanks, which varied in size, with five tanks being 10,000 gallons or larger at one point. The tanks were removed between 1965 and 1977. The current building on the site was constructed in the late 1970s as a warehouse and field office for Ritchfield Petroleum Company. At one point, the building was also occupied by pasta and sausage factories.

These (and possibly other unknown former uses) of may have resulted in various subsurface soil and groundwater contaminants to be present in the subsurface soils beneath the site. Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH). The Maher Ordinance requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. The Phase I ESA would
determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project. Based on that information, the project sponsor may be required to conduct soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis. Where such analysis reveals the presence of hazardous substances in excess of state or federal standards, the project sponsor is required to submit a site mitigation plan (SMP) to the DPH or other appropriate state or federal agency(ies), and to remediate any site contamination in accordance with an approved SMP prior to the issuance of any building permit.

In compliance with the Maher Ordinance, the project sponsor had submitted a Voluntary Remedial Action Program Application to DPH on July 25, 2013 as well as Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments (ESA).\textsuperscript{46,47} As part of these reports, John Carver Consulting (JCC) and ERM collected and analyzed subsurface samples from the property. The ERM investigation included four borings to 15 to 20 feet deep and analyzed for Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons as motor oil (TPHmo), diesel (TPHd), Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) as gasoline (TPHg), gasoline components benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene and xylenes (BTEX) and metals. TPH as gasoline diesel and motor oil, and elevated metals concentrations were detected in soil and groundwater. The JCC investigation included shallow soil samples (1.5-2.5 feet deep) and included TPH, volatile organic compounds (VOC), California Title 22 list of 17 metals (CAM 17).

Following DPH review of the above reports, DPH requested additional work in compliance with the Maher Ordinance in their December 6, 2013 communication to the project sponsor.\textsuperscript{49} The requested work included submittal of updated site use information, additional subsurface sampling, proposed building plans, including details of excavation and grading, and a Site Mitigation Plan (SMP) following implementation of an approved investigation work plan. DPH indicated in their letter that a deed restriction would be required for the proposed project because residual contamination will remain in the subsurface. The DPH letter indicated that they would consider issuing a No Further Action letter upon review of the final project completion report.

Following a meeting with DPH in March 2014 to discuss the proposed site development and status of environmental review, ACC submitted an investigation work plan in April 2014. DPH issued a work plan approval letter in July 2014.\textsuperscript{50} Lastly, ACC submitted a Soil and Groundwater Sampling Report in April 2015, which is being reviewed by DPH.\textsuperscript{51} The steps outlined above are in compliance with the Maher Program requirements and, consistent with standard procedures for similar properties throughout the city that deal with subsurface contamination, DPH will continue to work with the project sponsor to complete site remediation efforts to DPH satisfaction through project completion.

\textsuperscript{46} Voluntary Remedial Action Program Application, 1301 16\textsuperscript{th} Street, SF, July 25, 2013. Although Maher Application came into effect after this application was submitted and now supersedes the VRAP application, both applications serve the same purpose, which is to initiate coordination between the project sponsor and DPH regarding contamination characterization and site remediation. Hence, for purposes of this project, the VRAP and Maher applications are the same thing.

\textsuperscript{47} ACC Environmental Consultants, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Report, 1301 and 1313 16\textsuperscript{th} Street, and 130 Wisconsin Street, San Francisco, CA 94103, Project Number: 9883-002.00, November 18, 2013.

\textsuperscript{48} ERM, Report of Findings, Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, Domenici Property, 1301-1345 16\textsuperscript{th} Street, San Francisco, California, August 10, 2005.

\textsuperscript{49} Scott Nakamura, Department of Public Health, letter to William Mollard, Subject: Request for Supplemental Subsurface Investigation and Site Mitigation Plan, 1301 16\textsuperscript{th} Street, SMED 972, December 6, 2013.

\textsuperscript{50} Stephanie K. J. Cushing, Department of Public Health, letter to William Mollard, Subject: Workplan Approval, 1301 16\textsuperscript{th} Street, SMED 972, July 16, 2014.

\textsuperscript{51} ACC Environmental Consultants, Soil & Groundwater Sampling Report, 1301 16\textsuperscript{th} Street, San Francisco, CA 94103, Project Number: 9883-002.01, April 10, 2015.
Because the proposed project would be required to remediate soil and groundwater contamination described above in accordance with Article 22A of the Health Code, it would not result in any significant impacts related to hazardous materials that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES—Would the project:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

MITIGATION MEASURES

The project sponsor has agreed to implement the following mitigation measures, which would reduce the significant impacts of the project to a less-than-significant level. The project sponsor has agreed to implement them.

CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Project Mitigation Measure 1 – Accidental Discovery (Mitigation Measure J-2 of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)

The following mitigation measure is required to avoid any potential adverse effect from the proposed project on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) and (c). The project sponsor shall distribute the Planning Department archeological resource “ALERT” sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); or utilities firm involved in soils disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils disturbing activities being undertaken each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the “ALERT” sheet is circulated to all field personnel including, machine
operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the Alert Sheet.

Should any indication of an archeological resource be encountered during any soils disturbing activity of the project, the project Head Foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soils disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken.

If the ERO determines that an archeological resource may be present within the project site, the project sponsor shall retain the services of an archaeological consultant from the pool of qualified archaeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist. The archeological consultant shall advise the ERO as to whether the discovery is an archeological resource, retains sufficient integrity, and is of potential scientific/historical/cultural significance. If an archeological resource is present, the archeological consultant shall identify and evaluate the archeological resource. The archeological consultant shall make a recommendation as to what action, if any, is warranted. Based on this information, the ERO may require, if warranted, specific additional measures to be implemented by the project sponsor.

Measures might include: preservation in situ of the archeological resource; an archeological monitoring program; or an archeological testing program. If an archeological monitoring program or archeological testing program is required, it shall be consistent with the Environmental Planning (EP) division guidelines for such programs. The ERO may also require that the project sponsor immediately implement a site security program if the archeological resource is at risk from vandalism, looting, or other damaging actions.

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

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

Project Mitigation Measure 2: Construction Air Quality (Mitigation Measure G-1 of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)

The project sponsor or the project sponsor’s Contractor shall comply with the following

A. Engine Requirements.

1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 hp and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall have engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or California Air Resources Board (ARB) Tier 2 off-road emission standards, and have been retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy. Equipment with engines meeting Tier 4 Interim or Tier 4 Final off-road emission standards automatically meet this requirement.

2. Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited.

3. Diesel engines, whether for off-road or on-road equipment, shall not be left idling for more than two minutes, at any location, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment (e.g., traffic conditions, safe operating conditions). The Contractor shall post legible and visible signs in English, Spanish, and Chinese, in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two minute idling limit.

4. The Contractor shall instruct construction workers and equipment operators on the maintenance and tuning of construction equipment, and require that such workers and operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications.

B. Waivers.

1. The Planning Department’s Environmental Review Officer or designee (ERO) may waive the alternative source of power requirement of Subsection (A)(2) if an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site. If the ERO grants the waiver, the Contractor must submit documentation that the equipment used for onsite power generation meets the requirements of Subsection (A)(1).

2. The ERO may waive the equipment requirements of Subsection (A)(1) if: a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is technically not feasible; the equipment would not produce desired emissions reduction due to expected operating modes; installation of the equipment would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator; or, there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that is not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS. If the ERO grants the waiver, the Contractor must use the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment, according
to Table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Alternative</th>
<th>Engine Emission Standard</th>
<th>Emissions Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>ARB Level 2 VDECS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>ARB Level 1 VDECS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>Alternative Fuel*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How to use the table: If the ERO determines that the equipment requirements cannot be met, then the project sponsor would need to meet Compliance Alternative 1. If the ERO determines that the Contractor cannot supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then the Contractor must meet Compliance Alternative 2. If the ERO determines that the Contractor cannot supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 2, then the Contractor must meet Compliance Alternative 3.

** Alternative fuels are not a VDECS.

C. **Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.** Before starting on-site construction activities, the Contractor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the ERO for review and approval. The Plan shall state, in reasonable detail, how the Contractor will meet the requirements of Section A.

1. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase, with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. The description may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For VDECS installed, the description may include: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, ARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, the description shall also specify the type of alternative fuel being used.

2. The ERO shall ensure that all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into the contract specifications. The Plan shall include a certification statement that the Contractor agrees to comply fully with the Plan.

3. The Contractor shall make the Plan available to the public for review on-site during working hours. The Contractor shall post at the construction site a legible and visible sign summarizing the Plan. The sign shall also state that the public may ask to inspect the Plan for the project at any time during working hours and shall explain how to request to inspect the Plan. The Contractor shall post at least one copy of the sign in a visible location on each side of the construction site facing a public right-of-way.
D. Monitoring. After start of Construction Activities, the Contractor shall submit quarterly reports to the ERO documenting compliance with the Plan. After completion of construction activities and prior to receiving a final certificate of occupancy, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities, including the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase, and the specific information required in the Plan.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Project Mitigation Measure 3 – Hazardous Building Materials (Mitigation Measure L-1 of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR)

The project sponsor shall ensure that any existing equipment containing PCBs or DEPH, such as fluorescent light ballasts (that may be present within the existing buildings on the project site), are removed and property 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.

IMPROVEMENT MEASURES

The following improvement measures would reduce impacts of the proposed project that have been found to be less than significant. The project sponsor has agreed to implement them.

TRANSPORTATION

Project Improvement Measure 1 - Implement Additional and Project-Specific Travel Demand Strategies to Reduce Vehicle Trips

The Project sponsor and subsequent property owner would implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program that seeks to minimize the number of single occupancy vehicle trips (SOV) generated by the proposed Project for the lifetime of the Project. The TDM Program targets a reduction in SOV trips by encouraging persons to select other modes of transportation, including: walking, bicycling, transit, car-share, carpooling and/or other modes. The following contains a full menu of TDM program options which have been provided to the Project sponsor. The Project sponsor should consider the following TDM measures and select those that the Project would commit to implementing:

TR-1(a): Identify TDM Coordinator: The Project sponsor would identify a TDM coordinator for the Project site. The TDM Coordinator is responsible for the implementation and ongoing operation of all other TDM measures described below. The TDM Coordinator may be a brokered service through an existing transportation management association (e.g. the Transportation Management Association of San Francisco, TMASF), or the TDM Coordinator may be an existing staff member (e.g., property manager); the TDM Coordinator does not have to work full-time at the Project site. However, the TDM Coordinator would be the single point of contact for all transportation-related questions from building occupants and City staff. The TDM Coordinator would provide TDM training to other building staff about the transportation amenities and options available at the Project site and nearby.
TR-1(b): Provide Transportation and Trip Planning Information to Building Occupants:

Move-in packet: Provide a transportation insert for the move-in packet that includes information on transit service (local and regional, schedules and fares), information on where transit passes could be purchased, information on the 511 Regional Rideshare Program and nearby bike and car share programs, and information on where to find additional web-based alternative transportation materials (e.g., NextMuni phone app). This move-in packet should be continuously updated as local transportation options change, and the packet should be provided to each new building occupant. Provide Muni maps, San Francisco Bicycle and Pedestrian maps upon request.

TR-1(c): City Access for Data Collection: As part of an ongoing effort to quantify the efficacy of TDM measures in general, City staff may need to access the Project site (including the garage) to perform trip counts, and/or intercept surveys and/or other types of data collection. Any on-site activity would require sponsor or property management approval and be coordinated through the TDM Coordinator.

TR-1(d): Bicycle Measures:

(i) Parking: Increase the number of on-site secured bicycle parking beyond Planning Code requirements and/or provide additional bicycle facilities in the public right-of-way in on public right-of-way locations adjacent to or within a quarter mile of the Project site (e.g., sidewalks, on-street parking spaces).

(ii) Bay Area Bike Share: Project sponsor would cooperate with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, San Francisco Department of Public Works, and/or Bay Area Bike Share (agencies) and allow installation of a bike share station in the public right-of-way along the project’s frontage.

Project Improvement Measure 2 - Queue Abatement

It is the responsibility of the owner/operator of any off-street parking facility with more than 20 parking spaces (excluding loading and car-share spaces) to ensure that recurring vehicle queues do not occur on the public right-of-way.

A vehicle queue is defined as one or more vehicles (destined to the parking facility) blocking any portion of any public street, alley or sidewalk for a consecutive period of three minutes or longer on a daily or weekly basis. If recurring queuing occurs, the property owner, building manager, and/or operator of the parking garage shall employ methods as needed to abate the queue.

Appropriate abatement methods would vary depending on the characteristics and causes of the recurring queue, as well as the characteristics of the parking facility, the street(s) to which the facility connects, and the associated land uses (if applicable).

Suggested abatement methods include but are not limited to the following: redesign of facility to improve vehicle circulation and/or on-site queue capacity; employment of parking attendants; installation of LOT FULL signs with active management by parking attendants; use of valet parking or other space-efficient parking techniques; identification of alternative routes for accessing the garage; use of off-site parking
facilities or shared parking with nearby uses; use of parking occupancy sensors and signage directing drivers to available spaces; and travel demand management strategies such as those listed in Improvement Measure TR-1. Parking management techniques may be considered including additional bicycle parking, customer shuttles, delivery services, parking time limits, paid parking, time-of-day parking surcharge, or validated parking.

If the Planning Director, or his or her designee, suspects that a recurring queue is present, the Department shall notify the property owner in writing. Upon request, the owner/operator shall hire a qualified transportation consultant to evaluate the conditions at the site for no less than seven days. The consultant shall prepare a monitoring report to be submitted to the Department for review. If the Department determines that a recurring queue does exist, the facility owner/operator shall have 90 days from the date of the written determination to abate the queue.

**Project Improvement Measure 3 - Pedestrian Safety Enhancements**

Lack of sidewalk on Project’s western Carolina Street frontage which is a route to the nearest bus stop is being addressed by the applicant who proposes to build a new sidewalk during the construction of the Project.

**Project Improvement Measure 4 - Construction Management**

The Project sponsor or property owner would develop and implement a Construction Management Plan (CMP), as required, addressing transportation-related circulation, access, worker parking, staging, and hours for work and deliveries.

The CMP would disseminate appropriate information to contractors and affected agencies with respect to coordinating construction activities to minimize overall disruptions and ensure that overall circulation in the Project area is maintained to the extent possible, with particular focus on ensuring transit, pedestrian, and bicycle connectivity. The CMP should include, but not limited to, the following additional measures:

1. Identify construction traffic management best practices in San Francisco, as well as others that, although not being implemented in the City, could provide valuable information for the Project. Management practices include, but are not limited to the following:
   a) Identifying ways to reduce construction worker vehicle-trips through transportation demand management programs and methods to manage construction worker parking demands, including encouraging and rewarding alternate modes of transportation, carpooling, or providing shuttle service from a nearby off-street parking facility, or a remote worker parking location.
   b) Identifying ways to consolidate truck delivery trips, minimizing delivery trips.
   c) Restricting deliveries and trucks trips to the Project site during peak hours (generally 7 AM to 9 AM and 4 PM to 6 PM, but may include other times of peaked traffic in the Showplace Square/Potrero District).
   d) Require consultation with surrounding community, including business and property owners near the Project site to assist coordination of construction traffic management strategies as they relate to the needs of other users adjacent to the Project site.
e) Develop a public information plan to provide adjacent residents and businesses with regularly-updated information regarding Project construction activities and duration, peak construction vehicle activities, (e.g. concrete pours), lane closures, and provide construction management contact to log and address community concerns.

2. Temporary rerouting of the eastbound direction of Bicycle Route 40 (most likely to 17th Street) during active construction along the 16th Street frontage, and possibly for the duration of the Project construction.

3. Temporary rerouting of pedestrian travel along the Project frontage, and/or construction of a temporary partially enclosed passageway along the Project’s frontage. Such a passageway may also suffice as protection for bicyclists riding eastbound on Route 40, if kept free of construction debris.