PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is an approximately 17,600-square-foot lot located at 793 South Van Ness Avenue in San Francisco’s Mission District on the northeast corner of South Van Ness Avenue and 19th Street (refer to Figure 1). The project site is a former gas station built in 1968 that has been out of service since 2002. The immediate area surrounding 793 South Van Ness Avenue contains residential uses to the north and to the west, and mixed-use and Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) uses1 to the east and to the south.

The proposed project would demolish two remaining structures (a 20-foot tall gas pump canopy and a 2,000-square-foot, single-story building), and construct an approximately 75-foot-tall (approximately 81 feet tall with rooftop appurtenances), seven-story, mixed-use building with 75 residential units, approximately 4,500 square feet of ground floor retail space, and 38 off-street parking spaces. The proposed project seeks to use the state density bonus law under California Government Code sections 65915-65918 to obtain a 35% increase in density above the base 55 units that would be permitted under the existing NC-3 zoning district controls. The density increase is allowed in exchange for the project sponsor providing 20% of the project’s base 55 units for low-income households.2

The proposed project would construct an approximately 86,600-square-foot building containing 75 units, comprised of 30 two-bedroom units and 45 one-bedroom units. The proposed project would also provide two separate retail spaces: an approximately 3,900-square-foot retail space on the corner of 19th Street and South Van Ness Avenue and an approximately 600-square-foot retail space on 19th Street.

---

1 PDR use is a grouping of uses that includes, but is not limited to all Industrial and Agricultural Uses, Ambulance Services, Animal Hospital, Automotive Service Station, Automotive Repair, Automotive Wash, Arts Activities, Business Services, Cat Boarding, Catering Service, Commercial Storage, Kennel, Motor Vehicle Tow Service, Livery Stable, Parcel Delivery Service, Public Utilities Yard, Storage Yard, Trade Office, Trade Shop, Wholesale Sales, and Wholesale Storage.

2 The “base project” describes the maximum density permitted under the Planning Code without the state density bonus.
The state density bonus law permits project sponsors to select three waivers or concessions from local development standards if a certain percentage of affordable units are included in the project. Under the state density bonus law, the proposed project is seeking two concessions: an increase in height from 55 feet to 75 feet and modification of the rear yard requirement as defined in section 134 of the San Francisco Planning Code.

**Table 1. Proposed Project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 feet (approximately 81 feet including the elevator shaft on roof)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total building area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86,600 square feet (gross floor area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73,900 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,500 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage/parking/building circulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,200 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two bedrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1 (residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1 (retail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2 (residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2 (retail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,600 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear yard (Floor 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof top open space (Floor 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,100 square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Open Space**

The proposed project would provide common open spaces for the residential component of the project on the second and sixth stories. The proposed project would provide an approximately 3,500-square-foot corner rear yard and a 1,100-square-foot roof deck on the sixth floor of the building.

**Site Circulation**

The proposed project would provide 37 off-street vehicle parking spaces and one car share space on the ground floor level of the building. Vehicle parking would be provided via a pit stacker parking system\(^3\) for 30 of the proposed 37 parking spaces. The proposed project would provide 86 bicycle parking spaces.

---

\(^3\) Pit stackers are a type of stacker parking device in which cars drive into a multi-level system, located within a single parking space. The levels are then adjusted in or out of the pit to allow for the stacked parking of two vehicles in one parking space.
comprised of 75 class 1 spaces and five class 2 spaces for the residential uses and two class 1 spaces and four class 2 spaces for the retail uses.4

The project site has four existing curb cuts, varying in width from approximately 27 feet to 45 feet. The proposed project would remove two existing curb cuts on South Van Ness Avenue and one existing curb cut on 19th Street. The proposed project would retain the fourth curb cut on 19th Street, but reduce the width from 30 feet to 10 feet to allow for vehicle access for the building’s at-grade parking on the ground floor. A warning system alerting pedestrians when a vehicle is exiting from the garage would be installed at the garage entrance. One bicycle parking area would be accessed via the lobby entrance on 19th Street and a second bicycle parking area would be accessed via the ground floor garage. Four class 2 bicycle spaces would be located on 19th Street, two class 2 bicycle spaces would be located on South Van Ness Avenue, and three class 2 spaces would be located on the ground floor level inside of the proposed building.

Additionally, a striped yellow passenger loading zone is proposed in front of the entrance to the building on 19th Street.

Construction Activities
Construction of the proposed project would occur over approximately 24 months. The majority of construction staging would occur on site. The curb lane on 19th Street in front of the project site may be used for construction staging at certain points during the construction of the proposed project. The proposed project would require excavation to a maximum depth of approximately 8 feet for the installation of the 15 vehicle pit stacker systems and elevator pit. Approximately 2,400 cubic yards of soil would be removed from the project site during construction activities. Pile driving is not proposed as part of this project.

---

4 Section 155.1(a) of the Planning Code defines class 1 bicycle spaces as “spaces in secure, weather-protected facilities intended for use as long-term, overnight, and work-day bicycle storage by dwelling unit residences, nonresidential occupants, and employees” and defines class 2 bicycles as “spaces located in a publicly-accessible, highly visible location intended for transient or short-term use by visitors, guests, and patrons to the building or use”.

---
Figure 1. Project Location
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Figure 2. 793 South Van Ness Avenue (view looking northeast)
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Figure 3. Proposed Project Site Plan
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Figure 9. Proposed Project 19th Street Elevation (South Elevation)

ELEVATION KEYNOTES
1. LARGE FORMAT TILE
2. ALUMINUM WINDOW
3. LIGHT BEIGE STUCCO
4. RAIN SCREEN SIDING
5. STOREFRONT WINDOWS
6. CANOPY
7. ALUM. RAILING
8. GARAGE DOOR
9. WARM GRAY STUCCO
10. MOCHA BROWN STUCCO
11. COOL GRAY STUCCO
12. LIGHT FIXTURES
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PROJECT APPROVALS

The proposed project at 793 South Van Ness Avenue would require the following approvals:

Actions by the Planning Commission

- Conditional Use Authorization

Actions by other City Departments

- Demolition, Site, and Building Permits (Department of Building Inspection)
- Street Improvement Permit for modifications to public sidewalks, street trees, and curb cuts (Public Works Bureau of Street use and Mapping)
- Review for compliance with Article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code (Department of Public Health)
- Stormwater Management Plan (San Francisco Public Utilities Commission)
- Approval of a proposed passenger loading space (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency’s color curb program)

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

This initial study evaluates whether the environmental impacts of the proposed project are addressed in the programmatic environmental impact report for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR). The initial study considers whether the proposed project would result in significant impacts that: (1) are peculiar to the project or project site; (2) were not identified as significant project-level, cumulative, or off-site effects in the PEIR; or (3) are previously identified significant effects, which as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the PEIR. Such impacts, if any, will be evaluated in a project-specific, focused mitigated negative declaration or environmental impact report. If no such impacts are identified, no additional environmental review shall be required for the project beyond that provided in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and this project-specific initial study in accordance with CEQA section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183.

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

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

---

cumulative transit impacts on seven Muni lines), cultural resources (cumulative impacts from demolition of historical resources), and shadow (program-level impacts on parks).

The proposed project would demolish the remaining gas station facilities on the project site and construct a seven-story mixed-use building containing 75 dwelling units, approximately 4,500 square feet of ground floor retail space, and 38 off-street parking spaces. The environmental effects of the proposed project are analyzed in this document. As discussed below in this initial study, the proposed project would not result in new, significant environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already analyzed and disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

**CHANGES IN THE REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT**

Since the certification of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR in 2008, several new policies, regulations, statutes, and funding measures have been adopted, passed, or are underway that affect the physical environment and/or environmental review methodology for projects in the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas. As discussed in each topic area referenced below, these policies, regulations, statutes, and funding measures have implemented or will implement mitigation measures or further reduce less-than-significant impacts identified in the PEIR. These include:

- State legislation amending CEQA to eliminate consideration of aesthetics and parking impacts for infill projects in transit priority areas, effective January 2014.

- State legislation amending CEQA and San Francisco Planning Commission resolution replacing level of service (LOS) analysis of automobile delay with vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis, effective March 2016 (see “CEQA Section 21099” heading below).

- The adoption of 2016 interim controls in the Mission District requiring additional information and analysis regarding housing affordability, displacement, loss of PDR and other analyses, effective January 14, 2016 through January 14, 2018.

- San Francisco Bicycle Plan update adoption in June 2009, Better Streets Plan adoption in 2010, Transit Effectiveness Project (aka “Muni Forward”) adoption in March 2014, Vision Zero adoption by various City agencies in 2014, Proposition A and B passage in November 2014, and the Transportation Sustainability Program (see initial study Transportation section).

- San Francisco ordinance establishing Noise Regulations Related to Residential Uses near Places of Entertainment effective June 2015 (see initial study Noise section).

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

- San Francisco Clean and Safe Parks Bond passage in November 2012 and San Francisco Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan adoption in April 2014 (see initial study Recreation section).

- Urban Water Management Plan adoption in 2011 and Sewer System Improvement Program process (see initial study Utilities and Service Systems section).

- Article 22A of the Health Code amendments effective August 2013 (see initial study Hazardous Materials section).
Aesthetics and Parking

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

a) The project is in a transit priority area;

b) The project is on an infill site; and

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

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

Automobile Delay and Vehicle Miles Traveled

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

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

---

6 San Francisco Planning Department. Eligibility Checklist: CEQA section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for 793 South Van Ness Avenue, June 30, 2017. This document (and all other documents cited in this report, unless otherwise noted), is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 as part of Case File No. 2015-001360ENV.

7 This document is available online at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_sb743.php.
1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING—Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

c) Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR analyzed a range of potential rezoning options and considered the effects of losing between approximately 520,000 to 4,930,000 square feet of PDR space in the plan area throughout the lifetime of the plan (year 2025). This was compared to an estimated loss of approximately 4,620,000 square feet of PDR space in the plan area under the No Project scenario. Within the Mission Area Plan subarea, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR considered the effects of losing up to approximately 3,370,000 square feet of PDR space through the year 2025. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that adoption of the rezoning and area plans would result in an unavoidable significant impact on land use due to the cumulative loss of PDR space. This impact was addressed in a statement of overriding considerations with CEQA findings and adopted as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Areas Plans approval on January 19, 2009.

Development of the proposed project would result in the net loss of approximately 2,000 square feet of former PDR building space and would preclude future PDR uses on the 17,600-square-foot lot. This would contribute to the significant cumulative land use impact related to loss of PDR space that was identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The project site is located in the NC-3 District, which is intended to offer a wide range of goods and services with a mix of residential units, and the proposed project is consistent with the development density established for the site under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans. As stated above, the PEIR acknowledges that the loss of PDR space resulting from development under the adopted rezoning and area plans would have a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact on land use. The proposed project would contribute to the cumulative loss of PDR space analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, but would not result in new or more severe impacts than were disclosed in the PEIR. As such, the project’s contribution to this cumulative impact does not require any additional environmental review beyond that provided in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and this project-specific initial study.

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

The Citywide Planning and Current Planning divisions of the planning department have determined that the proposed project is permitted in the NC-3 (Moderate-Scale Neighborhood Commercial) Use District.
and are consistent with the land uses as envisioned in the Mission Area Plan. N-3 zoning districts are meant to offer a wide range of goods and services with a mix of residential units while the Mission Area Plan calls for transportation improvements and reduced parking in order to encourage alternatives to vehicle travel. As a mixed-use residential project with reduced parking, the proposed project is consistent with this designation. The proposed project’s bulk and density is permitted within the Northeast Mission generalized zoning district in accordance with the state density bonus law. 8,9

As proposed, the project is permitted with the development density established in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans and with the allowable height concessions pursuant to the state density bonus. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to land use and land use planning, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

One of the objectives of the Eastern Neighborhoods area plans is to identify appropriate locations for housing in the City’s industrially zoned land to meet the citywide demand for additional housing. The PEIR assessed how the rezoning actions would affect housing supply and location options for businesses in the Eastern Neighborhoods and compared these outcomes to what would otherwise be expected without the rezoning, assuming a continuation of development trends and ad hoc land use changes (such as allowing housing within industrial zones through conditional use authorization on a case-by-case basis, site-specific rezoning to permit housing, and other similar case-by-case approaches). The PEIR concluded that adoption of the rezoning and area plans: “would induce substantial growth and concentration of population in San Francisco.” The PEIR states that the increase in population expected to occur as a result of the proposed rezoning and adoption of the area plans would not, in itself, result in adverse physical effects, and would serve to advance key City policy objectives, such as providing

housing in appropriate locations next to Downtown and other employment generators and furthering the City’s transit first policies. It was anticipated that the rezoning would result in an increase in both housing development and population in all of the area plan neighborhoods. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population and density would not directly result in significant adverse physical effects on the environment. However, the PEIR identified significant cumulative impacts on the physical environment that would result indirectly from growth afforded under the rezoning and area plans, including impacts on land use, transportation, air quality, and noise. The PEIR contains detailed analyses of these secondary effects under each of the relevant resource topics, and identifies mitigation measures to address significant impacts where feasible.

The PEIR determined that implementation of the rezoning and area plans would not have a significant impact from the direct displacement of existing residents, and that each of the rezoning options considered in the PEIR would result in less displacement as a result of unmet housing demand than would be expected under the No-Project scenario because the addition of new housing would provide some relief to housing market pressure without directly displacing existing residents. However, the PEIR also noted that residential displacement is not solely a function of housing supply, and that adoption of the rezoning and area plans could result in indirect, secondary effects on neighborhood character through gentrification that could displace some residents. The PEIR discloses that the rezoned districts could transition to higher-value housing, which could result in gentrification and displacement of lower-income households, and states moreover that lower-income residents of the Eastern Neighborhoods, who also disproportionately live in crowded conditions and in rental units, are among the most vulnerable to displacement resulting from neighborhood change.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines sections 15131 and 15064(e), economic and social effects such as gentrification and displacement are only considered under CEQA where these effects would cause substantial adverse physical impacts on the environment. Only where economic or social effects have resulted in adverse physical changes in the environment, such as “blight” or “urban decay” have courts upheld environmental analysis that consider such effects. But without such a connection to an adverse physical change, consideration of social or economic impacts “shall not be considered a significant effect” per CEQA Guidelines section 15382. While the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR disclosed that adoption of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans could contribute to gentrification and displacement, it did not determine that these potential socio-economic effects would result in significant adverse physical impacts on the environment.

The proposed project would demolish the existing gasoline station facilities on the project site and construct a seven-story mixed-use building containing 75 dwelling units, approximately 4,500 square feet of ground floor retail space, and 38 off-street parking spaces. The 75 dwelling units would result in about 182 residents on the project site and the ground floor retail areas would employ approximately 13 people. These direct effects of the proposed project on population and housing would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts on the physical environment beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The project’s contribution to indirect effects on the physical environment attributable to population growth are evaluated in this initial study under land use.

---

10 The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR assumed that the Plan Area would have an average household size of about 2.43 residents per dwelling unit in the year 2025.
11 The number of employees for retail space is estimated based on the assumption of 350 average gross square feet per employee.
transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, recreation, utilities and service systems, and public services.

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

Historic Architectural Resources

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

The proposed project would demolish the existing gasoline station facilities on the project site and construct a seven-story building containing 75 dwelling units, approximately 4,500 square feet of ground floor retail space, and 38 off-street parking spaces. The existing gas station located on the project site was constructed in 1968. The project site was not surveyed in 2010 as part of the Inner Mission North Historic Resources Survey due to its age at the time. Therefore, a Historic Resource Evaluation was prepared for the proposed 793 South Van Ness Avenue project.12 The Preservation Team Review, completed by the Planning Department preservation staff, relied on the information provided in the evaluation to conclude

---

that the existing facilities at 793 South Van Ness are not historic resources.\(^\text{13}\) As discussed in the project’s evaluation, the Shell gasoline service station was one of more than 3,000 similar structures that Shell Oil Company built in their ranch design, a style the company instituted in the late 1950s. The subject building is not a particularly early example of the style, nor is it one of the most intact or well-preserved. No known historic events occurred at the subject property and there are no individual owners or occupants that could be identified as important to history, and the building is not architecturally distinct such that it would qualify individually for listing on the local, state, or federal registers. The subject property is not eligible for any local, state, or federal register under any criteria individually or as part of a historic district. The 793 South Van Ness Avenue project site is not located within the boundaries of any identified historic district. Although a number of historic districts were identified in the surrounding neighborhood, the immediate vicinity was determined to not contain a sufficient concentration of historically or aesthetically related buildings due to the inconsistent pattern of development and dissimilar collection of building types. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to the significant historic resource impact identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and no historic resource mitigation measures would apply to the proposed project.

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

**Archeological Resources**

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

The proposed project would excavate approximately 8 feet below ground surface for the installation of 15 vehicle pit stacker systems and an elevator pit. Approximately 2,400 cubic yards of soil would be removed from an area where no previous archeological studies have been prepared. In accordance with Mitigation Measure J-2, Planning Department staff archeologists performed a Preliminary Archeological Review of the project site. Based on this evaluation, the 793 South Van Ness Avenue Project site may have archeological resources present within the project site. The potential for the project to adversely affect archeological resources would be avoided by implementation of Project Mitigation Measure Number 1 Archeological Testing, as described in the Mitigation Measures section at the end of this document.\(^\text{14}\)

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

\(^\text{13}\) Tina Tam, San Francisco Planning Department, *Preservation Team Review Form, 793 South Van Ness Avenue*, August 10, 2016.

4. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION—Would the project:

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes would not result in significant impacts related to pedestrians, bicyclists, loading, or construction traffic. The PEIR states that in general, the analyses of pedestrian, bicycle, loading, emergency access, and construction transportation impacts are specific to individual development projects, and that project-specific analyses would need to be conducted for future development projects under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans.

Accordingly, the planning department conducted project-level analysis of the pedestrian, bicycle, loading, emergency access, and construction transportation impacts of the proposed project.15 Based on this project-level review, the department determined that the proposed project would not have significant impacts that are peculiar to the project or the project site. As part of the proposed project, the project sponsor has agreed to implement two Project Improvement Measures to further reduce transportation and circulation impacts associated with the construction and operation of the proposed building at 793

15 San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Calculations for 793 South Van Ness Avenue, October 6, 2017.
South Van Ness Avenue. These improvement measures are described below and full text of each improvement measure is provided in the Mitigation and Improvements section of this initial study.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes could result in significant impacts on transit ridership, and identified seven transportation mitigation measures, which are described further below in the Transit sub-section. Even with mitigation, however, it was anticipated that the significant adverse cumulative impacts on transit lines could not be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Thus, these impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable.

As discussed above under “SB 743”, in response to state legislation that called for removing automobile delay from CEQA analysis, the Planning Commission adopted resolution 19579 replacing automobile delay with a VMT metric for analyzing transportation impacts of a project. Therefore, impacts and mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR associated with automobile delay are not discussed in this checklist.

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

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

**Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis**

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

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

The San Francisco Transportation Authority uses the San Francisco Chained Activity Model Process (SF-CHAMP) to estimate VMT by private automobiles and taxis for different land use types. Travel behavior in SF-CHAMP is calibrated based on observed behavior from the California Household Travel Survey 2010-2012, Census data regarding automobile ownership rates and county-to-county worker flows, and observed vehicle counts and transit boardings. SF-CHAMP uses a synthetic population, which is a set of individual actors that represents the Bay Area’s actual population, who make simulated travel decisions for a complete day. The Transportation Authority uses tour-based analysis for office and residential uses, which examines the entire chain of trips over the course of a day, not just trips to and from the project. For retail uses, the Transportation Authority uses trip-based analysis, which counts VMT from individual trips to and from the project (as opposed to entire chain of trips). A trip-based approach, as opposed to a
tour-based approach, is necessary for retail projects because a tour is likely to consist of trips stopping in multiple locations, and the summarizing of tour VMT to each location would over-estimate VMT. 16,17

For residential development, the existing regional average daily VMT per capita is 17.2.18 For retail development, regional average daily retail VMT per employee is 14.9.19 Regional average daily VMT for these land uses is projected to decrease in future 2040 cumulative conditions. Refer to Table 2. Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled, which includes the TAZ in which the project site is located, 537.

Table 2. Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Bay Area Regional Average</th>
<th>Existing Bay Area Regional Average minus 15%</th>
<th>Existing TAZ 537</th>
<th>Cumulative 2040 Bay Area Regional Average</th>
<th>Cumulative 2040 Bay Area Regional Average minus 15%</th>
<th>Cumulative 2040 TAZ 537</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households (Residential)</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (Retail)</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 one of the three screening criteria provided (Map-Based Screening, Small Projects, and Proximity to Transit Stations), then it is presumed that VMT impacts would be less-than-significant for the project and a detailed VMT analysis is not required. Map-Based Screening is used to determine if a project site is located within a TAZ that exhibits low levels of VMT; Small Projects are projects that would generate fewer than 100 vehicle trips per day; and the Proximity to Transit Stations criterion includes projects that are within a half mile of an existing major transit stop, have a floor area ratio of greater than or equal to 0.75, vehicle parking that is less than or equal to that

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


18 Includes the VMT generated by the households in the development and averaged across the household population to determine VMT per capita.

19 Retail travel is not explicitly captured in SF-CHAMP, rather, there is a generic “Other” purpose which includes retail shopping, medical appointments, visiting friends or family, and all other non-work, non-school tours. The retail efficiency metric captures all of the “Other” purpose travel generated by Bay Area households. The denominator of employment (including retail; cultural, institutional, and educational; and medical employment; school enrollment, and number of households) represents the size, or attraction, of the zone for this type of “Other” purpose travel.
required or allowed by the Planning Code without conditional use authorization, and are consistent with the applicable Sustainable Communities Strategy.

The proposed project would include residential and retail use. As shown in Table 2, the existing residential average daily VMT in TAZ 537 per capita is 5.0. The existing residential average VMT per capita is 61 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per capita of 17.2. The future 2040 residential average daily VMT per capita is estimated to be 4.4 in TAZ 537, which is 66 percent below the future 2040 regional average daily VMT per capita of 16.1. The existing average daily retail VMT per capita is 9.2 in TAZ 537. The existing average daily retail VMT per capita is 39 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per capita for retail of 14.9. The future 2040 retail average daily VMT per capita is estimated to be 9.7, which is 34 percent below the future 2040 average daily retail VMT per capita of 14.6. Given that the project site is located in an area in which the existing future 2040 residential VMT would be below the existing and future 2040 regional averages, the proposed project’s residential 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. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause substantial additional VMT and impacts would be less-than-significant.

Trip Generation

The proposed project involve the demolition of existing gas station facilities and the construction of an approximately 75-foot-tall, mixed-use building containing 75 residential units and approximately 4,500 square feet of ground floor retail space. The proposed project would provide 38 off-street parking spaces and 86 bicycle parking spaces.

Localized trip generation of the proposed project was calculated using a trip-based analysis and information in the 2002 Transportation Impacts Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review (SF Guidelines) developed by the San Francisco Planning Department. Refer to Tables 3 and 4 for the proposed project trip generation.

### Table 3. Estimated New Daily Project Trip Generation by Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Auto</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Other modes</th>
<th>Total person trips (inbound and outbound)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1,313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Estimated p.m. Peak Hour Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Auto</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Other modes</th>
<th>Total (inbound and outbound)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>84(a)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

\(a\) 469 vehicle trips accounting for vehicle occupancy data for Census Tract 537

---


21 San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Calculations for 793 South Van Ness Proposed Project, October 6, 2017.
Transit

Mitigation Measures E-5 through E-11 in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR were adopted as part of the Plan with uncertain feasibility to address significant transit impacts. These measures are not applicable to the proposed project, as they are plan-level mitigations to be implemented by City and County agencies. In compliance with a portion of Mitigation Measure E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding, the City adopted impact fees for development in Eastern Neighborhoods that go towards funding transit and complete streets. In addition, San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code, referred to as the Transportation Sustainability Fee (Ordinance 200-154, effective December 25, 2015). The fee updated, expanded, and replaced the prior Transit Impact Development Fee, which is in compliance with portions of Mitigation Measure E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding. In compliance with a portion of Mitigation Measure E-11: Transportation Demand Management, the city adopted a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management Program for most new development citywide (Ordinance 34-17, effective March 19, 2017). The proposed project would be subject to the fee. Both the Transportation Sustainability Fee and the transportation demand management efforts are part of the Transportation Sustainability Program. In compliance with all or portions of Mitigation Measure E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements, Mitigation Measure E-7: Transit Accessibility, Mitigation Measure E-9: Rider Improvements, and Mitigation Measure E-10: Transit Enhancement, the SFMTA is implementing the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP), which was approved by the SFMTA Board of Directors in March 2014. The TEP (now called Muni Forward) includes system-wide review, evaluation, and recommendations to improve service and increase transportation efficiency. Examples of transit priority and pedestrian safety improvements within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area as part of Muni Forward include the 14 Mission Rapid Transit Project, the 22 Fillmore Extension along 16th Street to Mission Bay (expected construction between 2017 and 2020), and the Travel Time Reduction Project on Route 9 San Bruno (initiation in 2015). In addition, Muni Forward includes service improvements to various routes with the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area; for instance the implemented new Route 55 on 16th Street.

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

---

22 Two additional files were created at the Board of Supervisors for TSF regarding hospitals and health services, grandfathering, and additional fees for larger projects: see Board file nos. 151121 and 151257.

23 http://tsp.sfplanning.org
The project site is located within a quarter mile of several local transit lines including Muni lines 12-Folsom, 14-Mission, 14R-Mission, 22-Fillmore, 27-Bryant, 33-Ashbury/18th Street, and 49-Van Ness/Mission. The proposed project would be expected to generate 293 daily transit trips, including 44 during the p.m. peak hour. Given the wide availability of nearby transit, the addition of 44 p.m. peak hour transit trips would be accommodated by existing capacity. As such, the proposed project would not result in unacceptable levels of transit service or cause a substantial increase in delays or operating costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service could result.

Each of the rezoning options in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts relating to increases in transit ridership on Muni lines, with the Preferred Project having significant impacts on seven lines. Of those lines, the project site is located within a quarter-mile of three Muni lines: 22-Fillmore, 33-Ashbury/18th Street, and 49-Van Ness/Mission. The proposed project would not contribute considerably to these conditions as the minor contribution of 44 p.m. peak hour transit trips would not be a substantial proportion of the overall additional transit volume generated by Eastern Neighborhood projects. The proposed project would also not contribute considerably to 2025 cumulative transit conditions and thus would not result in any significant cumulative transit impacts.

Emergency Vehicle Access

San Francisco Fire Department’s Station 7 is located at 2300 Folsom Street at 19th Street, one block east from the project site. Overall, the construction-related transportation impacts from the proposed project on emergency vehicles would be less than significant because these activities would be temporary and intermittent in nature and limited in their effects. Construction of the proposed project would occur over approximately 24 months. The majority of construction staging activities would occur on-site. The curb lane on 19th Street in front of the project site may be used for construction staging at certain points during the construction of the proposed project. There would be an average of between 15 to 40 construction workers per day at the project site. U.S. Route 101 provides the primary regional access to the project site. Construction truck routes would access U.S. 101 from either Caesar Chavez Street via South Van Ness Avenue or from Vermont Street via 17th Street. Given the proximity to Station 7, the project sponsor has agreed to implement Project Improvement Measure 1, in which the project sponsor will implement a construction management plan to address transportation-related circulation, access, staging, and hours of delivery to reduce potential conflicts between construction activities and emergency vehicles path of travel. The construction management plan will be provided to the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments for review and approval.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified that the existing street grid provides ample access for emergency responders and egress for residents and workers, and that there would be no direct or indirect alteration of this situation to any substantial degree. Furthermore, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified that the Fire Department reviews building permits for multi-story structures so there would be no interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.24 The proposed project would not permanently alter or sever 19th Street as a western emergency access route nor would it impact other western routes for emergency vehicles. However, to minimize the potential for vehicle queues at the 793 South Van Ness Avenue project driveway into the public right-of-way on 19th Street to interfere with emergency vehicles, the project sponsor has agreed to implement Project Improvement

Measure 2: Queue Abatement, in which the project sponsor will implement queue abatement measures if there is recurring queue. Abatement measures could include redesign of the facility to improve vehicle circulation, employment of parking attendants, or other methods as listed in the improvement measure. As described in the project description, the project proposes to construct a yellow passenger loading zone on 19th Street to prevent conflicts between pedestrian or passenger loading activities and vehicular traffic.

Conclusion

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

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would result in significant noise impacts during construction activities and due to conflicts between noise-sensitive uses in proximity to noisy uses such as PDR, retail, entertainment, cultural/institutional/educational uses, and office uses. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also determined that incremental increases in traffic-related noise attributable to implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would be less-than-significant. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified six noise mitigation measures, three of which may be applicable to subsequent...
development projects. These mitigation measures would reduce noise impacts from construction and noisy land uses to less-than-significant levels.

**Construction Noise**

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 relate to construction noise. Mitigation Measure F-1 addresses individual projects that include pile-driving, and Mitigation Measure F-2 addresses individual projects that include particularly noisy construction procedures (including pile-driving). The proposed project would be supported by drilled, cast-in-place, concrete piers. No pile driving activities are proposed during the construction activities. Since construction would not require pile driving, Mitigation Measure F-1 is not applicable. Because construction activities would require heavy equipment, PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2 is applicable to the proposed project, and is included in the Mitigation Measures section as Project Mitigation Measure 2. Project Mitigation Measure 2 would reduce construction noise by requiring the sponsor to develop and implement a set of noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant.

In addition, all construction activities for the proposed project (approximately 24 months) would be subject to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code) (Noise Ordinance). Construction noise is regulated by the Noise Ordinance. The Noise Ordinance requires construction work to be conducted in the following manner: (1) noise levels of construction equipment, other than impact tools, must not exceed 80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the source (the equipment generating the noise); (2) impact tools must have intake and exhaust mufflers that are approved by the Director of Public Works (PW) or the Director of the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) to best accomplish maximum noise reduction; and (3) if the noise from the construction work would exceed the ambient noise levels at the site property line by 5 dBA, the work must not be conducted between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. unless the Director of PW authorizes a special permit for conducting the work during that period.

DBI is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance for private construction projects during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.). The Police Department is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance during all other hours. Nonetheless, during the construction period for the proposed project of approximately 24 months, occupants of the nearby properties could be disturbed by construction noise. Times may occur when noise could interfere with indoor activities in nearby residences and other businesses near the project site. The increase in noise in the project area during project construction would not be considered a significant impact of the proposed project, because the construction noise would be temporary, intermittent, and restricted in occurrence and level, as the contractor would be

---

25 Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-3, F-4, and F-6 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](http://www.courts.ca.gov/opinions/documents/S213478.PDF)). As noted above, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that incremental increases in traffic-related noise attributable to implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would be less-than-significant, and thus would not exacerbate the existing noise environment. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measures F-3, F-4, and F-6 are not applicable. Nonetheless, for all noise sensitive uses, the general requirements for adequate interior noise levels of Mitigation Measures F-3 and F-4 are met by compliance with the acoustical standards required under the California Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations Title 24).
required to comply with the Noise Ordinance and Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2, which would reduce construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Operational Noise**

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5 addresses impacts related to individual projects that include uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise in the project vicinity. The proposed project involves the construction of a seven-story, mixed-use building with 75 units and approximately 4,500 square feet of retail use. The proposed project’s residential and retail uses would be similar to surrounding uses and are not expected to be in excess of existing ambient noise levels, therefore, PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5 is not applicable.

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

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

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

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

6. **AIR QUALITY—Would the project:**

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
### Topics:

| 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)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☒ |

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

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 addresses air quality impacts during construction, and PEIR Mitigation Measures G-3 and G-4 address proposed uses that would emit DPM and other TACs.

#### Construction Dust Control

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

---

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

27 The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also includes Mitigation Measure G-2, which has been superseded by Health Code Article 38, as discussed below, and is no longer applicable.
The regulations and procedures set forth by the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance would ensure that construction dust impacts would not be significant. These requirements supersede the dust control provisions of PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1. Therefore, the portion of PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 Construction Air Quality that addresses dust control is no longer applicable to the proposed project.

Criteria Air Pollutants

While the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that at a program-level the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in significant regional air quality impacts, the PEIR states that “Individual development projects undertaken in the future pursuant to the new zoning and area plans would be subject to a significance determination based on the BAAQMD’s quantitative thresholds for individual projects.” The BAAQMD’s CEQA Air Quality Guidelines provide screening criteria for determining whether a project’s criteria air pollutant emissions would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. Pursuant to the Air Quality Guidelines, projects that meet the screening criteria do not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants. Criteria air pollutant emissions during construction and operation of the proposed project would meet the Air Quality Guidelines screening criteria. The proposed project would demolish the existing gas station facilities and construct an approximately 75-foot-tall, mixed-use building with 75 residential units, approximately 4,500 square feet of ground floor retail space, which would meet the Air Quality Guidelines screening criteria for operation and construction. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants, and a detailed air quality assessment is not required.

Health Risk

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

---


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

30 Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, Updated May 2011. Table 3-1. Criteria air pollutant screening sizes for an apartment, low-rise building is 451 dwelling units for operational and 240 dwelling units for construction. Criteria air pollutant screen sizes for a General Office Building is 346,000 square feet for operational and 277,000 square feet for construction.
Construction

The project site is not located within an identified Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. Therefore, the ambient health risk to sensitive receptors from air pollutants is not considered substantial and the remainder of Mitigation Measure G-1 that requires the minimization of construction exhaust emissions is not applicable to the proposed project.

Siting New Sources

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

Conclusion

For the above reasons, none of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR air quality mitigation measures are applicable to the proposed project and the proposed project would not result in significant air quality impacts that were not identified in the 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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR assessed the GHG emissions that could result from rezoning of the Mission Area Plan under the three rezoning options. The Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning Options A, B, and C are anticipated to result in GHG emissions on the order of 4.2, 4.3 and 4.5 metric tons of CO2E31 per service population,32 respectively. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that the resulting GHG emissions from the three options analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans would be less-than-significant. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

31 CO2E, defined as equivalent Carbon Dioxide, is a quantity that describes other greenhouse gases in terms of the amount of Carbon Dioxide that would have an equal global warming potential.

32 Memorandum from Jessica Range to Environmental Planning staff, Greenhouse Gas Analyses for Community Plan Exemptions in Eastern Neighborhoods, April 20, 2010. This memorandum provides an overview of the GHG analysis conducted for the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and provides an analysis of the emissions using a service population (equivalent of total number of residents and employees) metric.
The BAAQMD has prepared guidelines and methodologies for analyzing GHGs. These guidelines are consistent with CEQA Guidelines sections 15064.4 and 15183.5 which address the analysis and determination of significant impacts from a proposed project’s GHG emissions and allow for projects that are consistent with an adopted GHG reduction strategy to conclude that the proposed project’s GHG impact is less-than-significant. San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions\(^{33}\) 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,\(^{34}\) exceeding the year 2020 reduction goals outlined in the BAAQMD’s 2010 Clean Air Plan,\(^{35}\) Executive Order S-3-05\(^{36}\), and Assembly Bill 32 (also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act).\(^{37,38}\) In addition, San Francisco’s GHG reduction goals are consistent with, or more aggressive than, the long-term goals established under Executive Orders S-3-0539 and B-30-15.40,41 Therefore, projects that are consistent with San Francisco’s GHG Reduction Strategy would not result in GHG emissions that would have a significant effect on the environment and would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations.

The proposed project would increase the intensity of use of the site by introducing residential uses (75 dwelling units) and approximately 4,500 square feet of retail space to the project site. Thirty-seven parking spaces and one car share space would be provided as part of the proposed project. The addition of residential and commercial uses would result in annual increased GHG emissions through added vehicle trips (mobile sources) to the site and an increase from operational uses – such as energy consumption and increased waste and wastewater, and solid waste disposal. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to annual long-term increases in GHGs as a result of increased vehicle trips (mobile sources) and residential and commercial 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.

---


\(^{34}\) ICF International, Technical Review of the 2012 Community-wide Inventory for the City and County of San Francisco, January 21, 2015.


\(^{38}\) 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.

\(^{39}\) 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 MTCO\(_2\)E); by 2020, reduce emissions to 1990 levels (approximately 427 million MTCO\(_2\)E); and by 2050 reduce emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels (approximately 85 million MTCO\(_2\)E).


\(^{41}\) San Francisco’s GHG reduction goals are codified in Section 902 of the Environment Code and include: (i) by 2008, determine City GHG emissions for year 1990; (ii) by 2017, reduce GHG emissions by 25 percent below 1990 levels; (iii) by 2025, reduce GHG emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels; and by 2050, reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels.
The proposed project would be subject to regulations adopted to reduce GHG emissions as identified in the GHG reduction strategy. As discussed below, compliance with the applicable regulations would reduce the proposed project’s GHG emissions related to transportation, energy use, waste disposal, wood burning, and use of refrigerants.

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

The proposed project would be required to comply with the energy efficiency requirements of the City’s Green Building Code, Stormwater Management Ordinance, Water Conservation and Irrigation ordinances, and Energy Conservation Ordinance, which would promote energy and water efficiency, thereby reducing the proposed project’s energy-related GHG emissions.42

The proposed project’s waste-related 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 landfill, reducing GHGs emitted by landfill operations. These regulations also promote reuse of materials, conserving their embodied energy43 and reducing the energy required to produce new materials.

Compliance with the City’s Street Tree Planting requirements would serve to increase carbon sequestration. Other regulations, including the Wood Burning Fireplace Ordinance would reduce emissions of GHGs and black carbon, respectively. Regulations requiring low-emitting finishes would reduce volatile organic compounds (VOCs).44 Thus, the proposed project was determined to be consistent with San Francisco’s GHG reduction strategy.45

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

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

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

44 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.

45 San Francisco Planning Department, Greenhouse Gas Analysis: Compliance Checklist for 793 South Van Ness Avenue, April 27, 2017.
8. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:

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

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

Wind

Based upon experience of the Planning Department in reviewing wind analyses and expert opinion on other projects, it is generally (but not always) the case that projects under 80 feet in height do not have the potential to generate significant wind impacts. The proposed project proposes to construct a 75-foot-tall building, up to 81-feet-tall with rooftop appurtenances. The rooftop appurtenances include an elevator penthouse. The new elevator penthouse would be set back about 39 feet from the South Van Ness Avenue façade of the building and 34 feet from 19th Street façade of the building. Given the small footprint of this rooftop structure and its location away from the sidewalks on South Van Ness Avenue and 19th Street, any overhead winds that they intercept would be redirected onto the roof of the proposed building. Overhead winds that are intercepted and redirected by the penthouse structure would not reach the sidewalks on 19th Street or South Van Ness Avenue. Although the proposed 75-foot-tall building would be taller than the immediately adjacent buildings, it would be similar in height to existing buildings in the surrounding area. For the above reasons, the proposed project is not anticipated to cause significant impacts related to wind that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Shadow

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

The proposed project would construct a 75-foot-tall building (up to 81-feet-tall including roof top appurtenances); therefore, the Planning Department prepared a preliminary shadow fan analysis to
determine whether the proposed project would have the potential to cast new shadow on nearby parks.\textsuperscript{46} No parks or open spaces would be impacted by the proposed project.

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

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

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{46} San Francisco Planning Department, Shadow Fan Analysis for 793 South Van Ness Avenue, May 26, 2017.
fees and the 2012 San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond are funding measures similar to that described in PEIR Improvement Measure H-1: Support for Upgrades to Existing Recreation Facilities.

An update of the Recreation and Open Space Element (ROSE) of the General Plan was adopted in April 2014. The amended ROSE provides a 20-year vision for open spaces in the City. It includes information and policies about accessing, acquiring, funding, and managing open spaces in San Francisco. The amended ROSE identifies areas within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area for acquisition and the locations where new open spaces and open space connections should be built, consistent with PEIR Improvement Measure H-2: Support for New Open Space. Daggett Park opened on April 19, 2017 and Folsom Park at 17th and Folsom opened on June 23, 2017. In addition, the amended ROSE identifies the role of both the Better Streets Plan (refer to “Transportation” section for description) and the Green Connections Network in open space and recreation. Green Connections are special streets and paths that connect people to parks, open spaces, and the waterfront, while enhancing the ecology of the street environment. Six routes identified within the Green Connections Network cross the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area: Mission to Peaks (Route 6); Noe Valley to Central Waterfront (Route 8), a portion of which has been conceptually designed; Tenderloin to Potrero (Route 18); Downtown to Mission Bay (Route 19); Folsom, Mission Creek to McLaren (Route 20); and Shoreline (Route 24).

Furthermore, the Planning Code requires a specified amount of new usable open space (either private or common) for each new residential unit. Some developments are also required to provide privately owned, publicly accessible open spaces. The Planning Code open space requirements would help offset some of the additional open space needs generated by increased residential population to the project area. The proposed project would provide private useable open spaces for the new residential units. The proposed project would provide an approximately 3,500-square-foot corner rear yard and a 1,200-square-foot roof deck on the sixth floor.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact to the provision of water, wastewater collection and treatment, and solid waste collection and disposal. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

Since certification of the PEIR, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) adopted the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) in June 2016. The UWMP update includes city-wide demand projections to the year 2040, compares available water supplies to meet demand and presents water demand management measures to reduce long-term water demand. Additionally, the UWMP update includes a discussion of the conservation requirement set forth in Senate Bill 7 passed in November 2009 mandating a statewide 20% reduction in per capita water use by 2020. The UWMP includes a quantification of the SFPUC's water use reduction targets and plan for meeting these objectives. The UWMP projects sufficient water supply in normal years and a supply shortfall during prolonged droughts. Plans are in place to institute varying degrees of water conservation and rationing as needed in response to severe droughts.

In addition, the SFPUC is in the process of implementing the Sewer System Improvement Program, which is a 20-year, multi-billion dollar citywide upgrade to the City’s sewer and stormwater infrastructure to ensure a reliable and seismically safe system. The program includes planned improvements that will serve development in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area including at the Southeast Treatment Plant, the Central Bayside System, and green infrastructure projects, such as the Mission and Valencia Green Gateway. The project site is located within an area in San Francisco that is prone to flooding during storms. For a discussion of the proposed project’s potential flooding impacts, please refer to section 14. Hydrology and Water Quality.

As the proposed project is consistent with the development density established under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on utilities and service systems beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.
11. PUBLIC SERVICES—Would the project:

   a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services such as fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other services?

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered public services, including fire protection, police protection, and public schools. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR. For a discussion of the proposed project’s impacts to emergency access vehicles, please refer to section 4. Transportation and Circulation.

As the proposed project is consistent with the development density established under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, the proposed project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts on the physical environment associated with the provision of public services beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:

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

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

   c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
As discussed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area is in a developed urban environment that does not provide native natural habitat for any rare or endangered plant or animal species. There are no riparian corridors, estuaries, marshes, or wetlands in the Plan Area that could be affected by the development anticipated under the Area Plan. In addition, development envisioned under the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan would not substantially interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory wildlife species. For these reasons, the PEIR concluded that implementation of the Area Plan would not result in significant impacts on biological resources, and no mitigation measures were identified.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

A geotechnical investigation was prepared for the proposed project. The investigation concluded that the project site is underlain by approximately 5 to 12 feet of fill and possible fill consisting of very stiff to hard sandy clay with gravel, clay with sand, and medium dense to very dense clayey sand, and silty sand with gravel. The fill is underlain by dense to very dense silty sand and clayey sand, and very stiff to hard clay with sand and sandy clay to the maximum depth explored (approximately 52 feet). The project site does not fall within an area of potential seismic hazards from liquefaction during seismic events. The sand layers encountered as part of the geotechnical investigation are dense to very dense or have sufficient fines to resist liquefaction during seismic events. The likelihood of these layers liquefying is low. The proposed project would be supported by drilled, cast-in-place, concrete piers. No pile driving is proposed as part of project construction.

The proposed project is required to conform to the San Francisco Building Code, which ensures the safety of all new construction in the City. DBI will review the project-specific geotechnical report during its review of the building permit for the project. In addition, DBI may require additional site specific soils report(s) through the building permit application process, as needed. The DBI requirement for a geotechnical report and review of the building permit application pursuant to DBI’s implementation of

---

47 Rollo & Ridley, Geotechnical Investigation, 799 South Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California, June 24, 2015.
the Building Code would ensure that the proposed project would have no significant impacts related to soils, seismic or other geological hazards.

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

14. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY—Would the project:
   a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
   b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?
   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?
   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?
   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?
   f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
   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?
   h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?
   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?
   j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?
The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact on hydrology and water quality, including the combined sewer system and the potential for combined sewer outflows. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

For informational purposes, below is a description of the requirements for development in areas prone to flooding and flood hazards. Development in the City and County of San Francisco must account for flooding potential. Areas located on fill or bay mud can subside to a point at which the sewers do not drain freely during a storm (and sometimes during dry weather) and there can be backups or flooding near these streets and sewers. The project site is located within an area in San Francisco that is prone to flooding during storms, especially where ground stories are located below an elevation of 0.0 City Datum or, more importantly, below the hydraulic grade line or water level of the sewer.

Pursuant to Planning Director Bulletin Number 4, the project sponsor submitted the proposed project proposal for preliminary review to San Francisco Department of Public Works Hydraulics Division. The purpose of this review is to avoid flooding problems caused by the relative elevation of a proposed structure to the hydraulic grade line in the sewers. The Department of Public Works reviewed the proposed project at 793 South Van Ness Avenue and recommended that the ground floor elevations of the building be at or above the official grade elevations to minimize the potential of street storm flows from entering the property. As required, the project sponsor is continuing coordination with public works regarding conceptual sewer design. Therefore, these requirements would ensure that the proposed project would not exacerbate an existing flood hazard in the project area.

The proposed project would construct rear yards on a site currently occupied entirely by structures and an impervious surface parking lot. The proposed project would have an approximately 3,500-square foot rear yard. The rear yard would be constructed on top of a concrete slab on the second story of the building. Although the yard would be constructed on top of an impervious surface, a stormwater management system composed of pervious surface materials, such as concrete pavers over gravel, flow through planters, traditional planters, and decking over gravel or pedestals in the rear yard, would slow and lessen the volume of runoff entering the combined sewer system from the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially increase runoff from the site when compared to the existing condition. In accordance with the City’s Stormwater Management Ordinance (Ordinance No. 83-10), the proposed project would be subject to Low Impact Design approaches. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect runoff and drainage.

48 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/archive/S213478.PDF). Accordingly, hazards resulting from a project that place development in an area prone to flooding are not considered impacts under CEQA unless the project would exacerbate the existing flood hazard.


Groundwater is expected to be encountered at an estimated depth of 13 to 14 feet below grade. The proposed project involves ground disturbing activities to a depth of approximately 8 feet so groundwater is not anticipated to be encountered during construction. However, in the event that groundwater is encountered during construction of the proposed project, dewatering and discharge would be subject to the requirements of the City of San Francisco’s Sewer Use Ordinance (Ordinance Number 19-92, amended 116-97).

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

---

15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS—Would the project:

| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

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

Hazardous Building Materials

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

Soil and Groundwater Contamination

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

The proposed project site is a vacant Shell gasoline facility which ceased operations in 2002. The facility was constructed in 1968 and was owned by Shell gasoline until 2004. The proposed project would require excavation up to 8 feet deep for the installation of the 15 vehicle pit stacker systems and one elevator pit. Approximately 2,400 cubic yards of soil would be removed from the project site during construction activities. Therefore, the project is subject to the Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health.

In compliance with the Maher Ordinance, the project sponsor has submitted a Maher Application to DPH and a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for the project to assess the potential
for site contamination. 52,53 According to the Phase I ESA, the gasoline underground storage tanks, waste oil tank, product dispensers, piping, and hydraulic hoists associated with the former gasoline station were removed in December 2004 and groundwater monitoring wells were sampled on a quarterly and semi-annual basis from 2004-2009. In August 2014, a human health risk assessment was prepared and submitted to the San Francisco DPH– Local Oversight Program and in October 2014, a Corrective Action Plan was submitted to DPH- Local Oversight Program. Therefore, the project sponsor is currently in consultation with the San Francisco Department of Public Health to obtain a site closure letter for 793 South Van Ness Avenue. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to hazardous materials that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

The proposed project would be required to remediate any identified potential soil contamination in accordance with Article 22A of the Health Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to hazardous materials that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

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

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

As the proposed project is consistent with the development density established under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on mineral and energy resources beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

### Topics:

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

#### 17. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:—Would the project:

- 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?
- ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

- Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

- 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)?
- ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

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

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

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

### MITIGATION MEASURES

Project Mitigation Measure 1 – Archeological Testing (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure J-2)

Based on a reasonable presumption that archeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources. The project sponsor shall retain the
services of an archaeological consultant from the rotational Department Qualified Archaeological Consultants List (QACL) maintained by the Planning Department archaeologist. The project sponsor shall contact the Department archaeologist to obtain the names and contact information for the next three archeological consultants on the QACL. The archeological consultant shall undertake an archeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this measure. The archeological consultant’s work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less than significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Sect. 15064.5 (a) and (c).

Consultation with Descendant Communities: On discovery of an archeological site\(^{54}\) associated with descendant Native Americans, the Overseas Chinese, or other potentially interested descendant group an appropriate representative\(^{55}\) of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of the site and to offer recommendations to the ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated archeological site. A copy of the Final Archaeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group.

Archeological Testing Program. The archeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archeological testing plan (ATP). The archeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA.

At the completion of the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archeological testing program the archeological consultant finds that significant archeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archeological testing, archeological monitoring, and/or an

\(^{54}\) By the term “archeological site” is intended here to minimally include any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

\(^{55}\) An “appropriate representative” of the descendant group is here defined to mean, in the case of Native Americans, any individual listed in the current Native American Contact List for the City and County of San Francisco maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission and in the case of the Overseas Chinese, the Chinese Historical Society of America. An appropriate representative of other descendant groups should be determined in consultation with the Department archaeologist.
archaeological data recovery program. No archaeological data recovery shall be undertaken without the prior approval of the ERO or the Planning Department archaeologist. If the ERO determines that a significant archaeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:

A) The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archaeological resource; or

B) A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archaeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.

Archeological Monitoring Program. If the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant determines that an archeological monitoring program shall be implemented the archeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:

- The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils-disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context;

- The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource;

- The archeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with project archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits;

- The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis;

- If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile driving or deep foundation activities (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving or deep foundation activities may affect an archeological resource, the pile driving or deep foundation activities shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.

Whether or not significant archeological resources are encountered, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.
Archeological Data Recovery Program. The archeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archeological consultant shall submit a draft ADRP to the ERO. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

- **Field Methods and Procedures.** Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations.
- **Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis.** Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures.
- **Discard and Deaccession Policy.** Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies.
- **Interpretive Program.** Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archeological data recovery program.
- **Security Measures.** Recommended security measures to protect the archeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities.
- **Final Report.** Description of proposed report format and distribution of results.
- **Curation.** Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities.

Human Remains, Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects. The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal Laws, including immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner’s determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The ERO shall also be immediately notified upon discovery of human remains. The archeological consultant, project sponsor, ERO, and MLD shall have up to but not beyond six days after the discovery to make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects with appropriate dignity (CEQA Guidelines. Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, curation, possession, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. Nothing in existing State regulations or in this mitigation measure compels the project sponsor and the ERO to accept recommendations of an MLD. The archeological consultant shall retain possession of any Native American human remains and associated or unassociated burial objects until completion of any scientific analyses of the human remains or objects as specified in the treatment agreement if such as agreement has been made or, otherwise, as determined by the archeological consultant and the ERO. If no agreement is reached State regulations shall be followed.
including the reinternment of the human remains and associated burial objects with appropriate dignity on
the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98).

Final Archeological Resources Report. The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft 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 testing/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.

Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological
Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a
copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning division of the Planning
Department shall receive one bound, one unbound and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on 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 in or the high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a
different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

Project Mitigation Measure 2 – Construction Noise (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR
Mitigation Measure F-2)
The project sponsor shall develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision
of a qualified acoustical consultant. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be
submitted to the Department of Building Inspection to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation
will be achieved. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as
feasible:

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

Project Mitigation Measure 3 - Hazardous Building Materials (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods
PEIR Mitigation Measure L-1)
The sponsor shall ensure that any equipment containing PCBs or DEHP, such as fluorescent light ballasts,
are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the
start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly
removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during
work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.

PROJECT IMPROVEMENT MEASURES

Project Improvement Measure 1 – Construction Management Plan and Public Updates
Community Plan Evaluation
Initial Study Checklist  793 South Van Ness Avenue
2015-001360ENV

- **Construction Management Plan** – The project sponsor will develop and, upon review and approval by the SFMTA, the Fire Department, the Police Department, and Public Works, implement a Construction Management Plan, addressing transportation-related circulation, access, staging and hours of delivery. The Construction Management Plan would disseminate appropriate information to contractors and affected agencies with respect to coordinating construction activities to minimize overall disruption and ensure that overall circulation in the project area is maintained to the extent possible, with particular focus on ensuring transit, pedestrian, and bicycle connectivity. The Construction Management Plan would supplement and expand, rather than modify or supersede, and manual, regulations, or provisions set forth by the SFMTA, Public Works, or other City departments and agencies, and the California Department of Transportation. Management practices could include: best practices for accommodating pedestrians and bicyclists, identifying routes for construction trucks to utilize, minimizing deliveries and travel lane closures during the a.m. (7:30 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.) and p.m. (4:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.) peak periods along South Van Ness Avenue and 19th Street (Monday through Friday).

- **Carpool, Bicycle, Walk and Transit Access for Construction Workers** – To minimize parking demand and vehicle trips associated with construction workers, the construction contractor could include as part of the Construction Management Plan methods to encourage carpooling, bicycle, walk and transit access to the project site by construction workers (such as providing secure bicycle parking spaces, participating in free-to-employee and employer ride matching program from www.511.org, participating in emergency ride home program through the City of San Francisco (www.sferh.org), and providing transit information to construction workers.

- **Construction Worker Parking Plan** - As part of the Construction Management Plan that will be developed by the construction contractor, the location of construction worker parking could be identified as well as the person(s) responsible for monitoring the implementation of the proposed parking plan. The use of on-street parking to accommodate construction worker parking could be discouraged. The project sponsor could provide on-site parking once the below grade parking garage is usable.

- **Project Construction Updates for San Francisco Fire and Police Departments** – The project sponsor will coordinate with the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments for the duration of project construction activities regarding the construction schedule and activities that could temporarily impact 19th Street access. Two months prior to beginning construction, the project sponsor will provide the San Francisco Fire and Police Departments the proposed construction schedule and indicate the proposed activities that could temporarily impact 19th Street access. Subsequent updates or addendums to the proposed schedule and a list of construction activities will be provided to the Fire and Police Departments on a quarterly basis to avoid conflict between project construction activities and emergency services.

**Project Improvement Measure 2: Queue Abatement**
To minimize the vehicle queues at the project driveway into the public right-of-way, the project will be subject to the Planning Department’s vehicle queue abatement conditions of approval:

- It will be the responsibility of the owner/operator of any off-street parking facility with more than 20 parking spaces (excluding loading and car-share spaces) to ensure that recurring vehicle queues do not occur on the public right-of-way. A vehicle queue is defined as one or
more vehicles (destined to the parking facility) blocking any portion of any public street, alley, or sidewalk for a consecutive period of three minutes or longer on a daily or weekly basis.

- If a recurring queue occurs, the owner/operator of the parking facility will employ abatement methods as needed to abate the queue. Appropriate abatement methods will vary depending on the characteristics and causes of the recurring queue, as well as the characteristics of the parking facility, the street(s) to which the facility connects, and the associated land uses (if applicable).

- Suggested abatement methods include but are not limited to the following: redesign of the facility to improve vehicle circulation and/or on-site queue capacity; employment of parking attendants; installation of “LOT FULL” signs with active management by parking attendants; use of valet parking or other space-efficient parking techniques; use of off-site parking facilities or shared parking with nearby uses; use of parking occupancy sensors and signage directing drivers to available spaces; travel demand management strategies such as additional bicycle parking, customer shuttles, delivery services; and/or parking demand management strategies such as parking time limits, paid parking, time-of-day parking surcharge, or validated parking.

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