PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site at 340 Bryant Street is located in San Francisco's South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood. The 16,505 square foot (sf) site (Assessor's Block 3764, Lot 061) is located on the block bounded by Rincon Street to the east, Sterling Street to the west, Interstate 80 to the north, and Bryant Street to the south (see Figure 1, Project Location).

The project site is located on Bryant Street, adjacent to one of the primary access ramps to the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (Interstate 80). The boundaries of the project site are curvilinear in shape, owing to the curved Bay Bridge on- and off-ramps that adjoin the site on all sides. The project site is occupied by a four-story, 44-foot-tall, 62,050 square foot (sf) building (see Figure 2, Site Plan). The existing building was constructed in 1932 and includes no off-street vehicular parking. The building also contains a 732-sf ground-floor retail space. The height of the building reaches 44 feet above street level, plus rooftop parapets, skylights, and mechanical equipment that reaches a total height of 60 feet above street level. No off-street parking exists on the project site and no trees are present along any of the street frontages. The building is presently vacant, and has plywood coverings over some of the ground level doorways and windows to minimize intrusion and vandalism. The existing building is currently undergoing construction after receiving building permits previously issued for work not subject to this environmental review. The existing building is currently vacant, although it recently (2012) was occupied by industrial tenants. To ensure that the maximum potential environmental impacts are analyzed, the building is assumed to be currently vacant for the purposes of transportation, air quality, and other CEQA impact topics that rely on square footage calculations; the conversion of industrial space to office use is also addressed.

The proposed project would convert the upper three of the four floors of the existing building to office use and part of the first floor to common areas: 1,259 sf on the first floor (for common areas), 16,788 sf on the second floor, 16,877 sf on the third floor, and 11,880 sf on the fourth floor and mezzanine. A total of
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1 Building Permit Numbers 201302089837, 201304265528, 201304265541, 201401307399, 201404233911, 201405276721, 201406279819, and 201409196831
46,804 sf of industrial space would be converted, and the total office space created would be 45,545 sf. Approximately 14,500 sf of the approximately 16,500 sf ground floor would remain as PDR uses. The remaining 1,991 sf on the ground floor would be used for common circulation areas and mechanical equipment. This remaining ground floor space would require removal of the existing 732 sf retail space. Loading activities to support the PDR space would continue to occur on an existing easement in the Caltrans-owned parking lot immediately west of the project site. Construction work would include interior demolition and renovation, exterior façade improvements, and the addition of a circulation penthouse and roof deck (see Figure 3, Proposed Floor Plans). No expansion of the building envelope or square footage would occur, other than the additional roof-level features. The height of the building from street level to the top of the finish roof would remain at approximately 44 feet (60 feet including parapets, rooftop access, a roof deck, and mechanical equipment, which are typically excluded from building height calculations for Planning Code purposes) (see Figure 4, Proposed Elevations). Existing elevator shafts would remain and no excavation or deepening of the foundation would occur. The building would have 16 bicycle parking spaces at the ground level and no off-street vehicular parking. Construction would last approximately four months, and would not include pile driving or excavation.
Figure 1 Project Location
Figure 3(a) Proposed Ground Floor Plan

- GROSS BLDG: 14,514 SF
- PORCH: NOT INCL. IN GROSS: 94 SF
- 12 CLASS 1 BIKE PARKING
- 4 CLASS 2 BIKE PARKING
- 2 SHOWERS PER FLOOR (8 TOTAL IN BLDG)
- 18 LOCKERS PER FLOOR (72 TOTAL IN BLDG)
- BIKE STORAGE: NOT INCL. IN GROSS: 103 SF
- GROSS BUILDING COMMON: 1,991 SF
Figure 3(b) Proposed Representative Upper Floor Plan
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Figure 3(c) Proposed Roof Plan

- **PLANTERS**: NOT INCL. IN GROSS SF, 176 SF
- **MECHANICAL**: NOT INCL. IN GROSS SF, 1,225 SF
- **ELEVATOR PH**: NOT INCL. IN GROSS SF, 138 SF
- **PLANTERS**: NOT INCL. IN GROSS SF, 231 SF
- **ROOF DECK**: NOT INCL. IN GROSS SF, 1,684 SF
- **STAIR 1 PH**: NOT INCL. IN GROSS SF, 261 SF

**CANOPY**
- NOT INCL. IN GROSS SF, 371 SF

**STAIR 2 PH**
- NOT INCL. IN GROSS SF, 201 SF
The proposed 340 Bryant Street project would require the following approvals:

**Actions by the Planning Commission**
- Planning Code Section 321 (Office Allocation) approval

**Actions by other City Departments**
- Approval of a building permit by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI)
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 conversion of an existing industrial (PDR) building (with 732 sf of ground floor retail space) to a combination of office and PDR uses. 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 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 project site at 340 Bryant Street currently contains approximately 61,318 square feet of vacant PDR space (the non-retail portion of the existing 62,050 square foot building). The proposed project would convert approximately 45,545 sf of PDR space to office use, and an additional 1,991 sf of the PDR space would contain common areas. Approximately 14,514 sf of PDR space (the entire ground floor square footage, minus space needed for common areas, circulation, and mechanical equipment) would remain. This conversion would constitute a net loss of approximately 46,804 of PDR space within the Eastern Neighborhoods plan area. Such conversion of PDR space to office uses and the related contribution to significant unavoidable cumulative land use impacts, including those of the proposed project, were anticipated and analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. As part of the Eastern Neighborhoods program, the project site was rezoned from SSO (Service/Secondary Office – a zone that allows small-scale light industrial uses) to MUO (Mixed Use-Office – a zone that encourages office uses and housing). This rezoning was studied in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and therefore, the potential loss of PDR on the project site was included in the cumulative land use impacts that the PEIR identified. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified a potential reduction of PDR floor area up to approximately 771,276 square feet in the East SoMa area, where the 340 Bryant Street project site is located. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to the significant cumulative land use impact related to loss of PDR uses that was identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Furthermore, 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 bulk, density, and land uses envisioned in the East SoMa Area Plan. The area plan encourages small, flexible
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3 San Francisco Planning Department. Transit-Oriented Infill Project Eligibility Checklist for 340 Bryant 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. 2013.1600E.
office space throughout East SoMa, and larger offices along the 2nd Street corridor, which is intended to serve as a “secondary office reservoir for downtown.” As proposed, under Section 321 of the Planning Code, the project requires an Office Allocation from the Planning Commission. The proposed project also complies with all other applicable Planning Code requirements and, on balance, is consistent with the General Plan.45

For these reasons, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to land use and land use planning, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. POPULATION AND HOUSING—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 involve conversion of PDR space to office use and common areas, resulting in approximately 45,545 square feet of new office space. The proposed project’s office use is anticipated to add approximately 165 jobs. Approximately 14,514 sf of PDR space would remain on the ground floor of the building. The increase in jobs would also result in an increase in demand for housing, though not
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4 Adam Varat, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 340 Bryant Street, March 25, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.1600E.

5 Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 340 Bryant Street, October 31, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.1600E.
Community Plan Exemption Checklist
340 Bryant Street
Case No. 2013.1600E

All workers would seek housing within the Eastern Neighborhoods area. No displacement of existing housing would occur, as there is no housing present on the project site. These direct effects of the proposed project on population and housing are within the scope of the population growth anticipated under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans and evaluated in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

---

**3. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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>
</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 “6L” (ineligible for local listing or designation through local government review process; may warrant special consideration in local planning). The existing industrial building on the project site, which would be retained and mostly converted to office use, is not considered a historic resource, nor is it located within a designated historic district. Planning Department preservation technical staff also indicated that, given no substantial building additions would occur as part of the proposed project, impacts to surrounding
historic resources (including the nearby South End Historic District) would be unlikely. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to the significant historic resource impact identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and no historic resource mitigation measures would apply to the proposed project.

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

**Archeological Resources**

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

The proposed project involves converting existing PDR space to office use. The project site is located within Eastern neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure J-1. However, the proposed project would not include any excavation or soil disturbance. As such, no archeological resource impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures would be necessary.

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

---

E-mail from Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, “340 Bryant Street E Case,” dated March 19, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.1600E.
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 includes conversion of the upper three floors of an existing vacant 62,050 square foot building to office use. The four-story building currently contains approximately 61,318 square feet of industrial space and 732 square feet of retail space. After implementation of the proposed project, the building would contain approximately 45,545 sf of office space, 14,514 sf of PDR space, and common areas totaling 1,991 sf. The project site would continue to have no off-street vehicular parking spaces, and 16 bicycle parking spaces would be constructed as part of the proposed project.

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. Given that the subject building is currently vacant, no existing trips were deducted from the trip generation estimates for the existing industrial and retail uses, to ensure that the estimates are conservative and reflect the maximum possible transportation effects. The proposed project would generate an estimated 939 person trips (inbound and outbound) on a weekday daily basis, consisting of 348 person trips by auto, 329 transit trips, 215 walk trips and 46 trips by other modes. During the p.m. peak hour, the proposed project would generate an estimated 21 vehicle trips.
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7 San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Calculations for 340 Bryant Street, November 17, 2014. These calculations are available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.1600E.
Traffic

The proposed project would generate an estimated 21 new p.m. peak hour vehicle trips that could travel through surrounding intersections. This amount of new p.m. peak hour vehicle trips would not substantially increase traffic volumes at nearby intersections, would not substantially increase average delay that would cause intersections that currently operate at acceptable LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable LOS, or would not substantially increase average delay at intersections that currently operate at unacceptable LOS.

The proposed project would not contribute considerably to LOS delay conditions as its contribution of an estimated 21 new p.m. peak-hour vehicle trips would not be a substantial proportion of the overall traffic volume or the new vehicle trips generated by Eastern Neighborhoods' Plan projects. The proposed project would also not generate enough new vehicle trips to contribute considerably to 2025 cumulative conditions and thus, the proposed project would not have any significant cumulative traffic impacts.

The project site is located adjacent to the Harrison Street off-ramp from westbound Interstate 80. The proposed project includes modification to the exterior walls of the existing building and the addition of new rooftop features that would be visible from the off-ramp. The State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) reviewed the proposed project and construction encroachments. Caltrans required the project sponsor to make modifications to the proposed project to avoid potential hazards (such as vehicular line-of-sight and encroachment considerations) as part of a transfer of air rights above the existing building to the project sponsor. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause traffic hazards.

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

Transportation Demand Management

Transportation demand management (TDM) measures typically target a reduction in single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips by encouraging persons to select alternative modes of transportation, such as walking, bicycling, public or private transit, carshare, carpooling and/or other alternative modes. The project sponsor has agreed to implement the following improvement measures to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation, and to further reduce the less-than-significant transportation impacts of the proposed project.

Project Improvement Measure 1 – TDM Coordinator: The project sponsor shall identify a TDM Coordinator for the project site. The TDM Coordinator shall be responsible for the implementation and ongoing operation of all other TDM measures (Project Improvement Measures 2 and 3) included in the proposed project. The TDM Coordinator could be a brokered service through an existing transportation management association (e.g., the Transportation Management Association of San Francisco, TMASF), or the TDM Coordinator could be an existing staff member (e.g., property manager); the TDM Coordinator does not have to work full-time at the project site. However, the TDM Coordinator shall be the single point of contact for all transportation-related questions from building occupants and City staff. The TDM Coordinator shall provide TDM...
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8 Phone conversation with Renata Frey, Caltrans District 4 Real Estate Division – Excess Land Sales, May 23, 2014. Staff notes from this phone conversation are available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, in Case File No. 2013.1600E.
training to other building staff about the transportation amenities and options available at the project site and nearby.

Project Improvement Measure 2 – Transportation and Trip Planning Information/New-Hire Packet: The project sponsor shall provide a transportation insert for the new-hire packet that includes information on transit service (local and regional, schedules and fares), information on where transit passes could be purchased, information on the 511 Regional Rideshare Program and nearby bike and car share programs, and information on where to find additional web-based alternative transportation materials (e.g., NextMuni phone app). This new hire packet shall be continuously updated as local transportation options change, and the packet should be provided to each new building occupant. The project sponsor shall provide Muni maps, San Francisco Bicycle and Pedestrian maps upon request.

Project Improvement Measure 3 – Bicycle Parking: The project sponsor shall provide at least 12 on-site secured bicycle parking spaces and 4 on-site publicly-accessible (visitor) bicycle parking spaces. Within one year after Final Certification of Completion for the subject project, the project sponsor shall contact in writing the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, San Francisco Department of Public Works, and/or Bay Area Bike Share (agencies) to fund the installation of up to 20 new bicycle racks on public right-of-way locations adjacent to or within a quarter mile of the project site (e.g., sidewalks, on-street parking spaces).

Transit

The project site is located within a quarter mile of several local transit lines including Muni lines 8X, 8AX, 8BX, 10, 12, 30, 45, 76, 81X, 82X, 91, N, and T. The proposed project would be expected to generate 329 daily transit trips, including 39 during the p.m. peak hour. Given the wide availability of nearby transit, the addition of 39 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. The project site is not located within a quarter mile of any of the significantly affected lines, and would therefore add small numbers of riders to these affected lines. Mitigation measures would address these transit impacts by 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 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 39 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 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.9 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 office use and existing PDR use (retail parking factor used) 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 87 spaces. The proposed project would provide no off-street parking spaces. Thus, as proposed, the project would have an unmet parking demand of an estimated 87 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, and the proposed project would include 16 bicycle spaces. 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.

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
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9 San Francisco Planning Department, Transit-Oriented Infill Project Eligibility Checklist for 340 Bryant 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. 2013.1600E.
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 Policies, 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. NOISE—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, in an area within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified potential conflicts related to residences and other noise-sensitive uses in proximity to noisy uses such as PDR, retail, entertainment, cultural/institutional/educational uses, and office uses. In addition, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR noted that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would incrementally increase traffic-generated noise on some streets in the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas and result in construction noise impacts from pile driving and other construction activities. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR therefore identified six noise mitigation measures that would reduce noise impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 relate to construction noise. Mitigation Measure F-1 addresses individual projects that include pile-driving, and Mitigation Measure F-2 addresses individual projects that include particularly noisy construction procedures (including pile-driving). The proposed project consists of conversion of existing PDR space to office use. New rooftop mechanical equipment and an elevator penthouse would be added. No major exterior alterations or substantial additions would be constructed, and no pile driving would occur. Pile driving and other particularly noisy construction procedures would therefore not be necessary. As such, Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 would not apply to the proposed project.

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

DBI is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance for private construction projects during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.). The Police Department is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance during all other hours. Nonetheless, during the construction period for the proposed project of approximately four 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 and may be considered an annoyance by occupants of nearby properties. The increase in noise in the project area during project construction would not be considered a significant impact of the proposed project, because the construction noise would be temporary, intermittent, and restricted in occurrence and level, as the contractor would be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance.
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 does not include noise-sensitive uses, therefore Mitigation Measures F-3 and F-4 are not applicable.

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5 addresses impacts related to individual projects that include new noise-generating uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise in the proposed project site vicinity. Given that the proposed project would convert existing PDR space to office use, the proposed project is not expected to generate any additional operational noise. New mechanical equipment would be added to the roof of the building. Since the site is adjacent to a freeway, the mechanical equipment is not likely to substantially increase noise in the surrounding area. Therefore, Mitigation Measure F-5 is not applicable to the proposed project.

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 does not include noise-sensitive uses, therefore Mitigation Measure F-6 is not applicable.

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.

---

### Topics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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\(^\text{10}\) 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. All other air quality impacts were found to be less than significant.

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 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. The proposed project would not involve soil disturbance, and would therefore have no significant construction dust impacts. The portion of PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 Construction Air Quality that addresses dust control is not applicable to the proposed project.

Health Risk

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 addresses air quality impacts during construction, 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.

Subsequent to certification of the PEIR, San Francisco (in partnership with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)) inventoried and assessed air pollution and exposures from mobile, stationary, and area sources within San Francisco and identified portions of the City that result in additional health risks for affected populations (“Air Pollutant Exposure Zone”). The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone was identified based on two health based criteria:

1. Areas where the excess cancer risk from all sources is greater than 100; or
2. Areas where PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations from all sources (including ambient concentrations) are greater than 10µg/m$^3$.

The project site is located within an identified Air Pollutant Exposure Zone; therefore, the ambient health risk to sensitive receptors from air pollutants is considered substantial. The proposed project would require heavy-duty off-road diesel vehicles and equipment during the anticipated four-month construction period. Thus, the remainder of Mitigation Measure G-1 that requires the minimization of construction exhaust emissions is applicable to the proposed project. The full text of Mitigation Measure G-1 is provided in the Mitigation Measures Section below.

The proposed project would include conversion of PDR space to office use and include a new roof deck adjacent to Interstate 80. One of the main factors of air quality impact evaluation is the duration of exposure and the age of the occupants. Occupants of office uses are not considered a sensitive land use for purposes of air quality evaluation because they typically do not spend the majority of their lives in the building nor are they typically the most vulnerable age groups to health impacts from air pollution.
Therefore, for the above reasons, even though the project site is located within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, Mitigation Measure G-2 is not applicable.

Lastly, the proposed project would not emit substantial levels of DPM or other TACs and Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measures G-3 and G-4 are therefore not applicable.

Criteria Air Pollutants

While the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that at a program-level the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in significant regional air quality impacts, the PEIR states that “Individual development projects undertaken in the future pursuant to the new zoning and area plans would be subject to a significance determination based on the BAAQMD’s quantitative thresholds for individual projects.” The BAAQMD’s CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (Air Quality Guidelines) provide screening criteria\(^\text{12}\) 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. For projects that do not meet the screening criteria, a detailed air quality assessment is required to further evaluate whether project-related criteria air pollutant emissions would exceed BAAQMD significance thresholds. Criteria air pollutant emissions during construction and operation of the proposed project would meet the Air Quality Guidelines screening criteria. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants, and a detailed air quality assessment is not required.

For the above reasons, only the construction exhaust emissions portion of Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 is applicable to the proposed project. None of the other Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR air quality mitigation measures are 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,

---


\(^{12}\) Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, updated May 2011. See pp. 3-2 to 3-3.
and C are anticipated to result in GHG emissions on the order of 4.2, 4.3 and 4.5 metric tons of CO₂E\(^{13}\) per service population,\(^{14}\) respectively. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that the resulting GHG emissions from the three options analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans would be less than significant. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

Regulations outlined in San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions have proven effective as San Francisco’s GHG emissions have measurably reduced when compared to 1990 emissions levels, demonstrating that the City has met and exceeded EO S-3-05, AB 32, and the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan GHG reduction goals for the year 2020. The proposed project was determined to be consistent with San Francisco’s GHG Reduction Strategy\(^ {15}\). Other existing regulations, such as those implemented through AB 32, will continue to reduce a proposed project’s contribution to climate change. Therefore, the proposed project’s GHG emissions would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations, and thus the proposed project’s contribution to GHG emissions would not be cumulatively considerable or generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment.

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.

### Wind

Based upon experience of the Planning Department in reviewing wind analyses and expert opinion on other projects, it is generally (but not always) the case that projects under 80 feet in height do not have the potential to generate significant wind impacts. The existing 44-foot-tall building on the project site is similar in height to existing buildings in the surrounding area, and the building’s height would not increase as a result of the proposed project, except for roof deck and mechanical features that would not be substantially taller than buildings in structures in the surrounding area. For the above reasons, the proposed project is not anticipated to cause significant impacts related to wind that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

\(^{13}\) 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.

\(^{14}\) 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.

\(^{15}\) Compliance Checklist Table for Greenhouse Gas Analysis, March 27, 2014. This document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, in Case File No. 2013.1600E.
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 convert the upper three floors of an existing 44-foot-tall PDR building to office use. The proposed elevator penthouse would reach 60 feet above street level, and this additional 14 feet in height would not be substantially taller than buildings and structures (adjacent freeway) in the surrounding area. The project site is also not located sufficiently close to any recreational resources to potentially cast new shadow on them. Therefore, the project would not have the potential to cast new shadow on nearby parks, streets, or sidewalks.

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

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

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in substantial or accelerated deterioration of existing recreational resources or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may have an adverse effect on the environment. No mitigation measures related to recreational resources were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.
As the proposed project would not degrade recreational facilities and is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on recreation beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that would serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact to the provision of water, wastewater collection and treatment, and solid waste collection and disposal. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

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:

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?

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

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

12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
As discussed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area is in a developed urban environment that does not provide native natural habitat for any rare or endangered plant or animal species. There are no riparian corridors, estuaries, marshes, or wetlands in the Plan Area that could be affected by the development anticipated under the Area Plan. In addition, development envisioned under the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan would not substantially interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory wildlife species. For these reasons, the PEIR concluded that implementation of the Area Plan would not result in significant impacts on biological resources, and no mitigation measures were identified.

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

The proposed project would convert the upper three floors of an existing industrial building to office use. No soil disturbance, foundation construction, or subsurface work would occur as part of the proposed project. The project is required to conform to the San Francisco Building Code, which ensures the safety of all new construction in the City. DBI may require a geotechnical report or additional site specific soils report(s) through the building permit application process, as needed. The DBI requirement for review of the building permit application pursuant to DBI's implementation of the Building Code would ensure that the proposed project would have no significant impacts related to soils, seismic or other geological hazards.

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

### Topics:

| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? | ⬜ | ⬜ | ⬜ | ⬜ |
| f) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site? | ⬜ | ⬜ | ⬜ | ⬜ |

### HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY—Would the project:

| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | ⬜ | ⬜ | ⬜ | ⬜ |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | ⬜ | ⬜ | ⬜ | ⬜ |
The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact on hydrology and water quality, including the combined sewer system and the potential for combined sewer outflows. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The project site is fully covered by an existing building, most of which would be converted to office use as part of the proposed project. No change in 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.
The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR noted that implementation of any of the proposed project’s rezoning options would encourage construction of new development within the project area. The PEIR found that there is a high potential to encounter hazardous materials during construction activities in many parts of the project area because of the presence of 1906 earthquake fill, previous and current land uses associated with the use of hazardous materials, and known or suspected hazardous materials cleanup cases. However, the PEIR found that existing regulations for facility closure, Under Storage Tank (UST) closure, and investigation and cleanup of soil and groundwater would ensure implementation of measures to protect workers and the community from exposure to hazardous materials during construction.

**Hazardous Building Materials**

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that future development in the Plan Area may involve demolition or renovation of existing structures containing hazardous building materials. Some building materials commonly used in older buildings could present a public health risk if disturbed during an accident or during demolition or renovation of an existing building. Hazardous building materials addressed in the PIER 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 or renovation of a building, these materials would also require special disposal procedures. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified a significant impact associated with hazardous building materials including PCBs, DEHP, and mercury and determined that that Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials, as outlined below, would reduce effects to a less-than-significant level. Because the proposed development includes renovation of an existing building, Mitigation Measure L-1 would apply to the proposed project. See the full text of Mitigation Measure L-1 in the Mitigation Measures Section below.

Soil and Groundwater Contamination

The proposed project includes renovation of an existing building, and conversion of PDR space to office use. The proposed project would not involve ground disturbance or excavation. Therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to expose the public to contaminated soil or groundwater. The proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to soil and groundwater contamination that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES— Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the Area Plan would facilitate the construction of both new residential units and commercial buildings, as well as conversion of existing buildings to different uses. Development of these uses would not result in use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy in a wasteful manner or in the context of energy use throughout the City and region. The energy demand for individual buildings would be typical for such projects and would meet, or exceed, current state and local codes and standards concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations enforced by DBI. The Plan Area does not include any natural resources routinely extracted and the rezoning does not result in any natural resource extraction programs. Therefore, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that implementation of the Area Plan would not result in a significant impact on mineral and energy resources. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.
As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on mineral and energy resources beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<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>17. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

**Air Quality**

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

A. *Construction Emissions Minimization Plan.* Prior to issuance of a construction permit, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The Plan shall detail project compliance with the following
requirements:

1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 hp and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall meet the following requirements:

   a) Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited;

   b) All off-road equipment shall have:

      i. Engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or California Air Resources Board (ARB) Tier 2 off-road emission standards, and

      ii. Engines that are retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS).\(^{16}\)

   c) Exceptions:

      i. Exceptions to A(1)(a) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site and that the requirements of this exception provision apply. Under this circumstance, the sponsor shall submit documentation of compliance with A(1)(b) for onsite power generation.

      ii. Exceptions to A(1)(b)(ii) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is: (1) technically not feasible, (2) would not produce desired emissions reductions due to expected operating modes, (3) installing the control device would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator, or (4) there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that are not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS and the sponsor has submitted documentation to the ERO that the requirements of this exception provision apply. If granted an exception to A(1)(b)(ii), the project sponsor must comply with the requirements of A(1)(c)(iii).

---

\(^{16}\) Equipment with engines meeting Tier 4 Interim or Tier 4 Final emission standards automatically meet this requirement, therefore a VDECS would not be required.
iii. If an exception is granted pursuant to A(1)(c)(ii), the project sponsor shall provide the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment as provided by the step down schedules in Table 1.

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

* Alternative fuels are not a VDECS.

2. The project sponsor shall require the idling time for off-road and on-road equipment be limited to no more than two minutes, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment. Legible and visible signs shall be posted in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Chinese) in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two minute idling limit.

3. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications.

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

5. The Plan shall be kept on-site and available for review by any persons requesting it and a legible sign shall be posted at the perimeter of the construction site indicating to the public the basic requirements of the Plan and a way to request a copy of the Plan. The
project sponsor shall provide copies of Plan to members of the public as requested.

B. **Reporting.** Quarterly reports shall be submitted to the ERO indicating the construction phase and off-road equipment information used during each phase including the information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used.

Within six months of the completion of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities. The final report shall indicate the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase. For each phase, the report shall include detailed information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used.

C. **Certification Statement and On-site Requirements.** Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project sponsor must certify (1) compliance with the Plan, and (2) all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into contract specifications.

**Hazardous Materials**

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

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.

**IMPROVEMENT MEASURES**

**Transportation and Circulation**

*Project Improvement Measure 1 – TDM Coordinator*

The project sponsor shall identify a TDM coordinator for the project site. The TDM Coordinator shall be responsible for the implementation and ongoing operation of all other TDM measures (Project Improvement Measures 2 and 3) included in the proposed project. The TDM Coordinator could be a brokered service through an existing transportation management association (e.g., the Transportation Management Association of San Francisco, TMASF), or the TDM Coordinator could be an existing staff member (e.g., property manager); the TDM Coordinator does not have to work full-time at the project site. However, the TDM Coordinator shall be the single point of contact for all transportation-related questions from building occupants and City staff. The TDM Coordinator shall provide TDM training to other building staff about the transportation amenities and options available at the project site and nearby.
**Project Improvement Measure 2 – Transportation and Trip Planning Information/New-Hire Packet**

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

**Project Improvement Measure 3 – Bicycle Parking**

The project sponsor shall provide at least 12 on-site secured bicycle parking spaces and 4 on-site publicly-accessible (visitor) bicycle parking spaces. Within one year after Final Certification of Completion for the subject project, the project sponsor shall contact in writing the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, San Francisco Department of Public Works, and/or Bay Area Bike Share (agencies) to fund the installation of up to 20 new bicycle racks on public right-of-way locations adjacent to or within a quarter mile of the project site (e.g., sidewalks, on-street parking spaces).