Community Plan Exemption Checklist

Case No.: 2013.0485E
Project Address: 750 Harrison Street
Zoning: MUO (Mixed-Use Office)
85-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 3751/029
Lot Size: 6,398 square feet
Plan Area: Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan
Project Sponsor: Will Mollard, Workshop2 (415) 523-0304
Staff Contact: Kansai Uchida – (415) 575-9048, kansai.uchida@sfgov.org

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site at 750 Harrison Street is located in San Francisco’s East South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood. The approximately 6,400 square foot (sf) site (Assessor’s Block 3751, Lot 029) is located on the north side of Harrison Street, just west of Lapu Lapu Street (a small street between 3rd and 4th Streets). The subject block is bounded by Harrison Street to the south, 4th Street to the west, Folsom Street to the north, and 3rd Street to the east (see Figure 1, Project Location). The Interstate 80 freeway is located one-half block south of the project site, and the nearest access ramp is the westbound on-ramp located on the southwest corner of 4th and Harrison Streets approximately one-half block west of the project site. The project site is a through lot, with frontages on both Harrison Street and Rizal Street. The lot is L-shaped, and the Rizal Street frontage is narrower than the Harrison Street frontage.

The project site currently contains a 5,300 sf, one-story commercial building constructed in 1954, which is occupied by a nightclub (see Figure 2, Site Plan). A curb cut is present along the building’s Harrison Street frontage, and three off-street parking spaces are present on the project site. A curb cut and commercial loading door is present on the Rizal Street frontage. A paved setback exists along the Harrison Street frontage, and the rest of the parcel is covered by the existing building.

The proposed project includes demolition of the existing building and construction of a new eight-story, 85-foot-tall mixed-use building. Construction would last up to 18 months. The ground floor would be used for commercial space and residential common areas, and the upper floors would contain dwelling units. In total, the proposed new 42,000-sf building would include 77 studio dwelling units, approximately 2,900 sf of ground floor commercial space, a 1,300 sf internal courtyard at the second floor, and a 3,100 sf roof deck located at the Harrison Street side of the building. The roof of the proposed building would be 85 feet above street level, with roof deck features and circulation penthouses extending an additional 10 feet above the roof level. No basement level is proposed, and the building’s foundation system would require soil disturbance to approximately 22 feet below existing grade. No off-street vehicle parking is proposed, and the curb cuts on the Harrison Street and Rizal Street frontages would be removed. The project sponsor proposes to replace the site’s Harrison Street curb cut with a 350-sf sidewalk bulb-out that would include six on-street (Class 2) bicycle parking spaces. The building’s lobby would contain 78 indoor (Class 1) bicycle parking spaces for residents’ use. Figure 3, Proposed
Floor Plans and Figure 4, Proposed Street-Facing Elevations show additional details of the proposed building.

Figure 1 – Project Location
Figure 2(a) – Site Plan – Existing
Figure 2(b) – Site Plan – Proposed
Figure 3(a) – Proposed Floor Plans – Floor 1
Figure 3(b) – Proposed Floor Plans – Floor 2
Figure 3(c) – Proposed Floor Plans – Floors 3 through 8 (Typical)
Figure 3(d) – Proposed Floor Plans – Roof
Figure 4(a) – Proposed Street-Facing Elevations – South (Harrison Street)
Figure 4(b) – Proposed Street-Facing Elevations – North (Rizal Street)
The proposed 750 Harrison Street project would require the following approvals:

**Actions by the Planning Commission**
- Planning Code Section 329 (Large Project Authorization) approval

**Actions by other City Departments**
- Approval of building permits by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for demolition and new construction

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

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

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

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

The proposed project would include demolition of a single-story nightclub building and construction of a new eight-story, 77-unit residential building with ground floor retail 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.

**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 and thus, this checklist does not consider aesthetics or parking in determining the significance of project impacts under CEQA. Project elevations are included in the project description, and an assessment of parking demand is included in the Transportation section for informational purposes.

<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>1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that adoption of the Area Plans would result in an unavoidable significant impact on land use due to the cumulative loss of PDR. The proposed project would not remove any existing PDR uses and would therefore not contribute to any impact related to loss of PDR uses that was identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the Area Plans would not create any new physical barriers in the Easter Neighborhoods because the rezoning and Area Plans do not provide for any new major roadways, such as freeways that would disrupt or divide the project 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 MUO District and is consistent with the height, bulk, density and land uses envisioned in the East SoMa Area Plan. The project falls within the 2nd Street Corridor generalized zoning district and near the Folsom Street Corridor district, which both allow for residential

---

2 San Francisco Planning Department. Transit-Oriented Infill Project Eligibility Checklist for 750 Harrison Street, February 26, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 as part of Case File No. 2013.0485E.
and mixed uses. As a residential building with ground floor retail, the proposed project is consistent with these goals.3,4

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

<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>2. POPULATION AND HOUSING— Would the project:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The proposed project would replace the existing 5,300-sf nightclub building with a new building containing 77 studio dwelling units and 2,900 sf of commercial space. The increase in housing would also result in an increase in demand for jobs, though not all residents would seek employment within the Eastern Neighborhoods area. No displacement of existing housing would occur, as there is no housing present on the project site. These direct effects of the proposed project on population and housing are

3 Adam Varat, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 750 Harrison Street, February 21, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0485E.
4 Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 750 Harrison Street, March 3, 2015. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0485E.
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.

3. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined 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 project site was evaluated in the South of Market Historic Resource Survey and was rated “6Z”, meaning that it was found ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Resources, or local designation. The project site is not located within or adjacent to any historic districts. The nearest historic district is the South Park Historic District, located two block southeast of the project site, on the opposite side of the Interstate 80 freeway. The project site is too far from the district to result in any substantive effects. 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 Plans 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 includes excavation to approximately 22 feet below existing grade on a property subject to Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure J-2 (properties with no previous archeological studies). Mitigation Measure J-2 states that any soil-disturbing project on parcels within the J-2 area requires a preliminary archeological sensitivity study prepared by a qualified archeologist having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. Based on the study, a determination shall be made if additional measures are needed to reduce the potential effects of a project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. The Planning Department’s archeological staff conducted a Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) in conformance with the study requirements of Mitigation Measure J-2.\(^5\) The PAR noted that no basement level is proposed as part of the project, but that a deep foundation system with piles to 22 feet below existing grade would be needed. The PAR concluded that archeological testing (the Planning Department’s third standard archeological mitigation measure) would be needed to fulfill the requirements of Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure J-2. The project sponsor has agreed to implement Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure J-2, including the requirements of the Planning Department’s third standard archeological mitigation measure, as Project Mitigation Measure 1 (full text provided in the “Mitigation Measures” section below).

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

---

\(^5\) Allison Vanderslice, *Environmental Planning Preliminary Archeological Review Checklist, 750 Harrison Street*. March 27, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0485E.
### 4. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION—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 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</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. 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 demolish the 5,300-sf nightclub building on the project site, and construct a new 42,000-sf building containing 77 studio dwelling units, 2,900 sf of ground floor commercial space, 84 bicycle parking spaces, and no off-street auto parking.
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. In an effort to produce a conservative trip generation estimate, existing trips generated by the nightclub currently occupying the project site were not subtracted from the estimated trips generated by the proposed project (i.e. the site was assumed to be vacant for trip generation purposes). The proposed project would generate an estimated 1,015 person trips (inbound and outbound) on a weekday daily basis, consisting of 358 person trips by auto, 244 transit trips, 339 walk trips and 74 trips by other modes. During the p.m. peak hour, the proposed project would generate an estimated 39 vehicle trips (accounting for vehicle occupancy data for this Census Tract) that could travel through the surrounding intersections.

**Traffic**

The 39 new p.m. peak hour vehicle trips would not substantially increase traffic volumes at nearby intersections, would not substantially increase average delay that would cause intersections that currently operate at acceptable LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable LOS, and would not substantially increase average delay at intersections that currently operate at unacceptable LOS.

The proposed project would not contribute considerably to cumulative LOS delay conditions as its contribution of an estimated 39 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 implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan projects. The proposed project would also not contribute considerably to 2025 cumulative conditions and thus, the proposed project would not have any significant direct or cumulative traffic impacts.

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**

The project site is located within a quarter mile of several local transit lines including Muni lines 8/8AX/8BX-Bayshore Express, 12-Folsom/Pacific, 27-Bryant, 30-Stockton, 45-Union/Stockton, 47-Van Ness, 76X-Marin Headlands, and 91-Owl. The proposed project would be expected to generate 244 daily transit trips, including 36 during the p.m. peak hour. Given the wide availability of nearby transit, the addition of 36 p.m. peak hour transit trips would be accommodated by existing capacity. As such, the proposed project would not result in unacceptable levels of transit service or cause a substantial increase in delays or operating costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service could result.

Each of the rezoning options in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts relating to increases in transit ridership on Muni lines, with the Preferred Project having significant impacts on seven lines. Of those lines, the project site is located within a quarter-mile of Muni line 27-Bryant. Mitigation measures proposed to address these impacts relate to pursuing enhanced transit funding; conducting transit corridor and service improvements; and increasing transit accessibility, service information and storage/maintenance capabilities for Muni lines in the Eastern Neighborhoods. Even with mitigation, however, cumulative impacts on the above lines were found to be significant and unavoidable and a Statement of Overriding Considerations related to the significant and

---

6 San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Calculations for 750 Harrison Street, April 13, 2015. These calculations are available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0485E.
unavoidable cumulative transit impacts was adopted as part of the PEIR Certification and project approval.

The proposed project would not contribute considerably to these conditions as its minor contribution of 36 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 2025 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 transit 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.

**Parking**

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 and thus, this determination does not consider the adequacy of parking in determining the significance of project impacts under CEQA. The Planning Department acknowledges that parking conditions may be of interest to the public and the decision makers. Therefore, the following parking demand analysis is provided for informational purposes only.

The parking demand for the new residential and commercial uses associated with the proposed project was determined based on the methodology presented in the Transportation Guidelines. On an average weekday, the demand for parking would be for 92 spaces. The proposed project would provide no off-street spaces. Thus, as proposed, the project would have an unmet parking demand of an estimated 92 spaces. At this location, the unmet parking demand could be accommodated within existing on-street and off-street parking spaces within a reasonable distance of the project vicinity. Additionally, the project site is well served by public transit and bicycle facilities. Therefore, any unmet parking demand associated with the project would not materially affect the overall parking conditions in the project vicinity such that hazardous conditions or significant delays would be created.

Further, the project site is located in a MUO zoning district where under Section 842.08 of the Planning Code, the proposed project would not be required to provide any off-street parking spaces. It should be noted that the Planning Commission has the discretion to adjust the number of on-site parking spaces included in the proposed project, typically at the time that the project entitlements are sought.

---

7 San Francisco Planning Department, Transit-Oriented Infill Project Eligibility Checklist for 750 Harrison Street, February 26, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0485E.
As mentioned above, the proposed project would not include any off-street parking spaces, and would result in an unmet demand of 92 spaces. The three existing parking spaces on the project site would be removed. The unmet parking demand could be accommodated within existing on-street and off-street parking spaces nearby and through alternative modes such as public transit and bicycle facilities. Given that the unmet demand could be met by existing facilities and given that the proposed project site is well-served by transit and bicycle facilities, a reduction in the number of off-street parking spaces associated with the proposed project, even if no off-street spaces are provided, would not result in significant traffic delays or hazardous conditions.

Parking conditions are not static, as parking supply and demand varies from day to day, from day to night, from month to month, etc. Hence, the availability of parking spaces (or lack thereof) is not a permanent physical condition, but changes over time as people change their modes and patterns of travel. While parking conditions change over time, a substantial shortfall in parking caused by a project that creates hazardous conditions or significant delays to traffic, transit, bicycles or pedestrians could adversely affect the physical environment. Whether a shortfall in parking creates such conditions will depend on the magnitude of the shortfall and the ability of drivers to change travel patterns or switch to other travel modes. If a substantial shortfall in parking caused by a project creates hazardous conditions or significant delays in travel, such a condition could also result in secondary physical environmental impacts (e.g., air quality or noise impacts caused by congestion), depending on the project and its setting.

The absence of a ready supply of parking spaces, combined with available alternatives to auto travel (e.g., transit service, taxis, bicycles or travel by foot) and a relatively dense pattern of urban development, induces many drivers to seek and find alternative parking facilities, shift to other modes of travel, or change their overall travel habits. Any such resulting shifts to transit service or other modes (walking and biking), would be in keeping with the City’s “Transit First” policy and numerous San Francisco General Plan Polices, including those in the Transportation Element. The City’s Transit First Policy, established in the City’s Charter Article 8A, Section 8A.115, provides that “parking policies for areas well served by public transit shall be designed to encourage travel by public transportation and alternative transportation.”

The transportation analysis accounts for potential secondary effects, such as cars circling and looking for a parking space in areas of limited parking supply, by assuming that all drivers would attempt to find parking at or near the project site and then seek parking farther away if convenient parking is unavailable. The secondary effects of drivers searching for parking is typically offset by a reduction in vehicle trips due to others who are aware of constrained parking conditions in a given area, and thus choose to reach their destination by other modes (i.e. walking, biking, transit, taxi). If this occurs, any secondary environmental impacts that may result from a shortfall in parking in the vicinity of the proposed project would be minor, and the traffic assignments used in the transportation analysis, as well as in the associated air quality, noise and pedestrian safety analyses, would reasonably address potential secondary effects.
5. NOISE—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)</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>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would result in significant noise impacts during construction activities and due to conflicts between noise-sensitive uses in proximity to noisy uses such as PDR, retail, entertainment, cultural/institutional/educational uses, and office uses. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also determined that incremental increases in traffic-related noise attributable to implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would be less than significant. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR therefore 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). A torque-down pile or auger cast-in-place pile system is proposed as part of the building’s foundation. Impact pile driving is feasible, but not recommended by the proposed project’s Geotechnical Report. The Geotechnical Report recommends the torque-down and auger cast-in-place methods due to the noise and vibration effects that impact pile driving can cause. Since piles are needed as part of the proposed building’s foundation, and pile driving is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint, Mitigation Measure F-1, which pertains to construction noise resulting from pile driving, is applicable to the

---

8 Rockridge Geotechnical. *Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Residential Building, 750 Harrison Street*. October 14, 2013. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0485E.
proposed project. As part of Mitigation Measure F-1, the project sponsor would be required to avoid impact pile driving unless absolutely necessary. Other heavy equipment would be required during construction of the proposed building, so Mitigation Measure F-2, which requires use of site-specific construction noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant, is applicable to the proposed project at 750 Harrison Street. The project sponsor has agreed to implement Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 as Project Mitigation Measures 2 and 3 (full text provided in the “Mitigation Measures” section below), which requires use of site-specific construction noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant.

In addition, all construction activities for the proposed project (approximately 18 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 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 18 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 construction would not be considered a significant impact of the proposed project, because the construction noise would be temporary, intermittent, and restricted in occurrence and level, as the contractor would be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance and Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2, 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). The proposed project would add noise-sensitive uses (dwelling units) in an area where street noise levels exceed 60 dBA (Ldn). Therefore, Mitigation Measures F-3 and F-4 apply to the proposed project, and have been agreed to by the project sponsor as Project Mitigation Measures 4 and 5, respectively (full text provided in the “Mitigation Measures” section below). Accordingly, the project sponsor has conducted an environmental noise study demonstrating that the proposed project can feasibly attain acceptable interior noise levels.9

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.

---

9 Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. 750 Harrison Street Environmental Noise Assessment. May 15, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0321E.
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 includes open space in a second-floor interior courtyard and on a roof deck. Mitigation Measure F-6 is therefore applicable to the proposed project, and has been agreed to by the project sponsor as Project Mitigation Measure 6 (full text provided in the “Mitigation Measures” section below). The noise study prepared in accordance with Mitigation Measure F-4 (Project Mitigation Measure 4) addressed noise levels at the proposed outdoor spaces, and concluded that the courtyard and roof deck would be adequately shielded from ambient noise by intervening residential buildings and the proposed rooftop wind shelter. Exterior noise levels at these spaces would therefore be below 60 dBA (Ldn)\(^{10}\)

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. AIR QUALITY—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified potentially significant air quality impacts resulting from construction activities and impacts to sensitive land uses\(^{11}\) 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 Plans

---

\(^{10}\) Ibid.
\(^{11}\) 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.
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.

Construction Dust Control

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 Construction Air Quality requires individual projects involving construction activities to include dust control measures and to maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions of particulates and other pollutants. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors subsequently approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes, generally referred to as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008). The intent of the Construction Dust Control Ordinance is to reduce the quantity of fugitive dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of on-site workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by DBI. Project-related construction activities would result in construction dust, primarily from ground-disturbing activities. 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.”12 The BAAQMD’s CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (Air Quality Guidelines) provide screening criteria13 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 add 77 dwelling units and 2,900 sf of commercial space, which is below the residential screening criterion of 240 dwelling units and the most restrictive retail criterion of 5,000 square feet. 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

Subsequent to certification of the Eastern Neighborhoods 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 PM2.5 concentration, cumulative excess cancer risk, and incorporates health vulnerability factors and proximity to freeways. Projects within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone require special consideration to determine whether the project’s activities would expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations or add emissions to areas already adversely affected by poor air quality.

Construction

The project site is located within an identified Air Pollutant Exposure Zone; therefore, the ambient health risk to sensitive receptors from air pollutants is considered substantial. The proposed project would require heavy-duty off-road diesel vehicles and equipment during two months of the anticipated 18-month construction period. Thus, Project Mitigation Measure 7 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 7 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 7 Construction Air Quality. The full text of Project Mitigation Measure 7 Construction Air Quality is provided in the Mitigation Measures Section below.

Siting Sensitive Land Uses

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

---

14 PM emissions benefits are estimated by comparing off-road PM emission standards for Tier 2 with Tier 1 and 0. Tier 0 off-road engines do not have PM emission standards, but the United States Environmental Protection Agency’s Exhaust and Crankcase Emissions Factors for Nonroad Engine Modeling – Compression Ignition has estimated Tier 0 engines between 50 hp and 100 hp to have a PM emission factor of 0.72 g/hp-hr and greater than 100 hp to have a PM emission factor of 0.40 g/hp-hr. Therefore, requiring off-road equipment to have at least a Tier 2 engine would result in between a 25 percent and 63 percent reduction in PM emissions, as compared to off-road equipment with Tier 0 or Tier 1 engines. The 25 percent reduction comes from comparing the PM emission standards for off-road engines between 25 hp and 50 hp for Tier 2 (0.45 g/bhp-hr) and Tier 1 (0.60 g/bhp-hr). The 63 percent reduction comes from comparing the PM emission standards for off-road engines above 175 hp for Tier 2 (0.15 g/bhp-hr) and Tier 0 (0.40 g/bhp-hr). In addition to the Tier 2 requirement, ARB Level 3 VDECSs are required and would reduce PM by an additional 85 percent. Therefore, the mitigation measure would result in between an 89 percent (0.0675 g/bhp-hr) and 94 percent (0.0225 g/bhp-hr) reduction in PM emissions, as compared to equipment with Tier 1 (0.60 g/bhp-hr) or Tier 0 engines (0.40 g/bhp-hr).
In compliance with Article 38, the project sponsor has submitted an initial application to DPH.15 The regulations and procedures set forth by Article 38 would ensure that exposure to sensitive receptors would not be significant. These requirements supersede the provisions of Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-2. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-2 Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses is no longer applicable to the proposed project, and impacts related to siting new sensitive land uses would be less than significant through compliance with Article 38.

Siting New Sources

The proposed project would not generate 100 trucks per day or 40 refrigerated trucks per day. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-3 is not applicable. The project would not include a backup diesel generator, therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-4 Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators is not applicable.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, only the construction exhaust emissions portion Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR air quality Mitigation Measure G-1 is applicable to 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 CO2E16 per service population,17 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.

15 Letter from DPH, March 14, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No 2013.0485E.
16 CO2E, defined as equivalent Carbon Dioxide, is a quantity that describes other greenhouse gases in terms of the amount of Carbon Dioxide that would have an equal global warming potential.
17 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.
The proposed project was determined to be consistent with San Francisco’s GHG Reduction Strategy, which is comprised of regulations that have proven effective in reducing San Francisco’s overall GHG emissions; GHG emissions have measurably reduced when compared to 1990 emissions levels, demonstrating that the City has met and exceeded Executive Order S-3-05, AB 32, and the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan GHG reduction goals for the year 2020. Other existing regulations, such as those implemented through Assembly Bill (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.

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.

| Topics: |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 8. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project: | Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site | Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR | Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information | No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR |
| a) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

Wind

Based on the height and location of the proposed approximately 85-foot-tall building (plus roof deck and circulation penthouse features extending an additional 10 feet above roof level), a pedestrian wind assessment (“Wind Assessment”) was prepared by a qualified wind consultant for the proposed project. The objective of the Wind Assessment was to provide a qualitative evaluation of the potential wind impacts of the proposed development, which provides a screening-level estimation of the potential wind impact. The Wind Assessment found that the existing wind conditions on the adjacent streets do not exceed the 26-mile-per-hour wind hazard criterion for a single full hour, or approximately 0.0114 percent of the time, as outlined in San Francisco Planning Code Section 148. The Wind Assessment also found that the proposed building would not cause winds that would reach or exceed the 26-mile-per-hour wind hazard criterion at all pedestrian areas on and around the proposed development and that wind speeds at building entrances and public sidewalks would be suitable for the intended pedestrian usage. This finding was based on comparisons to wind tests performed for nearby projects, such as the Moscone

---

18 San Francisco Planning Department. Compliance Checklist, Greenhouse Gas Analysis, 750 Harrison Street, October 1, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No 2013.0485E.

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

20 Environmental Science Associates. Wind Evaluation of Proposed Project, 750 Harrison Street. June 21, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, as part of Case File No. 2013.0485E.
Center Expansion and the Central SoMa Plan, and the prevalence of seven to ten story buildings on the subject block that would help moderate wind speeds along nearby streets. The Wind Assessment also found that only limited gaps exist between existing buildings that would allow wind flow across the subject block, thus further reducing the likelihood of wind hazard criterion exceedances. The report concludes that future construction of additional in-fill buildings, such as the proposed project, may reduce street-level wind speeds. Therefore, 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 proposed proposals could not be determined at that time. Therefore, the PEIR determined shadow impacts to be significant and unavoidable. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The proposed project would construct an 85-foot-tall building (plus roof deck and circulation penthouse features extending an additional 10 feet above roof level); therefore, the Planning Department prepared a preliminary shadow fan analysis to determine whether the project would have the potential to cast new shadow on nearby parks. The shadow fan analysis, which did not take intervening buildings into account, identified a possibility of the proposed project casting shadow on Yerba Buena Gardens and the community garden just north of the project site at 55 Lapu Lapu Street. Neither facility is subject to Section 295 of the Planning Code because they are not under jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department, but were analyzed as publicly-accessible outdoor recreational facilities for CEQA purposes.

Based on the results of the shadow fan analysis, a more detailed Shadow Study was prepared including a quantitative analysis of the potential shadow impacts of the proposed project that accounts for surrounding buildings. The study concluded that the proposed project would not cast new shadow on Yerba Buena Gardens because the proposed project’s shadow would be subsumed by intervening buildings. Therefore, no shadow impacts to Yerba Buena Gardens would occur.

The study also showed that the proposed project would cast new shadow on a portion the community garden from approximately mid-October to mid-February each year. The maximum duration and size of the shadow would occur on the winter solstice. On the winter solstice, the shadow would last for up to two hours, occurring during the time period of 11:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., and the shadow would reach a maximum size of 1,630 sf out of the garden’s total square footage of approximately 17,300 sf at 12:00 p.m. Shadows on other days during the mid-October to mid-February period would be smaller and would last for less time. No new shadow on the community garden is anticipated on the majority of days during the

---

21 San Francisco Planning Department, *Preliminary Shadow Fan Analysis, 750 Harrison Street*. May 7, 2013. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0485U.

22 Toan Nguyen Design. *750 Harrison Street Project – Shadow Study*. October 13, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0485E.
year (days outside of the mid-October to mid-February period). Given the limited size, duration, and frequency of the new shadow on the community garden that would be caused by the proposed project, it is unlikely that use or enjoyment of the garden would be substantially diminished. Therefore, the proposed project’s shadow on the community garden would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. RECREATION—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Physically degrade existing recreational resources?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in substantial or accelerated deterioration of existing recreational resources or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may have an adverse effect on the environment. The proposed project would add residents to the area, which may increase demand for and use of local recreational facilities, but the increase in usage would not be substantial and would be within the magnitude analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. No mitigation measures related to recreational resources were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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.
### 10. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—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) 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.

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.

### 11. PUBLIC SERVICES—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) 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 resulting from implementation of the Area Plans 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 Plans. In addition, development envisioned under the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans 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 Plans 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 Plans and 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.

<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>13. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—Would the project:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that implementation of the Plan would indirectly increase the population that would be subject to an earthquake, including seismically induced ground-shaking, liquefaction, and landslides. The PEIR also noted that new development is generally safer than comparable older development due to improvements in building codes and construction techniques. Compliance with applicable codes and recommendations made in project-specific geotechnical analyses would not eliminate earthquake risks, but would reduce them to an acceptable level, given the seismically active characteristics of the Bay Area. Thus, the PEIR concluded that implementation of the Plan would not result in significant impacts with regard to geology, and no mitigation measures were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.
A geotechnical investigation was prepared for the proposed project.\(^2\) The report concluded that the proposed building may be adequately supported by a concrete floor slab foundation with torque-down piles or auger cast-in-place piles extending 22 feet below existing grade. The report recognizes that the project site is located in a seismic hazard zone (liquefaction zone), and concludes that the proposed foundation system would adequately address the risk of liquefaction.

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

In light of the above, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact 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.

\(^{2}\) Rockridge Geotechnical. *Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Residential Building, 750 Harrison Street.* October 14, 2013. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0485E.
The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population resulting from implementation of the Area Plans 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 currently fully covered by the existing nightclub building and the concrete-paved setback along Harrison Street. The proposed building would fully cover the project site. 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.
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires?

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 Plan Area because of the presence of 1906 earthquake fill, previous and current land uses associated with the use of hazardous materials, and known or suspected hazardous materials cleanup cases. However, the PEIR found that existing regulations for facility closure, Under Storage Tank (UST) closure, and investigation and cleanup of soil and groundwater would ensure implementation of measures to protect workers and the community from exposure to hazardous materials during construction.

Hazardous Building Materials

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that future development in the Plan Area may involve demolition or renovation of existing structures containing hazardous building materials. Some building materials commonly used in older buildings could present a public health risk if disturbed during an accident or during demolition or renovation of an existing building. Hazardous building materials addressed in the PEIR include asbestos, electrical equipment such as transformers and fluorescent light ballasts that contain PCBs or di (2 ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), fluorescent lights containing mercury vapors, and lead-based paints. Asbestos and lead based paint may also present a health risk to existing building occupants if they are in a deteriorated condition. If removed during demolition of a building, these materials would also require special disposal procedures. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified a significant impact associated with hazardous building materials including PCBs, DEHP, and mercury and determined that 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 an existing building, Mitigation Measure L-1 would apply to the proposed project. The project sponsor has agreed to implement Mitigation Measure L-1 for the proposed project as Project
Mitigation Measure 8 (full text of Mitigation Measure L-1 is provided in the Mitigation Measures section below).

**Soil and Groundwater Contamination**

The proposed project would require greater than 50 cubic yards of soil disturbance on a site with known former automotive use. Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH). The Maher Ordinance requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6.

The Phase I ESA would determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project. Based on that information, the project sponsor may be required to conduct soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis. Where such analysis reveals the presence of hazardous substances in excess of state or federal standards, the project sponsor is required to submit a site mitigation plan (SMP) to the DPH or other appropriate state or federal agencies, 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.\(^2\) The report identified that the existing building has previously housed an automotive repair shop, and other industrial businesses. No hazardous materials or evidence of prior inappropriate storage of hazardous materials were found at the side during the Phase I analysis. No records of an underground fuel storage tank were found, and the existing building’s foundation was found to be intact with no evidence of hazardous materials seeping into the soil or groundwater. The report noted that other businesses in the area routinely store and dispose of materials that could be hazardous.

The proposed project would be required to remediate any potential soil and 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) John Carver Consulting. *Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment at 750 Harrison Street*. July 16, 2007. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0485E.
The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the Area Plans 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 Plans 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 Plan Area; 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

Archeological Resources

Project Mitigation Measure 1 – Properties With No Previous Studies (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure J-2)

This measure would apply to those properties within the project area 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 (CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5(a)(1)(3) and (c)(1)(2)), with the exception of those properties within Archeological Mitigation Zone B as shown in Figure 29 in Chapter IV, for which Mitigation Measure J-3, below, is applicable. That is, this measure would apply to the entirety of the study area outside of Archeological Mitigation Zones A and B.

For projects proposed outside Archeological Mitigation Zones A and B, a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study must be prepared by an archeological consultant with expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The Sensitivity Study should contain the following:

1) Determine the historical uses of the project site based on any previous archeological documentation and Sanborn maps;

2) Determine types of archeological resources/properties that may have been located within the project site and whether the archeological resources/property types would potentially be eligible for listing in the CRHR;

3) Determine if 19th or 20th century soils-disturbing activities may adversely affected the identified potential archeological resources;

4) Assess potential project effects in relation to the depth of any identified potential archeological resource;

5) Conclusion: assessment of whether any CRHP-eligible archeological resources could be adversely affected by the proposed project and recommendation as to appropriate further action.
Based on the Sensitivity Study, the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) shall determine if an Archeological Research Design/Treatment Plan (ARD/TP) shall be required to more definitively identify the potential for CRHP-eligible archeological resources to be present within the project site and determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effect of the project on archeological resources to a less than significant level. The scope of the ARD/TP shall be determined in consultation with the ERO and consistent with the standards for archeological documentation established by the Office of Historic Preservation for purposes of compliance with CEQA, in Preservation Planning Bulletin No. 5).

Noise

**Project Mitigation Measure 2 – Construction Noise (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-1)**

For subsequent development projects within proximity to noise-sensitive uses that would include pile-driving, individual project sponsors shall ensure that piles be pre-drilled wherever feasible to reduce construction-related noise and vibration. No impact pile drivers shall be used unless absolutely necessary. Contractors would be required to use pile-driving equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices. To reduce noise and vibration impacts, sonic or vibratory sheetpile drivers, rather than impact drivers, shall be used wherever sheetpiles are needed. Individual project sponsors shall also require that contractors schedule pile-driving activity for times of the day that would minimize disturbance to neighbors.

**Project Mitigation Measure 3 – Construction Noise (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-2)**

Where environmental review of a development project undertaken subsequent to the adoption of the proposed zoning controls determines that construction noise controls are necessary due to the nature of planned construction practices and the sensitivity of proximate uses, the Planning Director shall require that the sponsors of the subsequent development project develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:

- Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around a construction site, particularly where a site adjoins noise-sensitive uses;
- Utilize noise control blankets on a building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site;
- Evaluate the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings housing sensitive uses;
- Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements;
• Post signs on-site pertaining to permitted construction days and hours and complaint procedures and who to notify in the event of a problem, with telephone numbers listed.

Project Mitigation Measure 4 – Interior Noise Levels (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-3)

For new development including noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn), as shown in EIR Figure 18, where such development is not already subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the project sponsor shall conduct a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements. Such analysis shall be conducted by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering. Noise insulation features identified and recommended by the analysis shall be included in the design, as specified in the San Francisco General Plan Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise to reduce potential interior noise levels to the maximum extent feasible.

Project Mitigation Measure 5 – Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-4)

To reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors, for new development including noise-sensitive uses, the Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-generating uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes), prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 standards, where applicable, can be met, and that there are no particular circumstances about the proposed project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. Should such concerns be present, the Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action, in order to demonstrate that acceptable interior noise levels consistent with those in the Title 24 standards can be attained.

Project Mitigation Measure 6 – Open Space in Noisy Environments (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-6)

To minimize effects on development in noisy areas, for new development including noise-sensitive uses, the Planning Department shall, through its building permit review process, in conjunction with noise analysis required pursuant to Mitigation Measure F-4, require that open space required under the Planning Code for such uses be protected, to the maximum feasible extent, from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space. Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, site design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources, construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-family dwellings, and implementation would also be undertaken consistent with other principles of urban design.
Air Quality

Project Mitigation Measure 7 – Construction Air Quality (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure G-1)

The City shall condition approval of individual development proposals under the proposed project upon implementation of an appropriate dust abatement program, patterned after the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) approach described below.

The BAAQMD approach to dust abatement, as put forth in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, calls for “basic” control measures that should be implemented at all construction sites, “enhanced” control measures that should be implemented at construction sites greater than four acres in area, and “optional” control measures that should be implemented on a case-by-case basis at construction sites that are large in area, located near sensitive receptors or which, for any other reason, may warrant additional emissions reductions.

Elements of the “basic” dust control program for project components that disturb less than four acres shall include, but not necessarily be limited to the following:

• Water all active construction areas at least twice daily. Watering should be sufficient to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency may be necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible.

• Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., the minimum required space between the top of the load and the top of the trailer).

• Pave, apply water (reclaimed if possible) three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.

• Sweep streets (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads.

Elements of the “enhanced” dust abatement program for project components that disturb four or more acres are unlikely to be required, in that no sites anticipated for development in the Plan area are as large as four acres. Should a site this size be proposed for development, dust control shall include all of the “basic” measures in addition to the following measures to be implemented by the construction contractor(s):

• Hydroteed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for one month or more).

• Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).

• Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.
Limit the amount of the disturbed area at any one time, where possible.

Pave all roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

Designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the BAAQMD prior to the start of construction.

The “optional” dust-control measures supplement the “basic” and “enhanced” programs to address site-specific issues. They include:

- Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site.
- Install windbreaks, or plant tree/vegetative wind breaks at windward side(s) of construction areas.
- Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.

Ordinance 175-91, passed by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors on May 6, 1991, requires that non-potable water be used for dust control activities. Therefore, project sponsors would require that construction contractors obtain reclaimed water from the Clean Water Program for this purpose.

The City would also condition project approval such that each subsequent project sponsor would require the contractor(s) to maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions of particulates and other pollutants, by such means as a prohibition on idling motors when equipment is not in use or when trucks are waiting in queues, and implementation of specific maintenance programs to reduce emissions for equipment that would be in frequent use for much of the construction period.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure G-1 would reduce construction-related air quality effects to a less-than-significant level.

Hazardous Materials

Project Mitigation Measure 8 – Hazardous Building Materials (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure L-I)

The City shall condition future development approvals to require that the subsequent project sponsors ensure that any equipment containing PCBs or DEPH, such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local
laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.