Community Plan Exemption Checklist

Case No.: 2014-002628ENV
Project Address: 1125 Mission Street
Zoning: MUO (Mixed Use – Office) Zoning District
65-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 3727/091
Lot Size: 12,000 square feet [0.28 acres]
Plan Area: Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan
Project Sponsor: John Kevlin - Reuben, Junius, & Rose – (415) 567-9000
Staff Contact: Christopher Espiritu – (415) 575-9022; christopher.espiritu@sfgov.org

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site at 1125 Mission Street is located within San Francisco’s East South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood. The project site is a mid-block through lot located on the block bounded by Mission Street to the north, Minna Street to the south, Seventh Street to the east, and Julia Street to the west (See Figure 1, Project Location).

The proposed project would include the conversion of an existing automobile repair facility and parking garage to a new office building. The existing building is approximately 36,000 gross square feet (gsf), with two stories over a basement level and includes 40 vehicle parking spaces and an auto repair facility. The existing building occupies the entire approximately 12,000-square-foot (sq ft) rectangular lot, which extends from Mission Street through to Minna Street.

The proposed project would not include demolition of the existing building (constructed in 1927), but would include the removal of existing ramps between the two floors, exterior façade changes and interior renovation. Figures 2 and 3 show proposed plans for the Basement, Floor 1, Floor 2, and the proposed Mezzanine. The proposed project would not include excavation, or any soil disturbance, and would not include any addition in height to the existing building (see Figure 4, Proposed Elevations). The project would not provide off-street vehicle parking; however, 16 Class II bicycle parking spaces would be located on-site. Also, two existing curb cuts located along the Mission Street frontage of the project site would be removed and restored to standard sidewalk dimensions, resulting in the addition of two new on-street vehicle parking spaces. The Interstate 80 freeway is located less than one-and-a-half miles south of the project site, and the nearest access ramp is the westbound on-ramp located at Seventh and Harrison Streets approximately four blocks southeast of the project site.
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Figure 4. Proposed Elevations
The proposed 1125 Mission Street project would require the following approvals:

**Actions by the Planning Commission**

- Approval of an Office Allocation from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 321 to allow for additional office space. The approval of the office allocation by the Planning Commission is the Approval Action for the project.

**Actions by other City Departments**

- Approval of Building Permits from the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for the proposed interior construction.
- Approval of a Street Improvement Permit from the Department of Public Works for the construction of standard-height sidewalks along the project frontage.

**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) were 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 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 involves the conversion of an existing two-story building. The project would not include demolition, but would create approximately 39,000 sq ft of new office 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 regulating Aesthetics and Parking Impacts for Transit Priority Infill, effective January 2014 (see associated heading below);
- 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, effective 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 area, 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).\textsuperscript{2} The 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).\textsuperscript{3}

As of July 31, 2015, projects containing 8,559 dwelling units and 2,231,595 square feet of non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) have completed or are proposed to complete environmental review\textsuperscript{4} within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area. These estimates include projects that have completed environmental review (4,885 dwelling units and 1,472,688 square feet of non-residential space) and foreseeable projects, including the proposed project (3,674 dwelling units and 758,907 square feet of non-residential space). Foreseeable projects are those projects for which environmental evaluation applications have been submitted to the San Francisco Planning Department. Of the 4,885 dwelling units that have completed environmental review, building permits have been issued for 3,710 dwelling units, or approximately 76 percent of those units (information is not available regarding building permit non-residential square footage). An issued building permit means the buildings containing those dwelling units are currently under construction or open for occupancy.

Within the East SoMa subarea, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR projected that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan could result in an increase of 2,300 to 3,100 net dwelling units and 1,000,000 to 1,600,000 net non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) through the year 2025. As of July 31, 2015, projects containing 2,114 dwelling units and 1,041,289 square feet of non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) have completed or are proposed to complete environmental review within the East SoMa subarea. These estimates include projects that have completed environmental review (808 dwelling units and 713,271 square feet of non-residential space) and foreseeable projects, including the proposed project (1,306 dwelling units and 328,018 square feet of non-residential space). Of the 808 dwelling units that have completed environmental review, building permits have been issued for 745 dwelling units, or approximately 92 percent of those units.

\textsuperscript{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 separately in Tables 5, 7, 9, and 11 in the Draft EIR. Environmental impact assessments for these pipeline projects were considered separately from the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning effort.


\textsuperscript{4} 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).
Growth that has occurred within the Plan area 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 reasonably foreseeable growth in the residential land use category is approaching the projections within the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, the non-residential reasonably foreseeable growth is between approximately 34 and 69 percent of the non-residential projections in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. 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. In summary, projects proposed within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area have not exceeded the overall 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.

**AESTHETICS AND PARKING IMPACTS FOR TRANSIT PRIORITY INFILL DEVELOPMENT**

Public Resources Code Section 21099(d), effective January 1, 2014, provides that, “aesthetics and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project on an infill site located within a transit priority area shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.” Accordingly, aesthetics and parking are no longer to be considered in determining if a project has the potential to result in significant environmental effects for projects that meet 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 because the project is located on a site that is currently developed and zoned MUO, which allows office use, and within a dense urban area. The project is located in proximity to the 14/14R Mission bus line, and other nearby transit lines, and would create a new employment center on-site. 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 (Figure 4), and an assessment of parking demand is included in the Transportation section for informational purposes.

---

5 San Francisco Planning Department. Transit-Oriented Infill Project Eligibility Checklist for 1125 Mission Street, November 2015. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 as part of Case File No. 2014-002628ENV.
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 East SoMa subarea, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR considered the effects of losing up to approximately 770,000 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 Considerations with CEQA Findings and adopted as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Areas Plans approval on January 19, 2009.

As of July 2014, projects containing the removal of 1,748,422 net square feet of PDR space have completed or are proposed to complete environmental review within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area. These estimates include projects that have completed environmental review (796,446 square feet of PDR space loss) and foreseeable projects, including the proposed project (951,976 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 July 2014, projects containing the removal of approximately 516,935 net square feet of PDR space have completed or are proposed to complete environmental review within the East SoMa subarea. These estimates include projects that have completed environmental review (loss of 329,408 square feet of PDR space) and foreseeable projects, including the proposed project (loss of 187,527 square feet of PDR space).

Development of the proposed project would result in the net loss of approximately 36,000 square feet of PDR building space 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 MUO (Mixed Use – Office) Use District, which encourages office uses and housing, and the proposed project is within the development density as envisioned for the site under the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The proposed loss of 36,000 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 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 MU O (Mixed Use – Office) Zoning District and is consistent with the height, bulk, density and land uses envisioned in the East SoMa Area Plan. The area plan encourages small, flexible office space throughout East SoMa, and larger offices along the 2nd Street corridor, which is intended to serve as a "secondary office reservoir for downtown." As proposed, under Section 321 of the Planning Code, the project requires an Office Allocation from the Planning Commission. The proposed project also complies with all other applicable Planning Code requirements and, on balance, is consistent with the General Plan. The Mixed Use district acknowledges and maintains the mixed character of the area by encouraging PDR, small office, and residential uses.6 7

For these reasons, 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.

<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>

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)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

6 Adam Varat, Senior Planner, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 1125 Mission Street, December 2015. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2014-002628ENV.

7 Jeff Joslin, Director of Current Planning, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 1125 Mission Street, December 2015. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2014-002628ENV.
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 involve conversion of PDR space to office use, resulting in approximately 39,000 square feet of new office space. The proposed project’s office use is anticipated to add approximately 150 jobs. The increase in jobs would also result in an increase in demand for housing, though not all workers would seek housing within the Eastern Neighborhoods area. No displacement of existing housing would occur, as there is no housing present on the project site. 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: CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:</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) 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 building on the project site was determined to be a historic resource by the Department. In order to determine whether the proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change to a historic resource, Preservation Staff reviewed the proposed project for consistency with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. As described the Preservation Team Review Form (PTR), the proposed project would undertake interior alterations and appropriately rehabilitate the exterior of the subject property according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. In addition, the project would restore and preserve the historic character of 1125 Mission Street by removing inappropriate alterations. On the ground floor, the project would replace the existing roll-up door with a new glazed aluminum storefront system. This glazed storefront system would maintain the existing

---

8 Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, *Preservation Team Review Form - 1125 Mission Street*, December 2015. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2014-002628ENV.
arched openings, and would permit transparency at the street level. On the upper levels, the project would replace the existing windows with new multi-lite windows, which would match the existing historic configuration and pattern. Finally, the project would remove inappropriate alterations to the subject property, including a large projecting sign on the primary facade and a metal guardrail on the roof along the parapet. As determined by Staff, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in a historic resource, and would be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. 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 assessment report has been prepared or for which the archeological documentation is incomplete or inadequate to serve as an evaluation of potential effects on archeological resources under CEQA. Mitigation Measure J-3, which applies to properties in the Mission Dolores Archeological District, requires that a specific archeological testing program be conducted by a qualified archeological consultant with expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology.

The proposed project involves converting existing PDR space to office use. The project site is located within Eastern neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure J-2. However, the proposed project would not include any excavation or soil disturbance. As such, no archeological resource impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on archeological resources that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.
## Topics:

### 4. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION—

**Would the project:**

- **a)** Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

- **b)** Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

- **c)** Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels, obstructions to flight, or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?

- **d)** Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?

- **e)** Result in inadequate emergency access?

- **f)** Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

<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)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>☐</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 traffic and transit ridership, and identified 11 transportation mitigation measures, which are described further below in the Traffic and Transit sub-sections. Even with mitigation, however, it was anticipated that the significant adverse cumulative traffic impacts and the cumulative impacts on transit lines could not be fully mitigated. Thus, these impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable.

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.
Trip Generation

The proposed project would include the conversion of an existing two-story industrial building to new office space. The proposed project would not include vehicle parking spaces on-site, but would include 16 Class II bicycle parking spaces on-site.

Trip generation of the proposed project was calculated using information in the 2002 Transportation Impacts Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review (SF Guidelines) developed by the San Francisco Planning Department. For the purposes of trip generation calculations, the project site is assumed to be vacant. The proposed project would generate an estimated 691 person trips (inbound and outbound) on a weekday daily basis, consisting of 256 person trips by auto, 241 transit trips, 159 walk trips and 35 trips by other modes. During the p.m. peak hour, the proposed project would generate an estimated 14 vehicle trips (accounting for vehicle occupancy data for this Census Tract).

Traffic

Mitigation Measures E-1 through E-4 in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR were adopted as part of the Plan with uncertain feasibility to address significant traffic impacts. These measures are not applicable to the proposed project, as they are plan-level mitigations to be implemented by City and County agencies. Since certification of the PEIR, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) has been engaged in public outreach regarding some of the parking-related measures identified in Mitigation Measures E-2 and E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management, although they have not been implemented. Measures that have been implemented include traffic signal installation at Rhode Island/16th streets as identified in Mitigation Measure E-1 and enhanced funding as identified in Mitigation Measure E-3 through San Francisco propositions A and B passed in November 2014. Proposition A authorized the City to borrow $500 million through issuing general obligation bonds in order to meet some of the transportation infrastructure needs of the City. These funds are allocated for constructing transit-only lanes and separated bikeways, installing new boarding islands and escalators at Muni/Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) stops, installing sidewalk curb bulb-outs, raised crosswalks, median islands, and bicycle parking and upgrading Muni maintenance facilities, among various other improvements. Proposition B, which also passed in November 2014, amends the City Charter to increase the amount the City provides to the SFMTA based on the City’s population, with such funds to be used to improve Muni service and street safety. Some of this funding may be applied to transportation projects within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area.

The proposed project’s vehicle trips would travel through the intersections surrounding the project block. Intersection operating conditions are characterized by the concept of Level of Service (LOS), which ranges from A to F and provides a description of an intersection’s performance based on traffic volumes, intersection capacity, and vehicle delays. LOS A represents free flow conditions, with little or no delay, while LOS F represents congested conditions, with extremely long delays; LOS D (moderately high
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9 San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Calculations for 1125 Mission Street, November 2015. These calculations are available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2014-002628ENV.
delays) is considered the lowest acceptable level in San Francisco. The intersections near the project site (within approximately 800 feet) include Seventh/Mission, Seventh/Market, Ninth/Mission, Eighth/Market, Eighth/Howard, Eighth/Folsom, and Seventh/Folsom streets. Table 1 provides existing and cumulative LOS data gathered for these intersections, per the California Pacific Medical Center Long Range Development Plan (CPMC LRDP) project, 1036 Market Street, and Western SoMa Community Plan.10

Table 1: Level of Service at Nearby Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing LOS</th>
<th>Cumulative LOS (2030)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Street/Mission Street</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>LOS D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Street/Market Street</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth Street/Mission Street</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>LOS D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Street/Market Street</td>
<td>LOS E</td>
<td>LOS F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Street/Howard Street</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Street/Folsom Street</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>LOS D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Street/Folsom Street</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: CPMC LRDP (Planning Department Case No. 2005.0555E), 1036 Market Street (Planning Department Case No. 2014.0103E) and Western SoMa Community Plan (Planning Department Case No. 2008.0877E).

The proposed project would generate an estimated 14 new p.m. peak hour vehicle trips that could travel through surrounding intersections. This amount of new p.m. peak hour vehicle trips would not substantially increase traffic volumes at these or other nearby intersections, would not substantially increase average delay that would cause intersections that currently operate at acceptable LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable LOS, or would not substantially increase average delay at intersections that currently operate at unacceptable LOS.

The proposed project would not contribute considerably to LOS delay conditions as its contribution of an estimated 14 new p.m. peak-hour vehicle trips would not be a substantial proportion of the overall traffic volume or the new vehicle trips generated by Eastern Neighborhoods’ Plan projects. The proposed project would also not contribute considerably to cumulative conditions and thus, the proposed project would not have any significant cumulative traffic impacts.

10 CPMC LRDP (Planning Department Case No. 2005.0555E), 1036 Market Street (Planning Department Case No. 2014.0103E) and Western SoMa Community Plan (Planning Department Case No. 2008.0877E). These documents are available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of their respective case file numbers.
For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on traffic that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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, the City is currently conducting outreach regarding Mitigation Measures E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding and Mitigation Measure E-11: Transportation Demand Management as 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.

The project site is located within a quarter mile of several local transit lines including Muni lines 5 Fulton, 6 Parnassus, 7/7R Haight/Noriega, 9/9R San Bruno, 12 Folsom/Pacific, 14/14R Mission, 19 Polk, and 83X Mid-Market Express, as well as the Muni Metro (J, K, L, M, N, T) and the Historic Streetcar F Line. The proposed project would be expected to generate 241 daily transit trips, including 28 during the p.m. peak hour. Given the wide availability of nearby transit, the addition of 28 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 analyzed, the project site is located within a quarter-mile of Muni line 9 San Bruno.

The proposed project would not contribute considerably to these conditions as its minor contribution of 28 p.m. peak hour transit trips would not be a substantial proportion of the overall additional transit volume generated by Eastern Neighborhood projects. The proposed project would also not contribute considerably to cumulative transit conditions and thus would not result in any significant cumulative transit impacts.
For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to transit and would not contribute considerably to cumulative transit impacts that were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

While the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes would not result in significant impacts related to pedestrians and bicyclists, the proposed project would introduce new pedestrian and bicycle traffic to the project site and nearby streets. The proposed project would add approximately seven pedestrian walk-trips and two trips made by other modes (including bicycles) during the p.m. peak hour. The addition of nine p.m. peak hour pedestrian and other trips (including bicycles) to nearby streets in the vicinity of the project site would not be a substantial contribution to pedestrian and bicycle traffic conditions. The proposed project would not include on-site vehicle parking and would not include street changes. Therefore, the project would not create new design features (i.e. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses that would substantially increase hazards beyond those that already exist, nor would it decrease the performance or safety of existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the project area.

In addition, PEIR Mitigation Measure E-7 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.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to pedestrian facilities and bicycles and would not contribute considerably to cumulative impacts that were 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>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>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, in an area within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
f) For a project located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
g) Be substantially affected by existing noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The 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 that would reduce noise impacts from construction and noisy land uses to less-than-significant levels.

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). The proposed project would include the interior conversion of an existing two-story building from automobile repair and parking garage to office. The project would not involve demolition of the existing building. No new foundations would be proposed as part of the project. Mitigation Measure F-1, which pertains to construction noise resulting from pile driving, is not applicable to the proposed project. The proposed project would require limited use of heavy construction equipment for approximately four to six hours per day and no more than five days per week, during the 10-month construction period. In addition, construction equipment noise would primarily occur in the building interior and would be primarily insulated by the existing building. Therefore Mitigation Measure F-2, which requires use of site-specific construction noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant, would not be applicable to the proposed project at 1125 Mission Street.
In addition, all construction activities for the proposed project (approximately 10 months) would be subject to and would comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code) (Noise Ordinance). 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 Department of Public Works (DPW) 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 DPW 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 10 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 businesses near the project site. The increase in noise in the project area during project-related 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, which would reduce construction noise impacts to a less than significant level.

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-3 and F-4 require that a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements be conducted for new development that includes noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn) or near existing noise-generating uses. The proposed project does not include noise-sensitive uses, therefore Mitigation Measures F-3 and F-4 are not applicable.

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5 addresses impacts related to individual projects that include new noise-generating uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise in the proposed project site vicinity. The proposed project does not include noise-generating land uses, so Mitigation Measure F-5 is not applicable. However, the proposed project would include the installation of a new Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) system. The proposed HVAC system would be required to comply with the noise limits for fixed stationary sources detailed in Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code. Thus, the proposed HVAC system would not result in significant noise impacts.

Mitigation Measure F-6 addresses impacts from existing ambient noise levels on open space required under the Planning Code for new development that includes noise sensitive uses. The proposed project would not include any proposed open space; therefore, Mitigation Measure F-6 is not applicable to the proposed project. 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.

---

### AIR QUALITY—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) 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\(^\text{11}\) 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.

---

\(^{11}\) 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. The proposed project requires demolition of the interior ramp, which could generate construction dust. In compliance with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance, the project sponsor and contractor responsible for construction activities at the project site would be required to control construction dust on the site through a combination of watering disturbed areas, covering stockpiled materials, street and sidewalk sweeping and other measures.

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.”

The BAAQMD’s CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (Air Quality Guidelines) provide screening criteria 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. The proposed project would include the interior conversion of an existing two-story building from an automobile repair and parking garage use to office use, which is below the screening criterion of 277,000 sq ft for new construction and 346,000 sq ft for operation of a general office building. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants, and a detailed air quality assessment is not required.

---


13 Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, updated May 2011. See pp. 3-2 to 3-3.
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, effective 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.

The proposed project would include conversion of PDR space to office use. One of the main factors of air quality impact evaluation is the duration of exposure and the age of the occupants. Occupants of proposed office uses are not considered a sensitive land use for purposes of air quality evaluation because they typically do not spend the majority of their lives in the building nor are they among the age groups that are particularly vulnerable to health impacts from air pollution. While the project site is located within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, Article 38 requirements would not be applicable to the project because the project does not propose sensitive land uses.

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 the anticipated 10-month construction period. Thus, Project Mitigation Measure 1 pertaining to 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 1 Construction Air Quality would reduce DPM exhaust from construction equipment by 89 to 94 percent compared to uncontrolled construction equipment. Therefore, impacts related to construction health risks would be less than significant through implementation of Project Mitigation Measure 1 Construction Air Quality. The full text of Project Mitigation Measure 1 Construction Air Quality is provided in the Mitigation Measures Section below.

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. Also, the proposed project would not include a backup diesel generator, or other sources of DPM or other TACs. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-4 related to siting of uses that emit TACs would not be applicable to the project.

---

13 CO$_2$E, 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.
For the above reasons, the proposed project and 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 East SoMa 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 CO$_2$E$^{15}$ per service population,$^{16}$ respectively. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded 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.

Regulations outlined in San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions have proven effective as San Francisco’s GHG emissions have measurably reduced when compared to 1990 emissions levels, demonstrating that the City has met and exceeded EO S-3-05, AB 32, and the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan GHG reduction goals for the year 2020. The proposed project was determined to be consistent with San Francisco’s GHG Reduction Strategy. Other existing regulations, such as those implemented through AB 32, will continue to reduce a proposed project’s contribution to climate change. Therefore, the proposed project’s GHG emissions would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations, and thus the proposed project’s contribution to GHG emissions would not be cumulatively considerable or generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment.

$^{15}$ CO$_2$E, 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.

$^{16}$ 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.
As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on greenhouse gas emissions 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>8. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 project would not involve the development of new buildings or any new structures 80 feet or taller at the project site. The proposed project would include the interior conversion of the existing two-story building on-site. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in 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 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 not involve the development of new buildings or any new structures above 40 feet in height at the project site and therefore, would not have the potential to cast new shadows.

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.
9. **RECREATION**—Would the project:

a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Physically degrade existing recreational resources? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The 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.

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 set to open in 2015 and 2016, respectively. 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).

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 citywide 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 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>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 East SoMa Plan 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.
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.

The proposed project would not include excavation or modifications to the existing foundations. A review of Planning Department records indicates that the project site is located in a seismic hazard zone (liquefaction zone), however no expansion of the existing building would occur and modifications to the existing building foundations are not proposed.
The project is required to conform to the San Francisco Building Code, which ensures the safety of all construction in the City. DBI will review the project-specific structural plans and any supplemental information during its review of the building permit for the project. In addition, DBI may require additional site specific studies, as needed. DBI’s 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.

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 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>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>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>
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 covered by the existing two-story industrial building. No changes to the footprint are proposed; therefore, no increase or decrease of the impervious surface coverage on the project site would occur. As a result, 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>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>

### 15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS—Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
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 Polychlorinated Biphenyl (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, as outlined below, would reduce effects to a less-than-significant level. Because the proposed development includes demolition of interior floors within an existing building which may contain hazardous materials, Project Mitigation Measure 2 (Mitigation Measure L-1) would apply to the proposed project. This mitigation measure requires proper handling and disposal of hazardous building materials. See full text of Project Mitigation Measure 2 (Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials) in the Mitigation Measures Section, below.
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 not require any soil disturbance greater than 50 cubic yards on the project site. However, the project site was known to have previous industrial uses (auto repair and parking garage). Therefore, the project would be subject to 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, 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 has submitted a Maher Application to DPH and a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment has been prepared to assess the potential for site contamination. The report identified that the existing building, at the time of the Phase I analysis, contained properly labeled and stored hazardous materials containers related to the auto repair use. No other evidence of hazardous materials or evidence of prior inappropriate storage of hazardous materials was found at the site during the Phase I analysis. A historical recognized environmental condition was identified at the project site due to the former presence of two 285-gallon underground storage tanks along the front of the building on Mission Street. However, both tanks were properly removed, including excavation of impacted soils, and a letter from DPH noting “no further action” was issued in September 20, 1996.

The proposed project would be required to remediate potential soil or groundwater contamination described above in accordance with Article 22A of the Health Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to hazardous materials 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>16. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mineral resource that would be of value to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important mineral resource recovery site delineated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on a local general plan, specific plan or other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land use plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Encourage activities which result in the use of</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these in a wasteful manner?</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:

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?  ☒

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?  ☒

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526)?  ☒

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?  ☒

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use?  ☒

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

Air Quality

Project Mitigation Measure 1 – Construction Air Quality (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure G-I)

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 – Off-Road Equipment Compliance Step-down Schedule

<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 2 – Hazardous Building Materials (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure L-1)

The project sponsor shall ensure that any equipment containing Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCBs) or di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.