



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Community Plan Exemption Checklist

Case No.: **2014.0836E**
Project Title: **340-350 11th Street**
Zoning/Plan Area: WMUO (WSoMa Mixed Use Office) District
55-X Height and Bulk District
Western SoMa Community Plan
Block/Lot: 3521/005 and 007
Lot Size: 7,380 square feet
Project Sponsor: 340-350 11th Street LLC
c/o Neil Kaye – Natoma Architects, Inc.
(415) 626-8977, x112, nkaye@saitowitz.com
Staff Contact: Michael Li
(415) 575-9107, michael.j.li@sfgov.org

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377


PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site, which is on the west side of 11th Street between Folsom and Harrison streets in San Francisco's South of Market neighborhood, consists of two adjacent parcels: Assessor's Block 3521, Lots 005 and 007. Lot 005 is occupied by a two-story, 22-foot-tall building that has been vacant since 2013. The previous tenant of the building was a sheet metal shop. Lot 007 has no permanent structure and is leased to a mobile food vendor who uses the property for storage.

The proposed project consists of merging the two existing lots into a single 7,380-square-foot lot, the demolition of the existing building, and the construction of a four-story, 55-foot-tall, building containing 17,850 gross square feet (gsf) of office space and 5,500 gsf of retail space. There would be a six-foot-tall skylight on the roof of the building; the maximum building height would be 61 feet. The office space would occupy the second through fourth floors, and the retail space would occupy the ground floor. There would be no automobile parking spaces, and the two existing curb cuts on 11th Street would be removed. A total of eight bicycle parking spaces would be provided (four Class 1 spaces and four Class 2 spaces). The Class 1 spaces would be in a secure storage room on the ground floor of the building, and the Class 2 spaces would be on the sidewalk adjacent to the project site.

Project Construction

Construction of the proposed project is expected to take about 12 months. The proposed building would rest on a mat foundation; no pile driving would be required. Construction of the proposed project would require excavation to a depth of two feet below ground surface and the removal of about 552 cubic yards of soil.



SOURCE: San Francisco Planning Department

FIGURE 1: PROJECT LOCATION




FIGURE 2: PROPOSED SITE PLAN

SOURCE: Natoma Architects




FIGURE 3: PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN

SOURCE: Natoma Architects




FIGURE 4: PROPOSED THIRD FLOOR PLAN
(SECOND AND FOURTH FLOORS SIMILAR)

SOURCE: Natoma Architects




FIGURE 5: PROPOSED ROOF PLAN

SOURCE: Natoma Architects




FIGURE 6: PROPOSED EAST ELEVATION

SOURCE: Natoma Architects




FIGURE 7: PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION

SOURCE: Natoma Architects




FIGURE 8: PROPOSED SOUTH ELEVATION

SOURCE: Natoma Architects



FIGURE 9: VIEW ALONG 11TH STREET

SOURCE: Natoma Architects

Project Approval

The proposed project would require the following approvals:

- **Demolition Permit** (*Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection*)
- **Site/Building Permit** (*Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection*)

The proposed project is subject to notification under Planning Code Section 312. If discretionary review before the Planning Commission is requested, the discretionary review decision constitutes the Approval Action for the proposed project. If no discretionary review is requested, the issuance of the building permit by the Department of Building Inspection constitutes the Approval Action for the proposed project. The Approval Action date establishes the start of the 30-day appeal period for this CEQA exemption determination pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

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 Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, and 350 Eighth Street Project (Western SoMa PEIR).¹ 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 Western SoMa 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 topics 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 described in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) that is attached to the CPE Certificate.

The Western SoMa PEIR identified significant impacts related to cultural and paleontological resources, transportation and circulation, noise and vibration, air quality, wind and shadow, biological resources, and hazards and hazardous materials. Additionally, the PEIR identified significant cumulative impacts related to cultural and paleontological resources, transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, and shadow. Mitigation measures were identified for the above impacts—aside from shadow—and reduced said impacts to less-than-significant levels except for those related to cultural and paleontological resources (cumulative impacts from demolition of historic resources), transportation (cumulative transit impacts on several Muni lines), noise (cumulative noise impacts), and air quality (program-level TACs and PM_{2.5} pollutant impacts, program-level and cumulative criteria air pollutant impacts).

¹ San Francisco Planning Department, *Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, and 350 Eighth Street Project Final Environmental Impact Report* (PEIR), Planning Department Cases No. 2008.0877E and 2007.1035E, State Clearinghouse No. 2009082031, certified December 6, 2012. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>, accessed June 3, 2016.

The proposed project would include construction of a 55-foot-tall building containing 17,850 gsf of office space and 5,500 gsf of retail space. As discussed in this CPE 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 Western SoMa PEIR.

SENATE BILL 743

Aesthetics and Parking

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

- a) The project is in a transit priority area;
- b) The project is on an infill site; and
- c) The project is residential, mixed-use residential, or an employment center.

The proposed project meets each of the above criteria; therefore, this checklist does not consider aesthetics or parking in determining the significance of project impacts under CEQA.² Project elevations and a rendering are included in the project description.

Automobile Delay and Vehicle Miles Traveled

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

In January 2016, the OPR published for public review and comment a [Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA](#),³ recommending that transportation impacts for projects be measured using a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) metric. On March 3, 2016, in anticipation of the future certification of the revised CEQA Guidelines, the San Francisco Planning Commission adopted the OPR’s recommendation to use the VMT metric instead of automobile delay to evaluate the transportation impacts of projects (Resolution No. 19579). The VMT metric does not apply to the analysis of project impacts on non-automobile modes of travel such as riding transit, walking, and bicycling. Therefore, impacts and mitigation measures from the Western SoMa PEIR associated with automobile delay are not discussed in this checklist, including PEIR Mitigation Measure M-TR-1c: Optimization of Signal Timing at the Eighth/Harrison/I-80 Westbound Off-Ramp Intersection. Instead, VMT and induced automobile travel impact analyses are provided in the Transportation and Circulation section of this checklist.

² San Francisco Planning Department, *Eligibility Checklist for CEQA Section 21099: Modernization of Transportation Analysis*, 340-350 11th Street, May 12, 2016.

³ This document is available online at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_sb743.php.

Topics:	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING— Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that adoption of the *Western SoMa Community Plan* would not result in a significant impact related to land use. The Western SoMa PEIR anticipated that future development under the Community Plan would result in more cohesive neighborhoods and would include more clearly defined residential, commercial, and industrial areas. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

Furthermore, the Citywide Planning and Current Planning divisions of the Planning Department have determined that the proposed project is permitted in the WMUO (WSoMa Mixed Use Office) Zoning District and is consistent with the height, density, and land uses as specified in the *Western SoMa Community Plan*, maintaining the mixed character of the area by encouraging residential and commercial development.^{4,5}

For these reasons, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to land use and land use planning that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

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

⁴ Adam Varat, San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning Analysis, 340-350 11th Street*, June 27, 2016.

⁵ Jeff Joslin, San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 340-350 11th Street*, June 30, 2016.

Topics:	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

One of the objectives of the *Western SoMa Community Plan* is to identify appropriate locations for housing to meet the citywide demand for additional housing. The Western SoMa PEIR concluded that an increase in population in the Plan Area is expected to occur as a secondary effect of the proposed rezoning and that any population increase would not, in and of 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 throughout the Plan Area. The Western SoMa 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 consists of construction a new building containing approximately 17,850 gsf of office space and approximately 5,500 gsf of retail space, which would result in a total of about 80 employees on the project site.⁶ These direct effects of the proposed project on population and housing are within the scope of the population growth anticipated under the *Western SoMa Community Plan* and are evaluated in the Western SoMa PEIR.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to population and housing that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

Topics:	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
3. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5, including those resources listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the San Francisco <i>Planning Code</i> ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

⁶ San Francisco Planning Department, *2002 Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review*, October 2002, Table C-1, p. C-3. The estimated number of employees is based on the following factors: one employee for every 350 sf of general retail space and one employee for every 276 sf of general office space.

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 Western SoMa PEIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts related to causing a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource through demolition.

The proposed project would demolish the existing two-story building constructed in 1907. The existing building and adjacent vacant lot were evaluated as part of the South of Market Area Historic Resource Survey. Based on this survey, the existing building and vacant lot were each assigned a California Historic Resource Status Code of 6Z, which defines the properties as “ineligible for [National Register], [California Register], or local designation through survey evaluation.” Therefore, the existing building and vacant lot are not considered to be historic resources for the purposes of CEQA. As such, the proposed project would not result in the demolition or alteration of any historic resource and would not contribute to the significant historic resource impact identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

The project site is in the Western SOMA Light Industrial and Residential Historic District, which is considered a historic resource under CEQA, and the Planning Department has reviewed the proposed project for design compatibility with the district.⁷ For the reasons discussed below, the Planning Department concluded that the proposed project is not compatible with the architectural character of the district. Existing buildings in the district are characterized by solid massing with vertical and horizontal rhythms that delineate window bays or floor lines, and windows are broken up into smaller panes of glass; the proposed project does not reflect these patterns. The material palette of existing industrial buildings in the district consists of concrete or brick construction with brick or stucco cladding; the proposed project does not address this material palette. Since the project site is at the edge of the district, the design compatibility of the proposed project is less of a concern than it would be if the project site were more centrally located within the district. Given the large area covered by the district, an incompatible addition at the edge of the district would not affect the significance of the district.⁸ For these reasons, implementation of the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource.⁹

As part of the South of Market Area Historic Resource Survey, the adjacent building at 320 11th Street (Assessor’s Block 3521, Lot 004) was assigned a California Historic Resource Status Code of 3D, which defines the property as “appears eligible for [National Register] as a contributor to a [National Register] eligible district through survey evaluation.” For the purposes of CEQA, this building is considered a historic resource. Project-related construction activities have the potential to damage this historic resource. The Western SoMa PEIR identified two mitigation measures that would reduce construction-related impacts on historic resources to less-than-significant levels.

PEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-7a: Protect Historical Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities, requires project sponsors to ensure that construction contractors use all feasible means to avoid damage

⁷ San Francisco Planning Department, *Historic Resource Evaluation Response, 340-350 11th Street* (hereinafter “HRER”), February 29, 2016.

⁸ HRER, p. 6.

⁹ HRER, p. 6.

to adjacent and nearby historic buildings. Such methods may include maintaining a safe distance between the construction site and the historic buildings, using construction techniques that reduce vibration, using appropriate excavation shoring methods to prevent movement of adjacent structures, and providing adequate security to minimize risks of vandalism and fire. PEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-7a, discussed under Project Mitigation Measure 1 on p. 41, is applicable to the proposed project.

PEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-7b: Construction Monitoring Program for Historical Resources, requires project sponsors to monitor adjacent historic resources for damage caused by project-related construction activities, especially when heavy equipment is used, and to repair any damage that may occur. PEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-7b, discussed under Project Mitigation Measure 2 on pp. 41-42, is applicable 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 Western SoMa PEIR.

Archeological Resources

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that implementation of the *Western SoMa Community Plan* could result in significant impacts on archeological resources and identified two mitigation measures that would reduce these potential impacts to less than-significant levels. PEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a: Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment, and M-CP-4b: Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources, apply to projects involving any soils-disturbing or soils-improving activities, including excavation to a depth of five or more feet below grade. As the proposed project at 340-350 11th Street would involve up to two feet of soils disturbance to construct the building foundation, PEIR Mitigation Measures M-CP-4a and M-CP-4b are applicable to the proposed project.

As part of project implementation of PEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a, the Planning Department's archeologist conducted a Preliminary Archeology Review (PAR) of the project site and the proposed project. The PAR determined that the project would not have the potential to adversely affect an archeological resource. However, the proposed project is subject to PEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-4b to reduce potential impacts from accidental discovery of buried archeological resources during project construction to less-than-significant levels.¹⁰ PEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-4b is discussed on pp. 42-43 under Project Mitigation Measure 3. The proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to archeological resources with implementation of these mitigation measures.

For the reasons above, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on cultural and paleontological resources that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

¹⁰ Randall Dean, San Francisco Planning Department, email to Michael Li, San Francisco Planning Department, July 23, 2015.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
4. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION— Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, CPE Checklist Topic 4c is not applicable to the proposed project.

The Western SoMa PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes would not result in significant impacts related to pedestrians, bicyclists, emergency access, or construction. Transportation system improvements included as part of the *Western SoMa Community Plan* were identified to have significant impacts related to loading, but the impacts were reduced to less-than-significant levels with mitigation.

The Western SoMa PEIR anticipated that adoption of the *Western SoMa Community Plan* could result in significant impacts on transit and loading, and identified two transportation mitigation measures. One mitigation measure reduced loading impacts to less-than-significant levels. Even with mitigation, however, it was anticipated that the significant cumulative impacts on transit lines could not be fully mitigated. Thus, these impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable.

Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis

Many factors affect travel behavior. These factors include density, diversity of land uses, design of the transportation network, access to regional destinations, distance to high-quality transit, development scale, demographics, and transportation demand management. Typically, low-density development at great distance from other land uses, located in areas with poor access to non-private vehicular modes of

travel, generate more automobile travel compared to development located in urban areas, where a higher density, mix of land uses, and travel options other than private vehicles are available.

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

The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Transportation Authority) uses the San Francisco Chained Activity Model Process (SF-CHAMP) to estimate VMT by private automobiles and taxis for different land use types. Travel behavior in SF-CHAMP is calibrated based on observed behavior from the California Household Travel Survey 2010-2012, census data regarding automobile ownership rates and county-to-county worker flows, and observed vehicle counts and transit boardings. SF-CHAMP uses a synthetic population, which is a set of individual actors that represents the Bay Area's actual population, who make simulated travel decisions for a complete day. The Transportation Authority uses tour-based analysis for residential uses, which examines the entire chain of trips over the course of a day, not just trips to and from the project site.¹¹

For office development, the regional average daily VMT per capita is 19.1. For retail development, the regional average daily VMT per capita is 14.9. Please see Table 1: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled, which includes the transportation analysis zone (TAZ), 589, in which the project site is located.

Table 1: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled

<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Existing</u>			<u>Cumulative 2040</u>		
	<u>Bay Area Regional Average</u>	<u>Bay Area Regional Average minus 15%</u>	<u>TAZ 589</u>	<u>Bay Area Regional Average</u>	<u>Bay Area Regional Average minus 15%</u>	<u>TAZ 589</u>
Employment (Office)	19.1	16.2	8.0	17.0	14.5	7.1
Employment (Retail)	14.9	12.6	9.3	14.6	12.4	9.2

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

¹¹ San Francisco Planning Department, *Executive Summary: Resolution Modifying Transportation Impact Analysis*, Appendix F, Attachment A, March 3, 2016.

In TAZ 589, the existing average daily office employee VMT per capita is 8.0, and the existing average retail employee VMT per capita is 9.3.¹² In TAZ 589, the future 2040 average daily office employee VMT per capita would be 7.1, and the future 2040 average daily retail employee VMT per capita would be 9.2.¹³ Given that the project site is located in an area in which the existing and future 2040 residential and retail employee VMT are and would be more than 15 percent below the existing and future 2040 regional averages, the proposed project's office and retail uses would not result in substantial additional VMT, and impacts would be less than significant. Furthermore, the project site meets the Proximity to Transit Stations screening criterion, which also indicates the proposed project's residential uses would not cause substantial additional VMT.¹⁴

Induced Automobile Travel Analysis

A proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would substantially induce additional automobile travel by increasing physical roadway capacity in congested areas (i.e., by adding new mixed-flow lanes) or by adding new roadways to the network. The OPR's proposed transportation impact guidelines includes a list of transportation project types that would not likely lead to a substantial or measureable increase in VMT. If a project fits within the general types of projects (including combinations of types), then it is presumed that VMT impacts would be less than significant, and a detailed VMT analysis is not required.

The proposed project is not a transportation project. However, the proposed project would include features that would alter the transportation network. The two existing curb cuts on 11th Street would be removed, and Class 2 bicycle parking facilities would be installed on the 11th Street sidewalk adjacent to the project site. These features fit within the general types of projects that would not substantially induce automobile travel, and the impacts would be less than significant.¹⁵

Trip Generation

Trip generation for the proposed project was calculated using information in the *2002 Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review (Transportation Guidelines)* developed by the San Francisco Planning Department.¹⁶ The proposed project would generate an estimated 1,148 person trips (inbound and outbound) on a weekday daily basis, consisting of 731 person trips by auto, 161 transit trips, 220 walk trips, and 36 trips by other modes. During the p.m. peak hour, the proposed project would generate an estimated 67 person trips by auto. Accounting for vehicle occupancy data for the project site's census tract, the proposed project would generate 405 daily vehicle trips, 40 of which would occur during the p.m. peak hour.

Transit

The project site is well served by public transportation. Within one-quarter mile of the project site, the San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) operates the following bus lines: the 9 San Bruno, 9L San Bruno Limited, 12 Folsom/Pacific, 14 Mission, 14L Mission Limited, 27 Bryant, 47 Van Ness, 49 Van Ness-

¹² San Francisco Planning Department, *Eligibility Checklist for CEQA Section 21099: Modernization of Transportation Analysis, 340-350 11th Street*, May 16, 2016.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ San Francisco Planning Department, *Transportation Calculations, 340-350 11th Street*, revised May 16, 2016.

Mission, and the 83X Mid-Market Express. The intersection of 11th and Folsom streets, which is closest to the project site, has a bus stop on each corner. These bus stops serve the 9 San Bruno, 12 Folsom/Pacific, and 47 Van Ness bus lines. There are additional public transportation options within 0.5 mile of the project site. Muni operates buses that run on Market, Mission, and Bryant streets as well as light rail service that runs underneath Market Street, and the San Mateo County Transit District operates buses that run on 9th, 10th, and Mission streets.

According to the *Western SoMa Community Plan Transportation Impact Study*, all of the transit lines serving the Plan Area are currently operating well-below Muni's capacity utilization (the number of passengers on board a transit vehicle relative to the total capacity) of 85 percent.¹⁷ The proposed project would generate a total of 161 daily transit trips and 14 p.m. peak-hour transit trips, which would be distributed among the multiple transit lines serving the project vicinity. These 161 daily and 14 p.m. peak-hour transit trips represent a minor contribution to overall transit demand in the Plan Area that would be accommodated by existing transit capacity. The proposed project would not result in unacceptable levels of transit service or cause an increase in transit service delays or operating costs.

As discussed above, the Western SoMa PEIR identified significant cumulative impacts related to delays in transit service. The proposed project would not contribute considerably to this impact, because its contribution of an estimated 405 daily and 40 p.m. peak-hour vehicle trips would not be a substantial proportion of the overall traffic volume or the new vehicle trips generated by *Western SoMa Community Plan* projects.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to transit that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

Loading

The Western SoMa PEIR analyzed loading impacts associated with development projects and streetscape projects that would be implemented under the *Western SoMa Community Plan*. The analysis provided an overall comparison of proposed loading space supply to the Planning Code requirements and discussed the extent to which the estimated daily and peak-hour loading demand would affect loading conditions throughout the Plan Area. Based on the development anticipated under the Western SoMa PEIR, implementation of the *Western SoMa Community Plan* would generate about 446 delivery and service vehicle trips per day and a demand of about 26 loading spaces during the peak hour of loading activities throughout the Plan Area.

Because it is expected that individual development projects implemented under the *Western SoMa Community Plan* would include off-street loading spaces consistent with Planning Code requirements, the loading demand generated by these development projects would be accommodated within the combination of proposed off-street loading spaces and existing and new on-street loading spaces. Therefore, loading impacts would be less than significant.

Pursuant to Planning Code Section 152.1, the proposed project is not required to provide any off-street loading spaces. The project site is on the west side of 11th Street between Folsom and Harrison streets. There is an existing on-street loading space on 11th Street directly in front of the project site, and there is a

¹⁷ LCW Consulting, *Western SoMa Community Plan Transportation Impact Study*, Table 4, June 2012.

second on-street loading space on 11th Street about 40 feet north of the project site. During a midday field observation, one loading space was being used for a delivery and the other loading space was unoccupied and available for use.¹⁸ The proposed project would generate less than one loading trip per day, which equates to an average peak-hour loading demand of less than one space.¹⁹ The peak loading demand for the proposed project could be met by existing on-street loading spaces.

Given the peak-hour loading demand of less than one space for the proposed project and the availability of existing on-street loading spaces near the project site, the proposed project would not have significant loading impacts.

The Western SoMa PEIR stated that *Western SoMa Community Plan's* transportation system improvements such as the widening of sidewalks and the construction of bulb-outs within the Plan Area, specifically along Folsom Street between 4th and 13th streets, could affect the existing supply of on-street commercial vehicle loading spaces. The PEIR identified Mitigation Measure M-TR-4: Provision of New Loading Spaces on Folsom Street, to reduce potential loading impacts on Folsom Street to less-than-significant levels. This mitigation measure would be applicable to the removal of any commercial vehicle loading spaces on Folsom Street within the Plan Area due to proposed transportation improvements and requires project sponsors to coordinate with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to install new commercial vehicle loading spaces of equal length, on the same block, and on the same side of the street at locations where commercial vehicle loading spaces are removed.

The block of Folsom Street between 11th and 12th streets, which is just north of the project site, does not include any existing commercial vehicle loading spaces. Sidewalk widenings or bulb-outs proposed for this segment of Folsom Street would not result in the removal of any existing commercial vehicle loading spaces, and PEIR Mitigation Measure M-TR-4 is not applicable to the proposed project.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant loading impacts that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

Topics:	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
5. NOISE—Would the project:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

¹⁸ Field observation, June 8, 2016.

¹⁹ San Francisco Planning Department, *2002 Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review*, October 2002, Appendix H, pp. H-1 to H-2.

<u>Topics:</u>	<u>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</u>	<u>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</u>	<u>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</u>	<u>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</u>
d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Be substantially affected by existing noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Western SoMa PEIR identified potential conflicts related to residences and other noise-sensitive uses in proximity to noise-generating uses such as PDR, retail, entertainment, office, and cultural/institutional/educational uses. In addition, the Western SoMa PEIR noted that implementation of the *Western SoMa Community Plan* would incrementally increase traffic-generated noise on some streets in the Plan Area and would result in construction noise impacts from pile driving and other construction activities. The Western SoMa PEIR identified six noise mitigation measures that would reduce noise impacts to less-than-significant levels; three of these mitigation measures may be applicable to subsequent development projects.²⁰

PEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-1c addresses impacts related to individual development projects containing land uses that could generate noise that exceeds ambient noise levels in their respective vicinities. The proposed project includes office and retail uses; it does not include noise-generating uses. For this reason, PEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-1c is not applicable to the proposed project.

The proposed project would be subject to the California Building Standards Code (Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations), which establishes uniform noise insulation standards. The Title 24 acoustical standards for nonresidential structures are incorporated into the San Francisco Green Building Code. Title 24 allows the project sponsor to choose between a prescriptive or performance-based acoustical standard for nonresidential structures. Pursuant to the Title 24 acoustical standards, all

²⁰ Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a, M-NO-1b, and M-NO-1d address the siting of sensitive land uses in noisy environments. In a decision issued on December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require an agency to consider the effects of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project's future users or residents except where a project or its residents may exacerbate existing environmental hazards (*California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District*, December 17, 2015, Case No. S213478. Available at: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/opinions/documents/S213478.PDF>). As noted above, the Western SoMa PEIR determined that incremental increases in traffic-related noise attributable to implementation of the *Western SoMa Community Plan* would be less than significant and thus would not exacerbate the existing noise environment. Therefore, Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a, M-NO-1b, and M-NO-1d are not applicable. Nonetheless, for all noise-sensitive uses, the general requirements for adequate interior noise levels of Mitigation Measures M-NO-1a, M-NO-1b, and M-NO-1d would be met by compliance with the acoustical standards set forth in the California Building Standards Code (Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations).

building wall, floor/ceiling, and window assemblies are required to meet certain sound transmission class or outdoor-indoor sound transmission class ratings to ensure that adequate interior noise levels are achieved. In compliance with Title 24, the DBI would review the final building plans to ensure that the building wall, floor/ceiling, and window assemblies meet Title 24 acoustical requirements. If determined necessary by the DBI, a detailed acoustical analysis of the exterior wall and window assemblies may be required.

PEIR Mitigation Measures M-NO-2a: General Construction Noise Control Measures, and M-NO-2b: Noise Control Measures During Pile Driving, require implementation of noise controls during construction in order to reduce construction-related noise impacts. The proposed project consists of the demolition of the existing building on the project site and the construction of a new four-story building, which would contribute to construction-related noise impacts. Therefore, PEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a, discussed under Project Mitigation Measure 4 on pp. 43-44, is applicable to the proposed project. The proposed project would be supported by a mat foundation over improved soils; pile driving would not be required. Since the building foundation would avoid vibration effects typically generated by pile-driving activities, PEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b is not applicable to the proposed project.

In addition, all construction activities for the proposed project, which would occur over the course of approximately 12 months, are subject to and would comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (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 (L_{dn})^{21, 22} 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 San Francisco Public Works (SFPW) 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 level by 5 dBA at the project site's property line, the work must not be conducted between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. unless the Director of SFPW authorizes a special permit for conducting the work during that period.

The 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.), and the Police Department is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance during all other hours. Nonetheless, during the approximately 12-month construction period for the proposed project, occupants of nearby properties could be disturbed by construction noise. There may be times when construction noise could interfere with indoor activities in residences and businesses near the project site and be perceived as an annoyance by the occupants of nearby properties. The increase in project-related construction noise in the project vicinity would not be considered a significant impact of the proposed project, because the construction noise would be temporary (approximately

²¹ The standard method used to quantify environmental noise involves evaluating the sound with an adjustment to reflect the fact that human hearing is less sensitive to low-frequency sound than to mid- and high-frequency sound. This measurement adjustment is called "A" weighting, and the data are reported in A-weighted decibels (dBA).

²² The L_{dn} is the L_{eq} , or Energy Equivalent Level, of the A-weighted noise level over a 24-hour period, obtained after the addition of 10 dB to sound levels during nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.). The L_{eq} is the level of a steady noise which would have the same energy as the fluctuating noise level integrated over the time period of interest.

12 months), intermittent, and restricted in occurrence and level, as the contractor is subject to and would comply with the Noise Ordinance. Compliance with the Noise Ordinance would reduce any construction-related noise effects on nearby residences to the greatest extent feasible.

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, CPE Checklist Topics 5e and 5f are not applicable to the proposed project.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant noise impacts that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

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

The Western SoMa PEIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts related to violation of an air quality standard, uses that emit diesel particulate matter (DPM), exposure of sensitive land uses to substantial pollutant concentrations, and construction emissions. The Western SoMa PEIR identified five mitigation measures that would help reduce air quality impacts; however, due to the uncertain nature of future development proposals that would result from adoption of the *Western SoMa Community Plan*, it could not be determined whether implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Criteria Air Pollutants

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the regional agency with jurisdiction over the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. As part of its *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (Air Quality Guidelines)*, the BAAQMD developed screening criteria for determining whether a project’s criteria air pollutant emissions would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants.²³

²³ Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, updated May 2011, pp. 3-2 to 3-3.

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, with 17,850 gsf of office space and 5,500 gsf of retail space, is below both the construction screening criterion and the operational screening criterion for the “general office building” and “strip mall” land use types. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants, and a detailed air quality assessment is not required.

PEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2: Transportation Demand Management Strategies for Future Development Projects, is required for projects generating more than 3,500 daily vehicle trips, resulting in excessive criteria pollutant emissions. The proposed project would generate about 405 daily vehicle trips. Therefore, PEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2 is not applicable to the proposed project.

Health Risk

Subsequent to certification of the Western SoMa PEIR, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes (Ordinance No. 224-14, effective December 7, 2014), generally referred to as Health Code Article 38: Enhanced Ventilation Required for Urban Infill Sensitive Use Developments (Article 38). The purpose of Article 38 is to protect the public health and welfare by establishing an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone (APEZ) and imposing an enhanced ventilation requirement for all urban infill sensitive use development within the APEZ. The project site is within an APEZ. The APEZ, as defined in Article 38, consists of areas that, based on modeling of all known air pollutant sources, exceed health protective standards for cumulative PM_{2.5} concentration and cumulative excess cancer risk. The APEZ incorporates health vulnerability factors and proximity to freeways. Projects within the APEZ, such as the proposed project, 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.

Siting Sensitive Land Uses

For sensitive use projects within the APEZ 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 PM_{2.5} (fine particulate matter) equivalent to that associated with a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value 13 filtration. The DBI will not issue a building permit without written notification from the Director of the DPH that the applicant has an approved Enhanced Ventilation Proposal.

The proposed project does not include any land uses that are considered sensitive receptors. Therefore, PEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Reduction in Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants for New Sensitive Receptors and the provisions of Article 38 are not applicable to the proposed project.

Siting New Sources

PEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4: Siting of Uses that Emit PM_{2.5} or DPM and Other TACs, requires analysis of operational emissions for new development that would generate substantial levels of TACs as part of everyday operations, whether from stationary or mobile sources. The proposed project would not generate more than 10,000 vehicle trips per day, more than 100 truck trips per day, or more than

40 refrigerated truck trips per day. In addition, the proposed project would not include a backup diesel generator. For these reasons, PEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4 is not applicable to the proposed project.

Construction

The proposed project would require heavy-duty off-road diesel vehicles and equipment during the first three to four months of the anticipated 12-month construction period. PEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-6: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Criteria Air Pollutants, requires a development project that may exceed the standards for criteria air pollutants to undergo an analysis of its construction emissions. If, based on that analysis, the construction emissions may be significant, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for review and approval by the Planning Department. As discussed above, the proposed project does not exceed the BAAQMD's construction screening criterion for the "general office building" and "strip mall" land use types. For this reason, PEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-6 is not applicable to the proposed project.

PEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Health Risks and Hazards, requires projects proposing construction in areas of poor air quality to maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions of particulates and other pollutants. PEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7 requires, among other things, diesel equipment to meet a minimum performance standard (all engines greater than 25 horsepower must meet Tier 2 emissions standards and be equipped with a Level 3-verified diesel emissions control strategy). The project site is within an APEZ, and construction activities from the proposed project would result in DPM and other TACs from equipment exhaust, construction-related vehicular activity, and construction worker automobile trips. Construction would last approximately 12 months, and diesel-generating equipment would be required for the duration of the project's construction phase. As a result, the proposed project's temporary and variable construction activities would result in short-term emissions of DPM and other TACs that would add emissions to areas already adversely affected by poor air quality. Therefore, PEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7 is applicable to the proposed project and is discussed under Project Mitigation Measure 5 on pp. 44-46. Compliance with this mitigation measure would result in less-than-significant air quality impacts from construction vehicles and equipment.

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes, generally referred to as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance No. 176-08, effective August 29, 2008). The intent of this 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 avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection. 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, sweeping streets and sidewalks, and other measures. The regulations and procedures set forth in the Construction Dust Control Ordinance would ensure that construction dust impacts would not be significant.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the proposed project is required to comply with the provisions of the Construction Dust Control Ordinance. In addition, implementation of PEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7 would reduce construction-related air quality impacts to less-than-significant levels. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant air quality impacts that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

Topics:	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
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS—Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Western SoMa PEIR

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has prepared guidelines and methodologies for analyzing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. These guidelines are consistent with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.4 and 15183.5, which address the analysis and determination of significant impacts from a proposed project's GHG emissions and allow for projects that are consistent with a GHG reduction strategy to conclude that the project's GHG impact is less than significant. San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*²⁴ presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy in compliance with the BAAQMD and CEQA guidelines. These GHG reduction actions have resulted in a 23.3 percent reduction in GHG emissions in 2012 compared to 1990 levels,²⁵ exceeding the year 2020 reduction goals outlined in the BAAQMD's *Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan*, Executive Order S-3-05, and Assembly Bill 32 (also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act).^{26, 27} In addition, San Francisco's GHG reduction goals are consistent with, or more aggressive than, the long-term goals established under Executive Orders S-3-05²⁸

²⁴ San Francisco Planning Department, *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions in San Francisco*, November 2010. Available at http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/GHG_Reduction_Strategy.pdf, accessed March 3, 2016.

²⁵ ICF International, *Technical Review of the 2012 Community-wide Inventory for the City and County of San Francisco*, January 21, 2015.

²⁶ California Legislative Information, Assembly Bill 32, September 27, 2006. Available at http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/05-06/bill/asm/ab_0001-0050/ab_32_bill_20060927_chaptered.pdf, accessed March 3, 2016.

²⁷ 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.

²⁸ Executive Order S-3-05, sets forth a series of target dates by which statewide emissions of GHGs need to be progressively reduced, as follows: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels (approximately 457 million MTCO₂E); by 2020, reduce emissions to 1990 levels (approximately 427 million MTCO₂E); and by 2050 reduce emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels (approximately 85 million MTCO₂E).

and B-30-15.^{29, 30} Therefore, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's GHG Reduction Strategy would not result in GHG emissions that would have a significant effect on the environment and would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations.

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that the goals and policies of the area plan were consistent with San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy and that implementation of the area plan policies would ensure that subsequent development would be consistent with GHG plans and would result in less-than-significant impacts with respect to GHG emissions.

Proposed Project

The proposed project would increase the intensity of use of the project site by introducing 17,850 gsf of office space and 5,500 gsf of retail space to replace a vacant industrial building and a vacant lot. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to annual long-term increases in GHGs as a result of increased vehicle trips (mobile sources) and office and retail operations that result in an increase in energy use, water use, wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal. Construction activities would also result in temporary increases in GHG emissions.

The proposed project would be subject to regulations adopted to reduce GHG emissions as identified in the GHG reduction strategy. As discussed below, compliance with the applicable regulations would reduce the project's GHG emissions related to transportation, energy use, waste disposal, wood burning, and use of refrigerants.

Compliance with the City's Community Benefits Program, Emergency Ride Home Program, Transportation Sustainability Fee, and bicycle parking requirements would reduce the proposed project's transportation-related GHG emissions. These regulations reduce GHG emissions from single-occupancy vehicles by promoting the use of alternative transportation modes with zero or lower GHG emissions on a per capita basis.

The proposed project would be required to comply with the energy efficiency requirements of the City's Green Building Code and Stormwater Management Ordinance, which would promote energy and water efficiency and reduce the proposed project's energy-related GHG emissions.³¹ Additionally, the project would be required to meet the renewable energy criteria of the Green Building Code, further reducing the project's energy-related GHG emissions.

The proposed project's waste-related GHG emissions would be reduced through compliance with the City's Recycling and Composting Ordinance, Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Ordinance, and Green Building Code requirements. These regulations reduce the amount of materials sent to a

²⁹ Office of the Governor, Executive Order B-30-15, April 29, 2015. Available at <https://www.gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=18938>, accessed March 3, 2016. Executive Order B-30-15 sets a State GHG emissions reduction goal of 40 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2030.

³⁰ San Francisco's GHG Reduction Goals are codified in Section 902 of the Environment Code and include: (i) by 2008, determine City GHG emissions for year 1990; (ii) by 2017, reduce GHG emissions by 25 percent below 1990 levels; (iii) by 2025, reduce GHG emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels; and by 2050, reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels.

³¹ Compliance with water conservation measures reduce the energy (and GHG emissions) required to convey, pump and treat water required for the project.

landfill, reducing GHGs emitted by landfill operations. These regulations also promote reuse of materials, conserving their embodied energy³² and reducing the energy required to produce new materials.

Compliance with the City’s street tree planting requirements would serve to increase carbon sequestration. Regulations requiring low-emitting finishes would reduce volatile organic compounds (VOCs).³³ Thus, the proposed project was determined to be consistent with San Francisco’s GHG reduction strategy.³⁴

Therefore, the proposed project’s GHG emissions would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations, and 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 such, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact with respect to GHG emissions. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts beyond those identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
8. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:				
a) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Wind

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that implementation of the *Western SoMa Community Plan* would have a potentially significant impact related to the alteration of wind in a manner that would substantially affect public areas. However, the PEIR determined that this impact could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of PEIR Mitigation Measure M-WS-1: Screening-Level Wind Analysis and Wind Testing, which would require a wind analysis for any new structures within the Plan Area that are 80 feet or taller. The proposed project would be 55 feet tall (61 feet tall at its highest point), so PEIR Mitigation Measure M-WS-1 is not applicable to the proposed project.

A proposed project’s wind impacts are directly related to its height, orientation, design, location, and surrounding development context. When a building is substantially taller than surrounding buildings, it can intercept winds that might otherwise flow overhead. The intercepted winds can be redirected down the vertical face of the building to ground level, and these redirected winds can be strong and turbulent.

³² Embodied energy is the total energy required for the extraction, processing, manufacture and delivery of building materials to the building site.
³³ While not a GHG, VOCs are precursor pollutants that form ground-level ozone. Increased ground-level ozone is an anticipated effect of future global warming that would result in added health effects locally. Reducing VOC emissions would reduce the anticipated local effects of global warming.
³⁴ San Francisco Planning Department, *Greenhouse Gas Analysis: Compliance Checklist for 340-350 11th Street*, May 12, 2016.

At a height of 55 feet (61 feet at the building's tallest point), the proposed project would be about five feet taller than the three existing adjacent buildings at 49-51, 55, and 65 Norfolk Street. These existing adjacent buildings, which are west and southwest of the project site, would largely shelter the proposed project from prevailing westerly and southwesterly winds. The proposed project would not be substantially taller than the existing adjacent buildings; any overhead winds from the west or southwest that are intercepted by the proposed project would be redirected onto the roofs of the existing adjacent buildings instead of downward to the sidewalk along 11th Street.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not cause significant wind impacts beyond those identified in the Western SoMa 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. The Western SoMa PEIR determined that implementation of the *Western SoMa Community Plan* would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to the creation of new shadows in a manner that would substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the construction of a four-story, 55-foot tall building (61 feet at the building's tallest point). The Planning Department prepared a preliminary shadow fan analysis and determined that the proposed project would not cast shadows on any properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission at any time during the year.^{35, 36}

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

For these reasons, the project would not contribute to the significant shadow impact identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

³⁵ A shadow fan is a diagram that shows the maximum potential reach of project shadow, without accounting for intervening buildings that could block the shadow, over the course of an entire year (from one hour after sunrise until one hour before sunset on each day of the year) in relation to the locations of nearby open spaces, recreation facilities, and parks.

³⁶ San Francisco Planning Department, *Shadow Fan Analysis, 340-350 11th Street*, May 11, 2016.

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

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that implementation of the *Western SoMa Community Plan* 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 were identified in the PEIR.

In November 2012, the voters of San Francisco passed the 2012 San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond, providing the Recreation and Park Department an additional \$195 million to continue capital projects for the renovation and repair of parks, recreation, and open space assets. An update of the Recreation and Open Space Element (ROSE) of the *General Plan* was adopted in April 2014. The amended ROSE provides a 20-year vision for open spaces in the City. The amended ROSE includes information and policies about accessing, acquiring, funding, and managing open spaces in San Francisco. The amended ROSE identifies locations where proposed open space connections should be built, specifically streets appropriate for potential “living alleys.” In addition, the amended ROSE identifies the role of both the *Better Streets Plan* and the Green Connections Network in open space and recreation. Green Connections are streets and paths that connect people to parks, open spaces, and the waterfront while enhancing the ecology of the street environment. Two routes identified within the Green Connections Network cross the Western SoMa Community Plan Area: Tenderloin to Potrero (Route 18) and Folsom, Mission Creek to McLaren (Route 20).

As the proposed project does not degrade recreational facilities and is within the scope of development projected under the *Western SoMa Community Plan*, there would be no additional impacts on recreation beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
10. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact on 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 scope of development projected under the *Western SoMa Community Plan*, there would be no additional impacts on utilities and service systems beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact on 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 scope of development projected under the *Western SoMa Community Plan*, there would be no additional impacts on public services beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.

Topics:	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

As discussed in the Western SoMa PEIR, the Plan Area is almost fully developed with buildings and other improvements such as streets and parking lots. Most of the Plan Area consists of structures that have been in industrial use for many years. As a result, landscaping and other vegetation is sparse, except for a few parks. Because future development projects under the *Western SoMa Community Plan* would largely consist of new construction in heavily built-out former industrial neighborhoods, loss of vegetation or disturbance of wildlife other than common urban species would be minimal. Therefore, the Western SoMa PEIR concluded that implementation of the *Western SoMa Community Plan* would not result in any significant effects related to riparian habitat, wetlands, movement of migratory species, local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, or habitat conservation plans.

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that the *Western SoMa Community Plan* would result in significant but mitigable impacts on special-status birds and bats that may be nesting in trees or roosting in

buildings that are proposed for removal/demolition as part of an individual project. As identified in the PEIR, Mitigation Measures M-BI-1a: Pre-Construction Special-Status Bird Surveys, and M-BI-1b: Pre-Construction Special-Status Bat Surveys, would reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

PEIR Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a requires that building permits issued for construction of projects within the Plan Area include conditions of approval requiring pre-construction special-status bird surveys when trees would be removed or buildings would be demolished as part of an individual project. Pre-construction special-status bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist between February 1 and August 15 if tree removal or building demolition is scheduled to take place during that period. The proposed project is subject to PEIR Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a, which is identified as Project Mitigation Measure 6 and discussed on p. 46.

PEIR Mitigation Measure M-BI-1b requires pre-construction special-status bat surveys by a qualified bat biologist when large trees (those with trunks over 12 inches in diameter) are to be removed, or when vacant buildings or buildings used seasonally or not occupied, especially in the upper stories, are to be demolished. The proposed project would not involve removal of any large trees but would involve demolition of an existing 20-foot-tall commercial building that has been vacant since 2013. For these reasons, demolition of the existing building could contribute to the impact on bats identified in the Western Soma PEIR. The proposed project is subject to PEIR Mitigation Measure M-BI-1b, which is identified as Project Mitigation Measure 7 and discussed on p. 46.

As the proposed project includes the mitigation measures discussed above and is within the scope of development projected under the *Western SoMa Community Plan*, there would be no additional impacts on biological resources beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
13. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Western SoMa PEIR concluded that implementation of the *Western SoMa Community Plan* would indirectly increase the population that would be subject to geologic hazards, including earthquakes, 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 risk, but would reduce them to an acceptable level given the seismically active characteristics of the San Francisco Bay Area. Therefore, the PEIR concluded that implementation of the *Western SoMa Community Plan* would not result in significant impacts related to geologic hazards. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

A geotechnical investigation was conducted to assess the geologic conditions underlying the project site and provide recommendations related to the proposed project’s design and construction. The findings and recommendations, presented in a 2004 geotechnical report and a 2015 update, are summarized below.^{37, 38}

The geotechnical investigation included the drilling of two test borings on the project site to depths of 25 and 40 feet below ground surface (bgs) and a Cone Penetrometer Test (CPT). Based on the soil samples and the CPT, the project site is underlain by fill consisting of medium dense to very dense sand. Groundwater was encountered approximately 12 feet bgs. There are no known active earthquake faults that run underneath the project site or in the project vicinity; the closest active fault to the project site is the San Andreas Fault, which is about seven miles to the southwest. The project site is not in a landslide zone or a liquefaction zone.³⁹

The proposed project would rest on a conventional mat foundation; no pile driving is required. Alternatively, a post-tensioned mat foundation or a spread footings foundation could be used.⁴⁰

³⁷ ENGEO, *Geotechnical Exploration, Mixed Use Townhouse Project, 340-350 11th Street, San Francisco, California*, August 27, 2004.

³⁸ ENGEO, *Updated Geotechnical Recommendations, 340-350 11th Street, San Francisco, California* (hereinafter “2015 Updated Geotechnical Recommendations”), April 17, 2015.

³⁹ San Francisco Planning Department, GIS database geology layer, accessed April 27, 2015.

⁴⁰ 2015 Updated Geotechnical Recommendations, p. 3.

Construction of the proposed project requires excavation to a depth of two feet bgs and the removal of about 552 cubic yards of soil from the project site. Groundwater would not be encountered during excavation. The 2004 geotechnical report and 2015 update include recommendations related to grading; demolition and stripping; excavation, underpinning, and shoring; site preparation; fill placement; foundations; slab moisture vapor reduction; site drainage; slab-on-grade construction; retaining walls; and utilities. The project sponsor has agreed to implement the recommendations in the geotechnical report.

The proposed project is required to comply with the San Francisco Building Code (Building Code), which ensures the safety of all new construction in San Francisco. The Department of Building Inspection (DBI) will review the project-specific geotechnical report during its review of the building permit application for the proposed project. In addition, the DBI may require additional site-specific soils report(s) as needed. Implementation of the recommendations in the geotechnical report, in combination with the requirement for a geotechnical report and the review of the building permit application pursuant to the DBI’s implementation of the Building Code would minimize the risk of loss, injury, or death due to seismic or other geologic hazards.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to geology and soils that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
14. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY—Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact related to 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 entire project site is covered by impervious surfaces, and the proposed building’s footprint would cover the entire project site. As a result, the proposed project would not result in an increase in the amount of impervious surface area on the project site or an increase in the amount of runoff and drainage from the project site. In accordance with the Stormwater Management Ordinance (Ordinance No. 83-10, effective May 22, 2010), the proposed project is subject to and would comply with the Stormwater Design Guidelines, incorporating Low Impact Design approaches and stormwater management systems into the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect runoff and drainage.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS— Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Western SoMa PEIR identified less-than-significant impacts related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous material; the potential for the *Western SoMa Community Plan* or subsequent development projects within the Plan Area to interfere with an adopted emergency response plan; and the potential for subsequent development projects within the Plan Area to expose people or structures to a significant risk with respect to fires.

Hazardous Building Materials

The proposed project would involve demolition of the existing 22-foot-tall building on the project site, which was built in 1907. Because this structure was built before the 1970s, hazardous building materials such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), mercury, asbestos and lead-based paint are likely to be present in this structure. Demolishing the existing structure could expose workers or the community to hazardous building materials. In compliance with the Western SoMa PEIR, the proposed project would be required to implement PEIR Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2: Hazardous Building Materials Abatement, identified as Project Mitigation Measure 8 and discussed on p. 47, before demolition of the existing structure, which would reduce potential impacts related to hazardous building materials to less-than-significant levels.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to hazardous building materials that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

Handling of Potentially Contaminated Soils

The Western SoMa PEIR identified potentially significant impacts related to exposing the public or the environment to unacceptable levels of hazardous materials as a result of subsequent development projects within the Plan Area. The PEIR determined that Mitigation Measure M-HZ-3: Site Assessment and Corrective Action, would reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Subsequently, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors amended Health Code Article 22A (also known as the Maher Ordinance), which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH).

Amendments to the Maher Ordinance became effective August 24, 2013 and require that sponsors for projects that disturb more than 50 cubic yards of soil 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. PEIR Mitigation Measure M-HZ-3, related to contaminated soil and groundwater, is therefore superseded by the Maher Ordinance.

The project site is located in a Maher Area, meaning that it is known or suspected to contain contaminated soil and/or groundwater.⁴¹ The proposed project would require excavation to a depth of two feet below grade and the disturbance of more than 50 cubic yards of soil. Therefore, the project sponsor is required to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I 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 proposed 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.

A Phase I ESA has been prepared to assess the potential for site contamination.⁴² The Phase I ESA identified one Recognized Environmental Condition: evidence of the presence or likely presence of benzene associated with a former dry cleaner on the project site.⁴³ The Phase I ESA recommends that a subsurface investigation be conducted to determine whether the soil underlying the project site may be contaminated.⁴⁴

In compliance with the Maher Ordinance, the project sponsor has submitted a Maher Ordinance Application to the DPH.⁴⁵ Pursuant to compliance with the Maher Ordinance, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to hazardous soil and/or groundwater beyond those identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

As discussed above, implementation of Project Mitigation Measure 8 and compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations would ensure that the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

⁴¹ San Francisco Planning Department, *Expanded Maher Area Map*, March 2015. Available online at http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/library_of_cartography/Maher%20Map.pdf. Accessed June 3, 2016.

⁴² AEI Consultants, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 340-350 11th Street, San Francisco, California* (hereinafter "Phase I ESA"), September 9, 2014.

⁴³ *Phase I ESA*, pp. iv-v.

⁴⁴ *Phase I ESA*, p. vi.

⁴⁵ *Maher Ordinance Application, 340-350 11th Street*, submitted December 3, 2014.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
16. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES— Would the project:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that the *Western SoMa Community Plan* would facilitate the construction of both new residential and commercial buildings. Development of these uses would not result in use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy in a wasteful manner 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 the 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 Western SoMa PEIR concluded that implementation of the *Western SoMa Community 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 scope of development projected under the *Western SoMa Community Plan*, there would be no additional impacts on mineral and energy resources beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<u>Topics:</u>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that no agriculture or forest resources exist in the Plan Area; therefore the *Western SoMa Community Plan* would have no effect on agriculture and forest resources. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

As the proposed project is within the scope of development projected under the *Western SoMa Community Plan*, there would be no additional impacts on agriculture and forest resources beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Project Mitigation Measure 1 – Protect Historical Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities

The project sponsor shall consult with Planning Department environmental planning/preservation staff to determine whether adjacent or nearby buildings constitute historical resources that could be adversely affected by construction-generated vibration. For purposes of this measure, nearby historic buildings shall include those within 100 feet of a construction site if pile driving would be used; otherwise, it shall include historic buildings within 25 feet if heavy equipment would be used on the construction site. (No measures need be applied if no heavy equipment would be employed.) If one or more historical resources is identified that could be adversely affected, the project sponsor shall incorporate into construction specifications for the proposed project a requirement that the construction contractor(s) use all feasible means to avoid damage to adjacent and nearby historic buildings. Such methods may include maintaining a safe distance between the construction site and the historic buildings (as identified by the Planning Department preservation staff), using construction techniques that reduce vibration, appropriate excavation shoring methods to prevent movement of adjacent structures, and providing adequate security to minimize risks of vandalism and fire.

Project Mitigation Measure 2 – Construction Monitoring Program for Historical Resources

The project sponsor shall undertake a monitoring program to minimize damage to adjacent historic buildings and to ensure that any such damage is documented and repaired. The monitoring program, which shall apply within 100 feet where pile driving would be used and within 25 feet otherwise, shall include the following components. Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the project sponsor shall engage a historic architect or qualified historic preservation professional to undertake a pre-construction survey of historical resource(s) identified by the San Francisco Planning Department within 125 feet of planned construction to document and photograph the buildings’ existing conditions. Based on the construction and condition of the resource(s), the consultant shall also establish a maximum vibration level that shall not be exceeded at each building, based on existing condition, character-defining features, soils conditions, and anticipated construction practices (a common standard is 0.2 inch per second, peak particle velocity). To ensure that vibration levels do not exceed the established standard,

the project sponsor shall monitor vibration levels at each structure and shall prohibit vibratory construction activities that generate vibration levels in excess of the standard.

Should vibration levels be observed in excess of the standard, construction shall be halted and alternative construction techniques put in practice, to the extent feasible. (For example, pre-drilled piles could be substituted for driven piles, if feasible based on soils conditions; smaller, lighter equipment might be able to be used in some cases.) The consultant shall conduct regular periodic inspections of each building during ground-disturbing activity on the project site. Should damage to either building occur, the building(s) shall be remediated to its pre-construction condition at the conclusion of ground-disturbing activity on the site.

Project Mitigation Measure 3 – Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources

This mitigation measure is required to avoid any potential adverse effect on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources as defined in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(a) and (c).

The project sponsor shall distribute the San Francisco Planning Department archeological resource “ALERT” sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); and to utilities firms involved in soils-disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils-disturbing activities being undertaken, each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the “ALERT” sheet is circulated to all field personnel, including machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, and supervisory personnel. The project sponsor shall provide the ERO with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firms) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the “ALERT” sheet.

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

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

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

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

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

Project Mitigation Measure 4 – General Construction Noise Control Measures

To ensure that project noise from construction activities is minimized to the maximum extent feasible, the sponsor shall undertake the following:

- The sponsor shall require the general contractor to ensure that equipment and trucks used for project construction use the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible).
- The sponsor shall require the general contractor to locate stationary noise sources (such as compressors) as far from adjacent or nearby sensitive receptors as possible, to muffle such noise sources, and to construct barriers around such sources and/or the construction site, which could reduce construction noise by as much as 5 dBA. To further reduce noise, the contractor shall locate stationary equipment in pit areas or excavated areas, if feasible.
- The sponsor shall require the general contractor to use impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) that are hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. Where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used, along with external noise jackets on the tools, which could reduce noise levels by as much as 10 dBA.
- The sponsor shall include noise control requirements in specifications provided to construction contractors. Such requirements could include, but not be limited to: performing all work in a manner that minimizes noise to the extent feasible; undertaking the most noisy activities during times of least disturbance to surrounding residents and occupants, as feasible; and selecting haul routes that avoid residential buildings inasmuch as such routes are otherwise feasible.
- Prior to the issuance of each building permit, along with the submission of construction documents, the sponsor shall submit to the San Francisco Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection (DBI) a list of measures to respond to and track complaints pertaining to construction noise. These measures shall include: (1) a procedure and phone numbers for notifying DBI, the Department of Public Health, and the Police Department (during regular

construction hours and off-hours); (2) a sign posted on-site describing noise complaint procedures and a complaint hotline number that shall be answered at all times during construction; (3) designation of an on-site construction complaint and enforcement manager for the project; and (4) notification of neighboring residents and non-residential building managers within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 30 days in advance of extreme noise-generating activities (defined as activities generating noise levels of 90 dBA or greater) about the estimated duration of the activity.

Project Mitigation Measure 5 – Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Health Risks and Hazards

The project sponsor or the project sponsor's Contractor shall comply with the following:

A. Engine Requirements.

1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 hp and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall have engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or California Air Resources Board (ARB) Tier 2 off-road emission standards, and have been retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy. Equipment with engines meeting Tier 4 Interim or Tier 4 Final off-road emission standards automatically meet this requirement.
2. Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited.
3. Diesel engines, whether for off-road or on-road equipment, shall not be left idling for more than two minutes, at any location, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment (e.g., traffic conditions, safe operating conditions). The Contractor shall post legible and visible signs in English, Spanish, and Chinese, in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two-minute idling limit.
4. The Contractor shall instruct construction workers and equipment operators on the maintenance and tuning of construction equipment, and require that such workers and operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications.

B. Waivers.

1. The Planning Department's Environmental Review Officer (ERO) or designee may waive the alternative source of power requirement of Subsection (A)(2) if an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site. If the ERO grants the waiver, the Contractor must submit documentation that the equipment used for on-site power generation meets the requirements of Subsection (A)(1).
2. The ERO may waive the equipment requirements of Subsection (A)(1) if: a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is

technically not feasible; the equipment would not produce desired emissions reduction due to expected operating modes; installation of the equipment would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator; or, there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that is not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS. If the ERO grants the waiver, the Contractor must use the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment, according to the table below.

Table – Off-Road Equipment Compliance Step-down Schedule

Compliance Alternative	Engine Emission Standard	Emissions Control
1	Tier 2	ARB Level 2 VDECS
2	Tier 2	ARB Level 1 VDECS
3	Tier 2	Alternative Fuel*

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

** Alternative fuels are not a VDECS.

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

1. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase, with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. The description may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For VDECS installed, the description may include: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, ARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, the description shall also specify the type of alternative fuel being used.
2. The ERO shall ensure that all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into the contract specifications. The Plan shall include a certification statement that the Contractor agrees to comply fully with the Plan.
3. The Contractor shall make the Plan available to the public for review on-site during working hours. The Contractor shall post at the construction site a

legible and visible sign summarizing the Plan. The sign shall also state that the public may ask to inspect the Plan for the project at any time during working hours and shall explain how to request to inspect the Plan. The Contractor shall post at least one copy of the sign in a visible location on each side of the construction site facing a public right-of-way.

- D. *Monitoring.* After start of construction activities, the Contractor shall submit quarterly reports to the ERO documenting compliance with the Plan. After completion of construction activities and prior to receiving a final certificate of occupancy, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities, including the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase, and the specific information required in the Plan.

Project Mitigation Measure 6 – Pre-Construction Special-Status Bird Surveys

The project sponsor shall ensure that pre-construction special-status bird surveys are conducted when trees would be removed or buildings would be demolished as part of an individual project. Pre-construction special-status bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist between February 1 and August 15 if tree removal or building demolition is scheduled to take place during that period. If bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or the California Fish and Game Code are found to be nesting in or near any work area, an appropriate no-work buffer zone (e.g., 100 feet for songbirds) shall be designated by the biologist. Depending on the species involved, input from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and/or United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) may be warranted. As recommended by the biologist, no activities shall be conducted within the no-work buffer zone that could disrupt bird breeding. Outside of the breeding season (August 16 – January 31), or after young birds have fledged, as determined by the biologist, work activities may proceed. Special-status birds that establish nests during the construction period are considered habituated to such activity and no buffer shall be required, except as needed to avoid direct destruction of the nest, which would still be prohibited.

Project Mitigation Measure 7 – Pre-Construction Special-Status Bat Surveys

The project sponsor shall ensure that pre-construction special-status bat surveys are conducted by a qualified bat biologist when large trees (those with trunks over 12 inches in diameter) are to be removed, or vacant buildings or buildings used seasonally or not occupied, especially in the upper stories, are to be demolished. If active day or night roosts are found, the bat biologist shall take actions to make such roosts unsuitable habitat prior to tree removal or building demolition. A no-disturbance buffer shall be created around active bat roosts being used for maternity or hibernation purposes at a distance to be determined in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Bat roosts initiated during construction are presumed to be unaffected, and no buffer would be necessary.

Project Mitigation Measure 8 – Hazardous Building Materials Abatement

The project sponsor shall ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or mercury, 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 tube fixtures, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed intact 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.