



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Mitigated Negative Declaration

PMND Date: June 27, 2018; amended on July 20, 2018 (amendments to the PMND include deletions shown as ~~strike through~~ and additions shown as double underline)

Case No.: **2017-007542ENV**

Project Title: **807 Franklin Street/635 Fulton Street**

BPA Nos.: 201712186731, 201712196870

Zoning: 807 Franklin St: RM-4 (Residential – Mixed, High Density) Use District and 80-B Height and Bulk District
635 Fulton St: RM-2 (Residential – Mixed, Moderate Density) Use District and 50-X Height and Bulk District

Block/Lot: 807 Franklin St: 0744/002, 635 Fulton St: 0795/027

Lot Size: 807 Franklin St: 10,312 square feet, 635 Fulton St: 10,420 square feet

Project Sponsor: Toby Morris, Kerman Morris Architects LLP
(415) 749-0302

Lead Agency: San Francisco Planning Department

Staff Contact: Jeanie Poling – (415) 575-9072
Jeanie.poling@sfgov.org

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project involves two lots and three buildings. One parcel is located at 807 Franklin Street and the other parcel is located at 635 Fulton Street, approximately a half-mile apart from one another.

The proposed project involves the following components: (1) relocate the existing three-story mortuary/residential building at 635 Fulton Street approximately 14 feet east and 6 feet south to the eastern edge of the project parcel, (2) relocate the two-story-over-basement Victorian building from 807 Franklin Street to the west side of the 635 Fulton Street project parcel, (3) add one-story vertical additions and horizontal rear additions to both buildings at 635 Fulton Street, (4) convert the mortuary use to residential use and reconfigure both buildings, resulting in a total of 17 dwelling units and no vehicle parking at 635 Fulton Street, and (5) construct a new nine-story building at 807 Franklin Street containing 48 dwelling units and 17 parking spaces.

FINDING:

This project could not have a significant effect on the environment. This finding is based upon the criteria of the Guidelines of the State Secretary for Resources, Sections 15064 (Determining Significant Effect), 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance), and 15070 (Decision to prepare a Negative Declaration), and the following reasons as documented in the Initial Evaluation (Initial Study) for the project, which is attached. Mitigation measures are included in this project to avoid potentially significant effects. See pages 148 to 156.

Mitigated Negative Declaration
June 20, 2018

CASE NO. 2017-007542ENV
807 Franklin Street/635 Fulton Street

In the independent judgment of the Planning Department, there is no substantial evidence that the project could have a significant effect on the environment.


Lisa Gibson
Environmental Review Officer

7/20/18
Date of Issuance of Final Mitigated
Negative Declaration

cc: Toby Morris, Mary Woods, M.D.F

TABLE OF CONTENTS

807 Franklin Street/635 Fulton Street

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION	1
B. PROJECT SETTING	31
C. COMBATIBILITY WITH EXISTING ZONING AND PLANS	32
D. SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS	37
E. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS	38
E.1 Land Use and Land Use Planning	39
E.2 Population and Housing	41
E.3 Cultural Resources	43
E.4 Transportation and Circulation	69
E.5 Noise	79
E.6 Air Quality	88
E.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	106
E.8 Wind and Shadow	109
E.9 Recreation	117
E.10 Utilities and Service Systems	118
E.11 Public Services	123
E.12 Biological Resources	126
E.13 Geology and Soils	128
E.14 Hydrology and Water Quality	132
E.15 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	139
E.16 Mineral and Energy Resources	144
E.17 Agriculture and Forest Resources	146
E.18 Mandatory Findings of Significance	147
F. MITIGATION MEASURES	148
G. PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT	155
H. DETERMINATION	156
I. INITIAL STUDY PREPARERS	157

List of Figures	<u>Page</u>
1 Location of Project Sites	3
2 807 Franklin Street Existing Site Plan	4
3 807 Franklin Street Proposed Site Plan	5
4 807 Franklin Street Proposed First Floor Plan	6
5 807 Franklin Street Proposed Second Floor Plan	7
6 807 Franklin Street Proposed Third Floor Plan	8
7 807 Franklin Street Proposed Typical Floor Plan (Levels 4 to 5)	9
8 807 Franklin Street Proposed Typical Floor Plan (Levels 6 to 8)	10
9 807 Franklin Street Proposed Ninth Floor Plan	11
10 807 Franklin Street Proposed Roof Plan	12
11 807 Franklin Street Proposed East Elevation	13
12 807 Franklin Street Proposed South Elevation	14
13 807 Franklin Street Proposed West Elevation	15
14 807 Franklin Street Proposed North Elevation	16
15 635 Fulton Street Existing Site Plan	17
16 635 Fulton Street Proposed Site Plan	18
17 635 Fulton Street Proposed Basement Floor Plan	19
18 635 Fulton Street Proposed First Floor Plan	20
19 635 Fulton Street Proposed Second Floor Plan	21
20 635 Fulton Street Proposed Third Floor Plan	22
21 635 Fulton Street Proposed Fourth Floor Plan	23
22 635 Fulton Street Proposed Roof Plan	24
23 635 Fulton Street Proposed North Elevation	25
24 635 Fulton Street Proposed East Elevation	26
25 635 Fulton Street Proposed South Elevation	27
26 635 Fulton Street Proposed West Elevation	28
27 Cumulative Projects within a Quarter Mile of 807 Franklin Street	35
28 Cumulative Projects within a Quarter Mile of 635 Fulton Street	36
29 807 Franklin Street Shadow Study Diagram	116

List of Tables	<u>Page</u>
1 Project Characteristics	29
2 Major Projects Within One Quarter Mile of Project Sites	34
3 Typical Noise Levels from Construction Equipment	83
4 Vibration Guidelines for Potential Damage to Structures	86
5 Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment	86
6 Criteria Air Pollutant Significance Thresholds	91



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration

Date: June 27, 2018
Case No.: **2017-007542ENV**
Project Title: **807 Franklin Street/635 Fulton Street**
BPA Nos.: 201712186731, 201712196870
Zoning: 807 Franklin St: RM-4 (Residential – Mixed, High Density) Use District and
80-B Height and Bulk District
635 Fulton St: RM-2 (Residential – Mixed, Moderate Density) Use District and
50-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 807 Franklin St: 0744/002, 635 Fulton St: 0795/027
Lot Size: 807 Franklin St: 10,312 square feet, 635 Fulton St: 10,420 square feet
Project Sponsor: Toby Morris, Kerman Morris Architects LLP
(415) 749-0302
Lead Agency: San Francisco Planning Department
Staff Contact: Jeanie Poling – (415) 575-9072
Jeanie.poling@sfgov.org

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project involves two lots and three buildings. One parcel is located at 807 Franklin Street and the other parcel is located at 635 Fulton Street, approximately a half-mile apart from one another.

The proposed project involves the following components: (1) relocate the existing three-story mortuary/residential building at 635 Fulton Street approximately 14 feet east and 6 feet south to the eastern edge of the project parcel, (2) relocate the two-story-over-basement Victorian building from 807 Franklin Street to the west side of the 635 Fulton Street project parcel, (3) add one-story vertical additions and horizontal rear additions to both buildings at 635 Fulton Street, (4) convert the mortuary use to residential use and reconfigure both buildings, resulting in a total of 17 dwelling units and no vehicle parking at 635 Fulton Street, and (5) construct a new nine-story building at 807 Franklin Street containing 48 dwelling units and 17 parking spaces.

FINDING:

This project could not have a significant effect on the environment. This finding is based upon the criteria of the Guidelines of the State Secretary for Resources, Sections 15064 (Determining Significant Effect), 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance), and 15070 (Decision to prepare a Negative Declaration), and the following reasons as documented in the Initial Evaluation (Initial Study) for the project, which is attached.

Mitigation measures are included in this project to avoid potentially significant effects. See pages 148 to 155.

Initial Study
807 Franklin Street/635 Fulton Street
Planning Department Case No. 2017-007542ENV

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location

The proposed project involves two lots and three buildings. One parcel is located at 807 Franklin Street and the other parcel is located at 635 Fulton Street, approximately a half-mile apart from one another. See Figure 1 on page 3.

807 Franklin Street

The project site is an approximately 10,312-square-foot (sf) lot located at 807 Franklin Street (Assessor's Block 0744, Lot 002) in the Western Addition/Civic Center neighborhood on a block that is bound by Franklin Street to the east, Turk Street to the south, Eddy Street to the north, and Gough Street to the west. The project site is occupied by a two-story-over-basement 5,170 sf single-family residential Victorian building built in 1880 and an approximately 5,500 sf side yard that is partially paved and partially graveled and used for vehicle parking. A two-vehicle garage at the rear of the building is accessed through the side yard. The project site is on an approximately 10 percent lateral slope, with the north being about 8 feet higher than the south.

635 Fulton Street

The project site is an approximately 10,420 sf lot located at 635 Fulton Street (Assessor's Block 0795, Lot 027) in the Western Addition on a block that is bound by Fulton Street to the north, Laguna Street to the east, Grove Street to the south, and the Buchanan Street Mall to the west. The project site is occupied by a three-story 35-foot-tall, 8,126 sf building that contains a 6,138 sf mortuary on the first and second floors and two residential units on the third floor, and 12 surface vehicle parking spaces. The project site is relatively flat.

Project Characteristics

The proposed project involves the following components: (1) relocate the existing building at 635 Fulton Street approximately 14 feet east and 6 feet south to the eastern edge of the project parcel, (2) relocate the Victorian building from 807 Franklin Street to the west side of the 635 Fulton Street project parcel, (3) add one-story vertical additions and horizontal rear additions to both buildings at 635 Fulton Street, (4) convert the mortuary use to residential use and reconfigure both buildings, resulting in a total of 17 dwelling units and no vehicle parking at 635 Fulton Street, and (5) construct a new nine-story building at 807 Franklin Street containing 48 dwelling units and 17 parking spaces.

807 Franklin Street

The new nine-story building at 807 Franklin Street would contain eight stories of approximately 56,287 sf of residential use in 48 dwelling units, comprised of 11 one-bedroom units, 33 two-bedroom units, and four three-bedroom units. See Figures 2 through 14, on pages 4 through 16, for project floor plans and elevations. The first level would include 17 vehicle parking spaces in stackers and 80 bicycle parking spaces. The building would extend 80 feet in height, with two stair penthouses rising to 90 feet in height, and an elevator penthouse rising to 96 feet in height. The building would include private usable open space on the ground floor and common open spaces at the rear yard and roof deck. The project proposes a drilled pier foundation system.

635 Fulton Street

The existing three-story mortuary/residential building would be moved 14 feet east and converted to a four-story, 46-foot-tall, approximately 13,162 sf building containing 10 residences, comprised of two one-bedroom units, seven two-bedroom units, and one three-bedroom unit. The Victorian structure from 807 Franklin Street would be relocated to the west side of the 635 Fulton Street property and would be converted to a three-story-over-basement building containing approximately 8,165 sf of residential use consisting of seven dwelling units, comprised of three one-bedroom units and four two-bedroom units. The total area of residential use on the project site would be 21,327 sf and the total number of dwelling units would be 17, consisting of five one-bedroom units, 11 two-bedroom units, and one three-bedroom unit. The project would include 32 bicycle parking spaces at the basement level of the Victorian building and no vehicle parking spaces. Both buildings would maintain independent entries and lobbies but would be internally connected via common stairs at the basement, first, and fourth levels. See Figures 15 through 26, on pages 17 through 28.

Table 1 on page 29 identifies project characteristics for both project sites.

Construction Schedule and Equipment

807 Franklin Street

Project construction would take approximately 33 months. During the first nine months, the foundation would be demolished and the existing building would be moved off site. Construction of the new nine-story building would take approximately 24 months, consisting of the following phases: 6.5 months for excavation and foundation installation; 8.5 months for construction of the above-grade structure; and 18 months for interior work.

The new building at 807 Franklin Street would involve excavation to a depth of 13 feet for the below-grade parking level, and to a depth of 19 feet at the locations of the vehicle pit stackers and elevator pit. Approximately 7,733 sf of ground surface area would be disturbed, and 3,607 cubic yards of soil would be removed from the project site during construction activities.



FIGURE 1 - LOCATION OF PROJECT SITES




FIGURE 2 - 807 FRANKLIN EXISTING SITE PLAN



807 Franklin Street/635 Fulton Street





FIGURE 4 - 807 FRANKLIN STREET PROPOSED 1ST FLOOR PLAN








FIGURE 6 - 807 FRANKLIN STREET PROPOSED 3RD FLOOR PLAN




FIGURE 7 - 807 FRANKLIN STREET PROPOSED TYPICAL FLOOR PLAN (LEVELS 4 TO 5)






FIGURE 8 - 807 FRANKLIN STREET PROPOSED TYPICAL FLOOR PLAN (LEVELS 6 TO 8)






FIGURE 9 - 807 FRANKLIN STREET PROPOSED 9TH FLOOR PLAN







FIGURE 10 - 807 FRANKLIN STREET PROPOSED ROOF PLAN








FIGURE 13 - 807 FRANKLIN STREET PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION





FIGURE 14 - 807 FRANKLIN STREET PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION





 $\oplus z$






FIGURE 19 - 635 FULTON STREET PROPOSED SECOND FLOOR PLAN






FIGURE 20 - 635 FULTON STREET PROPOSED THIRD FLOOR PLAN






FIGURE 21 - 635 FULTON STREET PROPOSED FOURTH FLOOR PLAN






FIGURE 22 - 635 FULTON STREET PROPOSED ROOF PLAN






FIGURE 23 - 635 FULTON STREET PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION



FIGURE 24 - 635 FULTON STREET PROPOSED EAST ELEVATION





Table 1 – Project Characteristics

807 Franklin Street		
Height of building	80' ^a	
Number of stories	9	
Residential use	56,287 sf	
One Bedroom units	11	
Two bedroom units	33	
Three bedroom units	4	
Total dwelling units	48	
Total vehicle parking spaces	17	
Total bicycle parking spaces	80	
635 Fulton Street		
	Mortuary building	Victorian building
Height of building	46'	44'
Number of stories	4	3 over basement
Residential use	13,162	8,165
One bedroom units	2	0
Two bedroom units	7	4
Three bedroom units	1	3
Dwelling units	10	7
Total dwelling units	17	
Total vehicle parking spaces	0	
Total bicycle parking spaces	32	

^a 90 feet to top of two stair penthouses, and 96 feet to top of elevator penthouse.

Prior to removing the Victorian from the project site, sewer, gas, and electric lines would be disconnected, and trees and parking meters would be removed. Saws would be used to separate the structure from its foundation, openings would be created to run beams the length of the structures, wheels would be placed below the structure, and hydraulic jacks would raise the structure. The front staircase, top floor penthouse, and wood rear structure would be removed from the building, and the building would be cut into pieces and moved by truck to the new site.

The new building at 807 Franklin Street would be supported on a deep foundation consisting of drilled, cast-in-place, concrete piers drilled to depths of roughly 40 feet below the proposed below-grade parking level. The 33-month construction period would consist of the following phases: nine months to move the Victorian and demolish the foundation; 6.5 months for excavation and foundation installation; 8.5 months for construction of the above-grade structure; and 18 months for interior work. Drill and hoe ram equipment would be used to remove the Victorian's foundation.

Relocation of the Victorian Building

A professional house moving company has provided logistics for the half-mile move.¹ A 1994 Kensworth truck would move the building south on Franklin Street, turn east on Fulton Street, and go three and a half blocks to 635 Fulton Street. The move would require streets to be fully closed for about two hours. The project sponsor would coordinate with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to close streets and temporarily remove overhead electric wires along Franklin Street between McAllister and Fulton streets and at the intersection of Franklin and Fulton streets.

635 Fulton Street

Project construction would take approximately 27 months. During the first nine months, the existing mortuary foundation would be demolished, new foundations installed, and the Victorian and mortuary buildings installed onto the new foundations. The renovation and expansion of the two buildings would take approximately 18 months (concurrent with 24-month new construction at 807 Franklin Street).

The project would require excavation of approximately 5.5 feet for the basement level of the Victorian building. Approximately 2,610 sf of ground surface area would be disturbed and 530 cubic yards of dirt/soil would be removed from the project site during construction activities.

Construction equipment would include earthmoving equipment, bobcat, dump truck, backhoe and delivery trucks (no construction crane, hoe ram, or pile driver).

PROJECT APPROVALS

807 Franklin Street

- Conditional Use Authorization for a structure exceeding 50 feet in height, and street frontage greater than 50 feet where the height exceeds 40 feet, per Planning Code section 253 (Planning Commission).
- Variance from Planning Code section 140 regarding dwelling unit exposure (Zoning Administrator)
- Shadow on parks (Recreation and Park Commission)
- Building permits for moving a building and new construction (Department of Building Inspection)
- Removal and addition of curb cut and addition of street trees (Public Works)
- Temporary street closures and removal of overhead wires (SFMTA)
- Stormwater Control Plan (San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC))

¹ Fisher Bros House Moving Company, response to request for information, July 10, 2017. This document (and all other documents cited in this initial study) is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2017-07542ENV.

635 Fulton Street

- Conditional Use Authorization for a structure exceeding 50 feet in height, and street frontage greater than 50 feet where the height exceeds 40 feet, per Planning Code section 253 (Planning Commission).
- Variance from Planning Code section 134 rear yard requirements (Zoning Administrator)
- Building permits for building relocation and alterations (Department of Building Inspection)
- Site Mitigation Plan (Department of Public Health)
- Removal of curb cuts and addition of street trees (Public Works)
- Stormwater Control Plan (SFPUC)

APPROVAL ACTION UNDER CEQA

- The Conditional Use Authorization for either 807 Franklin Street or 635 Fulton Street – whichever comes first – is the approval action for purposes of CEQA appeal that would establish the start of the 30-day appeal period for appeal of the final mitigated negative declaration to the Board of Supervisors pursuant to section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

B. PROJECT SETTING

Project Site and Surrounding Land Uses

807 Franklin Street

The project site is on the west side of Franklin Street on the block bounded by Eddy Street to the north, Turk Street to the south, Gough Street to the west and Franklin Street to the east at roughly the border of San Francisco's Western Addition and Civic Center neighborhoods. 807 Franklin Street faces east towards Franklin Street, a heavily trafficked automobile corridor that traverses through the eastern portion of the Western Addition. A gas station and paved surface parking area are adjacent to the project site to the south, and a four-story, multi-unit residential building is adjacent to the project site to the north. The surrounding neighborhood is composed primarily of multi-unit residential complexes, rising between four and seven stories in height, which were constructed during the 1970s and 1980s. Some mixed-use commercial properties are interspersed within the surrounding neighborhood.

635 Fulton Street

The project site is on the south side of Fulton Street, within a city block bounded by Laguna Street to the east, Fulton Street to the north, the Buchanan Street Mall to the west, and Grove Street to the south. The property is located in the Western Addition neighborhood of San Francisco. The immediately surrounding neighborhood is primarily comprised of multi-family residential complexes that were constructed in the 1960s as part of the Western Addition A-2 Redevelopment Project Area. The city block on which the subject property is located is immediately adjacent to the northern boundary of the Market & Octavia Area Plan area.

Cumulative Projects

The cumulative context for land use effects are typically localized, within the immediate vicinity of the project site, or at the neighborhood level. Table 2 identifies cumulative development in the project vicinity (within a quarter-mile radius of both project sites); these projects are either under construction or for which the Planning Department has an environmental evaluation application on file. Figure 27 shows the location of the cumulative projects near 807 Franklin Street that are identified in Table 2, and Figure 28 shows the location of cumulative projects near 635 Fulton Street that are identified in Table 2. The areas and the projects' relevance to the analysis vary, depending on the topic, as detailed in the cumulative analyses present in subsequent sections of this document.

C. COMPATIBILITY WITH EXISTING ZONING AND PLANS

	<i>Applicable</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
Discuss any variances, special authorizations, or changes proposed to the Planning Code or Zoning Map, if applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discuss any conflicts with any adopted plans and goals of the City or Region, if applicable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discuss any approvals and/or permits from City departments other than the Planning Department or the Department of Building Inspection, or from Regional, State, or Federal Agencies.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

San Francisco Planning Code

The San Francisco Planning Code, which incorporates the City's Zoning Maps, governs permitted land uses, densities, and the arrangement of building structures within the city. Permits to construct new buildings (or to alter or demolish existing ones) may not be issued unless (1) the proposed project conforms to the Planning Code, (2) allowable exceptions are granted pursuant to provisions of the Planning Code, or (3) amendments to the Planning Code are incorporated into the proposed project.

Zoning and Density

807 Franklin Street

The 807 Franklin Street site is located in a Residential-Mixed, High Density (RM-4) zoning district and an 80-B height and bulk district. The RM-4 district is devoted almost exclusively to apartment buildings of high density, usually with smaller units. Buildings over 40 feet in height are very common, and other tall buildings may be accommodated in some instances. Despite the intensity of development, distinct building styles and moderation of façades are still to be sought in new development, as are open areas for the residents. Group housing and supporting nonresidential uses are common in the RM-4 district. The project site is limited to 80 feet in height. Across Franklin Street from the project site is a 130-foot height district. Conditional Use Authorization is required for a structure exceeding 50 feet in height, and street frontage greater than 50 feet where the height exceeds 40 feet, per Planning Code section 253. A variance for dwelling unit exposure is required per Planning Code section 140.

The project site is located in a Residential-Mixed, Moderate Density (RM-2) zoning district and a 50-X height and bulk district. The RM-2 district contains a mixture of the dwelling types and a significant number of apartment buildings. Building widths and scales remain moderate, and considerable outdoor space is still available. Nonresidential uses are permitted. The project site is limited to 50 feet in height. Conditional Use Authorization is required for a structure exceeding 50 feet in height, and street frontage greater than 50 feet where the height exceeds 40 feet, per Planning Code section 253. A variance from rear yard requirements is required per Planning Code section 134.

Plans and Policies

San Francisco General Plan

Development in San Francisco is subject to the San Francisco General Plan. The general plan provides general policies and objectives to guide all land use decisions in the city. Any conflicts between the proposed project and policies that relate to physical environmental issues are discussed in Section E, Evaluation of Environmental Effects. The compatibility of the proposed project with general plan policies that do not relate to physical environmental issues would be considered by decision-makers as part of their decision to approve or disapprove the proposed project. Any potential conflicts identified as part of the process would not alter the physical environmental effects of the proposed project.

The Accountable Planning Initiative (Proposition M)

In November 1986, the voters of San Francisco approved Proposition M, the Accountable Planning Initiative, which added Section 101.1 to the City's Planning Code to establish eight priority policies. These policies, and the corresponding sections of this document addressing the environmental issues associated with these policies, are as follows: (1) preservation and enhancement of affordable housing (Population and Housing); (2) protection of neighborhood character (Aesthetics); (3) discouragement of commuter automobiles (Transportation and Circulation); (4) protection of industrial and service land uses from commercial office development and enhancement of resident employment and business ownership (Land Use); (5) maximization of earthquake preparedness (Geology and Soils); (6) landmark and historic building preservation (Cultural Resources); and (7) protection of open space (Recreation). Prior to issuing a permit for any project that requires an initial study under CEQA, or for any demolition, conversion, or change of use, and prior to taking any action that requires a finding of consistency with the general plan, the City is required to find the proposed project or legislation consistent with the priority policies of Section 101.1 of the Planning Code.

The consistency of the proposed project with the environmental topics associated with the priority policies is discussed in Section E, Evaluation of Environmental Effects. The case report and approval motions for the proposed project will contain the Planning Department's comprehensive project analysis and findings regarding consistency with the priority policies.

Table 2 – Major Projects Within One Quarter Mile of the Project Sites

Address	Case No.	Project Status	Net New Dwelling Units	Net New Non-residential (sf)	Description
<i>Within one-quarter mile of 807 Franklin Street</i>					
1001 Van Ness Ave.	2014.1305CUA	Planning entitled	239	-84,347	Demolish a four-story, office building and construct a 14-story, 127' tall building with 239 dwelling units and 5,100 sf of retail.
830 Eddy St.	2015-009460CUA	Planning entitled	126	0	New construction of a 15 story residential building with 126 dwelling units.
600 Van Ness Ave.	2015-012729ENV	Under environmental review	151	-2,803	Demolish a two-story, 9,600 sf retail building and construct an 11-story, 117' tall building containing 151 dwelling units and 6,797 sf of retail.
950 Gough St.	2012.0506C	Building permit issued	95	10,000	Construct an eight-story, 80' tall building containing 95 residential units and a 10,000 sf church.
555 Golden Gate Ave.	2014.1102CUA	Environmental review completed	55	-6,400	Demolish a two-story, 7,900 sf commercial building and construct an 11-story, 112' tall building containing 55 dwelling units and 1,500 sf of retail.
<i>Within one-quarter mile of 635 Fulton Street</i>					
465-477 Grove St.	2016-001059ENV	Pending environmental review	0	24,050	Demolish a hotel with 36 tourist rooms and 5 SROs and an adjacent two-residence building. Construct a new building with 100 tourist hotel rooms, 5 SROs, and two residences.
555 Fulton St.	2005.1085E	Under construction	139	13,180	Demolish a two-story commercial building and construct a five-story building containing 139 dwelling units and 32,80 sf of retail.
455 Fell St.	2015-002837CUA	Building permit issued	108	1,200	Construct a six-story building containing 108 residential units and 1,200 sf of retail.
300-380 Octavia St.	2014-002330ENV	Planning entitled	24	943	Construct two five-story, 55' tall buildings with a combined 24 residential units and 943 sf of retail.
1301 Turk St.	2012.1496E	Under construction	0	4,717	Demolish an existing two-story 12,700 sf fire station and build a new two-story 17,417 sf fire station.




FIGURE 27 - CUMULATIVE PROJECTS WITHIN A QUARTER MILE OF 807 FRANKLIN



FIGURE 28 - CUMULATIVE PROJECTS WITHIN A QUARTER MILE OF 635 FULTON

Regional Plans and Policies

Environmental plans and policies directly address physical environmental issues or contain targets or standards that must be met in order to preserve or improve San Francisco's physical environment. These include the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan² and Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy,³ and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board's Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the San Francisco Bay Basin.⁴ The proposed project would not obviously or substantially conflict with any such adopted environmental plan or policy. Other principal regional planning agencies in the San Francisco Bay Area and their over-arching policy plans to guide planning in the region include the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) and Association of Bay Area Government's Plan Bay Area 2040;⁵ and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission's San Francisco Bay Plan.⁶ No conflicts between regional plans and the proposed project have been identified.

D. SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The proposed project could potentially affect the environmental factor(s) checked below. The following pages present a more detailed checklist and discussion of each environmental factor.

<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Wind and Shadow	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials
<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation and Circulation	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral/Energy Resources
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources
		<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance

-
- 2 Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2017 Clean Air Plan: Spare the Air, Cool the Climate, April 19, 2017. Available at: http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/plans/2017-clean-air-plan/attachment-a_-proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf. Accessed May 4, 2018.
 - 3 Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2005, Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy. Available at: <http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/plans/2005>. Accessed September 22, 2017.
 - 4 San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the San Francisco Bay Basin, December 16, 2015. Available at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water_issues/programs/planningtmdls/basinplan/web/bp_ch1-7_print.shtml. Accessed November 7, 2017.
 - 5 Metropolitan Transit Commission and Association of Bay Area Governments, Plan Bay Area 2040: Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy for the San Francisco Bay Area 2017-2040: Final, July 26, 2017. Available at <http://files.mtc.ca.gov/library/pub/30060.pdf>. Accessed November 7, 2017.
 - 6 Bay Conservation and Development Commission, San Francisco Bay Plan, 1969. Available at: http://www.bcdc.ca.gov/plans/sfbay_plan#2. Accessed May 4, 2018.

E. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

All items on the initial study checklist that have been checked “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated,” “Less than Significant Impact,” “No Impact,” or “Not Applicable” indicate that, upon evaluation, staff has determined that the proposed project could not have a significant adverse environmental effect relating to that topic. A discussion is included for those issues checked “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” and “Less than Significant Impact” and for most items checked with “No Impact” or “Not Applicable.” For all of the items checked “Not Applicable” or “No Impact” without discussion, the conclusions regarding potential significant adverse environmental effects are based upon field observation, staff experience and expertise on similar projects, and/or standard reference material available within the Planning Department, such as the Department’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review, or the California Natural Diversity Data Base and maps, published by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. For each checklist item, the evaluation has considered the impacts of the proposed project both individually and cumulatively.

Public Resources Code Section 21099 – Aesthetics and Parking Analysis

On September 27, 2013, Governor Brown signed Senate Bill (SB) 743, which became effective on January 1, 2014.⁷ Among other provision, SB 743 amends the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by adding Public Resources section 21099 regarding analysis of aesthetics and parking impacts for urban infill projects.⁸

Public Resources Code section 21099(d), effective January 1, 2014, states, “Aesthetic and parking impacts of a residential, mixed- use residential, or employment center project on an infill site located within a transit priority area shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.”⁹ Accordingly, aesthetics and parking are no longer to be considered in determining if a project has the potential to result in significant environmental effects for projects that meet all of the following three criteria:

- a) The project is in a transit priority area¹⁰
- b) The project is on an infill site¹¹
- c) The project is residential, mixed-use residential, or an employment center¹²

7 SB 743 is available at: http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201320140SB743.

8 Public Resources Code section 21099(d).

9 Public Resources Code section 21099(d)(1).

10 Public Resources Code section 21099(a) defines a “transit priority area” as an area within one-half mile of an existing or planned major transit stop. A “major transit stop” is defined in Section 21064.3 of the Public Resources Code as a rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.

11 Public Resources Code section 21099(a) defines an “infill site” as a lot located within an urban area that has been previously developed, or a vacant site where at least 75 percent of the perimeter of the site adjoins, or is separated only by an improved public right-of-way from, parcels that are developed with qualified urban uses.

The proposed project meets each of the above three criteria because it (1) is located within one-half mile of several rail and bus transit routes, (2) is located on an infill site that is already developed with and surrounded by other urban development, and (3) would be a residential project.¹³ Thus, this initial study does not consider aesthetics and the adequacy of parking in determining the significance of project impacts under CEQA.

Public Resources Code section 21099(e) states that a lead agency maintains the authority to consider aesthetic impacts pursuant to local design review ordinances or other discretionary powers, and that aesthetics impacts as addressed by the revised Public Resources Code do not include impacts on historical or cultural resources. Thus, there will be no change in the Planning Department's methodology related to design and historic review.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
1. LAND USE AND PLANNING —Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact LU-1: The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project involves two lots and three buildings. The 807 Franklin Street site presently contains a single-family residential Victorian building and the 635 Fulton Street site presently contains a three-story building with two residences over mortuary use. The project proposes to move the existing mortuary structure to the eastern edge of its property line, relocate the existing single-family residential Victorian building from 807 Franklin Street to 635 Fulton Street, and construct a new nine-story 80-foot-tall (up to 96 feet with elevator penthouse) residential building at 807 Franklin Street. The proposed project would add one-story vertical additions and horizontal rear additions to both the Victorian and mortuary buildings at 635 Fulton Street.

12 Public Resources Code section 21099(a) defines an "employment center" as a project located on property zoned for commercial uses with a floor area ratio of no less than 0.75 and located within a transit priority area.

13 San Francisco Planning Department, Transit-oriented Infill Project Eligibility Checklists for 807 Franklin Street, May 2, 2018, and for 635 Fulton Street, May 10, 2018.

The project would result in the removal of the mortuary use. According to the project sponsor, the mortuary business owners have been winding down their business for years and are serving out their prior obligations per contract to a few remaining families. One of the two residences at 635 Fulton Street is vacant, and the tenant of the other unit has given notice that he will be moving soon voluntarily. The 807 Franklin Street residence has been occupied by a friend of the owner.¹⁴ The proposed project would not alter the established street grid or permanently close any streets or sidewalks. While the project would require the temporary closure of streets to move the Victorian building, the project would not require the permanent closure of any street or other right-of-way or impede the passage of persons through construction of any physical barriers. The temporary closure of streets to facilitate the movement of the Victorian would be completed in a manner that would not affect peak period traffic. Although portions of the sidewalk adjacent to the project site could be closed for periods of time during project construction, these closures would be temporary in nature. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community and would result in a less-than-significant impact.

Impact LU-2: The proposed project would be consistent with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. (Less than Significant)

Land use impacts could be considered significant if a proposed project conflicts with any plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding an environmental effect. The proposed project would add residential units to the city housing stock and would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation such that an adverse physical change would result. The project would be generally consistent with the land use policies outlined in the San Francisco General Plan, including promoting infill development, providing new housing, and concentrating more intense development adjacent to transit services. These changes would not result in adverse physical changes in the environment.

The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted environmental plan or policy, such as the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's 2017 Clean Air Plan, which directly addresses environmental issues and/or contains targets or standards that must be met in order to preserve or improve characteristics of the City's physical environment. See Section C, Compatibility with Existing Zoning and Plans, for a more detailed discussion. Thus, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact with regard to consistency with existing plans and policies, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Impact C-LU: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity, would result in less-than-significant cumulative land use impacts. (Less than Significant)

Table 2 on page 34 and Figures 27 and 28 on pages 35 and 36 identify cumulative development projects within a quarter-mile radius of both project sites that are either under construction or for

¹⁴ Per project sponsor's email, April 17, 2018.

which the Planning Department has an environmental evaluation application on file. The cumulative development projects primarily consist of mixed-use residential buildings with ground-floor retail. These projects would result in the intensification of land uses in the project vicinity, and would be similar to the residential land use of the proposed project. None of the cumulative infill projects would physically divide an established community by constructing a physical barrier to neighborhood access, such as a new freeway, or remove a means of access, such as a bridge or roadway. In addition, the cumulative projects would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Although these development projects would introduce new infill residential, commercial, and institutional uses in the project vicinity, these uses currently exist in the project area. Therefore, the cumulative development projects would not introduce incompatible uses that would adversely impact the existing character of the project vicinity. Thus, the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would result in a less-than-significant cumulative land use impact, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
2. POPULATION AND HOUSING — Would the project:					
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact PH-1: The proposed project would directly induce population growth in an area by proposing new housing, but that population growth would not be substantial in relation to the overall population of the area. (Less than Significant)

807 Franklin Street

The project would replace one dwelling unit with 48 dwelling units. According to the 2015 America Communities Survey, the project site is located within Census Tract 160, which had a reported population of 2,465 residents in 2010. The 2010 U.S. Census reported a population of 805,235 residents in the City and County of San Francisco. Based on San Francisco's average

household size of 2.33,¹⁵ the net 47 new units would accommodate approximately 110 new residents to the project site. The 110 new residents would increase the population within the Census Tract 160 by approximately 0.4 percent and would increase the citywide population by approximately 0.1 percent, which would not be considered substantial.

635 Fulton Street

The project would replace two dwelling units (one occupied) and a mortuary with 17 dwelling units. According to the 2015 America Communities Survey, the proposed project is located within Census Tract 163, which had a reported population of 4,293 residents in 2010. The 2010 U.S. Census reported a population of 805,235 residents in the City and County of San Francisco. Based on San Francisco's average household size of 2.33,¹⁶ the net 16 new units would accommodate approximately 40 new residents to the project site. The 40 new residents would increase the population within the Census Tract 163 by approximately 0.9 percent and would increase the citywide population by less than 0.1 percent, which would not be considered substantial.

In conclusion, population growth associated with the proposed project would not be substantial in relation to the overall population of the area, and this impact would be less than significant.

Impact PH-2: The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing. (Less than Significant)

One of the two residences at 635 Fulton Street is vacant, and the tenant of the other unit has given notice that he will be moving soon voluntarily. The 807 Franklin Street residence has been occupied by a friend of the owner.¹⁷ The project would replace a business and three housing units with 65 new dwelling units. The temporary loss of three residences during project construction would be a less-than-significant impact with respect to displacement of existing housing units.

Impact C-PH: The proposed project, cumulatively with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development, would induce substantial population growth in the project vicinity, but would not create substantial demand for additional housing and associated infrastructure. (Less than Significant)

The majority of cumulative projects listed in Table 2 on page 34 are mixed-use or housing projects, each of which would increase the residential population of the cumulative project area (within one-quarter mile radius of each of the two project sites). Consistent with the San

¹⁵ U.S. Census, 2010. Available at:

<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/sanfranciscocitycalifornia,sanfranciscocountycalifornia/HS-D310216#viewtop>. Accessed April 10, 2018.

¹⁶ U.S. Census, 2010. Available at:

<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/sanfranciscocitycalifornia,sanfranciscocountycalifornia/HS-D310216#viewtop>. Accessed April 10, 2018.

¹⁷ Per project sponsor's email, April 17, 2018.

Francisco General Plan 2014 Housing Element,¹⁸ the 2008 Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan,¹⁹ the 2012 Downtown Area Plan,²⁰ and the forthcoming Market Street Hub plan, all anticipate substantial residential population increase just beyond the quarter-mile cumulative project vicinity. This population increase would continue a trend of residential population growth in San Francisco that has been in progress since at least 2000.²¹

San Francisco Mayor’s Executive Directive 17-02²² calls for construction of “at least 5,000 units of new or rehabilitated housing every year for the foreseeable future,” and for the implementation of policies to facilitate this construction. As identified in Table 2, the cumulative projects considered here almost without exception include substantial housing components. Cumulative growth in the project area therefore is not expected to result in a cumulative demand for new housing. The project sites are well served by existing infrastructure, and past, present, and reasonably foreseeable transportation projects would provide transportation improvements to further serve anticipated population growth. For these reasons, the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable population and housing impact.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
3. CULTURAL RESOURCES —Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5, including those resources listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

18 City of San Francisco, 2015, San Francisco General Plan 2014 Housing Element, April. Available at: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/2014HousingElement-AllParts_ADOPTED_web.pdf. Accessed November 6, 2017.

19 Ibid. Footnote 6, page 30.

20 Ibid. Footnote 6, page 30.

21 The New York Times. Mapping the US Census 2010. Mapping the 2010 U.S. Census, San Francisco. Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/projects/census/2010/map.html?view=PopChangeView&l=14&lat=37.77752894957491&lng=-122.41932345299993>. Accessed May 2, 2018.

22 City and County of San Francisco Office of the Mayor, Executive Directive 17-02. Available at <http://sfmayor.org/article/executive-directive-17-02>. Accessed May 2, 2018.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code §21074?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project is comprised of three primary activities: the relocation of the building at 807 Franklin Street to a new parcel and construction of new additions in its new location; the relocation of the existing mortuary building at 635 Fulton Street within its current lot and construction of new additions; and the construction of a new residential building in the parcel vacated by 807 Franklin Street.

The existing building at 807 Franklin Street would be moved to the legal parcel currently containing 635 Fulton Street. The existing non-historic third floor penthouse, rear additions, and front stair would be removed from 807 Franklin Street prior to moving the building from its current site. Once relocated to the western edge of the 635 Fulton Street site, the Victorian building would undergo a one-story vertical addition that would be set back from the front and west sides, as well as a rear addition that would extend the building's footprint to the south. A new front staircase would be constructed, in addition to an excavated ramp adjacent to the west façade leading to an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant first floor entry.

The existing mortuary building at 635 Fulton Street would be moved to the eastern edge of its site, and a one-story vertical addition and rear addition would be constructed. The conversion of the building to entirely residential use would involve the removal of the existing ground-story storefront and identification signage, as well as interior elements including the chapel space that is associated with its current mortuary tenant. The project would also involve the removal of non-character-defining features, including windows at the building's east façade, light shaft at the building's west façade, and two gabled roof forms that are largely obscured as seen from the street behind the building's parapet.

The new building constructed within the parcel that currently contains 807 Franklin Street would be a nine-story, 80-foot-tall building with 48 residential apartment units. The first story would be below grade and would contain parking for 17 vehicles.

Impact CR-1: The proposed project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street, historical resources as defined by Section 15064.5. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Historical resources are those properties that meet the definitions in Section 21084.1 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) statute and section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Historical resources include properties listed in, or formally determined eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) or in an adopted

local historic register. Historical resources also include resources identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting one or more of the following criteria.

- Criterion 1 (Events): Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad pattern of California's history and cultural heritage;
- Criterion 2 (Persons): Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- Criterion 3 (Architecture): Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- Criterion 4 (Information Potential): Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Additionally, properties that are not listed but are otherwise determined to be historically significant, based on substantial evidence, would also be considered historical resources. Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b), a significant impact would occur if the project "demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance." Under these provisions, the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired—that is, a significant impact would occur—if the project would result in physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource (which would be considered direct impacts of the project) or its immediate surroundings.

Historical Resources in the Study Area

The study area encompasses two nonadjacent parcels, APN 0744/002 (containing 807 Franklin Street) and APN 0795/027 (containing 635 Fulton Street). The San Francisco Planning Department (Planning) has identified the subject properties as "Category A" individual historical resources for the purposes of CEQA review. The following discussion summarizes the significance of both of the historical resources, based on information provided in the following documents:

- Historic Resource Evaluation Part II, 807 Franklin Street, prepared in 2014 by ICF;²³
- Historic Resource Evaluation Part I, 635 Fulton Street, prepared in 2017 by ICF;²⁴ and
- Historic Resource Evaluation Response, 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street, prepared in 2018 by Planning.²⁵

807 Franklin Street

²³ ICF International, Historical Resource Evaluation Secretary of the Interior's Standards Analysis for Rehabilitation, 807 Franklin Street, San Francisco, CA, August 2014.

²⁴ ICF International, Historic Resource Evaluation Part I, 635 Fulton Street, San Francisco, CA, April 2017.

²⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, Historic Resource Evaluation Response, 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street, Case No. 2013.1224E/2017-007542ENV, February 28, 2018.

807 Franklin Street was built in 1880 and is a two-story-over-basement Italianate-style, wood-frame residence with a rectangular plan. The building features rear and penthouse additions that were constructed after its period of significance (1880-1915), as well as a front entry staircase that was replaced with a non-historic configuration c.1986.

807 Franklin Street was surveyed by the Junior League of San Francisco and was listed in the 1968 book *Here Today: San Francisco's Architectural Heritage*;²⁶ as the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has adopted the findings of the *Here Today* survey, 807 Franklin Street is included in a qualifying local survey and is a historical resource under CEQA. Based on an evaluation of the building under California Register criteria, 807 Franklin Street is significant under Criteria 1 (Events) and 3 (Architecture/Design). 807 Franklin Street is not significant under Criterion 2 (Persons) and Criterion 4 (Information Potential). The historic resource evaluation response (HRER) determined that 807 Franklin Street retains integrity of location, association, design, workmanship, feeling, and materials. Although the majority of the surrounding neighborhood was redeveloped in the post-World War II period, and thus the building's integrity of setting has been compromised, the loss of the building's historic setting does not prevent the building from conveying its era of construction, its location within the Western Addition, and its distinctively Italianate architectural elements. The property is a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA and has been evaluated in accordance with Section 15064.5(a)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, using the criteria outlined in Section 5024.1 of the California Public Resources Code.

In consideration of 807 Franklin Street's significance under California Register Criteria 1 and 3, the resource's period of significance is 1880–1915. The HRER identified the following character-defining features of 807 Franklin Street.

- Two- to three-story height
- Flat roof
- Large, arched windows with decorative molding
- Cornice with brackets and carved detailing
- Quoining at the façade corners
- Entryway with portico and Corinthian columns and pilasters and cornice hood and arched entryway transom
- Bay windows at the front façade, including engaged columns
- Projecting bay at the east end of the north façade with a balustrade balconette
- Horizontal wood siding

²⁶ Junior League of San Francisco, Inc., *Here Today: San Francisco's Architectural Heritage* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1968).

635 Fulton Street

The property at 635 Fulton Street was constructed c.1870 as a two-story-over-basement, Flat-Front Italianate multi-unit residential building. In 1913, a commercial storefront was inserted at the ground level of 635 Fulton Street, transforming the building to three full stories. The building underwent further alterations associated with its 1962 conversion to mortuary use, which included remodeling of the first story, installation of an awning over the first story, insertion of interior partition walls, construction of a chapel, and additional interior changes. The ground and second stories have housed the mortuary business since 1962. The parcel is rectangular shaped, with the building occupying approximately 3,000 sf at the northeast corner.

Based on an evaluation of the building under California Register criteria, 635 Fulton Street is significant under Criterion 1 (Events) for its association with African-American history of San Francisco during the post-World War II era. Specifically, the resource is significant as a long-operating mortuary in the Western Addition neighborhood and as a rare remaining example of an African American-owned business established prior to the redevelopment era. 635 Fulton Street is not significant under Criterion 2 (Persons), Criterion 3 (Architecture/Design), and Criterion 4 (Information Potential). The HRER found that 635 Fulton Street retains integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The loss of the building's historic setting due to the postwar redevelopment of the Western Addition does not prevent the building from conveying its historic significance under California Register Criterion 1, and its current redevelopment context actually reinforces its significance as a rare surviving example of an African American-owned business in the Western Addition that predates the redevelopment era. 635 Fulton Street has thus been found eligible for listing in the California Register. The property is a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA and has been evaluated in accordance with Section 15064.5(a)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines using the criteria outlined in Section 5024.1 of the California Public Resources Code.

In consideration of 635 Fulton Street's significance under California Register Criterion 1, the resource's period of significance is 1962-1968. The HRER identified the following character defining features of 635 Fulton Street.

- Three-story height and two bay configuration
- Ground floor commercial storefront character
- Retained Italianate features:
 - Bracketed cornice at main façade
 - Parapet
 - Tall, narrow, wood-frame segmental arch windows, with frame surrounds and sills supported on paired brackets and crowned by segmental pediments
 - Symmetrical organization of fenestration of upper levels
 - Corner and center quoining at the main façade
 - Narrow channel siding at the top two floors

- Bryant Mortuary sign on second story façade
- Mortuary chapel space at the ground floor interior

Standards Compliance and Level of Impact

The following discussion provides an analysis of the proposed project's compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards). The Standards provide guidance for reviewing proposed work on historic properties, with the stated goal of making possible "a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values."²⁷ The Standards are used by federal agencies for evaluating work on historic properties. The Standards have also been adopted by local government bodies across the country for reviewing proposed rehabilitation work on historic properties under local preservation ordinances. The Standards are a useful analytic tool for understanding and describing the potential impacts of substantial changes to historic resources. Conformance with the Standards does not determine whether a project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Rather, projects that comply with the Standards benefit from a regulatory presumption under CEQA that they would have a less-than-significant impact on a historical resource. Projects that do not comply with the Standards may or may not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

This analysis separately describes the Standards compliance of the two buildings; first analyzing the Standards compliance of proposed project activities occurring to the resource at 807 Franklin Street, and subsequently considers the Standards compliance of proposed project activities occurring to the resource at 635 Fulton Street. The analysis then summarizes the overall project's Standards compliance and identifies the proposed project's level of impact on historical resources under CEQA. The analysis summarizes the Standards analysis and impact findings of the HRER issued by Planning on February 28, 2018, which found that the project would not cause a significant adverse impact on the historic resources as proposed.

Standards Analysis of Project Activities at 807 Franklin Street

Rehabilitation Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

The relocation of the building at 807 Franklin Street to a new location at 635 Fulton Street would not alter its residential use, which has characterized the building since it was constructed in 1880. The existing setting of 807 Franklin has lost integrity from the period of significance, and thus moving the building would not further degrade its setting. Furthermore, the construction of an upper-story addition would provide additional living space that supports the building's historic

²⁷ National Park Service, Department of the Interior, "Technical Preservation Services, Rehabilitation as a Treatment." Available at <https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/four-treatments/treatment-rehabilitation.htm>. Accessed May 11, 2018.

residential use. For this reason, the proposed project complies with Standard 1 with regards to 807 Franklin Street.

Rehabilitation Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the property will be avoided.

The proposed project would not remove or alter the character-defining features of 807 Franklin Street, specifically its height and massing, materials, and decorative features. Furthermore, in its new location the west façade (currently the north façade) would remain separated from the neighboring building, and would preserve the historic spatial relationship that allows the building's decorative features to be seen from the public right-of-way. The new raised concrete foundation wall and front staircase would be compatible with the historic character of the residence and would not draw attention away from the ornate decorative elements located at its current east and north façades. Furthermore, the design of the new front staircase appears to reintroduce the stairway configuration that existed at the residence historically. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Standard 2 with regards to 807 Franklin Street.

Rehabilitation Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historical properties, will not be undertaken.

The relocation of the building at 807 Franklin Street to a new site several blocks away would separate the building from its original geographic context on Franklin Street, the location where it has stood since it was constructed in 1880. In its new location, the building would no longer maintain a physical record of its historic place within the residential growth of San Francisco during the second half of the nineteenth century. The project would consequently create a false sense of the historic development of the Western Addition neighborhood. Therefore, the proposed project does not comply with Standard 3 with regards to 807 Franklin Street.

Rehabilitation Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

The penthouse and rear additions currently at 807 Franklin Street were constructed after the period of significance and have not acquired significance in their own right, such that the removal of the penthouse and rear additions prior to the relocation of the building would not diminish the resource's historic integrity. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Standard 4 with regards to 807 Franklin Street.

Rehabilitation Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

The proposed upper-story and rear additions would not remove character-defining features. However, the measures required to relocate the building still have the potential to cause inadvertent damage or removal of the distinctive materials, features, finishes, construction techniques, and/or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the resource. The current level of detail that is available regarding measures required to relocate the building is not sufficient to determine whether the project would retain all character-defining features. Therefore, for the

purposes of the current analysis, the proposed project does not comply with Standard 5 with regards to 807 Franklin Street.

Rehabilitation Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

The proposed project retains the historic features located on the building's north and east façades. These features do not appear to be deteriorated such that they would require repair or replacement. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Standard 6 with regards to 807 Franklin Street.

Rehabilitation Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

It is not anticipated that the proposed project would require abrasive chemical or physical treatments that have the potential to damage the building's historic materials. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Standard 7 with regards to 807 Franklin Street.

Rehabilitation Standard 8: Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

This topic is addressed below under Impact CR-4.

Rehabilitation Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and environment.

The new addition proposed to be constructed at the roof of 807 Franklin Street is designed in a manner that preserves the building's character-defining features, which primarily are not located where new construction would occur. The new addition is designed with a flat roof and horizontal orientation, so that the addition would generally be compatible with the building's existing massing. Furthermore, the addition would increase the height of the building by approximately 10 feet (total height of approximately 42 feet). The setbacks incorporated into the design (15 feet from the front façade of the residence, and 5 feet from the side façade) would also minimize the visual impact of the addition on the residence's historic character as viewed from the street. The design of the addition is thus sensitively scaled so that it would not overwhelm the historic massing of the building. The addition's simple massing, subtle exterior material palette of vertical wood siding and glass, and lack of applied ornament are generally compatible with the historic building volume and would prevent the addition from diverting attention away from the historic form and distinctive architectural features of the original building volume.

The rear addition, featuring extensive new glazing and doors introduced at the rear façade of the building, would be constructed at an area that does not contain character-defining features that

express the building's original design. The addition is designed so that it would not extend beyond the projection that already exists at the side façade, and would not be visible from any points visible from the public right-of-way at the front or side of the residence and would not alter the perceived size, scale, proportion, and massing of the historic building.

The new staircase and handrail to be constructed at the front of the residence would replace a non-historic staircase and would express contemporary materials and construction methods, so that it would continue to serve the function of the feature historically in this location while remaining discernible as a new element.

For these reasons, the proposed project complies with Standard 9 with regards to 807 Franklin Street.

Rehabilitation Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The proposed alterations at 807 Franklin Street are not reasonably reversible. As a new 80-foot-tall building would be constructed in the current location of 807 Franklin Street after it is moved, it would not be possible to return 807 Franklin Street to its historic location. The construction of the upper-story and rear additions would require the removal of portions of the building's historic roof plane and rear façade. It is conceivable that the additions could be removed from the building without destroying its essential form and character-defining features. For these reasons, the proposed project does not comply with Standard 10 with regards to 807 Franklin Street.

Standards Analysis of Project Activities at 635 Fulton Street

Rehabilitation Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

Prior to the start of the project, the current commercial tenant of 635 Fulton Street, the Bryant Mortuary, would close and vacate the building. The rehabilitation of 635 Fulton Street would convert the entire building to residential use. Interior and exterior character-defining features associated with the vacated Bryant Mortuary would be removed during the building's rehabilitation: the ground-story commercial storefront, mortuary identification signage, and the interior chapel space. Therefore, the proposed project does not comply with Standard 1 with regards to 635 Fulton Street.

Rehabilitation Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the property will be avoided.

New windows introduced at the center of the second story would reinforce the original design of the building that featured doors in these locations. The proposed ground-floor design would invoke a compatible interpretation of the materials and design of the historic storefront, which is proposed to be removed, and would remain differentiated from the upper stories. Furthermore, construction of upper-story and rear additions would occur in locations not immediately visible

from the public right-of-way, would not remove or obscure character-defining features, and would not alter the overall massing of the building.

However, the removal of the mortuary sign and interior chapel would diminish the building's integrity of design, materials, feeling, and association. Therefore, the proposed project does not comply with Standard 2 with regards to 635 Fulton Street.

Rehabilitation Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historical properties, will not be undertaken.

The proposed upper-story addition, rear addition, new cladding and openings at the ground level, and two new windows at the front façade are designed to be identifiable as contemporary construction. Thus these elements would neither be conjectural features nor convey a false sense of historical development.

The relocation of 635 Fulton Street approximately 15 feet within its parcel to accommodate the relocated 807 Franklin Street would not sever 635 Fulton Street's relationship to its original location or its setting. However, as these buildings were not historically located immediately next to one another, the project would create a false sense of the historic development of the Western Addition neighborhood. Therefore, the proposed project does not comply with Standard 3 with regards to 635 Fulton Street.

Rehabilitation Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

The period of significance associated with 635 Fulton Street is 1962–1968. The character-defining features convey the building's significance as an African American-owned commercial mortuary that began operating before the redevelopment of the Western Addition. The removal of these historic features is addressed under Standards 2 and 5. The HRER identifies that the project partially complies with this Standard. However, ICF has determined that the alterations outside of the POS for 635 Fulton Street have not acquired significance in their own right. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Standard 4 with regards to 635 Fulton Street.

Rehabilitation Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Similar to the Standard 5 discussion for 807 Franklin Street, relocation of 635 Fulton Street within its lot would have the potential to cause inadvertent damage to the materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques that characterize the resource. Furthermore, the project proposes to remove the building's ground-level storefront, illuminated identification signage, and interior chapel space, which are distinctive features that convey the building's significant character as a commercial mortuary. Therefore, for the purposes of the current analysis, the proposed project does not comply with Standard 5 with regards to 635 Fulton Street.

Rehabilitation Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new

feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

The proposed project would retain the majority of the features located on the building's north façade. These features do not appear to be deteriorated such that they would require repair or replacement. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Standard 6 with regards to 635 Fulton Street.

Rehabilitation Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

It is not anticipated that the proposed project would require abrasive chemical or physical treatments that have the potential to damage the building's historic materials. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Standard 7 with regards to 635 Fulton Street.

Rehabilitation Standard 8: Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measure will be undertaken.

This topic is addressed below under Impact CR-4.

Rehabilitation Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and environment.

Both the upper-story and rear additions are designed in a manner that would not remove materials or features that convey the historic character of the building dating to the beginning of its commercial mortuary use in the early 1960s. The new additions would conform to the existing massing of the building. Given that the roofline at the front façade is defined by a projecting parapet, the upper-story addition's horizontal orientation and flat roof would generally reinforce the building's current roof form as perceived from the street. The parapet would also provide some visual screening of the new construction. The addition is designed with a scale (one story above the historic roofline) and setbacks (15 feet from the front façade of the residence, and 5.5 feet from the side façade) that would ensure that the addition would be subservient to the historic building volume and minimally visible from the public right-of-way. The addition would employ the same simple massing, architectural style, and exterior materials used at the upper-story addition of the neighboring 807 Franklin Street such that the new construction would be compatible with, yet differentiated from, the historic materials of 635 Fulton Street.

Likewise, the rear addition would reinforce the massing of the historic building and would be minimally visible from vantage points at the front of the building. The expansive fenestration pattern at the rear façade would be located in an area that does not contribute to the historic character of the resource and is not readily visible from the street.

The proposed design for the ground story at the front façade would remain distinct from the materials and window arrangement found on the two stories above, which date to the nineteenth

century, and would be identifiable as a new design intervention at the front façade. By invoking the current commercial storefront design through brick cladding, large plate glass windows, and low planters, the proposed design preserves the general commercial character of the building's first story despite removing historic materials (as described under Standards 2 and 5).

Furthermore, the two new double-hung windows to be inserted at the center of the second story would replicate the proportions and two-sash arrangement of the historic windows at the façade, would abide by the spacing of the original windows, and would be located where doors were placed originally. Because these proposed windows would lack the arched upper sashes and elaborate window surrounds with segmental arched hoods, they would be identifiable as new elements.

Therefore, the proposed project complies with Standard 9 with regards to 635 Fulton Street.

Rehabilitation Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Following completion of the project, 635 Fulton Street could not be returned to its original location within the parcel, as this location will be partially occupied by the building that currently stands at 807 Franklin Street. It is theoretically possible that the upper-story and rear additions could be removed in the future and would not alter the general massing and character-defining features at the upper stories of the front façade; however, the removal of the character-defining identification signage, ground-level commercial storefront design, and interior chapel is not reversible. Therefore, the proposed project does not comply with Standard 10 with regards to 635 Fulton Street.

Summary of Standards Compliance and Level of Impact

As the analysis above demonstrates, the proposed project is not in full compliance with the Standards with regards to 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street. Specifically, the proposed project activities at 807 Franklin Street do not comply with Standards 3, 5, and 10, and the proposed project activities at 635 Fulton Street do not comply with Standards 1, 2, 3, 5, and 10. The proposed project would remove the relationship of 807 Franklin Street with its original location on Franklin Street, which has already been compromised by subsequent development in the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed project would also remove some of 635 Fulton Street's character-defining features that contribute to the resource's integrity of design, materials, feeling, and association, and that convey the resource's significance under Criterion 1 as an African American-owned commercial mortuary in operation since 1962. Furthermore, measures required to relocate both buildings have the potential to diminish the resources' integrity of design, materials, and workmanship, which could materially alter the physical characteristics that qualify the resources for inclusion in the California Register.

As a result, the proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street because the project would materially impair characteristics that qualify the resources for listing in the California Register. Thus the proposed project would constitute a significant impact on historical resources. **Mitigation Measures**

M-CR-1, M-CR-2, and M-CR-3 have been identified to reduce the severity of project impacts, by bringing the project more fully into compliance with the Standards and by retaining the resources' ability to convey their historical and architectural significance. Implementation of all three of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact on historic resources to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure M-CR-1: Develop and Implement an Interpretive Program. The project sponsor shall develop an interpretive program to commemorate the history of the Silver Rush, as it relates to 807 Franklin Street, and the history of the post-World War II redevelopment of the Western Addition, as it relates to both buildings. Additionally the interpretive program shall commemorate the history of the Bryant Mortuary at 635 Fulton Street and its association with African American history in the Western Addition, using historic photos, and family and business histories as available. Interpretation of the site's histories shall be supervised by a qualified consultant meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Architectural Historian or Historian. Development of these interpretive programs will include outreach to the Western Addition and African American communities in order to involve these communities and to create a broader, more authentic interpretive approach for the project site and neighborhood.

The interpretive program should result, at minimum, in installation of two permanent on-site interpretive displays in publicly accessible locations within or adjacent to the subject buildings, such as a lobby or public street frontage. The permanent on-site interpretive displays should be located at both the current site of 807 Franklin Street (where a new building would be constructed as a component of the project) and at the current site of 635 Fulton Street (where both building would be located following completion of the project) to memorialize the importance and connection of the buildings after they are relocated. The content of the interpretive program should address the loss of original setting of the buildings in the context of the neighborhood. The interpretive program should include information about the significance of the subject buildings and their associations with the Silver Rush and the Redevelopment Agency. In addition, the program should include information about the Bryant Mortuary individually and collectively within the context of African American history and redevelopment history in the Western Addition. The display to be installed at the Franklin Street project site would interpret the significance of the building currently located at 807 Franklin Street; the display to be installed at the Fulton Street project site would interpret the significance of the building currently located at 635 Fulton Street. The interpretive materials may include, but are not limited to, a display of photographs, news articles, oral histories, memorabilia, and video. Historic information contained in the ICF HRE for 635 Fulton Street and HRE for 807 Franklin Street and in the Planning Department's Draft African American Historic Context Statement may be used for content. Interpretive materials may also include photographs taken for Historic American Building Survey (HABS)-style documentation of the buildings, as described under Mitigation Measure M-CR-3.

A proposal prepared by the qualified consultant, with input from the outreach conducted in the African American and Western Addition communities, describing the general

format, materials, locations, and content of the interpretive program, shall be approved by the San Francisco Planning Department preservation staff prior to issuance of the demolition or site permit for the proposed project. The detailed content, media, and other characteristics of the interpretive program shall be reviewed and approved by Planning Department preservation staff prior to issuance of the building demolition permit or architectural addendum of the site permit for the proposed project.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CR-1 would highlight 807 Franklin Street's significant associations with the Silver Rush in San Francisco, as well as 635 Fulton Street's significant associations with the Bryant Mortuary and the context of African American history and redevelopment history in the Western Addition. By commemorating these histories, implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CR-1 would compensate, to an extent, for the loss in historic feeling and association that would occur through the buildings' relocation and the removal of elements at 635 Fulton Street associated with its use as the Bryant Mortuary. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CR-1 would allow the resources to retain a sufficient degree of their integrity of feeling and association to convey their historic significance.

Mitigation Measure M-CR-2: Prepare and Implement a Historic Preservation Plan. The project sponsor shall retain a qualified historical architect who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 61) to prepare historic preservation plans (HPP) for the resources at 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street. ~~The specifications, monitoring schedule, and other supporting documents as specified below shall be incorporated into the building or site permit application plan sets.~~ The site permit and plans should state/reference that a Historic Preservation Plan will be prepared as part of the scope of work. The documentation shall be reviewed and approved by Planning Department preservation staff prior to the issuance of any demolition, site, or building permit or architectural addendum for the proposed project.

The HPP shall incorporate rehabilitation recommendations for protecting character-defining features of the historical resources to be retained during relocation and shall include the following elements:

- **Historic Preservation Protective Measures.** Each HPP shall be prepared and implemented to aid in preserving those portions of the historical resource that would be retained and/or rehabilitated as part of the project. The HPP shall establish measures to protect the retained building façades and character-defining features of the resource (as identified in the 2018 HREER) during relocation, from vibration effects as well as from construction equipment used in the vicinity of the resource. If deemed necessary upon further assessment of the resources' condition, the HPP shall include preliminary stabilization measures to be taken before construction to prevent further deterioration or damage during construction. Specifically, the protection measures shall incorporate construction specifications for the proposed project that require the construction contractor(s) to use all feasible means to avoid damage to historical resources, including but not necessarily limited to the following: staging equipment and materials as far as possible from historic buildings to limit direct impact or accidental damage; maintaining a buffer zone when possible between

heavy equipment and historical resources to avoid accidental damage; appropriately shoring excavation sidewalls to prevent movement of adjacent structures; and ensuring appropriate security to minimize risks of vandalism and fire.

The specifications as specified above shall be ~~incorporated into the building or site permit application plan sets~~ reviewed and approved as part of the demolition, site, or building permit or as part of an architectural addendum.

- **Relocation Plan and Relocation Best Practices for 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street.** The HPPs shall include a relocation plan to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department to ensure that character-defining features of the buildings will be retained. The Planning Department review shall occur prior to the commencement of any construction activities on the project sites. The relocation plan shall include required qualifications for the building relocation company to ensure that relocation is undertaken by a company that is experienced in moving historic buildings of a similar size and/or structural system as 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street. The relocation plan shall ensure that the buildings will be moved without irreparable damage to the character-defining historic fabric of the buildings. The project sponsor will incorporate into construction specifications for the proposed project a requirement that the construction contractor(s) use all feasible means to avoid damage to 635 Fulton Street and 807 Franklin Street during their relocations, including, but not limited to, relocation methods and relocation activity routes, closures, and timing.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CR-2 would avoid inadvertent damage to 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street during the project, including relocation of the buildings to their proposed locations at 635 Fulton Street. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CR-2 would therefore assist in bringing the proposed project into compliance with Standards 2 and 5, and would lessen the project's impact on the resources' integrity of design, materials, and workmanship. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CR-2 would ensure that the resources would continue to retain their integrity of design, materials, and workmanship.

Mitigation Measure M-CR-3: Document 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street. The project sponsor shall undertake HABS-like documentation of both subject properties and surrounding contexts prior to the commencement of any construction and issuance of a demolition or site permit. The project sponsor shall retain a professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Architectural Historian or Historian (36 CFR, Part 61) and a photographer with demonstrated experience in HABS photography, to prepare written and photographic documentation of 635 Fulton Street and 807 Franklin Street. The documentation shall consist of the following.

- *HABS-Level Photographs:* HABS standard digital photography shall be created to document the buildings and surrounding context prior to construction activities.
 - The scope of the digital photographs shall be reviewed and approved by Planning Department preservation staff, and all digital photography shall be conducted according to the latest National Park Service Standards.

- Photograph views for the dataset shall include (a) contextual views of existing settings for both buildings; (b) contextual views of each façade of the buildings; (c) façade details of the character-defining exterior features of the 635 Fulton Street building related to its former mortuary use that are proposed for removal; and (d) detailed views of character-defining interior features of the 635 Fulton Street building related to its former mortuary use that are proposed for removal.
- All views shall be referenced on a key map of the property including each photograph number with an arrow to indicate the direction of the view.
- Draft photograph contact sheets and the key map will be provided to Planning Department preservation staff for review to determine the final number and views of photographs for inclusion in the final dataset.
- Historic photographs identified in previous studies shall also be collected, scanned as high resolution digital files, and reproduced in the dataset.
- *Written HABS-Like Narratives:* For each resource, a written historical narrative shall be prepared in accordance with the HABS Historical Report Guidelines. The HABS narratives should incorporate content that is included in the HREs for 635 Fulton Street and 807 Franklin Street. The HABS narrative for 635 Fulton Street should also incorporate content gathered during community outreach conducted for the site's interpretive program, as described in Mitigation Measure M-CR-1. The full transcripts of any oral histories conducted for the on-site interpretation of 635 Fulton Street will be included in the HABS narrative as an appendix.
- *Format of Final Dataset:* Following the preparation of the HABS photography and narratives, a Print-on-Demand softcover book shall be produced for the subject resources that compiles the historical reports, historical photographs, and HABS photographs. The Print-on-Demand book shall be made available to the public for distribution. The project sponsor shall also provide hard copies of the completed book to the History Room of the San Francisco Public Library, San Francisco Architectural Heritage, the Planning Department, the Northwest Information Center, the San Francisco African American Historical and Cultural Society, the African American Arts and Culture Complex, and the African American Museum and Library at Oakland. Labeled hard copies and/or digital copies of the final book, containing the photograph sets and narrative HABS reports, shall be provided to the repositories in their preferred format.

By documenting the resources' current location, design, and materials, implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CR-3 would effectively preserve these aspects of the resources' integrity as a resource for future researchers. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CR-3 would therefore lessen the project's impact on the resources' integrity of location, design, materials, and association.

Level of Impact after Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-1, M-CR-2, and M-CR-3 would minimize the degree to which the project alters the resources' historic integrity of design, materials, and

workmanship, and through commemoration and documentation would create a record of the resources' historic setting, feeling, and association for the purposes of public interpretation and future research. Although implementation of the above mitigation measures would not bring the proposed project into compliance with all of the Standards and would not compensate for physical changes that would occur as a result of the proposed project, the resources would continue to convey their significant historical associations through the interpretation and documentation.

Specifically with regards to 807 Franklin Street, project activities would permanently place the residence in a new location that is not directly associated with its original parcel on Franklin Street. However, the building's character-defining features would be preserved during its relocation. Furthermore, in its new location, the building's immediate setting would include 635 Fulton Street, which was constructed in the same general era as 807 Franklin Street. Thus, the relocation of 807 Franklin Street would represent an improvement upon its highly diminished setting in its original location. Historic interpretation and documentation would additionally commemorate the building's former Franklin Street location and its relationship within the development patterns of San Francisco's Western Addition during the nineteenth-century Silver Rush.

With regards to 635 Fulton Street, project activities would remove character-defining features that convey the building's association with the Bryant Mortuary and the African American historic context of the Western Addition. This permanent action is required in order to accommodate the change in use of the building from commercial/residential to all residential. However, the building's remaining character-defining features would be preserved during its relocation, and the design and materials of the proposed ground story at the Fulton Street façade would be compatible with the commercial storefront historically associated with the building. Historic interpretation and documentation would furthermore create a publicly accessible record of the building's historic setting, lot placement, and features and spaces related to its use as a significant commercial mortuary. This record would commemorate the building's associations with African American community history and commercial establishments in the Western Addition prior to the neighborhood's redevelopment in the late 1960s and 1970s.

Following implementation of the mitigation measures, the project would retain the overall historic integrity of the two subject buildings to the degree that they would continue to convey their historic and architectural significance, which qualify the resources for listing in the California Register. Therefore, implementation of the mitigation measures would reduce the project-related impact to a less-than-significant level on historical resources.

Impact CR-2: Visual changes associated with the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse change in the significance of surrounding historical resources, as defined by Section 15064.5 (Less Than Significant)

For historical resources, adverse effects may include substantial changes at the project site that would introduce visually incompatible elements into the setting of adjacent significant historic built environment features. These would be considered indirect impacts of the project.

Historical Resources in the Vicinity of the Study Area

The following discussion addresses previously identified historical resources located within the vicinity of (within one block of and visible from) the two sites where project activities would occur, 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street. The proposed project has the potential to change the setting of these four nearby historical resources, and thus may result in an indirect impact on the significance of the resources. A summary of each historical resource is provided below to describe its reasons for significance, period of significance, and character-defining features.

801 Turk Street. 801 Turk Street is a four-story, International Style institutional building constructed in 1956. The building was documented in 2006 on a Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523A (Primary Record) form during the Market & Octavia Area Plan Historic Resource Survey; in 2010, Kelley & VerPlanck Historic Consulting (KVP) completed a DPR 523B (Building, Structure, and Object Record) form that evaluated 801 Turk Street's eligibility for listing in the California Register. The 2010 DPR 523B form found the resource to be significant under Criterion 1 for its association with the broad patterns of post-World War II redevelopment in the Western Addition, and under Criterion 3 as an early and characteristic example of the International Style in San Francisco designed by a respected local architect, Angus McSweeney. KVP assigned the resource a California Historical Resource Status code of 3CS, "appears eligible to the California Register as an individual property through survey evaluation." Furthermore, the resource retains sufficient integrity to convey its identified significance. The Planning Department has adopted this finding for the purposes of CEQA review. 801 Turk Street therefore qualifies as a historical resource under CEQA. KVP's 2010 DPR 523B form lists 801 Turk Street's period of significance as 1950–1961, and identified the following character-defining features: asymmetrical massing; low, squat height; blank first story of the primary (north façade); upper story fenestration pattern characterized by bands of continuous fixed, metal-sash windows set within a projecting surround; and concrete panel exterior cladding.²⁸

835 Turk Street/Hotel Gotham. 835 Turk Street, known historically as Hotel Gotham, is a seven-story residential building constructed in 1930. 835 Turk Street occupies the parcel immediately to the west of 801 Turk Street and was also initially documented by DPR 523A form in 2006 during the Market & Octavia Area Plan Historic Resource Survey and was evaluated for California Register eligibility in 2010 by KVP. The resource was found to be significant under Criterion 3 as a stately and intact example of Mediterranean Revival-style apartment building designed by Herman Baumann, a San Francisco-based architect who specialized in Art Deco and various Revival styles for residential architecture during the 1920s and 1930s. KVP assigned the resource a California Historical Resource Status code of 3CS, "appears eligible to the California Register as an individual property through survey evaluation." The Planning Department has adopted this finding for the purposes of CEQA review. 835 Turk Street therefore qualifies as a historical resource under CEQA. KVP's 2010 DPR 523B form lists 835 Turk Street's period of significance as 1929–1950, and identified the following character-defining features: seven-story height and rectangular massing; stucco cladding with applied stucco ornamentation; flat roof; entrance

²⁸ Kelley & VerPlanck Historic Consulting, 801 Turk Street, Department of Parks and Recreation Building, Structure, and Object Record, 2010.

canopy and doors; fenestration pattern including paired wood-frame, fixed windows in the first story; 8-over-1, double-hung wood-sash windows with fixed, divided sidelights in the second story; and semi-hexagonal bay windows and 6-over-1, double-hung wood-sash windows in the upper stories.²⁹

1-19 Banneker Way/Banneker Homes. Banneker Homes is a complex of multi-unit, three- to four-story, midcentury modern-style residential townhouse buildings that occupy the city block bounded by Fulton Street to the north, Webster Street to the west, Grove Street to the south, and the Buchanan Street Mall to the east (Assessor's Block 0796, Lot 004). Banneker Homes was designed by noted Modernist architect Joseph Esherick and constructed during the late 1960s as part of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency's redevelopment of the Western Addition A-2 area. Based on Planning's Property Information Map, Banneker Homes was found eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) as a district contributor during the Section 106 review process in 1996 and was assigned a California Historical Resource Status code of 2D2, contributor to a district determined eligible for the National Register by consensus through the Section 106 process. For this reason, Banneker Homes was listed in the California Register and qualifies as a historical resource under CEQA. The original documentation of this evaluation has not been located, and it is not known if the evaluation identified the resource's character-defining features or period of significance.

Hayes Valley Residential Historic District. The boundary of the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District is located approximately 160 feet to the southeast of the subject property. The district was documented by Page & Turnbull on a DPR 523D (District) form during the Market & Octavia Area Plan Historic Resource Survey in 2008. The 2008 523D form explains that the district was previously "evaluated in 1997 as a 'National Register eligible district' and is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources."³⁰ The Hayes Valley Residential Historic District was determined to be eligible under National Register Criterion C/California Register Criterion 3 and encompasses approximately 150 contributing resources located over approximately 30 city blocks roughly bounded by Hermann and Market streets to the south, Franklin Street to the east, Fulton Street to the north, and Fillmore Street to the west. The 2010 523D form documents the period of significance as 1860–1920, the period during which the district's numerous Victorian- and Edwardian-era residences were constructed.

Discussion of Level of Impact

The following analysis identifies the proposed project's level of impact related to indirect impacts under CEQA on the setting of surrounding historical resources.

801 Turk Street. 801 Turk Street occupies the parcel at the corner of Franklin and Turk streets, located approximately one-half block south of 807 Franklin Street; the north façade of 801 Turk

²⁹ Kelley & VerPlanck Historic Consulting, "835 Turk Street," Department of Parks and Recreation Building, Structure, and Object Record, 2010.

³⁰ Page & Turnbull, "Hayes Valley Residential Historic District," Department of Parks and Recreation District Record, 2008.

Street is oriented towards the south façade of 807 Franklin Street; the two resources are separated by Turk Street and a one-story gas station. Even though 801 Turk Street and 807 Franklin Street are visible from one another, 801 Turk Street lacks association with the historic context for which 807 Franklin Street is significant, and vice versa. Neither of these resources contributes to the significance of the other. As such, the relocation of 807 Franklin Street from its current parcel and the construction of a nine-story residential building in its place would represent a relatively minor change within the historic setting of 801 Turk Street, and this change would have a limited effect on 801 Turk Street's ability to convey its historic and architectural significance. Thus the project would not materially alter the characteristics that qualify 801 Turk Street for listing in the California Register.

835 Turk Street/Hotel Gotham. Similar to 801 Turk Street, 835 Turk Street is visible from 807 Franklin Street across the one-story gas station at the northwest corner of the Franklin and Turk intersection. The south façade of 807 Franklin Street is also visible from 835 Turk Street and contributes somewhat to 835 Turk Street's historic setting. However, the presence of the 807 Franklin Street residence in its current location is not a precondition for 835 Turk Street to convey its historic architectural design, for which it has been found to be significant under California Register Criterion 3. Construction of a new nine-story building on the current site of 807 Franklin Street would introduce a building that would be more visible from 835 Turk Street than the current 807 Franklin Street residence, but this change would not have an effect on 835 Turk Street's ability to convey its architectural significance. Thus the project would not materially alter any of the characteristics that qualify 835 Turk Street for listing in the California Register.

1-19 Banneker Way/Banneker Homes. Banneker Homes is located approximately one-half block to the west of 635 Fulton Street; both resources are located to the south of Fulton Street and are separated by a three-story residential building the length of one half of a city block. As a result, there is a limited visual relationship between 635 Fulton Street and Banneker Homes. The relocation of 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street within the latter property's lot would not result in a change readily visible within Banneker Homes' immediate setting, which would remain characterized by redevelopment-era residential complexes. As such, the project would represent a minimal change within the historic setting of Banneker Homes, and this change would have a limited effect on Banneker Homes' ability to convey its significance. Thus the project would not materially alter any of the characteristics that qualify Banneker Homes for listing in the California Register.

Hayes Valley Residential Historic District. Neither 807 Franklin Street nor 635 Fulton Street is located within the boundaries of a historic district eligible for listing in the California Register. The irregular, northern boundary of the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District passes in the vicinity of 635 Fulton Street: the district boundary leads from west to east variously along Grove Street, Ivy Street, and Birch Street. At its nearest location to 635 Fulton Street (the corner of Laguna and Birch streets), the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District is approximately one-half block, and around a corner, from 635 Fulton Street. The 635 Fulton Street site and the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District therefore do not have an evident visual relationship that relates to the respective resources' ability to convey their historical and architectural significance.

The proposed project would not materially alter the characteristics that qualify the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District for listing in the California Register.

Summary of Impacts

Project activities proposed at the current sites of 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street would be visible from and thus may alter the settings of a total of four identified historical resources within a distance of one block from the two project sites. However, the project activities would be minimally visible from the four surrounding historical resources, and any changes to the four resources' historic settings would not have the potential to substantially alter their ability to convey their historical significance. Therefore, the proposed project would not materially alter the characteristics that qualify any nearby historical resource for listing in the California Register. The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts on historical resources with regards to indirect impacts on setting.

Impact CR-3: Construction-related noise and vibration associated with the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse change in the significance of surrounding historical resources, as defined by Section 15064.5 (Less Than Significant)

Construction-related noise and vibration would occur as part of the proposed project, which would involve excavation and other activities at both the 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street sites. Ground-borne vibrations have the potential to cause physical damage to historical resources, and in some instances can result in the loss of character-defining features and thus can materially impair the significance of the resources.

The historical resources in the vicinity of the project sites are described above under Impact CR-2. The nearest of these resources to a location of proposed project-related construction are 801 Turk Street and 835 Turk Street/Hotel Gotham, which are both located approximately 150 feet from the current location of 807 Franklin Street. The parcel containing 635 Fulton Street is approximately 160 feet from 700 Laguna Street, the nearest contributing resource within the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District, and is more than 400 feet away from Banneker Homes.

Typically, ground-borne vibration generated by construction activities attenuates rapidly with distance from the source of the vibration, minimizing effects to buildings beyond the immediate vicinity of the construction. The nearest historical resource to either project site is 150 feet away, and as discussed under Impact NO-2 on page 82, this is sufficiently removed from construction activities that could cause ground-borne vibrations effects. Thus, construction associated with the proposed project would not materially alter the characteristics that qualify any nearby historical resource for listing in the California Register, and the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts on historical resources with regards to construction-related noise and vibration.

Impact CR-4: The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource, pursuant to Section 15064.5. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

This section discusses archeological resources, both as historical resources according to Section 15064.5 as well as unique archeological resources as defined in Section 21083.2(g).

The potential for encountering archeological resources is determined by several relevant factors including archeological sensitivity criteria and models, local geology, site history, and the extent of potential projects soils disturbance/modification, as well as any documented information on known archeological resources in the area. A Planning Department archeologist completed a preliminary archeological review (PAR) for the proposed project.³¹ The PAR determined that there is a low potential to adversely affect archeological resources. The project sites appear to have low sensitivity for prehistoric resources and, at the Franklin Street site, steepness of slope. There is a slight potential for historic features associated with the turn of the century development at both sites. While unlikely, it is possible that previously unrecorded and buried (or otherwise obscured) archeological deposits could be discovered during ground-disturbing activities. Excavating, grading, and moving heavy construction vehicles and equipment could expose and have impacts on unknown archeological resources, which would be a significant impact. However, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-CR-4, Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources**. This requires that archeological resources be avoided and, if accidentally discovered, that they be treated appropriately.

Mitigation Measure M-CR-4: Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources. The following mitigation measure is required to avoid any potential adverse effect from the proposed project on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources as defined in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(a) and (c), tribal cultural resources as defined in *CEQA Statute* Section 21074, and human remains. The project sponsor shall distribute the Planning Department archeological resource “ALERT” sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); or utilities firm involved in soils disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils disturbing activities being undertaken each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the “ALERT” sheet is circulated to all field personnel including, machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the Alert Sheet.

A preconstruction training shall be provided to all construction personnel performing or managing soils disturbing activities by a qualified archaeologist prior to the start of soils disturbing activities on the project. The training may be provided in person or using a video and include a handout prepared by the qualified archaeologist. The video and materials will be reviewed and approved by the ERO. The purpose of the training is to

³¹ San Francisco Planning Department Preliminary Archeological Review, 807 Franklin/635 Fulton, August 15, 2017.

enable personnel to identify archaeological resources that may be encountered and to instruct them on what to do if a potential discovery occurs. Images of expected archaeological resource types and archaeological testing and data recovery methods should be included in the training.

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

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

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

If human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects are discovered during any soils disturbing activity, all applicable State and Federal Laws shall be followed, 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 archaeological 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. Section 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).

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

Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (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 copy, one unbound copy 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 or interpretive value, the ERO may require an interpretation program or a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

Impact CR-5: The proposed project could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

There are no known human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, located in the immediate vicinity of the project site. In the event that construction activities disturb unknown human remains within the project site, any inadvertent damage to human remains would be considered a significant impact. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-CR-4**, as described above, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on previously unknown human remains.

Impact CR-6: The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

CEQA Section 21074.2 requires the lead agency to consider the effects of a project on tribal cultural resources. As defined in CEQA Section 21074, tribal cultural resources include sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California

Native American tribe and that are listed, or determined to be eligible for listing, on a national, state, or local register of historical resources. Pursuant to CEQA Section 21080.3.1, on August 14, 2015, the Planning Department requested consultation with Native American tribes regarding the potential for the proposed project to affect tribal cultural resources. The department received no response concerning the proposed project from any representative of a Native American tribe.

As discussed under Impact CR-4, **Mitigation Measure M-CR-4, Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources**, would be applicable to the proposed project as it would result in below-grade soil disturbance to a depth of up to 19" at 807 Franklin Street and up to 5'-5" at 635 Fulton Street. Unknown archeological resources may be encountered during construction that could be identified as tribal cultural resources at the time of discovery or at a later date. Therefore, the potential adverse effects of the proposed project on previously unidentified archeological resources also represent a potentially significant impact on tribal cultural resources. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-CR-4**, described above, would reduce potential adverse effects on tribal cultural resources to a less-than-significant level.

Impact C-CR-1: The proposed project in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity could result in cumulative impacts to historic resources. (Less than Significant)

The analysis of cumulative impacts on historical resources considers past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects within a 0.25-mile radius surrounding both 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street. The Planning Department has identified 10 environmental cases within this area associated with projects either under construction or for which entitlements have been approved. These projects are listed in Table 2 on page 34.

Those past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would be constructed in a densely developed urban environment and would be minimally visible from locations outside of their immediate vicinities. Two of the projects, at 830 Eddy Street and 950 Gough Street, propose construction of new buildings that are at least eight stories in height and are geographically close enough to 807 Franklin Street, as well as to the nearby historical resources at 801 Turk Street and 835 Turk Street, to be visible from those locations. 830 Eddy Street is located one half block northeast of the 807 Franklin Street site, and 950 Gough Street is located at the northwest corner of the block containing 807 Franklin Street. The new construction proposed at 830 Eddy Street and 950 Gough Street, when considered with the relocation of the building currently at 807 Franklin Street and subsequent construction of a new nine-story building on the parcel, would introduce three examples of modern construction into the setting of 801 Turk Street and 835 Turk Street. This change in setting, however, would not diminish the historical resources' ability to convey their historical and architectural significance.

The projects at 1301 Turk Street, 1001 Van Ness Avenue, 600 Van Ness Avenue, and 555 Golden Gate Avenue are geographically dispersed and sufficiently removed from both the 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street sites, such that demolition of existing buildings and new construction in these locations, considered with the 807 Franklin Street/635 Fulton Street project, would not act in combination with one another to substantially change the setting of any historical resource.

Thus these projects in combination with one another would not materially alter the characteristics that qualify any of the historical resources for listing in the California Register.

The remaining four project sites are somewhat geographically dispersed but are located adjacent to, and outside of, the boundaries of the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District. Due to the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District's large size, high number of contributors, and the relatively limited number of projects currently under consideration, these projects would not result in a significant impact on the historic district in combination with one another. The characteristics that qualify the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District for listing in the California Register—namely the relatively consistent late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century architectural character shared by approximately 150 residences located across many city blocks—would not be materially altered.

Furthermore, 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street are not located within the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District, nor would they be relocated to a new site within the district boundary. As such, the proposed project would represent a minor change in the setting of the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District, as the proposed project activities at 635 Fulton Street would be minimally visible at only one small segment of the historic district's northern boundary. Thus, if a potential cumulative impact on the Hayes Valley Residential Historic District were identified, the proposed 807 Franklin Street/635 Fulton Street project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulative impact on the Hayes Valley Residential District because the large size of the district, high number of contributors, and limited number of new projects ensure that the historic district can withstand the minor visual change near the adjacent edge of the district without being materially altered.

For the reasons stated above, the proposed project at 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not materially alter the characteristics that qualify any identified historical resource for listing in the California Register and would not contribute to any cumulative impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts on historical resources with regards to the proposed project in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.

Impact C-CR-2: The proposed project in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity could result in cumulative impacts to archeological resources, tribal cultural resources, and human remains. (Less than Significant)

Archeological resources, tribal cultural resources, and human remains are non-renewable resources of a finite class. All adverse effects to archeological resources erode a dwindling cultural/scientific resource base. Federal and state laws protect archeological resources in most cases, either through project redesign or by requiring that the scientific data present within an archeological resource be archeologically recovered. As discussed above, the proposed project could have a significant impact related to archeological resources, tribal cultural resources, and disturbance of human remains. The project's impact, in combination with other projects in the area that would also involve ground disturbance, and that also could encounter previously recorded or unrecorded archeological resources, tribal cultural resources, or human remains, could result in a significant cumulative impact. However, the same archaeological sensitivity

analysis process that was applied to the current project also applies to most other development projects in San Francisco. For each project assessed through this process as being located in an archaeologically sensitive location, and as having the potential to disturb soils that could contain archaeological resources, the same suite of mitigation measures identified above would be applied. The implementation of these measures for each project ensures that resources that are encountered are appropriately identified and assessed, and protected where feasible; and that any significant resource would be subject to respectful and appropriate treatment and to data recovery to preserve important information from the resource, to enhance our understanding of the area's history and prehistory. Compliance with these archeological review procedures and site-specific mitigation would ensure that the effects from nearby cumulative projects would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, in combination with cumulative projects, the proposed project or variant would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
4. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION — Would the project:					
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, and would not cause substantial air traffic safety risks. Therefore, topic 4c is not applicable to the project.

Project Setting

807 Franklin Street

The project site is located in San Francisco's Civic Center neighborhood and is located within a developed city block bounded by Eddy Street to the north, Gough Street to the west, Turk Street to the south, and Franklin Street to the east. The site is one block west of Van Ness Avenue, approximately three blocks north of San Francisco City Hall, and one block north and across the street from Opera Plaza, an 85-unit residential development over retail.

The project vicinity is served by public transit, with local transit service within walking distance and regional transit. Local service is provided by Muni bus and light rail under the direction of SFMTA. Transit service options include bus (both diesel motor coach and electric trolley), light rail (Muni Metro), cable car, and electric streetcar lines, which can be used to transfer to other bus routes and light rail lines. The Muni Van Ness Station serving the J Church, K/T Ingleside/Third, L Taraval, M Ocean View, and N Judah line is located less than a half mile south of the project site. The Van Ness Improvement Project, which includes construction of the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), is currently under construction and will be completed in 2019. As part of that project, two travel lanes will be provided on Van Ness Avenue in each direction, separated by median transit-only lanes.

Franklin Street contains three northbound vehicle traffic lanes with metered parking on both sides of the street. The metered parking lane on the west side (in front of the project site) becomes another vehicle lane from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. weekdays. The sidewalk in front of the project site is 10 feet wide, with a 13' 8"-wide curb cut leading to the surface parking on the north side of the project site.

Vision Zero is a road safety policy focused on eliminating traffic deaths in San Francisco by 2024 that the City and County of San Francisco adopted in 2014. Franklin Street has been designated a Vision Zero High Injury Corridor for vehicles.

635 Fulton Street

The project site is located in San Francisco's Western Addition neighborhood and is located within a developed city block bounded by Fulton Street to the north, Laguna Street to the east, Grove Street to the south, and the Buchanan Street Mall to the west. The site is five blocks west of Van Ness Avenue and San Francisco City Hall, and two blocks north and west of the Hayes Valley neighborhood commercial district.

The project vicinity is served by public transit, with local transit service within walking distance and regional transit. Muni service options include bus (both diesel motor coach and electric trolley), light rail (Muni Metro), cable car, and electric streetcar lines, which can be used to transfer to other bus routes and light rail lines. The Muni Van Ness Station serving the J Church, K/T Ingleside/Third, L Taraval, M Ocean View, and N Judah line is located less than a half mile south of the project site.

Fulton Street contains one vehicle lane and one separated bicycle lane in each (east and west) direction with metered parking on both sides of the street. Street parking is neither metered nor time limited. The sidewalk in front of the project site is 10 feet wide, with two approximately 15-foot-wide curb cuts on both sides of the building leading to surface parking behind the building.

Fulton Street been designated a Vision Zero High Injury Corridor for cyclists. The City and County of San Francisco adopted Vision Zero in 2014. Vision Zero is a road safety policy focused on eliminating traffic deaths in San Francisco by 2024.

Vehicle Miles Traveled in San Francisco and Bay Area

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 vehicle miles traveled (VMT) ratio than the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area region. In addition, some areas of the city have lower VMT ratios than other areas of the city. These areas of the city can be expressed geographically through transportation analysis zones (TAZs). TAZs 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 County Transportation Authority (the 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 an 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.³²

³² San Francisco Planning Department, Executive Summary: Resolution Modifying Transportation Impact Analysis, Appendix F, Attachment A, March 3, 2016

For residential development, the existing regional average daily VMT per capita is 14.6.³³ San Francisco 2040 cumulative conditions were projected using a SF-CHAMP model run, using the same methodology as outlined above for existing conditions, but includes residential and job growth estimates and reasonably foreseeable transportation investments through 2040. For residential development, the projected 2040 regional average daily VMT per capita is 13.7.

Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis

Land use projects may cause substantial additional VMT. The following identifies thresholds of significance and screening criteria used to determine if a land use project would result in significant impacts under the VMT metric.

For residential projects, a project would generate substantial additional VMT if it exceeds the regional household VMT per capita minus 15 percent. For office projects, a project would generate substantial additional VMT if it exceeds the regional VMT per employee minus 15 percent. As documented in the proposed transportation impact guidelines, a 15 percent threshold below existing development is “both reasonably ambitious and generally achievable.”

OPR’s proposed transportation impact guidelines provides screening criteria to identify types, characteristics, or locations of land use projects that would not exceed these VMT thresholds of significance. OPR recommends that if a project or land use proposed as part of the project meets any of the below screening criteria, then VMT impacts are presumed to be less than significant for that land use and a detailed VMT analysis is not required. These screening criteria and how they are applied in San Francisco are described below:

- **Map-Based Screening for Residential, Office, and Retail Projects.** OPR recommends mapping areas that exhibit where VMT is less than the applicable threshold for that land use. Accordingly, the transportation authority has developed maps depicting existing VMT levels in San Francisco for residential, office, and retail land uses based on the SF-CHAMP 2012 base-year model run. The planning department uses these maps and associated data to determine whether a proposed project is located in an area of the city that is below the VMT threshold.
- **Small Projects.** OPR recommends that lead agencies may generally assume that a project would not have significant VMT impacts if the project would either: (1) generate fewer trips than the level required for studying consistency with the applicable congestion management program; or (2) where the applicable congestion management program does not provide such a level, fewer than 100 vehicle trips per day. The transportation authority’s 2015 San Francisco Congestion Management Program does not include a trip threshold for studying consistency. Therefore, the planning department uses the 100 vehicle trip per day screening criterion as a level at which projects generally would not generate a substantial increase in VMT.
- **Proximity to Transit Stations.** OPR recommends that residential, retail, and office projects, as well as projects that are a mix of these uses, proposed within 0.5 miles of an existing major

³³ Includes the VMT generated by the households in the development.

transit stop (as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 21064.3) or an existing stop along a high quality transit corridor (as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 21155) would not result in a substantial increase in VMT. However, this presumption would not apply if the project would: (1) have a floor area ratio³⁶ of less than 0.75; (2) include more parking for use by residents, customers, or employees of the project than required or allowed, without a conditional use; or (3) is inconsistent with the applicable sustainable communities strategy.

807 Franklin Street

The existing average daily VMT per capita for the transportation analysis zone the project site is located in, TAZ 683, is below the existing regional average daily VMT. In TAZ 683, the average daily VMT per capita for residential uses is 2.6, which is 18 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per capita for residential uses of 14.6. Therefore, the project site is located within an area of the city where the existing VMT is more than 15 percent below the regional VMT, and the proposed project would not generate substantial additional VMT. Future 2040 average daily VMT per capita for TAZ 683 is 2.3; this is 17 percent below the future 2040 regional average daily VMT per capita of 13.7. Furthermore, the project meets the proximity to transit stations screening criterion, which also indicates that the proposed project use would not cause substantial additional VMT.

635 Fulton Street

The existing average daily VMT per capita for the transportation analysis zone the project site is located in, TAZ 267, is below the existing regional average daily VMT. In TAZ 267, the average daily VMT per capita for residential uses is 4.0, which is 27 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per capita for residential uses of 14.6. Therefore, the project site is located within an area of the city where the existing VMT is more than 15 percent below the regional VMT, and the proposed project would not generate substantial additional VMT. Future 2040 average daily VMT per capita for TAZ 267 is 3.5; this is 25 percent below the future 2040 regional average daily VMT per capita of 13.7. Furthermore, the project meets the proximity to transit stations screening criterion, which also indicates that the proposed project use would not cause substantial additional VMT.

Induced Automobile Travel Analysis

Transportation projects may substantially induce additional automobile travel. The following identifies thresholds of significance and screening criteria used to determine if transportation projects would result in significant impacts by inducing substantial additional automobile travel. Pursuant to OPR's proposed transportation impact guidelines, a transportation project would substantially induce automobile travel if it would generate more than 2,075,220 VMT per year. This threshold is based on the fair share VMT allocated to transportation projects required to achieve California's long-term greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

OPR's proposed transportation impact guidelines include a list of transportation project types that would not likely lead to a substantial or measureable increase in VMT. If a project fits within the general types of projects (including combinations of types) described below, then it is

presumed that VMT impacts would be less than significant and a detailed VMT analysis is not required.

- Active Transportation, Rightsizing (aka Road Diet), and Transit Projects:
 - Infrastructure projects, including safety and accessibility improvements, for people walking or bicycling.
- Other Minor Transportation Projects:
 - Removal of off-street or on-street parking spaces; and,
 - Adoption, removal or modification of on-street parking or loading restrictions (including meters, time limits, accessible spaces, and referential/reserved parking permit programs).

The proposed project is not a transportation project and does not include any of the above elements.

Project Travel Demand

Localized trip generation of the proposed project was calculated using a trip-based analysis and information in the 2002 Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review (SF Guidelines) developed by the San Francisco Planning Department.³⁴

807 Franklin Street

The project would move the existing single-family home on the project site to an off-site location and construct a new nine-story building containing 48 dwelling units and 17 parking spaces. The proposed project would generate 453 net new person trips on a daily basis, and 78 net-new person trips during the weekday PM peak hour. During the weekday PM peak hour, the proposed project would generate 31 net-new person trips by automobile, 32 net-new person trips by transit, 12 net-new person trips by walking, and four person trips by other modes. In addition, the proposed project would generate 27 net-new vehicle trips during the weekday PM peak hour.

635 Fulton Street

The project would relocate and remodel two existing buildings resulting in 17 dwelling units and no vehicle parking on site. The proposed project would generate 158 net-new person trips on a daily basis, and 27 net-new person trips during the weekday PM peak hour. During the weekday PM peak hour, the proposed project would generate seven net-new person trips by automobile, 13 net-new person trips by transit, two net-new person trips by walking, and six person trips by other modes. In addition, the proposed project would generate six net new vehicle trips during the weekday PM peak hour.

³⁴ San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Calculations for 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street, April 18 and May 2, 2018.

Project Impacts

Impact TR-1: The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system; and would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways (Less than Significant)

Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis. As discussed above, the existing average daily residential VMT per capita for both project sites is more than 15 percent below the existing regional average daily residential VMT per capita; thus, the proposed project would meet the map-based screening for the residential projects criterion. Additionally, the project sites also meet the proximity to transit stations screening criterion.³⁵ Therefore, the project's residential uses would not result in substantial VMT and impacts would be less than significant.

Induced Automobile Travel Analysis. The proposed project is not a transportation project. The proposed project would include minor features that would alter the transportation network. The 10-foot-wide curb cuts in front of 807 Franklin Street would be relocated further to the south in front of the project site, and the two existing curb cuts in front of 635 Fulton Street would be removed and standard sidewalk and curb dimensions restored. These changes fit within the general types of projects that would not substantially induce automobile travel.³⁶ Thus, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact with respect to induced automobile travel.

Impact TR-2: The proposed project would not result in substantially increased hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves of dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses. (Less than Significant)

No project design features are proposed that would substantially increase traffic-related hazards (e.g., a new sharp curve or dangerous intersections), and the proposed project does not include incompatible uses, as discussed under Topic E.1, Land Use and Land Use Planning. Therefore, traffic hazard impacts due to a design feature or resulting from incompatible uses from the proposed project would be less than significant.

Impact TR-3: The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access. (Less than Significant)

Emergency access to the project site would remain largely unchanged from existing conditions. Emergency service providers would to access the project site from existing streets. The proposed project land uses would not result in a substantial increase in vehicles on the adjacent streets, and

³⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, Transit-oriented Infill Project Eligibility Checklists for 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street, April 18, 2018

³⁶ Ibid.

because multiple travel lanes are provided on most streets in the vicinity of the project site, emergency vehicle travel would not be impeded or hindered. To move the Victorian the half mile from one site to the other would require that portions of Franklin and Fulton Streets be closed to traffic for two hours, but emergency vehicles could take other routes as necessary during the street closures. For these reasons, the proposed project would not inhibit emergency vehicle access to the project site and vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project's impacts related to emergency access would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

Impact TR-4: The proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance of such facilities. (Less than Significant)

Transit Facilities. The two project sites are well served by public transportation. Within two blocks of the 807 Franklin Street project site are stops for the 47 and 49 lines (to be replaced by bus rapid transit) running north/south, and the 31 Turk and 5 Fulton lines running downtown. The project is anticipated to generate about 32 transit trips during the PM peak hour to/from 807 Franklin Street project site, and about 13 transit trips during the PM peak hour to/from the 635 Fulton Street project site. Given the wide availability of nearby transit, the addition of 45 PM peak-hour transit trips would be accommodated by existing capacity. Thus, 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. Furthermore, there are no bus stops adjacent to either project sites. Therefore, the proposed project's impact on transit services would be less than significant.

Bicycle Facilities. The project vicinity is served by existing bicycle routes located along Polk Street (2 blocks east of 807 Franklin Street) and along Fulton Street in front of 635 Fulton Street. It is anticipated that some of the daily person trips to and from the project site would be made by bicycle. The 807 Franklin Street site would include 80 Class I bicycle parking spaces, and the 635 Fulton Street site would include 32 Class I bicycle parking spaces. Implementation of the proposed project would not alter the existing street grid or result in other physical changes that would affect the bicycle route along Fulton Street in front of one of the project sites. Vehicle trips would be distributed among many streets in the project vicinity and would not substantially conflict with cyclists in the vicinity of either project site. Drivers entering the 807 Franklin Street garage would not be anticipated to conflict with cyclists because Franklin Street is steep and heavily used by vehicles and not conducive to bike riding. While the project would increase the amount of vehicle traffic on streets in the vicinity of the project sites, the expected magnitude of this increase would not be substantial enough to result in conflicts with cyclists or affect overall bicycle circulation or the operations of bicycle facilities, and therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Pedestrian Facilities. Trips generated by the proposed project would include walk trips to and from the proposed residential uses, plus walk trips to and from transit stops. The 807 Franklin Street project site would generate 69 daily pedestrian trips and 185 daily pedestrian trips to transit stops (12 and 32, respectively, during the weekday PM peak hour). The 635 Fulton Street project site would generate 10 daily pedestrian trips and 73 daily pedestrian trips to transit stops (2 and 13, respectively, during the weekday PM peak hour). Sidewalk width in front of both

project sites would remain at 10 feet. The sidewalks in the project vicinity, which were observed to be underutilized,³⁷ would be able to accommodate the additional pedestrian trips generated by the proposed project without becoming substantially overcrowded or substantially affecting pedestrian flows. The increased pedestrian activity generated by the project, in combination with the proposed streetscape improvements, would be expected to enhance the overall pedestrian conditions in the area. Additionally, project-generated vehicle traffic would not be expected to result in significant impacts on pedestrian conditions. Therefore, pedestrian impacts from the proposed project would be less than significant.

Construction Activities. Construction of the 807 Franklin Street project would take approximately 33 months, and construction of the 635 Fulton Street project would take approximately 27 months. Construction staging would occur primarily on site. The Victorian house moving from 807 Franklin Street to 635 Fulton Street would require about two hours of complete street closure and then about 12 hours of partial street closure in front of 635 Fulton Street. The project sponsor would coordinate with SFMTA to close streets.

During the construction period, there would be a flow of construction-related trucks to and from the project sites, which could result in a temporary reduction in the capacities of local streets. Construction activities would generate construction worker trips to and from the project site and a temporary demand for parking and public transit. The temporary demand for public transit would not exceed the capacity of local or regional transit service. Any temporary traffic lane closures would be coordinated with the city in order to minimize the impacts on local traffic. In general, lane and sidewalk closures are subject to review and approval by San Francisco Public Works (Public Works) and the City's Transportation Advisory Staff Committee (TASC) that consists of representatives of City departments including SFMTA, Public Works, Fire, Police, Public Health, Port and the Taxi Commission. Due to the temporary nature of the construction activities, the construction-related impacts on transportation and circulation would be less than significant.

Impact C-TR-1: The proposed project in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative regional VMT (Less than Significant)

VMT by its very nature is largely a cumulative impact. The amount and distance of past, present, and future projects might cause people to drive contribute to the physical secondary environmental impacts associated with VMT. It is likely that no single project by itself would be sufficient in size to prevent the region or state in meeting its VMT reduction goals. Instead, a project's individual VMT contributes to cumulative VMT impacts. The VMT and induced automobile travel project-level thresholds are based on levels at which new projects are not anticipated to conflict with state and regional long-term greenhouse gas emission reduction targets and statewide VMT per capita reduction targets set in 2020. Therefore, because the proposed project would not exceed the project-level thresholds for VMT and induced automobile

³⁷ Weekday field observations, April 18, 2018 at 1:00 p.m.; April 30, 2018 at 1:00 p.m., and May 2, 2018 at 4:00 p.m.

travel (Impact TR-1), the proposed project would not be considered to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to VMT impacts.

Furthermore, as discussed above, the projected 2040 regional average daily VMT per capita for residential development is 13.7. The projected 2040 average daily residential VMT per capita for TAZ 683 (where 807 Franklin Street is located) is 2.3 and for TAZ 267 (where 635 Fulton Street is located) is 3.5. These are, respectively, 17 and 25 percent below the projected 2040 regional average daily VMT per capita of 13.7 for residential use.

Impact C-TR-2: The proposed project, in combination of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not have a cumulative impact on transportation. (Less than Significant)

Construction Activities. Construction of the proposed project could overlap with construction of nearby cumulative development projects listed in Table 2 on page 34. However, all of the cumulative projects are too far away from the project site to result in cumulative transportation impacts, with the exception of 950 Gough Street, which is on the same block as 807 Franklin Street, and 830 Eddy Street, which is located one half block northeast of 807 Franklin Street. Any combined construction-related traffic would be temporary and localized, and would not result in permanent impacts related to transportation and circulation. It is anticipated that the addition of the worker-related vehicle or transit trips would not substantially affect transportation conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would have less-than-significant cumulative construction impacts.

Project Operation. The cumulative projects would increase automobile traffic in the area, which would result in an increase in the potential for automobile-bicycle and automobile-pedestrian conflicts at intersections and driveways in the project vicinity. While there would be a general increase in vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic that is expected, the proposed project would not create potentially hazardous conditions for bicycles or pedestrians, or otherwise interfere with bicycle or pedestrian accessibility to the project site and adjoining areas. Therefore, the proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable development in the project vicinity, would have a less-than-significant impact on bicycle and pedestrian conditions.

For these reasons, the proposed project in combination with past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity would result in less than significant cumulative transportation impacts.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
5. NOISE —Would the project result in:					
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, in an area within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project site is not within an airport land use plan area, nor is it in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, topics 6e and 6f are not applicable.

Impact NO-1: The proposed project could expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of established standards and result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels or excessive vibration. (Less than Significant)

The project sites are located in an urbanized area with ambient noise levels typical of those in San Francisco's more intensively developed neighborhoods. The primary source of ambient noise in the vicinity of both projects is traffic flows. San Francisco traffic noise modeling indicates that existing noise levels at 807 Franklin Street range from 60 to above 75 Ldn, and existing noise levels at 635 Fulton Street range from 55 to 70 Ldn.³⁸

In the vicinity of 807 Franklin Street, traffic noise increases along Franklin Street weekdays between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m., when the parking lane in front of the project site becomes another

³⁸ San Francisco Planning Department, Traffic Noise Model, May 3, 2017. Ldn is the average equivalent sound level over a 24-hour period, with a penalty added for noise during the nighttime hours of 10:00 p.m. to 07:00 a.m. During the nighttime period, 10 decibels is added to reflect the impact of the noise.

vehicle lane. General city noise, including residential and commercial operations, people talking, and/or road, utility, and property maintenance, may also influence the existing noise environment at the project sites. The commercial uses in the project vicinity of 807 Franklin Street include a gas station, small-scale retail uses, and performing arts and civic buildings. Although some of these uses could be considered noisy and a nuisance to their neighbors, their noise levels fall within the range of what is expected in an urban area like San Francisco.

Exposure of Nearby Sensitive Receptors to Noise during Project Operation

The Environmental Protection Element of the San Francisco General Plan contains Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise.³⁹ These guidelines, which are similar to state guidelines promulgated by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, provide guidance as to when, based on the existing noise environment, a proposed land use should have a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements (through insulation) necessary for its structures to meet interior noise level requirements.⁴⁰ The Land Use Compatibility Chart guidelines do not provide significance criteria; rather, they present a range of noise levels that are considered compatible or incompatible with various land uses. For example, the maximum "satisfactory, with no special noise insulation" exterior noise level is 60 dBA (Ldn) for residential and hotel uses, 65 dBA (Ldn) for school classrooms, libraries, churches and hospitals, 70 dBA (Ldn) for playgrounds, parks, office buildings, retail commercial uses and noise-sensitive manufacturing/communications uses, and 77 dBA (Ldn) for other commercial uses such as wholesale, some retail, industrial/manufacturing, transportation, communications, and utilities.

The project proposes residential uses, which are common uses near both project sites. Potential sources of operational noise would include vehicular traffic and noise emitted from the project's mechanical features (such as rooftop mechanical equipment and heating, ventilation and air conditions (HVAC) systems). The operation of these uses would not generate groundborne vibration; therefore, operational vibration impact is considered to be a less than significant impact and is not discussed any further. The proposed project's construction-related vibration impact is discussed below under Impact NO-2.

Vehicular Traffic. Vehicular traffic makes the greatest contribution to ambient noise levels throughout most of San Francisco. Based on published scientific acoustic studies, the traffic volumes in a given location would need to approximately double to produce an increase in

³⁹ San Francisco General Plan Environmental Protection Element, Policy 11.1.

⁴⁰ In addition to Title 24, Section 1207 (Sound Transmission) of the San Francisco Building Code states that the allowable interior noise level attributable to exterior sources shall not exceed 45 dB in any habitable room of all residential structures, including single-family dwellings. Title 25, Section 1092 (Noise Insulation Standards) of the California Administrative Code, applies to new hotels, motels, apartment houses and dwellings other than detached single-family dwellings and requires that interior noise levels from exterior sources not exceed an annual CNEL of 45 dB in any habitable room with the windows closed.

ambient noise levels noticeable to most people.⁴¹ While implementation of the proposed project would increase the number of daily vehicle trips to and from both project sites by 191 trips (156 to/from 807 Franklin Street and 35 to/from 635 Fulton Street) and during the PM peak hour by 33 trips (27 to/from 807 Franklin Street and six to/from 635 Fulton Street), these new vehicle trips would represent a negligible increase in existing traffic on the surrounding streets, and would not lead to a substantial increase in existing traffic related noise. Therefore, traffic added to streets in the vicinity by the proposed project would not cause a noticeable increase in the ambient noise level in the project vicinity.

Mechanical and HVAC Equipment. The project includes mechanical equipment that could produce operational noise, such as that from HVAC systems. These operations would be subject to Section 2909 of the City's Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code). As amended in November 2008, this section establishes noise limits from mechanical sources, such as building equipment. For noise generated by residential uses, the limit is 5 dBA in excess of the ambient noise level at the property line. In addition, Section 2909(d) of the noise ordinance provides for a separate fixed-source noise limit for residential interiors of 45 dBA at night and 55 dBA during the day and evening hours (until 10:00 p.m.). Stationary equipment is unlikely to generate noise that exceeds established standards or results in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Thus, operational noise impacts would be less than significant.

Residential Uses. In the *California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District* case decided in 2015, the California Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require lead agencies to consider how existing environmental conditions might impact a project's users or residents, except where the project would significantly exacerbate an existing environmental condition.⁴² Accordingly, the significance criteria above related to exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of standards in the general plan or Noise Ordinance, exposure of persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, and people being substantially affected by existing noise levels are relevant only to the extent that a project significantly exacerbates the existing noise environment. As discussed above, the proposed project would not significantly exacerbate existing noise conditions; however, the following discussion is provided for informational purposes.

The proposed project's residential uses would be subject to the noise insulation requirements in both the California Building Code and the San Francisco Building Code. The 2013 California Building Code (Title 24, Part 2 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR)) requires that interior noise levels from outside sources not exceed 45 dBA (Ldn or CNEL) in any habitable room (rooms for sleeping, living, cooking, and eating, but excluding bathrooms, closets, and the like) or a residential unit, except for residential additions to structures constructed before 1974 (Building

41 FHWA. Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Guidance. Available at https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/regulations_and_guidance/analysis_and_abatement_guidance/revguidance.pdf. Accessed May 11, 2018.

42 *California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District*, 62 Cal.4th 369. Opinion Filed December 17, 2015. Case No. S213478. Available at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/33098.htm>. Accessed May 11, 2018.

Code section 1207.4). The building code (section 1207.2) also mandates that walls and floor/ceiling assemblies separating dwelling units from each other or from public or service areas have a Sound Transmission Class (STC) of at least 50, meaning they can reduce noise by a minimum of 50 decibels (dB).

The San Francisco Building Code was amended in 2015 to incorporate language included in Section 1207.4 (interior noise standards) of the State Building Code. San Francisco's current Section 1207.6.2 accordingly reads the same as Section 1207.4 of the State Building Code. The San Francisco Building Code also includes a requirement that residential structures in "noise critical areas, such as in proximity to highways, county roads, city streets, railroads, rapid transit lines, airports, nighttime entertainment venues, or industrial areas," be designed to exceed the Code's quantitative noise reduction requirements, and specifies, "Proper design to accomplish this goal shall include, but not be limited to, orientation of the residential structure, setbacks, shielding, and sound insulation of the building" (Section 1207.6.1). Section 1207.7 requires submittal of an acoustical report along with a project's building permit application to demonstrate compliance with the building code's interior noise standards.

While the proposed project would include residential uses that would place sensitive receptors in the vicinity of a noisy environment, compliance with Title 24 standards and the San Francisco Building Code would ensure that appropriate insulation is included in the project to meet the 45 dBA interior noise standard in the San Francisco Building Code. The project sponsor would be required to meet these insulation measures.

Based on the above, the proposed project's operations would not result in exposure of existing noise-sensitive uses (e.g., offsite existing and future residential uses) to permanent noise levels in excess of established standards or a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Impact NO-2: During construction, the proposed project could expose persons to temporary or periodic increases in noise levels significantly in excess of ambient noise levels and groundborne vibration. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Excavation and building construction would temporarily increase noise and produce groundborne vibration in the project vicinity. Construction equipment would generate noise and possibly vibrations that could be considered an annoyance by occupants of nearby properties. The amount of construction noise generated at any one time would vary depending on the types of construction activities underway, numbers and types of pieces of heavy equipment and duration of use of each, distance between noise source and listener, and presence or absence of barriers (including subsurface barriers) between the noise source and the receptors. There would be times when noise and vibration could interfere with indoor activities in nearby residences and other businesses near the project site.

Table 3 identifies typical noise levels from construction equipment. Construction noise is regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (San Francisco Police Code article 29). The ordinance requires that noise levels from individual pieces of construction equipment, other than impact tools, not exceed 80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the source. Impact tools (e.g.,

jackhammers, hoe rams, impact wrenches) must have manufacturer-recommended and City-approved mufflers for both intake and exhaust. Section 2908 of the Noise Ordinance prohibits construction work between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., if noise would exceed the ambient noise level by 5 dBA at the project property line, unless a special permit is authorized by the Director of the Department of Public Works or the Director of Building Inspection. The project would be required to comply with regulations set forth in the Noise Ordinance.

Table 3 – Typical Noise Levels from Construction Equipment

Construction Equipment	Noise Level (dBA, Leq at 50 feet)	Noise Level (dBA, Leq at 100 feet)
Jackhammer (Pavement Breaker) ¹	88	82
Hoe ram	90	94
Drill rig truck	79	73
Loader	79	73
Dozer	82	76
Excavator	81	75
Grader	85	79
Dump truck	76	70
Flatbed truck	74	68
Concrete truck	81	75
Forklift (gas-powered)	83	77
Generator	81	75
Compressor	78	72
San Francisco Noise Ordinance Limit	86	80

Source: Federal Highway Administration, Roadway Construction Noise Model User Guide, 2006.

Notes:

Leq noise levels are calculated assuming a 100 percent usage factor at full load (i.e., Lmax noise level 100 percent) for the one-hour measurement period. Noise levels in **bold** exceed the Noise Ordinance limit, but as indicated in note 1, two of the exceedances are exempt from this limit.

1. Exempt from the ordinance noise limit of 86 dBA at 50 feet or 80 dBA at 100 feet.

807 Franklin Street

The new building would be supported on a deep foundation consisting of drilled, cast-in-place, concrete piers drilled to depths of roughly 40 feet below the proposed below-grade parking level. The 33-month construction period would consist of the following phases: nine months to move the Victorian and demolish the foundation; 6.5 months for excavation and foundation installation; 8.5 months for construction of the above-grade structure; and 18 months for interior work.

Construction Noise. Average noise levels at the nearest noise-sensitive uses would vary by construction phase and would depend on the type of equipment used, the duration of the construction phase, and the proximity of construction activity to the noise-sensitive receptors. Project demolition and construction activities would be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance requirements. The noisiest construction period would be for no more than two weeks,

when hoe ram equipment would be used to demolish the Victorian's foundation. The new foundation would be installed using torque down piles; this method of pile installation results in little to no vibration, and noise is limited to the engine on the drill rig.⁴³ Construction noise from the hoe ram during demolition of the foundation could exceed noise levels commonly experienced in an urban environment. This would be a significant impact. To avoid significant construction noise impacts, **Mitigation Measure I-NO-1**, has been identified to minimize construction-related noise effects.

Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise at 807 Franklin Street. 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. Noise attenuation measures could include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:

- Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around the construction site.
- Utilize noise control blankets on the building as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site.
- Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements.
- Post signs on-site with information regarding permitted construction days and hours, complaint procedures, and the name(s) and telephone number(s) of the individual(s) to be contacted in the event of a problem.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1, construction noise impacts at 807 Franklin Street would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Construction Vibration at 807 Franklin Street. Vibration from the use of heavy construction equipment, particularly pile-driving equipment and other impact devices (e.g., hoe rams), creates seismic waves that radiate along the surface of the ground and downward. These surface waves can be felt as ground vibration. Vibration is an oscillatory motion through a solid medium in which the motion's amplitude can be described in terms of displacement, velocity, or acceleration. The effects of groundborne vibration on buildings include movement of building floors, rattling of windows, shaking of items on shelves or hanging on walls, and rumbling sounds. Fragile buildings and underground facilities, in particular those that are considered historic, are included in an analysis of groundborne vibration because of the potential for structural damage. In extreme cases, high levels of vibration can damage fragile buildings or interfere with sensitive equipment. Receptors sensitive to vibration include structures (especially older masonry structures), people (especially residents, the elderly, and sick), and vibration-sensitive equipment.

⁴³ <http://www.substructuresupport.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Description-Installation-of-Torque-Down-Piles.pdf>

As addressed under Impact CR-3 on page 63, there would be no construction-related noise and vibration impacts on historic resources because the nearest historic resources are sufficiently removed from the project site to be affected by construction activities.

With the exception of long-term occupational exposure, groundborne vibration rarely affects human health. Instead, most people consider vibration to be an annoyance that can affect concentration or disturb sleep. People may tolerate infrequent, short-duration vibration levels, but human annoyance to vibration becomes more pronounced if the vibration is continuous or occurs frequently. A vibration level that causes annoyance will be well below the damage threshold for normal buildings. Annoyance generally occurs in reaction to newly introduced sources of noise that interrupt ongoing activities. Community annoyance is a summary measure of the general adverse reaction of people to noise that causes speech interference, sleep disturbance, or interference with the desire for a tranquil environment.⁴⁴ People react to the duration of groundborne noise events, judging longer events to be more annoying than shorter ones. Construction vibration also often generates complaints, especially during lengthy periods of heavy construction, when nighttime construction is undertaken to avoid disrupting workday activity, or when the adjacent community has no clear understanding of the extent or duration of the construction.⁴⁵

The City does not have regulations that define acceptable levels of vibration. However, Caltrans provides various guidelines regarding the vibration associated with construction and operation of transportation infrastructure. Table 4 provides Caltrans' vibration guidelines for potential damage to different types of structures.

Vibration traveling through typical soil conditions may be estimated at a given distance by the following formula, where PPVref is the reference PPV at 25 feet: $PPV = PPV_{ref} \times (25/Distance)^{1.5}$.

Table 5 summarizes typical vibration levels generated by construction equipment at a reference distance of 25 feet and other distances, as determined by the preceding equation. High levels of vibration can damage fragile buildings or interfere with sensitive equipment. Depending on the age of the structure and type of vibration (transient, continuous, or frequent intermittent sources), vibration levels as low as 0.5 to 2.0 in/sec PPV can damage a structure.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, May 2006, pp. 8-1 to 8-3, Table 8-1. Available at https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf. Accessed May 11, 2018.

⁴⁵ Ibid. Page 12-1.

⁴⁶ Ibid. Table 9, page 23.

Table 4 – Vibration Guidelines for Potential Damage to Structures

Structure Type and Condition	Maximum Peak Particle Velocity (PPV, in/sec)	
	Transient sources	Continuous/Frequent Intermittent sources
Extremely fragile historic buildings	0.12	0.08
Fragile buildings	0.2	0.1
Historic and some old buildings	0.5	0.25
Older residential structures	0.5	0.3
New residential structures	1.0	0.5
Modern industrial/commercial buildings	2.0	0.5

Note: Transient sources create a single, isolated vibration event (e.g., blasting or drop balls). Continuous/frequent intermittent sources include impact pile drivers, pogo-stick compactors, crack-and-seat equipment, vibratory pile drivers, and vibratory compaction equipment.

Source: California Department of Transportation. 2013. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual, Table 19. September. Available: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/noise/pub/TCVGM_Sep13_FINAL.pdf. Accessed on May 2, 2018.

Table 5 – Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

Equipment	PPV at				
	25 Feet	50 Feet	75 Feet	100 Feet	175 Feet
Pile Driver (impact)	1.518	0.5367	0.2921	0.1898	0.0820
Pile driver (sonic)	0.734	0.2595	0.1413	0.0918	0.0396
Hoe Ram	0.089	0.0315	0.0171	0.0111	0.0048
Large Bulldozer	0.089	0.0315	0.0171	0.0111	0.0048
Loaded Trucks	0.076	0.0269	0.0146	0.0095	0.0041
Jackhammer	0.035	0.0124	0.0067	0.0044	0.0019
Small Bulldozer	0.003	0.0011	0.0006	0.0004	0.0002

Source: Federal Transit Administration. 2006. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. FTA-VA-90-1003-06. Office of Planning and Environment. Available at: https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf, Table 12-2. Accessed: May 10, 2018.

The project site is in close proximity to buildings with sensitive land uses that could experience vibration from construction of the proposed project. The closest sensitive receptors would be the residences north of the project site at the adjacent 1923 Eddy Street and 885 Franklin Street properties. As discussed above, while vibration effects associated with project construction could cause annoyance for these (and possibly other) residents in the project vicinity, such impacts would be less than significant, as they would be temporary and periodic and would not be expected to affect human health.

Based on the above, the proposed project's construction-related vibration impacts to sensitive uses and historic structures would be less than significant.

635 Fulton Street

Project construction would last 27 months and construction equipment would include earthmoving equipment, bobcat, dump truck, backhoe and delivery trucks (no construction crane, hoe ram, or pile driver). Because the project would not use heavy equipment, and would comply with noise regulations, noise and vibration impacts would be less than significant.

Impact C-NO-1: The implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a significant cumulative noise or vibration impacts. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Cumulative Operational Noise

Past and present development in the project vicinity has resulted in ongoing increases in local noise along Franklin Street and Fulton Street, including permanent increases in ambient noise levels from traffic and temporary and periodic increases from repeated and ongoing episodes of major construction. Recently approved and reasonably foreseeable nearby projects listed in Table 2 on page 34, including the proposed project, would be expected to result in continuing increases in traffic volumes and associated traffic noise, but would be distributed along local roadways and would not result in a doubling of traffic volumes along nearby streets. Moreover, the proposed project's mechanical equipment and mechanical equipment from reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects would be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance, and would be less than significant. Therefore, in combination with reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects, the project would not make a considerable contribution to any significant noise impacts during project operation.

Cumulative Construction Noise at 807 Franklin Street

Project construction-related noise would not substantially increase ambient noise levels at locations greater than a few hundred feet from the project site. There are two projects that are close enough to potentially result in cumulative construction noise impacts. 950 Gough Street, a proposed new eight-story building, is located at the northwest corner of same block containing 807 Franklin Street (170 feet away), and 830 Eddy Street, a proposed new 12-story building, is one half block northeast of 807 Franklin Street (300 feet away). It is conservatively assumed that the proposed project's construction activities would overlap with these nearby construction activities and result in a significant cumulative construction noise impact. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-NO-1**, which requires the preparation of site-specific noise attenuation measures for 807 Franklin Street, would reduce this impact to less than significant.

Cumulative Construction Noise at 635 Fulton Street

Nearby projects that could contribute to cumulative noise effects at 635 Fulton Street include 555 Fulton Street, a half block to the west. This project is currently under the interior stage of construction and would be unlikely to contribute to cumulative noise while 635 Fulton Street begins construction. Other major projects listed in Table 2 on page 34 would be unlikely to contribute to cumulative noise impacts because they are two blocks or more from the project site. Thus, project noise effects would not combine with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects to result in cumulative noise impacts.

Cumulative Vibration

The nearest project to 807 Franklin Street that could undergo construction vibration is 950 Gough Street, 170 feet from the project site. During the 22-month construction of the 950 Gough Street project,

[t]he greatest construction-generating noise and vibration phases would generally be limited to the initial and middle phases during excavation, new foundation construction, and exterior and façade element construction. In particular, the greatest noise and vibration levels would occur from the installation of cantilever soldier piles for a temporary shoring system to laterally restrain the sides of the excavation for the proposed below-grade parking level of the new building and limit the movement of adjacent improvements. Once the façade is in place, noise from interior finishing would generally be contained within the building envelope and would not be expected to generate excessive noise.⁴⁷

Construction of the 12-story building at 830 Eddy Street, 300 feet from the 807 Franklin Street project site, would involve a six-month excavation period that would result in noise generated by bulldozers, loaders, graders, and trucks.⁴⁸

Vibration effects associated with project construction at these three sites would be temporary and periodic and would not be expected to affect human health. Thus, these less-than-significant impacts would not combine with other projects and result in cumulative vibration impacts.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
6. AIR QUALITY —Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁴⁷ 950 Gough Street Mitigated Negative Declaration, June 15, 2015. Available for review at <http://propertymap.sfplanning.org/?dept=planning> by searching by address for documents related to Case No. 2012.0506E.

⁴⁸ 830 Eddy Street/815 Van Ness Avenue Certificate of Determination, Exemption from Environmental Review. Available for review at <http://propertymap.sfplanning.org/?dept=planning> by searching by address for documents related to Case No. 2015-009460E.

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overview

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (air district) is the regional agency with jurisdiction over the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (air basin), which includes San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Napa counties and portions of Sonoma and Solano counties. The air district is responsible for attaining and maintaining federal and state air quality standards in the air basin, as established by the federal Clean Air Act and the California Clean Air Act, respectively. Specifically, the air district has the responsibility to monitor ambient air pollutant levels throughout the air basin and to develop and implement strategies to attain the applicable federal and state standards. The federal and state clean air acts require plans to be developed for areas that do not meet air quality standards, generally. The most recent air quality plan, the 2017 Clean Air Plan, was adopted by the air district on April 19, 2017. The 2017 Clean Air Plan updates the most recent Bay Area ozone plan, the 2010 Clean Air Plan, in accordance with the requirements of the state Clean Air Act to implement all feasible measures to reduce ozone; provide a control strategy to reduce ozone, particulate matter, air toxics, and greenhouse gases in a single, integrated plan; and establish emission control measures to be adopted or implemented. The 2017 Clean Air Plan contains the following primary goals:

- Protect air quality and health at the regional and local scale: Attain all state and national air quality standards, and eliminate disparities among Bay Area communities in cancer health risk from toxic air contaminants; and
- Protect the climate: Reduce Bay Area greenhouse gas emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

The 2017 Clean Air Plan is the most current applicable air quality plan for the air basin. Consistency with this plan is the basis for determining whether the proposed project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of an air quality plan.

Criteria Air Pollutants

In accordance with the state and federal clean air acts, air pollutant standards are identified for the following six criteria air pollutants: ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter (PM),

nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and lead. These air pollutants are termed criteria air pollutants because they are regulated by developing specific public health- and welfare-based criteria as the basis for setting permissible levels. In general, the air basin experiences low concentrations of most pollutants when compared to federal or state standards. The air basin is designated as either in attainment⁴⁹ or unclassified for most criteria air pollutants with the exception of ozone, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀, for which these pollutants are designated as non-attainment for either the state or federal standards. By its very nature, regional air pollution is largely a cumulative impact in that no single project is sufficient in size to, by itself, result in non-attainment of air quality standards. Instead, a project's individual emissions contribute to existing cumulative air quality impacts. If a project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is considerable, then the project's impact on air quality would be considered significant.⁵⁰

Land use projects may contribute to regional criteria air pollutants during the construction and operational phases of a project. Table 6 identifies air quality significance thresholds followed by a discussion of each threshold. Projects that would result in criteria air pollutant emissions below these significance thresholds would not violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants within the air basin.

Ozone Precursors. As discussed previously, the air basin is currently designated as non-attainment for ozone and particulate matter. Ozone is a secondary air pollutant produced in the atmosphere through a complex series of photochemical reactions involving reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x). The potential for a project to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants, which may contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, are based on the state and federal clean air acts emissions limits for stationary sources. To ensure that new stationary sources do not cause or contribute to a violation of an air quality standard, air district regulation 2, rule 2 requires that any new source that emits criteria air pollutants above a specified emissions limit must offset those emissions. For ozone precursors ROG and NO_x, the offset emissions level is an annual average of 10 tons per year (or 54 pounds (lbs.) per day).⁵¹ These levels represent emissions below which new sources are not anticipated to contribute to an air quality violation or result in a considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants.

49 "Attainment" status refers to those regions that are meeting federal and/or state standards for a specified criteria pollutant. "Non-attainment" refers to regions that do not meet federal and/or state standards for a specified criteria pollutant. "Unclassified" refers to regions where there is not enough data to determine the region's attainment status for a specified criteria air pollutant.

50 Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines, page 2-1, May, 2017. Available at http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa_guidelines_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en. Accessed November 15, 2017.

51 BAAQMD 2009, Revised Draft Options and Justification Report, California Environmental Quality Act Thresholds of Significance, page 17. Available at http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/2014.0653E_Revised_FND.pdf. Accessed May 11, 2018.

Although this regulation applies to new or modified stationary sources, land use development projects result in ROG and NO_x emissions as a result of increases in vehicle trips, architectural coating, and construction activities. Therefore, the above thresholds can be applied to the construction and operational phases of land use projects and those projects that result in emissions below these thresholds would not be considered to contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation or result in a considerable net increase in ROG and NO_x emissions. Due to the temporary nature of construction activities, only the average daily thresholds are applicable to construction phase emissions.

Table 6 – Criteria Air Pollutant Significance Thresholds

Pollutant	Construction Thresholds	Operational Thresholds	
	Average Daily Emissions (lbs./day)	Average Daily Emissions (lbs./day)	Maximum Annual Emissions (tons/year)
ROG	54	54	10
NO _x	54	54	10
PM ₁₀	82 (exhaust)	82	15
PM _{2.5}	54 (exhaust)	54	10
Fugitive Dust	Construction Dust Ordinance or other Best Management Practices	Not Applicable	

Source: Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017, page 2-1

Particulate Matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}).⁵² The air district has not established an offset limit for PM_{2.5}. However, the emissions limit in the federal New Source Review for stationary sources in nonattainment areas is an appropriate significance threshold. For PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, the emissions limit under New Source Review is 15 tons per year (82 lbs. per day) and 10 tons per year (54 lbs. per day), respectively. These emissions limits represent levels below which a source is not expected to have an impact on air quality.⁵³ Similar to ozone precursor thresholds identified above, land use development projects typically result in particulate matter emissions as a result of increases in vehicle trips, space heating and natural gas combustion, landscape maintenance, and construction activities. Therefore, the above thresholds can be applied to the construction and operational phases of a land use project. Again, because construction activities are temporary in nature, only the average daily thresholds are applicable to construction-phase emissions.

Fugitive Dust. Fugitive dust emissions are typically generated during construction phases. Studies have shown that the application of best management practices at construction sites significantly control fugitive dust⁵⁴ and individual measures have been shown to reduce fugitive

⁵² PM₁₀ is often termed “coarse” particulate matter and is made of particulates that are 10 microns in diameter or smaller. PM_{2.5}, termed “fine” particulate matter, is composed of particles that are 2.5 microns or less in diameter.

⁵³ Ibid. Footnote 63, page 16.

⁵⁴ Western Regional Air Partnership, 2006, WRAP Fugitive Dust Handbook, September 7. Available at http://www.wrapair.org/forums/dej/f/fdh/content/FDHandbook_Rev_06.pdf. Accessed May 11, 2018.

dust by anywhere from 30 to 90 percent.⁵⁵ The air district has identified a number of best management practices to control fugitive dust emissions from construction activities.⁵⁶ The City's Construction Dust Control Ordinance (ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008) requires a number of measures to control fugitive dust and the best management practices employed in compliance with the ordinance are an effective strategy for controlling construction-related fugitive dust.

Other Criteria Pollutants. Regional concentrations of CO in the Bay Area have not exceeded the state standards in the past 11 years and SO₂ concentrations have never exceeded the standards. The primary source of CO emissions from development projects is vehicle traffic. Construction-related SO₂ emissions represent a negligible portion of the total basin-wide emissions and construction-related CO emissions represent less than five percent of the Bay Area total basin-wide CO emissions. As discussed previously, the Bay Area is in attainment for both CO and SO₂. Furthermore, the air district has demonstrated, based on modeling, that to exceed the California ambient air quality standard of 9.0 ppm (parts per million) (8-hour average) or 20.0 ppm (1-hour average) for CO, project traffic in addition to existing traffic would need to exceed 44,000 vehicles per hour at affected intersections (or 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal mixing is limited). Therefore, given the Bay Area's attainment status and the limited CO and SO₂ emissions that could result from development projects, development projects would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in CO or SO₂ emissions, and quantitative analysis is not required.

Local Health Risks and Hazards

In addition to criteria air pollutants, individual projects may emit toxic air contaminants (TACs). TACs collectively refer to a diverse group of air pollutants that are capable of causing chronic (i.e., of long-duration) and acute (i.e., severe but short-term) adverse effects to human health, including carcinogenic effects. Human health effects of TACs include birth defects, neurological damage, cancer, and mortality. There are hundreds of different types of TACs with varying degrees of toxicity. Individual TACs vary greatly in the health risk they present; at a given level of exposure, one TAC may pose a hazard that is many times greater than another.

Unlike criteria air pollutants, TACs do not have ambient air quality standards but are regulated by the air district using a risk-based approach to determine which sources and pollutants to control as well as the degree of control. A health risk assessment is an analysis in which human health exposure to toxic substances is estimated, and considered together with information regarding the toxic potency of the substances, to provide quantitative estimates of health risks.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, page D-47, May, 2017.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ In general, a health risk assessment is required if the air district concludes that projected emissions of a specific air toxic compound from a proposed new or modified source suggest a potential public health risk. The applicant is then subject to a health risk assessment for the source in question. Such an assessment generally evaluates chronic, long-term effects, estimating the increased risk of cancer as a result of exposure to one or more TACs.

Air pollution does not affect every individual in the population in the same way, and some groups are more sensitive to adverse health effects than others. Land uses such as residences, schools, children's day care centers, hospitals, and nursing and convalescent homes are considered to be the most sensitive to poor air quality because the population groups associated with these uses have increased susceptibility to respiratory distress or, as in the case of residential receptors, their exposure time is greater than that for other land uses. Therefore, these groups are referred to as sensitive receptors. Exposure assessment guidance typically assumes that residences would be exposed to air pollution 24 hours per day, seven days a week, for 30 years.⁵⁸ Therefore, assessments of air pollutant exposure to residents typically result in the greatest adverse health outcomes of all population groups.

Exposures to fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) are strongly associated with mortality, respiratory diseases, and lung development in children, and other endpoints such as hospitalization for cardiopulmonary disease.⁵⁹ In addition to PM_{2.5}, diesel particulate matter (DPM) is also of concern. The California Air Resources Board (California air board) identified DPM as a TAC in 1998, primarily based on evidence demonstrating cancer effects in humans.⁶⁰ The estimated cancer risk from exposure to diesel exhaust is much higher than the risk associated with any other TAC routinely measured in the region.

In an effort to identify areas of San Francisco most adversely affected by sources of TACs, San Francisco partnered with the air district to conduct a citywide health risk assessment based on an inventory and assessment of air pollution and exposures from mobile, stationary, and area sources within San Francisco. Areas with poor air quality, termed the "Air Pollutant Exposure Zone," were identified based on health-protective criteria that consider estimated cancer risk, exposures to fine particulate matter, proximity to freeways, and locations with particularly vulnerable populations. The 807 Franklin Street project site is located within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone but the 635 Fulton Street project site is not. Each of the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone criteria are discussed below.

Excess Cancer Risk. The Air Pollution Exposure Zone includes areas where modeled cancer risk exceeds 100 incidents per million persons exposed. This criterion is based on United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) guidance for conducting air toxic analyses and making risk management decisions at the facility and community-scale level.⁶¹ As described by the air district, the U.S. EPA considers a cancer risk of 100 per million to be within the "acceptable" range of cancer risk. Furthermore, in the 1989 preamble to the benzene National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants rulemaking,⁶² the U.S. EPA states that it

58 California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, 2015, Air Toxics Hot Spot Program Risk Assessment Guidelines, Pg. 4-44, 8-6, February. Available at <https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crn/2015guidancemanual.pdf>.

59 San Francisco Department of Public Health, 2014, Assessment and Mitigation of Air Pollutant Health Effects from Intra-Urban Roadways: Guidance for Land Use Planning and Environmental Review.

60 California Air Resources Board (ARB), Fact Sheet, The Toxic Air Contaminant Identification Process: Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions from Diesel-fueled Engines, October, 1998.

61 Ibid. Footnote 63, page 67.

62 54 Federal Register 38044, September 14, 1989.

“...strives to provide maximum feasible protection against risks to health from hazardous air pollutants by (1) protecting the greatest number of persons possible to an individual lifetime risk level no higher than approximately one in one million and (2) limiting to no higher than approximately one in ten thousand (100 in one million) the estimated risk that a person living near a plant would have if he or she were exposed to the maximum pollutant concentrations for 70 years.” The 100 per one million excess cancer cases is also consistent with the ambient cancer risk in the most pristine portions of the Bay Area based on air district regional modeling.⁶³

Fine Particulate Matter. U.S. EPA staff’s 2011 review of the federal PM_{2.5} standard concluded that the then current federal annual PM_{2.5} standard of 15 µg/m³ (micrograms per cubic meter) should be revised to a level within the range of 13 to 11 µg/m³, with evidence strongly supporting a standard within the range of 12 to 11 µg/m³.⁶⁴ The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone for San Francisco is based on the health protective PM_{2.5} standard of 11 µg/m³, as supported by the U.S. EPA’s assessment, although lowered to 10 µg/m³ to account for uncertainty in accurately predicting air pollutant concentrations using emissions modeling programs.

Proximity to Freeways. According to the California air board, studies have shown an association between the proximity of sensitive land uses to freeways and a variety of respiratory symptoms, asthma exacerbations, and decreases in lung function in children. Siting sensitive uses in close proximity to freeways increases both exposure to air pollution and the potential for adverse health effects. As evidence shows that sensitive uses in an area within a 500-foot buffer of any freeway are at an increased health risk from air pollution,⁶⁵ parcels that are within 500 feet of freeways are included in the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone.

Health Vulnerable Locations. Based on the air district’s evaluation of health vulnerability in the Bay Area, those ZIP codes (94102, 94103, 94105, 94124, and 94130) in the worst quintile of Bay Area health vulnerability scores as a result of air pollution-related causes were afforded additional protection by lowering the standards for identifying parcels in the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone to: (1) an excess cancer risk greater than 90 per one million persons exposed, and/or (2) PM_{2.5} concentrations in excess of 9 µg/m³.⁶⁶

The above citywide health risk modeling was also used as the basis in approving amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes, referred to as the Enhanced Ventilation Required for Urban Infill Sensitive Use Developments or Health Code Article 38 (ordinance 224-14, effective December 8, 2014) (article 38). The purpose of article 38 is to protect the public health and welfare by establishing an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone and imposing an enhanced

63 BAAQMD, 2017, Clean Air Plan, page D-43.

64 U.S. EPA, Policy Assessment for the Review of the Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards. “Particulate Matter Policy Assessment,” April, 2011.
Available at <https://www3.epa.gov/ttn/naaqs/standards/pm/data/20110419pmpafinal.pdf>.

65 California Air Resources Board, 2005 Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective. April. Available at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/landuse.htm>. .

66 San Francisco Planning Department and San Francisco Department of Public Health, Air Pollutant Exposure Zone Map (Memo and Map), April 9, 2014. These documents are part of San Francisco Board of Supervisors File No. 14806, Ordinance No. 224-14; Amendment to Health Code Article 38.

ventilation requirement for all urban infill sensitive use development within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. In addition, projects within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone require special consideration to determine whether the project's activities would add a substantial amount of emissions to areas already adversely affected by poor air quality.

Construction Air Quality Impacts

Project-related air quality impacts fall into two categories: short-term impacts from construction and long-term impacts from project operation. The following addresses construction-related air quality impacts resulting from the proposed project.

Impact AQ-1: The proposed project's construction activities would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, but would not violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant)

Construction activities (short-term) typically result in emissions of ozone precursors and fine particulate matter in the form of dust (fugitive dust) and exhaust (e.g., vehicle tailpipe emissions). Emissions of ozone precursors and fine particulate matter are primarily a result of the combustion of fuel from on-road and off-road vehicles. However, ROG's are also emitted from activities that involve painting, other types of architectural coatings, or asphalt paving. The proposed project would move, renovate, and expand two existing buildings at 635 Fulton Street and construct a new nine-story building at 807 Franklin Street. During the project's approximately 33-month construction period, construction activities would have the potential to result in emissions of ozone precursors and fine particulate matter, as discussed below.

Fugitive Dust

Project-related demolition, excavation, grading, and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. Depending on exposure, adverse health effects can occur due to this particulate matter in general and also due to specific contaminants such as lead or asbestos that may be constituents of soil. Although there are federal standards for air pollutants and implementation of state and regional air quality control plans, air pollutants continue to have impacts on human health throughout the country. California has found that particulate matter exposure can cause health effects at lower levels than national standards. The current health burden of particulate matter demands that, where possible, public agencies take feasible available actions to reduce sources of particulate matter exposure. According to the California air board, reducing PM_{2.5} concentrations to state and federal standards of 12 µg/m³ in the San Francisco Bay Area would prevent between 200 and 1,300 premature deaths.⁶⁷

In response, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008) with the intent of reducing the quantity of dust generated during site preparation, demolition and construction work in order to protect the

67 ARB, Methodology for Estimating Premature Deaths Associated with Long-term Exposure to Fine Airborne Particulate Matter in California, Staff Report, Table 4c, October 24, 2008.

health of the general public and of onsite workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection.

The Construction Dust Control Ordinance requires that all site preparation work, demolition, or other construction activities within San Francisco that have the potential to create dust or to expose or disturb more than 10 cubic yards or 500 sf of soil comply with specified dust control measures whether or not the activity requires a permit from the Department of Building Inspection. The Director of the Department of Building Inspection may waive this requirement for activities on sites less than one half-acre that are unlikely to result in any visible wind-blown dust.

In compliance with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance, the project sponsor and the contractor responsible for construction activities at the project sites would be required to use the following practices to control construction dust on the site or other practices that result in equivalent dust control that are acceptable to the director. Dust suppression activities may include watering all active construction areas sufficiently to prevent dust from becoming airborne; increased watering frequency may be necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. During excavation and dirt-moving activities, contractors shall wet sweep or vacuum the streets, sidewalks, paths, and intersections where work is in progress at the end of the workday. Inactive stockpiles (where no disturbance occurs for more than seven days) greater than 10 cubic yards or 500 sf of excavated material, backfill material, import material, gravel, sand, road base, and soil shall be covered with a 10 mil (0.01 inch) polyethylene plastic (or equivalent) tarp, braced down, or use other equivalent soil stabilization techniques. San Francisco ordinance 175-91 restricts the use of potable water for soil compaction and dust control activities undertaken in conjunction with any construction or demolition project occurring within the boundaries of San Francisco, unless permission is obtained from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. Non-potable water must be used for soil compaction and dust control activities during project construction and demolition. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission operates a recycled water truck-fill station at the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant that provides recycled water for these activities at no charge.

Compliance with the regulations and procedures set forth by the Dust Control Ordinance would ensure that potential dust-related air quality impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Criteria Air Pollutants

As discussed above, construction activities would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants from the use of off- and on-road vehicles and equipment. To assist lead agencies in determining whether short-term construction-related air pollutant emissions require further analysis as to whether the project may exceed the criteria air pollutant significance thresholds shown in Table 6, above, the air district, in its CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (May 2017), developed screening criteria. If a proposed project meets the screening criteria, then construction of the project would result in less-than-significant criteria air pollutant impacts. A project that exceeds the screening

criteria may require a detailed air quality assessment to determine whether criteria air pollutant emissions would exceed significance thresholds. The CEQA Air Quality Guidelines note that the screening levels are generally representative of new development on greenfield⁶⁸ sites without any form of mitigation measures taken into consideration. In addition, the screening criteria do not account for project design features, attributes, or local development requirements that could also result in lower emissions.

The proposed project would result in three- and four-story buildings containing 17 dwelling units at 635 Fulton Street and a nine-story building containing 48 dwelling units at 807 Franklin Street. The size of proposed construction activities would be below the criteria air pollutant screening sizes for low- and mid-rise apartments identified in the BAAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. Thus, quantification of construction-related criteria air pollutant emissions is not required and the proposed project's construction activities would result in a less-than-significant criteria air pollutant impact.

Impact AQ-2: The proposed project's construction activities would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

807 Franklin Street

The 807 Franklin Street project site is located within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as described above, with adjacent residential uses to the north and west.

With regards to construction emissions, off-road equipment (which includes construction-related equipment) is a large contributor to DPM emissions in California, although since 2007, the California air board has found the emissions to be substantially lower than previously expected.⁶⁹

Newer and more refined emission inventories have substantially lowered the estimates of DPM emissions from off-road equipment such that off-road equipment is now considered the sixth largest source of DPM emissions in California.⁷⁰ For example, revised PM emission estimates for the year 2010, which DPM is a major component of total PM, have decreased by 83 percent from previous 2010 emissions estimates for the air basin.⁷¹ Approximately half of the reduction in

⁶⁸ A greenfield site refers to agricultural or forest land or an undeveloped site earmarked for commercial, residential, or industrial projects.

⁶⁹ ARB, Staff Report: Initial Statement of Reasons for Proposed Rulemaking, Proposed Amendments to the Regulation for In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets and the Off-Road Large Spark-Ignition Fleet Requirements, pages 1 and 13 (Figure 4), October 2010.

⁷⁰ ARB, Staff Report: Initial Statement of Reasons for Proposed Rulemaking, Proposed Amendments to the Regulation for In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets and the Off-Road Large Spark-Ignition Fleet Requirements, October 2010.

⁷¹ ARB, "In-Use Off-Road Equipment, 2011 Inventory Model." Available at http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/categories.htm#inuse_or_category. Query accessed on April 2, 2012,

emissions can be attributed to the economic recession and half to updated methodologies used to better assess construction emissions.⁷²

Additionally, a number of federal and state regulations are requiring cleaner off-road equipment. Specifically, both the EPA and California air board have set emissions standards for new off-road equipment engines, ranging from Tier 1 to Tier 4. Tier 1 emission standards were phased in between 1996 and 2000 and Tier 4 Interim and Final emission standards for all new engines were phased in between 2008 and 2015. To meet the Tier 4 emission standards, engine manufacturers will be required to produce new engines with advanced emission-control technologies. Although the full benefits of these regulations will not be realized for several years, the EPA estimates that by implementing the federal Tier 4 standards, NO_x and PM emissions will be reduced by more than 90 percent.⁷³

In addition, construction activities do not lend themselves to analysis of long-term health risks because of their temporary and variable nature. As explained in the air district's CEQA Air Quality Guidelines:

"Due to the variable nature of construction activity, the generation of TAC emissions in most cases would be temporary, especially considering the short amount of time such equipment is typically within an influential distance that would result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations. Concentrations of mobile-source diesel PM emissions are typically reduced by 70 percent at a distance of approximately 500 feet (ARB 2005). In addition, current models and methodologies for conducting health risk assessments are associated with longer-term exposure periods of 9, 40, and 70 years, which do not correlate well with the temporary and highly variable nature of construction activities. This results in difficulties with producing accurate estimates of health risk."⁷⁴

Therefore, project-level analyses of construction activities have a tendency to produce overestimated assessments of long-term health risks. However, within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as discussed above, additional construction activity may adversely affect populations that are already at a higher risk for adverse long-term health risks from existing sources of air pollution.

The proposed project would require construction activities for the approximate 33-month construction period. Project construction activities would result in short-term emissions of DPM and other TACs. The project site is located in an area that already experiences poor air quality and project construction activities would generate additional air pollution, affecting nearby

⁷² ARB, Staff Report: Initial Statement of Reasons for Proposed Rulemaking, Proposed Amendments to the Regulation for In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets and the Off-Road Large Spark-Ignition Fleet Requirements, October 2010.

⁷³ USEPA, "Clean Air Nonroad Diesel Rule: Fact Sheet," May 2004.

⁷⁴ BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017, page 8-7.

sensitive receptors and resulting in a significant impact. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1, Construction Air Quality at 807 Franklin Street**, would reduce the magnitude of this impact to a less-than-significant level. While emission reductions from limiting idling, educating workers and the public and properly maintaining equipment are difficult to quantify, other measures, specifically the requirement for equipment with Tier 2 engines and Level 3 Verified Diesel Emission Control Strategy (VDECS) can reduce construction emissions by 89 to 94 percent compared to equipment with engines meeting no emission standards and without a VDECS.⁷⁵ Emissions reductions from the combination of Tier 2 equipment with level 3 VDECS is almost equivalent to requiring only equipment with Tier 4 Final engines. Therefore, compliance with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1 would reduce construction emissions impacts on nearby sensitive receptors to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Construction Air Quality at 807 Franklin Street. The project sponsor or the project sponsor's contractor shall comply with the following at the 807 Franklin Street project site:

Engine Requirements:

- All off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall have engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or California Air Resources Board (ARB) Tier 2 off-road emission standards, and have been retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy. Equipment with engines meeting Tier 4 Interim or Tier 4 Final off-road emission standards automatically meet this requirement.
- Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited.
- Diesel engines, whether for off-road or on-road equipment, shall not be left idling for more than two minutes, at any location, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment (e.g., traffic conditions, safe operating conditions). The

⁷⁵ PM emissions benefits are estimated by comparing off-road PM emission standards for Tier 2 with Tier 1 and 0. Tier 0 off-road engines do not have PM emission standards, but the United States Environmental Protection Agency's Exhaust and Crankcase Emissions Factors for Nonroad Engine Modeling – Compression Ignition has estimated Tier 0 engines between 50 hp and 100 hp to have a PM emission factor of 0.72 g/hp-hr and greater than 100 hp to have a PM emission factor of 0.40 g/hp-hr. Therefore, requiring off-road equipment to have at least a Tier 2 engine would result in between a 25 percent and 63 percent reduction in PM emissions, as compared to off-road equipment with Tier 0 or Tier 1 engines. The 25 percent reduction comes from comparing the PM emission standards for off-road engines between 25 hp and 50 hp for Tier 2 (0.45 g/bhp-hr) and Tier 1 (0.60 g/bhp-hr). The 63 percent reduction comes from comparing the PM emission standards for off-road engines above 175 hp for Tier 2 (0.15 g/bhp-hr) and Tier 0 (0.40 g/bhp-hr). In addition to the Tier 2 requirement, ARB Level 3 VDECSs are required and would reduce PM by an additional 85 percent. Therefore, the mitigation measure would result in between an 89 percent (0.0675 g/bhp-hr) and 94 percent (0.0225 g/bhp-hr) reduction in PM emissions, as compared to equipment with Tier 1 (0.60 g/bhp-hr) or Tier 0 engines (0.40 g/bhp-hr).

Contractor shall post legible and visible signs in English, Spanish, and Chinese, in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two minute idling limit.

- The Contractor shall instruct construction workers and equipment operators on the maintenance and tuning of construction equipment, and require that such workers and operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications.

Waivers:

- The Planning Department's Environmental Review Officer or designee (ERO) may waive the alternative source of power requirement above if an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site. If the ERO grants the waiver, the Contractor must submit documentation that the equipment used for onsite power generation meets the requirements above.
- The ERO may waive the equipment requirements above if: a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is technically not feasible; the equipment would not produce desired emissions reduction due to expected operating modes; installation of the equipment would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator; or, there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that is not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS. If the ERO grants the waiver, the Contractor must use the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment, according to Table M-AQ-1.

Table M-AQ-1 – Off-Road Equipment Compliance Step-down Schedule

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

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

** Alternative fuels are not a VDECS.

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

- The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase, with a

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

- The project sponsor shall ensure that all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into the contract specifications. The Plan shall include a certification statement that the Contractor agrees to comply fully with the Plan.
- The Contractor shall make the Plan available to the public for review on-site during working hours. The Contractor shall post at the construction site a legible and visible sign summarizing the Plan. The sign shall also state that the public may ask to inspect the Plan for the project at any time during working hours and shall explain how to request to inspect the Plan. The Contractor shall post at least one copy of the sign in a visible location on each side of the construction site facing a public right-of-way.
- *Monitoring.* After start of Construction Activities, the Contractor shall submit quarterly reports to the ERO documenting compliance with the Plan. After completion of construction activities and prior to receiving a final certificate of occupancy, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities, including the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase, and the specific information required in the Plan.

635 Fulton Street

As discussed above, the 635 Fulton Street project site is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. Although on-road heavy-duty diesel vehicles and off-road equipment would be used during the 27-month construction duration, emissions would be temporary and variable in nature and would not be expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutants. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to comply with California regulations limiting idling to no more than five minutes,⁷⁶ which would further reduce nearby sensitive receptor exposure to temporary and variable DPM emissions. Therefore, because the project site is not within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone and construction activities would be temporary and variable over the 27-month construction period, TAC emissions would result in a less-than-significant impact to sensitive receptors.

⁷⁶ California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Division 3, § 2485 (on-road) and § 2449(d)(2) (off-road).

Operational Air Quality Impacts

Land use projects typically result in emissions of criteria air pollutants and TACs primarily from an increase in motor vehicle trips. However, land use projects may also result in criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants from combustion of natural gas, landscape maintenance, use of consumer products, and architectural coating. The following addresses air quality impacts resulting from operation of the proposed project.

Impact AQ-3: During project operations, the proposed project would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants, but not at levels that 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. (Less than Significant)

As discussed above in Impact AQ-1, the air district, in its CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (May 2017), has developed screening criteria to determine whether a project requires an analysis of project-generated criteria air pollutants. If all the screening criteria are met by a proposed project, then the lead agency or applicant does not need to perform a detailed air quality assessment.

The proposed project would result in three- and four-story buildings containing 17 dwelling units at 635 Fulton Street and a nine-story building containing 48 dwelling units at 807 Franklin Street. The proposed project would be below the criteria air pollutant screening sizes for low- and mid-rise apartments identified in the air district's CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. Thus, quantification of project-generated criteria air pollutant emissions is not required, and the proposed project would not exceed any of the significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants, and would result in a less-than-significant impact with respect to criteria air pollutants.

Impact AQ-4: The proposed project would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, exposing sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant)

807 Franklin Street

The 807 Franklin Street project site is located within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as described above. Residential uses are adjacent to the project site to the north and west. The project would not add new sources of TACs but would add new sensitive land uses (48 residences).

Sources of Toxic Air Contaminants

Individual projects result in emissions of toxic air contaminants primarily as a result of an increase in vehicle trips. The air district considers roads with less than 10,000 vehicles per day "minor, low-impact" sources that do not pose a significant health impact even in combination with other nearby sources and recommends that these sources be excluded from the environmental analysis. The proposed project's 156 daily vehicle trips would be well below this level and would be distributed among the local roadway network; therefore, an assessment of project-generated toxic air contaminants resulting from vehicle trips is not required and the

proposed project would not generate a substantial amount of toxic air contaminant emissions that could affect nearby sensitive receptors.

Siting Sensitive Land Uses

The proposed project at 807 Franklin Street would include development of 48 residences and is considered a sensitive land use for purposes of air quality evaluation. For sensitive use projects within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone as defined by San Francisco Health Code article 38, such as the proposed project, article 38 requires that the project sponsor submit an enhanced ventilation proposal for approval by the Department of Public Health that achieves protection from PM_{2.5} (fine particulate matter) equivalent to that associated with a minimum efficiency reporting value (MERV) 13 filtration. The Department of Building Inspection will not issue a building permit without written notification from the Director of Public Health that the applicant has an approved enhanced ventilation proposal.

In compliance with article 38, the project sponsor has submitted an initial application to the health department.⁷⁷ The regulations and procedures set forth by article 38 would reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

635 Fulton Street

As discussed above, the 635 Fulton Street project site is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. However, as discussed above, vehicle trips would generate toxic air contaminants. The proposed project's 35 daily vehicle trips would be well below the BAAQMD's threshold for significant trip-generated TAC levels; therefore an assessment of project-generated TACs resulting from vehicle trips is not required, and the proposed project would not generate a substantial amount of TAC emissions that could affect nearby sensitive receptors.

In conclusion, the proposed project at 635 Fulton Street would not generate toxic air contaminants, including DPM, exposing sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations, and this impact would be less than significant.

Impact AQ-5: The proposed project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the 2017 Clean Air Plan. (Less than Significant)

The most recently adopted air quality plan for the air basin is the 2017 Clean Air Plan. The 2017 Clean Air Plan is a road map that demonstrates how the San Francisco Bay Area will achieve compliance with the state ozone standards as expeditiously as practicable and how the region will reduce the transport of ozone and ozone precursors to neighboring air basins. In determining consistency with the plan, this analysis considers whether the project would: (1) support the primary goals of the plan, (2) include applicable control measures from the plan, and (3) avoid disrupting or hindering implementation of control measures identified in the plan.

⁷⁷ Application for Article 38 Compliance Assessment, 807 Franklin Street, April 21, 2016.

The primary goals of the plan are to (1) protect air quality and health at the regional and local scale; (2) eliminate disparities among Bay Area communities in cancer health risk from toxic air contaminants; and (3) protect the climate by reducing greenhouse gas emissions. To meet the primary goals, the plan recommends specific control measures and actions. These control measures are grouped into various categories and include stationary and area source measures, mobile source measures, transportation control measures, land use measures, and energy and climate measures. The plan recognizes that to a great extent, community design dictates individual travel mode, and that a key long-term control strategy to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants, air toxics, and greenhouse gases from motor vehicles is to channel future Bay Area growth into vibrant urban communities where goods and services are close at hand, and people have a range of viable transportation options. To this end, the plan includes 85 control measures aimed at reducing air pollution in the air basin.

The measures most applicable to the proposed project sites are transportation control measures and energy and climate control measures. The proposed project's impact with respect to greenhouse gases are discussed in Section 7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, which demonstrates that the proposed project would comply with the applicable provisions of the city's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

The compact development of the proposed project and high availability of viable transportation options ensure that residents could bicycle, walk, and ride transit to and from the project site instead of taking trips via private automobile. These features ensure that the project would avoid substantial growth in automobile trips and vehicle miles traveled. The proposed project's anticipated 191 net new vehicle trips (156 to/from 807 Franklin Street and 35 to/from 635 Fulton Street) would result in a negligible increase in air pollutant emissions. Furthermore, the proposed project would be generally consistent with the San Francisco General Plan, as discussed in Section C. Transportation control measures that are identified in the 2017 Clean Air Plan are implemented by the general plan and the San Francisco Planning Code, for example, through the city's Transit First Policy, bicycle parking requirements, and transit impact development fees. Compliance with these requirements would ensure the project includes relevant transportation control measures specified in the 2017 Clean Air Plan. Therefore, the proposed project would include applicable control measures identified in the 2017 Clean Air Plan to meet the 2017 Clean Air Plan's primary goals.

Examples of a project that could cause the disruption or delay of 2017 Clean Air Plan control measures are projects that would preclude the extension of a transit line or bike path, or projects that propose excessive parking beyond parking requirements. The proposed project would add 150 new residences to a dense, walkable urban area near a concentration of regional and local transit service. It would not preclude the extension of a transit line or a bike path or any other transit improvement, and thus would not disrupt or hinder implementation of control measures identified in the 2017 Clean Air Plan.

For the reasons described above, the proposed project would not interfere with implementation of the 2017 Clean Air Plan, and because the proposed project would be consistent with the applicable air quality plan that demonstrates how the region will improve ambient air quality

and achieve the state and federal ambient air quality standards, this impact would be less than significant.

Impact AQ-6: The proposed project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (Less than Significant)

Typical odor sources of concern include wastewater treatment plants, sanitary landfills, transfer stations, composting facilities, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing facilities, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, auto body shops, rendering plants, and coffee roasting facilities. During construction, diesel exhaust from construction equipment would generate some odors. However, construction-related odors would be temporary and would not persist upon project completion. Observation during site visits indicates that the project site is not substantially affected by sources of odors. Additionally, the proposed project includes new residential uses, which would not be significant sources of new odors. Therefore, odor impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative Air Quality Impacts

Impact C-AQ-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development in the project area would contribute to cumulative air quality impacts. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

As discussed above, regional air pollution is by its very nature largely a cumulative impact. Emissions from past, present, and future projects contribute to the region's adverse air quality on a cumulative basis. No single project by itself would be sufficient in size to result in regional nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Instead, a project's individual emissions contribute to existing cumulative adverse air quality impacts.⁷⁸ The project-level thresholds for criteria air pollutants are based on levels by which new sources are not anticipated to contribute to an air quality violation or result in a considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. Therefore, because the proposed project's construction (Impact AQ-1) and operational (Impact AQ-3) emissions would not exceed the project-level thresholds for criteria air pollutants, the proposed project would not be considered to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional air quality impacts.

As discussed above, the 807 Franklin Street project site is located in an area that already experiences poor air quality. The project would add new sources of TACs from construction within an area already adversely affected by air quality, resulting in a considerable contribution to cumulative health risk impacts on nearby sensitive receptors. This would be a significant cumulative impact. The 807 Franklin Street portion of the project would be required to implement **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1, Construction Air Quality at 807 Franklin Street**, which could reduce construction period emissions by as much as 94 percent. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level. Furthermore, compliance with article 38 would ensure that new

⁷⁸ BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, page 2-1, May 2017.

sensitive receptors are not substantially affected by existing or proposed sources of toxic air contaminants.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS — Would the project:					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and global climate change represent cumulative impacts. GHG emissions cumulatively contribute to the significant adverse environmental impacts of global climate change. No single project could generate enough GHG emissions to noticeably change the global average temperature; instead, the combination of GHG emissions from past, present, and future projects have contributed and will continue to contribute to global climate change and its associated environmental impacts.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (air district) 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. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 allows lead agencies to rely on a qualitative analysis to describe GHG emissions resulting from a project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5 allows for public agencies to analyze and mitigate GHG emissions as part of a larger plan for the reduction of GHGs and describes the required contents of such a plan. Accordingly, San Francisco has prepared Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions⁷⁹ which presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco's qualified GHG reduction strategy in compliance with the CEQA guidelines. These GHG reduction actions have resulted in a 28 percent reduction in GHG emissions in 2015 compared to 1990 levels,⁸⁰ exceeding the year 2020 reduction goals

79 San Francisco Planning Department, 2017, Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions in San Francisco, 2017. Available at <http://sf-planning.org/strategies-address-greenhouse-gas-emissions>.

80 San Francisco Department of the Environment, San Francisco's Carbon Footprint. Available at <https://sfenvironment.org/carbon-footprint>. Accessed July 19, 2017.

outlined in the air district's 2017 Clean Air Plan, Executive Order S-3-05, and Assembly Bill 32 (also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act).⁸¹

Given that the City has met the state and region's 2020 GHG reduction targets and San Francisco's GHG reduction goals are consistent with, or more aggressive than, the long-term goals established under order S-3-05⁸², order B-30-15,^{83,84} and Senate Bill 32^{85,86} the City's GHG reduction goals are consistent with order S-3-05, order B-30-15, Assembly Bill 32, Senate Bill 32 and the 2017 Clean Air Plan. Therefore, proposed projects that are consistent with the City's GHG reduction strategy would be consistent with the aforementioned GHG reduction goals, would not conflict with these plans or result in significant GHG emissions, and would therefore not exceed San Francisco's applicable GHG threshold of significance.

The following analysis of the proposed project's impact on climate change focuses on the project's contribution to cumulatively significant GHG emissions. Because no individual project could emit GHGs at a level that could result in a significant impact on the global climate, this analysis is in a cumulative context, and this section does not include an individual project-specific impact statement.

Impact C-GG-1: The proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, but not at levels that would result in a significant impact on the environment or conflict with any policy,

81 Executive Order S-3-05, Assembly Bill 32, and the air district's 2017 Clean Air Plan (continuing the trajectory set in the 2010 Clean Air Plan) set a target of reducing GHG emissions to below 1990 levels by year 2020.

82 Office of the Governor, Executive Order S-3-05, 2005. Available at <http://www.pcl.org/projects/2008symposium/proceedings/Coatsworth12.pdf>. Accessed March 16, 2016. 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 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (MTCO₂E)); by 2020, reduce emissions to 1990 levels (approximately 427 million MTCO₂E); and by 2050 reduce emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels (approximately 85 million MTCO₂E). Because of the differential heat absorption potential of various GHGs, GHG emissions are frequently measured in "carbon dioxide-equivalents," which present a weighted average based on each gas's heat absorption (or "global warming") potential.

83 Office of the Governor, Executive Order B-30-15, April 29, 2015. Available at <https://www.gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=18938>. Accessed November 15, 2017. Executive Order B-30-15, issued on April 29, 2015, sets forth a target of reducing GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 (estimated at 2.9 million MTCO₂E).

84 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.

85 Senate Bill 32 amends California Health and Safety Code Division 25.5 (also known as the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006) by adding Section 38566, which directs that statewide greenhouse gas emissions to be reduced by 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

86 Senate Bill 32 was paired with Assembly Bill 197, which would modify the structure of the State Air Resources Board; institute requirements for the disclosure of greenhouse gas emissions criteria pollutants, and toxic air contaminants; and establish requirements for the review and adoption of rules, regulations, and measures for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. (Less than Significant)

Individual projects contribute to the cumulative effects of climate change by directly or indirectly emitting GHGs during construction and operational phases. Direct operational emissions include GHG emissions from new vehicle trips and area sources (natural gas combustion). Indirect emissions include emissions from electricity providers; energy required to pump, treat, and convey water; and emissions associated with waste removal, disposal, and landfill operations.

The proposed project involves the following components on two project sites: (1) relocate an existing three-story, 16,700 sf building at 635 Fulton Street, currently occupied by a mortuary and two dwelling units, to the eastern edge of its site along the property line, (2) relocate an existing single-family residential Victorian building from 807 Franklin Street to 635 Fulton Street (3) add one-story vertical additions and horizontal rear additions to both buildings at 635 Fulton Street, (4) convert the mortuary use and reconfigure the single-family Victorian, resulting in a total of 17 dwelling units and no vehicle parking at 635 Fulton Street, and (5) construct a new nine-story building at 807 Franklin Street containing 48 dwelling units and 17 parking spaces.

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

Compliance with the City's transportation management programs, transportation sustainability fee, and bicycle parking 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 (applicable to 807 Franklin Street but not 635 Fulton Street), Stormwater Management Ordinance, green building requirements for water use reduction, the Water Efficient Irrigation Ordinance, the Residential Water Conservation Ordinance, and green building requirements for renewable energy, which would promote energy and water efficiency, thereby reducing the proposed project's energy-related GHG emissions.⁸⁷

The proposed project's waste-related emissions would be reduced through compliance with the City's Recycling and Compositing Ordinance, Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Ordinance, and construction and demolition debris recycling requirements. These regulations reduce the amount of materials sent to a landfill, reducing GHGs emitted by landfill operations.

⁸⁷ Compliance with water conservation measures reduce the energy (and GHG emissions) required to convey, pump and treat water required for the project.

These regulations also promote reuse of materials, conserving their embodied energy⁸⁸ 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 air district’s wood-burning regulations would reduce emissions of GHGs and black carbon, respectively. Regulations requiring low-emitting finishes would reduce volatile organic compounds.⁸⁹ Thus, the proposed project was determined to be consistent with San Francisco’s GHG reduction strategy.^{90,91}

The project sponsor is required to comply with these regulations, which have proven effective as San Francisco’s GHG emissions have measurably decreased when compared to 1990 emissions levels, demonstrating that the City has met and exceeded Executive Order S-3-05, Assembly Bill 32, and the 2017 Clean Air Plan GHG reduction goals for the year 2020. Furthermore, the city has met its 2017 GHG reduction goal of reducing GHG emissions to 25% below 1990 levels by 2017. Other existing regulations, such as those implemented through Assembly Bill 32, will continue to reduce a proposed project’s contribution to climate change. In addition, San Francisco’s local GHG reduction targets are consistent with the long-term GHG reduction goals of Executive Order S-3-05, Executive Order B-30-15, Assembly Bill 32, Senate Bill 32 and the 2017 Clean Air Plan. Therefore, because the proposed project is consistent with the City’s GHG reduction strategy, it is also consistent with the GHG reduction goals of Executive Order S-3-05, Executive Order B-30-15, Assembly Bill 32, Senate Bill 32 and the 2017 Clean Air Plan, would not conflict with these plans, and would therefore not exceed San Francisco’s applicable GHG threshold of significance. As such, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact with respect to GHG emissions. No mitigation measures are necessary.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
8. WIND AND SHADOW —Would the project:					
a) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁸⁸ Embodied energy is the total energy required for the extraction, processing, manufacture and delivery of building materials to the building site.

⁸⁹ While not a GHG, volatile organic compounds 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 volatile organic compound emissions would reduce the anticipated local effects of global warming.

⁹⁰ San Francisco Planning Department, Greenhouse Gas Analysis: Compliance Checklist for 807 Franklin Street, May 4, 2018.

⁹¹ San Francisco Planning Department, Greenhouse Gas Analysis: Compliance Checklist for 635 Fulton Street, May 4, 2018.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact WS-1: The proposed project would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas. (Less than Significant)

In San Francisco, average winds speeds are the highest in the summer and lowest in winter. However, the strongest peak wind speeds occur in winter. The highest average wind speeds occur in mid-afternoon and the lowest in the early morning. Based on over 40 years of recordkeeping, the highest mean hourly wind speeds (approximately 20 mph) occur midafternoon in July, while the lowest mean hourly wind speeds (in the range of 6 to 9 mph) occur throughout the day in November. Meteorological data collected at the old San Francisco Federal Building at 50 United Nations Plaza over a 6-year period⁹² show that westerly⁹³ through northwesterly winds are the most frequent and strongest winds during all seasons. Of the 16 primary wind directions, four have the greatest frequency of occurrence: these are northwest, west-northwest, west, and southwest (referred to as prevailing winds).

Analysis of the Federal Building wind data shows that during the hours from 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., about 70 percent of the winds blow from five adjacent directions of the 16 directions as follows: northwest (10 percent of all winds), west-northwest (14 percent of all winds), west (35 percent of all winds), west-southwest (accounting for 2 percent of all winds), and southwest (9 percent of all winds). In San Francisco, over 90 percent of all measured winds with speeds over 13 mph blow from these five directions. The other 10 percent of winds over 13 mph are from storms and can come from any other direction.

The San Francisco Planning Code establishes wind comfort and wind hazard criteria used to evaluate new development in four areas of the City. As none of these areas includes the project sites, the wind comfort and wind hazard criteria established in the planning code would not be applicable. The cited planning code sections provide that any new building or addition in these areas of the City that would cause wind speeds to exceed the hazard level of 26-mph-equivalent wind speed (as defined in the planning code) more than one hour of any year must be modified to meet this criterion. (The 26 mph standard accounts for short-term—3-minute averaged—wind observations at 36 mph as equivalent to the frequency of an hourly averaged wind of 26 mph. As noted above, winds over 34 mph make it difficult for a person to maintain balance, and gusts can blow a person over.) The San Francisco Planning Department generally refers to the wind hazard

⁹² Arens, E. et al., "Developing the San Francisco Wind Ordinance and its Guidelines for Compliance," Building and Environment, Vol. 24, No. 4, pages 297-303, 1989.

⁹³ Wind directions are reported as directions from which the winds blow.

criterion to determine the significance for CEQA purposes evaluate wind effects of new development in all areas of the city.

Building structures near or greater than 100 feet in height could create pedestrian level conditions such that the wind hazard criterion of 26-mph-equivalent wind speed for a single hour of the year would be exceeded. There is no threshold height that triggers the need for wind-tunnel testing to determine whether the building design would result in street-level winds that exceed the standard. It is generally understood, however, from many prior wind-tunnel tests on a variety of projects in San Francisco that most, if not all, buildings under 100 feet do not result in adverse wind effects at street level, barring unusual circumstances.

807 Franklin Street

The proposed building at 807 Franklin Street would be 80 feet tall, and 96 feet tall with rooftop appurtenances. Due to the height of the proposed building, a wind evaluation was conducted to evaluate the proposed project's impact on pedestrian wind impacts.⁹⁴

While the proposed building would be taller than some of adjacent buildings, the size and scale of the project is comparable to the buildings on both sides of Eddy Street, on the east side of Franklin Street, and across Turk Street. The project is considered to be an infill building, and as an infill building with similar heights to surrounding structures, it is anticipated that the construction of the building would improve nearby wind conditions by reducing the amount of wind turbulence in the wind flow. The project is not expected to materially alter the wind flows, directions, and/or velocities in the project vicinity, especially on the Franklin Street sidewalks adjacent to the building. It is anticipated that wind speed increases caused by the project would occur primarily on private property at the rear of the 807 Franklin Street project site, whereas wind speed decreases would occur downwind on the public sidewalks of Franklin and Larch Streets. Wind speed is not expected to change on the Eddy Street and Turk Street sidewalks. For these reasons, the proposed building at 807 Franklin Street would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas, and this impact would be less than significant.

635 Fulton Street

The proposed project at 635 Fulton Street would involve modifications to the existing mortuary building and the relocated Victorian building. The mortuary building is anticipated to be 46 feet tall and the Victorian building is anticipated to be 44 feet tall; overall, the proposed building height at 635 Fulton Street would be less than 100 feet. Because the project elements would all be less than 100 feet tall and are not located near any other tall buildings, the project would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas.

Impact WS-2: The proposed project would not create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas. (Less than Significant)

⁹⁴ Environmental Science and Associates. Wind Evaluation of Proposed Project, 807 Franklin Street, San Francisco, CA, June 2017.

In an urban environment, shadow is a function of the height, size, and massing of buildings and other elements of the built environment, and the angle of the sun. The angle of the sun varies due to the time of day (from rotation of the earth) and the change in seasons (due to the earth's elliptical orbit around the sun and the earth's tilted axis). The longer mid-day shadows are cast during the winter, when the mid-day sun is lowest in the sky, and the shorter mid-day shadows are cast during the summer, when the mid-day sun is higher in the sky. At the time of the summer solstice (which falls on approximately June 21 of every year), the mid-day sun is highest in the sky, and the longest day and shortest night occur on this date. Conversely, the shortest day and longest night occur on the winter solstice (which falls on approximately December 21 of every year). The vernal and fall equinoxes (when day and night are equal in length) represent the halfway point between solstices.

Planning Code section 295, which was adopted in response to Proposition K (passed November 1984), mandates that new structures above 40 feet in height that would cast additional shadows on properties under the jurisdiction of, or designated to be acquired by, the Recreation and Parks Department cannot be approved by the Planning Commission (based on recommendation from the Recreation and Park Commission) if the shadow "will have any adverse impact on the use" of the park, unless the impact is determined to be insignificant.

807 Franklin Street

Two parks under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department are located a block west of the project site. Jefferson Square is a 5.6-acre urban park bounded by Eddy Street to the north, Turk Street to the south, Gough Street to the east, and Laguna Street to the west. Across Turk Street and directly south of Jefferson Square is Margaret S. Hayward Playground, a 5.6-acre property that is bounded by Turk Street to the north, Gough Street to the east, Laguna Street to the west, and Golden Gate Avenue to the south. Margaret S. Hayward Playground also includes a clubhouse, tennis and basketball courts, and a baseball field (James P. Lang Field).

The proposed building at 807 Franklin Street would be 80 feet tall, and 96 feet tall with rooftop appurtenances. The Planning Department prepared a preliminary shadow fan analysis, which indicated that the project could potentially cast new shadow on Jefferson Square, but would not cast shadow on Margaret S. Hayward Playground/James P. Lang Field.⁹⁵ The proposed project would not cast shadows on any public school facilities.

In compliance with Planning Code section 295, the Recreation and Parks Commission must determine whether project shadow would have a significant adverse impact on the use of Jefferson Square. A technical shadow study was completed to evaluate potential impacts to Jefferson Square.⁹⁶

⁹⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, Preliminary Shadow Fan, 807 Franklin Street, October 28, 2013.

⁹⁶ Prevision Design, Shadow Analysis Report for the Proposed 807 Franklin Street per SF Planning Code section 295 Standards, February 26, 2018.

Jefferson Square is an uphill sloping park containing grassy and landscaped areas, paved walkways and stairs, eight benches, areas for active and passive uses, and centrally located off-leash dog play areas. The existing shadow patterns at Jefferson Square include early morning shading on the eastern half of the park and late afternoon evening shading along the western edge, and little to no midway shadow. Based on a theoretical annual available sunlight, the Jefferson Square's current shadow load is 1.361 percent annually.⁹⁷

To determine the impact of 807 Franklin Street's net new shadow on Jefferson Square, multiple factors were taken into consideration. The value of sunlight depends on the nature of features being shaded, the intensity of use of these features, and the duration of the shadow on these features. Benches, picnic tables, play areas, and other similar features where users are typically stationary for longer periods of time are considered more sensitive than transitional spaces such as pathways. Likewise, open areas of sufficient size that do not have large amount of shadow may be considered less affected by net new shadow if the areas have low-use intensity and recreation and park users are able to navigate to sunny spots with minimal inconvenience. Finally, the value of sunlight varies with the abundance or scarcity of features relative to the demand.

The proposed 807 Franklin Street building would result in net new shadow on Jefferson Square, resulting in a new annual total shadow load of 1.365 percent (0.004 percent above current levels). This new net shadow would occur during the early morning hours between April 13 and August 29 and would be confined to the southeast corner of the park. The days of maximum net new shadow load on the park due to the proposed project would occur on May 31 and July 12, when the proposed project would shade the southeast corner of the park starting at 6:56 a.m. and leave the park between 7:00 and 7:14 a.m., a duration of approximately 18 minutes. The timing and duration of proposed project-generated net new shadow would vary throughout the year, with net new shadow occurring between 6:46 and 7:44 a.m. and, when present, lasting an average of approximately 11 minutes.

The portions of the park that would receive new shadow from the proposed project include walkways, some landscaped areas, and a small portion of grass adjacent to the pathway. Areas of Jefferson Square with the greatest active use, such as the fixed benches, centrally located grassy areas, and off-leash dog play areas, would not be impacted by net new shadow.

The proposed 807 Franklin Street building would not create new shadow in a manner that would substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas given the context and intensity of the net new shadow. Therefore, the proposed building at 807 Franklin Street would not create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas.

The proposed project would shade portions of streets, sidewalks, and private properties in the project vicinity at various times of the day throughout the year. Shadows on streets and

⁹⁷ Theoretical annual available sunlight is defined as the amount of sun that would fall on the park throughout the year if there were no shadow present at any time.

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 properties may regard the increase in shadow as undesirable, the limited increase in shading of private properties as a result of the proposed project would not be considered a significant impact under CEQA. For these reasons, the proposed building at 807 Franklin Street would not create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas, and this impact would be less than significant.

635 Fulton Street

The proposed project at 635 Fulton Street would involve modifications to the existing mortuary structure and the relocated Victorian structure. The mortuary building is anticipated to be 46 feet tall and the Victorian building is anticipated to be approximately 44 feet tall. The San Francisco 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 or open spaces. The shadow fan analysis indicated that the project as proposed would not cast shadows on any public school facilities but could potentially cast shadow on the Buchanan Street Mall, a San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department property subject to Planning Code section 295 review.⁹⁸ A technical shadow study was completed to evaluate potential impacts to the Buchanan Street Mall.⁹⁹ The shadow study incorporated additional project refinements into the shadow modeling, such as the lower building height and building setbacks, which were not taken into consideration in the preliminary shadow fan analysis. Taking into account the refined design, the shadow modeling indicated that the proposed project would not cast any net new shadow on the Buchanan Street Mall at any time during the year.

While the project would not shade any portion of the Buchanan Street Mall, the proposed project would shade portions of streets, sidewalks, and private properties in the project vicinity at various times of the day throughout the year. Shadows on 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 properties may regard the increase in shadow as undesirable, the limited increase in shading of private properties as a result of the proposed project would not be considered a significant impact under CEQA. For these reasons, the proposed building at 635 Fulton Street would not create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas, and this impact would be less than significant.

Impact C-WS-1: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to wind and shadow. (Less than Significant)

⁹⁸ San Francisco Planning Department, Preliminary Shadow Fan, 635 Fulton Street, August 17, 2017.

⁹⁹ CADP, 635 Fulton Street Shadow Analysis, December 20, 2017.

807 Franklin Street Cumulative Wind Impacts

The proposed 807 Franklin Street building would be 80 feet tall and 96 feet tall with rooftop appurtenances. The majority of the proposed new buildings listed in Table 2 on page 34 would be in similar scale and context to the existing conditions, so there is no anticipated alteration of existing wind flows, directions, and/or velocities in the vicinity of the 807 Franklin Street site as a result of cumulative development. Furthermore, as an infill project situated between a five-story building (at the corner of Franklin and Eddy Streets) and a gas station (on the corner of Franklin and Turk Streets), the 807 Franklin Street building is expected to improve pedestrian wind conditions on the adjacent sidewalks by reducing the amount of wind turbulence in the wind flow. Therefore, cumulative wind hazard impacts from the 807 Franklin Street building would be less than significant.

635 Fulton Street Cumulative Wind Impacts

As discussed above, the proposed building at 635 Fulton Street would be less than 100 feet tall and would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas. For this reason, the 635 Fulton Street building would not combine with cumulative development projects to create or contribute to a cumulative wind impact.

807 Franklin Street Cumulative Shadow Impacts

The proposed building would cast net new shadow on Jefferson Square, a park protected by Planning Code section 295. One project listed in Table 2, a proposed eight-story building at 950 Gough Street, would result in shadow effects on Jefferson Park; this project was considered in the shadow analysis of 807 Franklin Street to determine the cumulative shadow effect on Jefferson Square. The cumulative net new shadow from the 807 Franklin Street building and the 950 Gough Street building would represent a cumulative annual shadow load of 1.996 percent on Jefferson Square, a cumulative increase of 0.635 percent over existing conditions. The maximum net new shadow on Jefferson Square would occur on July 19 at 7:01 a.m., and the majority of the new net shadow from the 807 Franklin Street would occur within the proposed shadow of the 950 Gough Street building; only the southeast corner of Jefferson Square (at Gough and Turk streets) would be shaded by the solely by 807 Franklin Street building at this time (see Figure 29).

Given the limited duration of the building's net new shadow (an average of 11 minutes of net new shadow from April 29 to August 30 in the early mornings) and the fact that the project would not increase net new shadow on the areas of the park with the greatest active uses, such as the fixed benches, the centrally located grassy areas, and the off-leash dog play areas, the proposed project would not combine to create or contribute to a cumulative shadow impact on Jefferson Square. Thus, cumulative shadow impacts from the 807 Franklin Street building would be less than significant.

635 Fulton Street Cumulative Shadow Impacts

The proposed building would be greater than 40 feet tall but would not result in any net new shadow on Planning Code section 295 properties. For this reason, the 635 Fulton Street building would not combine with cumulative development projects to create or contribute to a cumulative shadow impact.



FIGURE 29 - 807 FRANKLIN STREET SHADOW STUDY DIAGRAM

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
9. RECREATION					
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact RE-1: The proposed project would not increase the use of existing parks and recreational facilities, would not deteriorate any such facilities, and would not require the expansion of such facilities. (Less than Significant)

The park and recreational facilities closest to 807 Franklin Street are the 5.6-acre Jefferson Square and the 5-acre Margaret S. Hayward Playground/ James P. Lang Field, both located one block to the west of the project site. The 807 Franklin Street project site would provide passive recreational uses onsite for the residents through approximately 2,100 sf of private open space and 1,400 sf of common open space. In addition, residents of the proposed units would be within walking distance of the above-noted open spaces.

The neighborhood parks and recreational facilities closest to the 635 Fulton Street site are the linear Buchanan Street Mall, one half-block to the west of the project site; Jefferson Square and Margaret S. Hayward Playground/James P. Lang Field three blocks northeast of the project site; and the 12.7-acre Alamo Square four blocks west of the project site. The 635 Fulton Street project site would include 825 sf of private open space and 3,161 sf of common open space for residents.

The projected 150 new permanent residents to the project sites would not be large enough to substantially increase demand for, or use of, neighborhood parks or recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration would be expected. Also, the permanent residential population on the sites would not require the construction of new recreational facilities or the expansion of existing facilities.

For these reasons, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on recreational facilities and resources.

Impact C-RE-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulative impacts on recreational facilities or resources. (Less than Significant)

Cumulative residential development in the project vicinity would result in an intensification of land uses and a cumulative increase in the demand for recreational facilities and resources in the project vicinity and in the city overall. The city has accounted for such growth in the 2014 update of the Recreation and Open Space Element of the San Francisco General Plan.¹⁰⁰ In addition, San Francisco voters passed two bond measures, in 2008 and 2012, to fund the acquisition, planning, and renovation of the recreational resources for the city. For these reasons, the proposed project would not combine with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity to create a significant cumulative impact on recreational facilities or resources.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
10. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS — Would the project:					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

¹⁰⁰ San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco General Plan, Recreation and Open Space Element, April 2014, pp. 20-36. Available at http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/Recreation_OpenSpace_Element_ADOPTED.pdf. Accessed May 20, 2016.

The project sites are within an urban area that is served by established utility service systems, including water, wastewater and stormwater collection and treatment, and solid waste collection and disposal. The proposed project would add an estimated 150 new residents to the sites that would increase the local demand for utilities and utility services, but not in excess of amounts expected and provided for in the project area under the San Francisco General Plan and other applicable planning documents, as discussed below.

Impact UT-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. (Less than Significant)

Project-related wastewater and stormwater would be treated to standards set forth in the city's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit for the city's Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant prior to discharge into San Francisco Bay. These permit standards are set and regulated by the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with water board requirements related to wastewater discharge and the impact would be less than significant.

Impact UT-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in water demand or wastewater generation in excess of the capacity of the water and wastewater treatment provider that would serve the project, and would not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater collection and treatment facilities. (Less than Significant)

Most of San Francisco, including the project sites, is served by a combined wastewater system. Under such a system, sewage and stormwater flows are captured by a single collection system and the combined flows are treated through the same wastewater treatment plants. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) provides and operates water supply and wastewater treatment facilities for the city.

Stormwater Drainage

The 807 Franklin Street project site is partially covered with impervious surfaces (the building) and an approximately 5,500 sf surface parking lot that is partially paved and partially graveled; the proposed new development could potentially reduce impervious surface area on the project site. The 635 Fulton Street project site is fully covered with impervious surfaces (the building and paved parking); the proposed development would increase impervious surface area on the project site. Both project sites would be required to comply with the SFPUC's stormwater management requirements and design guidelines.¹⁰¹ The project sponsor would submit stormwater control plans for both project sites; these plans would reduce stormwater runoff volume and runoff rates from the project site by implementing low impact design approaches such as reduced impervious cover, reuse of stormwater, or increased infiltration.

¹⁰¹ San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, San Francisco Stormwater Management Requirements and Design Guidelines, May 2016.
<http://www.sfwater.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentID=9026>. Accessed May 3, 2018.

Therefore, the project would comply with the guidelines as required and would not significantly increase stormwater flows from the project site.

Water Demand and Wastewater

The proposed project would add an estimated 150 new residents to the two project sites. This would result in increased water demand and increased wastewater flows.

Although the proposed project would incrementally increase the demand for potable water in San Francisco, the estimated increase in demand is not in excess of amounts expected and provided for in the project area by the utility service provider: according to the SFPUC projections through the year 2040, sufficient supplies are available through existing water entitlements to serve existing and projected new development.¹⁰² Further, as required by the San Francisco Green Building Code,¹⁰³ the proposed project would incorporate water-conserving design features, such as low-flush toilets and urinals, which would reduce both water demand and wastewater production. The project sites are not located within a designated recycled water use area, as defined in San Francisco's Recycled Water Ordinance 390-91 and 393-94.¹⁰⁴ The project therefore would not be required to install a recycled water system. Further, wastewater and water lines that serve the project site have sufficient capacity to serve the population added to the area by the project. As part of the typical project review process, the project sponsor would coordinate with the SFPUC to ensure that any increases in wastewater could be met by sewer system capacity. Moreover, the SFPUC would also review and approve dewatering discharge into the sewer system and would coordinate with the sponsor related to any modifications that affect the street flow, including but not limited to sidewalk bulbouts and altered or moved catch basins.

The SFPUC's treatment facilities have adequate capacity to serve the growth anticipated in the general plan. The project would not cause collection treatment capacity of the sewer system in the city to be exceeded. In addition, the proposed project would be required to comply with San Francisco's Mandatory Use of Alternate Water Supplies in New Construction Ordinance, adopted as Chapter 12C of the San Francisco Health Code. This ordinance regulates the collection, treatment and use of alternate water sources in San Francisco.

The project would provide open space at both project sites. While it is unknown how much of that space would be landscaped, if the project installs 500 sf or more of landscape areas, it would be required to comply with San Francisco's Water Efficient Irrigation Ordinance, adopted as

102 San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, June 14, 2016.

Available at <http://www.sfwater.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=9300>. Accessed May 3, 2018.

103 San Francisco Green Building Code,

[http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/sfbuilding/greenbuildingcode2016edition?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca\\$anc=JD_GreenBuilding](http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/sfbuilding/greenbuildingcode2016edition?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$anc=JD_GreenBuilding). Accessed May 3, 2018.

104 SFPUC, Designated Recycled Water Use Areas in San Francisco.

<http://sfgov.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=c7681b7bfc0d43ac92809f37c4d0f1cc&extent=-122.6051,37.6673,-122.2759,37.8627>. Accessed May 3, 2018.

Chapter 63 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and the SFPUC Rules and Regulations Regarding Water Service to Customers. The project's landscape and irrigation plans shall be reviewed and approved by the SFPUC prior to installation.

With regard to the project's construction phase, CCSF Ordinance 175-91 restricts the use of potable water for soil compaction and dust control activities undertaken in conjunction with any construction or demolition project occurring within the boundaries of San Francisco, unless permission is obtained from the SFPUC. Non-potable water must be used for soil compaction and dust control activities during project construction or demolition. Recycled water is available from the SFPUC for dust control on roads and streets. However, per state regulations, recycled water cannot be used for demolition, pressure washing, or dust control through aerial spraying. The SFPUC operates a recycled water truck-fill station at the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant that provides recycled water for these activities at no charge.

For the reasons discussed above, the water and wastewater service demand associated with the project-related residential population increase would not exceed the service capacity of the existing wastewater treatment provider or substantially increase the demand for wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage facilities, and thus would not require the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Impact UT-3: The proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. (Less than Significant)

In September 2015, the city entered into a landfill disposal agreement with Recology, Inc. for disposal of all solid waste collected in San Francisco, at the Recology Hay Road Landfill in Solano County, through September 2024 or until 3.4 million tons have been disposed, whichever occurs first. The city would have an option to renew the agreement for a period of six years or until an additional 1.6 million tons have been disposed, whichever occurs first.¹⁰⁵ The Recology Hay Road Landfill is permitted to accept up to 2,400 tons per day of solid waste. At that maximum permitted rate, the landfill has the capacity to accommodate solid waste until approximately 2034. Under existing conditions, the landfill receives an average of approximately 1,850 tons per day from all sources, with approximately 1,200 tons per day from San Francisco, which includes residential and commercial waste and demolition and construction debris that cannot be reused or recycled¹⁰⁶ (see discussion below). At the current rate of disposal, the landfill closure has operating capacity until 2041. The city's contract with the Recology Hay Road Landfill will extend until 2031 or when the city has disposed 5 million tons of solid waste, whichever occurs

¹⁰⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, Agreement for Disposal of San Francisco Municipal Solid Waste at Recology Hay Road Landfill in Solano County, Final Negative Declaration, Planning Department Case No. 2014.0653, May 21, 2015. Available at http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/2014.0653E_Revised_FND.pdf. Accessed May 11, 2018.

¹⁰⁶ CalRecycle, 2010, Jurisdiction diversion/disposal rate detail. Available at <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/reports/diversionprogram/JurisdictionDiversionDetail.aspx?JurisdictionID=438&Year=2010>. Accessed October 23, 2017.

first. At that point, the city would either further extend the landfill contract or find and entitle an alternative landfill site.

The project's population is part of the population growth taken into account in the San Francisco General Plan 2014 Housing Element Update, as discussed under Section E.2, Population and Housing, and therefore can be assumed to have been taken into account in waste management planning. Further, the project would be required to implement the city's Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance (No. 100-09), the objective of which is to minimize the City's landfill trash generation. In compliance with this ordinance, the project would be required to provide convenient facilities for the separation of recyclables, compostables and landfill trash for its users. All occupants of the project would be required to separate disposed material.

Project construction also would generate demolition and construction waste. The city's Mandatory Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Ordinance (No. 27-06) requires that, in order to obtain a permit for complete demolition, the project sponsor must submit a demolition debris recovery plan to the San Francisco Department of the Environment that provides for a minimum of 65 percent diversion from landfill of construction and demolition debris, and source separation for reuse or recycling. This plan must be submitted to and approved by the Department of the Environment before the Department of Building Inspection will issue a full demolition permit. Demolition and construction debris such as would be generated by the proposed project is included in the city's land waste generation daily averages cited above. As discussed above, the city has access to adequate landfill capacity at least through 2031 and potentially through 2041, and anticipates that an adequate alternative site will be identified at that point. On this basis, the city has adequate solid waste capacity to serve the proposed project. Therefore, the project's impact with respect to landfill capacity would be less than significant.

Impact C-UT-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonable foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulative impact related to utilities and service systems. (Less than Significant)

Cumulative development in the project vicinity would incrementally increase demand for utilities and service systems within the city, but not beyond levels anticipated and planned for by the City's public service providers. The SFPUC has accounted for the anticipated growth in its water demand and wastewater service projections. The City also has implemented various programs to minimize generation of solid waste disposed to landfills from all projects, as discussed above. All development projects in the city, including development that contributes to demand for utility service in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project, as well as projects throughout the city that contribute to water demand and the demand for wastewater treatment and for solid waste disposal, are required to comply with the City's water conservation, wastewater minimization, and solid waste reduction ordinances and policies. Compliance with these ordinances would reduce the effects of cumulative demand for utility capacity and services such that service capacities would not be exceeded; therefore, the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, have been accounted for in these plans and would not result in a cumulative utilities and service systems impact.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
11. PUBLIC SERVICES					
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or 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 of the public services such as fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact PS-1: The proposed project would increase demand for police and fire protection services but would not require construction of new or physically altered facilities, associated with the provision of such services, that could cause significant environmental impacts. (Less than Significant)

Both project sites receive police protection services from the San Francisco Police Department. The Northern police station, located at 1125 Fillmore Street, approximately a half-mile away from 807 Franklin Street and 0.4 mile away from 635 Fulton Street, serves both project sites.¹⁰⁷ The station underwent seismic, structural, electrical and plumbing improvements in 2016 and no expansions of the station are proposed. Fire Station 36, located at 109 Oak Street is about a half mile from both project sites and provides fire protection and first responder services for the project site.¹⁰⁸ This fire station was upgraded and completely renovated in 2015. In addition, a new public safety building, which serves as citywide police and fire headquarters, was completed in 2016. There are no current plans to construct or expand additional police or fire stations that serve the project area.

The project would add an estimated 150 residents to the project site. The project would comply with the regulations of the 2016 California Fire Code, which includes requirements for fire protection systems, such as the provision of smoke alarms and fire extinguishers, adequate building access, and emergency response systems.

The proposed project would incrementally contribute to increased service call volume and potential traffic delays for police department and fire department services due to cumulative development in the project area, but the project's contribution would not likely be substantial compared to the existing demand and capacity for police, fire suppression and emergency

¹⁰⁷ San Francisco Police Department, <http://sanfranciscopolice.org/police-district-maps>. Accessed April 30, 2018.

¹⁰⁸ San Francisco Fire Department, <http://sf-fire.org/FIRE-STATION-LOCATIONS>. Accessed April 30, 2018.

medical services in the city. As needed, the police and fire departments would minimize potential localized level of service impacts by shifting primary response duties to other nearby police or fire stations. Project-related increases to the city's tax base would contribute to the funding of increased services. For these reasons, the proposed project would not require the construction or alteration of a police or fire station or affect response times, service ratios, or other performance objectives related to police and fire protection services, and these impacts would be less than significant.

Impact PS-2: The proposed project would not result in a substantial increased demand for school facilities and would not require new or expanded school facilities. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would add an estimated 150 new residents in 65 households. Some of the households could include school-aged children who might attend schools operated by the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), while others might attend private schools. SFUSD ongoing enrollment forecasting allows the district to plan for additional expansion of its facilities if determined necessary.

Given the SFUSD's overall capacity of almost 64,000 students¹⁰⁹, the increase of five students¹¹⁰ associated with the project would not substantially change the demand for schools, nor would the project, alone, result in the need for construction of new school facilities.

Impact PS-3: The proposed project would not substantially increase the demand for other government services, and would not necessitate the need for new or physically altered government facilities to meet service performance objectives. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would increase the population of the city by approximately 150 residents. Population increase in the area from development of the proposed project would be nominal compared to population growth for the city overall. The project area is adequately served by government facilities. The population of the proposed project would not generate the need for new or physically altered government facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on governmental facilities.

¹⁰⁹ San Francisco Unified School District. Growing Population, Growing Schools. SPUR Forum Presentation, Slide 14. August 31, 2016. Available at https://www.spur.org/sites/default/files/events_pdfs/SPUR%20Forum_August%2031%202016.pptx_.pdf. Accessed May 23, 2018.

¹¹⁰ Student generation rates are calculated based on the following: of 65 units, eight units would be affordable and 57 would be market-rate, therefore (8 units x 0.25 students/unit) + (57 units x 0.05 students/unit) = 5 students. This is based on data provided by Lapkoff & Goblat Demographic Research, Inc., Demographic Analyses and Enrollment Forecasts for the San Francisco Unified School District, February 16, 2018, p. 33, table II-9. Available at <http://www.sfusd.edu/en/assets/sfusd-staff/about-SFUSD/files/demographic-analyses-enrollment-forecast.pdf>, accessed March 2, 2018.

Impact C-PS-1: The proposed project, combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not have a substantial cumulative impact to public services. (Less than Significant)

Development of cumulative projects within the city would result in increased population and employment-generating uses, which would result in an associated increase in the number of students to be served by the San Francisco Unified School District. Based on the projections for new housing units, population growth, birth rates, and resulting school enrollment, SFUSD estimates that San Francisco public schools will reach capacity by the year 2025.¹¹¹ The construction of new or expanded schools could have significant impacts on the environment such as construction-period noise and air quality impacts. However, any such impacts would be limited in both duration and magnitude (similar to other development projects in San Francisco), would comply with existing regulations such as the noise ordinance, Article 38 of the Health Code, the construction dust control ordinance, the clean construction ordinance, and construction stormwater regulations, would be subject to project-level CEQA review that if necessary would include additional measures to mitigate significant effects on the environment. Therefore, implementation of the project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts related to the construction of new or expanded schools.

In addition, the proposed project, in combination with the other residential and mixed-use projects proposed in the area, would incrementally increase demand for public services, which include fire and police protection, and other governmental services. The Fire Department, the Police Department, and other city agencies have accounted for such growth in providing other public services to the residents of San Francisco. For these reasons, the proposed project would not combine with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity to create a significant cumulative impact related to public services.

¹¹¹ San Francisco Unified School District. Growing Population, Growing Schools. SPUR Forum Presentation, Slide 14. August 31, 2016. Available at https://www.spur.org/sites/default/files/events_pdfs/SPUR%20Forum_August%2031%202016.pptx_.pdf. Accessed May 23, 2018.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES — Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project sites are located in a developed area of San Francisco. They provide no habitat for special status plants or wildlife, and do not include any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities as defined by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Questions 13a, 13b and 13c therefore are not applicable to the proposed project. The proposed project does not fall within any local, regional or state habitat conservation plan areas; therefore, Question 13f also is not applicable to the proposed project.

The project sites are not located within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, a Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans. The project sites are not located within a federally protected wetland, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and do not contain riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. Therefore, topics 12b, 12c, and 12f are not applicable to the proposed project.

Impact BI-1: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any special-status species. (Less than Significant)

The project sites are located in an urban environment with high levels of human activity, and only common bird species are likely to nest in the area. The project sites are previously developed, and thus, any special-status species have been extirpated from the project area. The project sites do not provide habitat for any rare or endangered plant or wildlife species. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on special-status species.

Impact BI-2: The proposed project would not interfere with the movement of native resident or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. (Less than Significant)

San Francisco is within the Pacific Flyway, a major north-south route of travel for migratory birds along the western portion of the Americas. Nesting birds, their nests, and eggs are fully protected by the California Fish and Game Code (Sections 3503, 3503.5, 3511, and 3513). Tree removal activities could potentially disturb nesting birds that are protected under the California Fish and Game Code. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) enforces the code by requiring that projects incorporate measures to avoid and minimize impacts to nesting birds if any tree removal would occur during the nesting or breeding season. For example, a qualified biologist would conduct a tree survey within 15 days before the start of construction occurring in March through May; or 30 days before the start of construction occurring in June through August. These surveys would help establish the presence of any nesting birds that would need to be protected through avoidance and minimization measures. Additionally, CDFW staff may require notifications if any active nests are identified including consultation with CDFW and establishment of construction-free buffer zones.

Compliance with these existing state regulations and City-adopted regulations for bird-safe buildings and state migratory bird regulations. For these reasons, the proposed project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no impact on migratory species movement.

Impact BI-3: The proposed project would not conflict with the City's local tree ordinance. (Less than Significant)

The City's Urban Forestry Ordinance, Public Works Code sections 801 et seq. require a permit from Public Works to remove any protected trees. Protected trees include landmark trees, significant trees, or street trees located on private or public property anywhere within the territorial limits of the City and County of San Francisco.

There are no trees located on the 807 Franklin Street property and three street trees in front of the property. The project includes the removal of the three street trees in front of the 807 Franklin Street

project site; however, these trees are not landmark trees and do not meet the size criteria for a significant tree. The proposed project would add three new street trees in front of 807 Franklin Street.

There are no existing trees located on or in front of the 635 Fulton Street property. The proposed project would plant five new street trees in front of 635 Fulton Street.

Because the proposed project would not conflict with the City's local tree ordinance, there would be no impact.

Impact C-BI-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulative impact related to biological resources. (Less than Significant)

The project vicinity does not currently support any candidate, sensitive, or special-status species, any riparian habitat, or any other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. As with the proposed project, nearby cumulative development projects would also be subject to the MBTA, which protects special-status bird species; the California Fish and Game Code; and the bird-safe building and urban forestry ordinances. As with the proposed project, compliance with these ordinances would reduce the effects of development projects to less-than-significant levels.

The proposed project would not modify any natural habitat and would have no impact on any candidate, sensitive, or special-status species, any riparian habitat, or other sensitive natural community; and/or would not conflict with any local policy or ordinance protecting biological resources or an approved conservation plan. For these reasons, the proposed project would not have the potential to combine with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity to result in a significant cumulative impact related to biological resources. Therefore, there would be no cumulative impacts on biological resources.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
13. GEOLOGY AND SOILS —Would the project:					
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would connect to the combined sewer system, which is the wastewater conveyance system for San Francisco, and would not use septic tanks or other on-site land disposal systems for sanitary sewage. Therefore, topic 13e is not applicable to the proposed project.

Impact GE-1: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides, and would not be located on unstable soil that could result in lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. (Less than Significant)

Geotechnical investigations were conducted to assess the geologic conditions underlying the project sites and to provide recommendations related to the proposed project's design and construction. The findings and recommendations, presented in the geotechnical reports, are discussed below.¹¹²

112 Rollo & Ridley, Geotechnical Investigation, 807 Franklin Street, San Francisco, California, January 8, 2014; and Geotechnical Investigation, 635 Fulton Street, San Francisco, California, July 7, 2017.

807 Franklin Street

On the basis of the consultant's field investigation, the 807 Franklin Street project site is underlain by up to 6.5 feet of sandy fill. The fill consists mostly of medium dense sand with varying amounts of clay. The fill is underlain by medium dense to very dense sand geologically referred to as Dune sand to depths ranging from 33 to 42 feet below the ground surface. The sand is underlain by hard sandy clay to approximately 51 to 53 feet below the ground surface. The sandy clay is underlain by Franciscan Complex bedrock to the maximum depth explored of 56.5 feet. No groundwater was encountered during the field exploration.

The geotechnical report concludes that the project can be constructed as planned, provided the recommendations presented in the report are incorporated into the project plans and specifications and implemented during construction. The report recommends that the proposed development be supported on a deep foundation consisting of drilled, cast-in-place, concrete piers that should be at least 18 inches in diameter and extend to bedrock at depths of roughly 40 feet below the proposed below-grade parking level. Pier drilling should be observed by the geotechnical consultant.

635 Fulton Street

The 635 Fulton Street site is blanketed by approximately 8 to 12 feet of sandy fill, consisting of loose to medium dense sand with rubble fragments. The sandy fill is underlain by medium dense to very dense sand with silt and silty sand to the maximum depth explored 31.5 feet below the existing ground surface. The sand with silt and silty sand underlying the fill soils is strong and capable of supporting moderately heavy building loads without significant settlement. Groundwater was encountered at a depth of approximately 18 feet below the site. It is anticipated that the groundwater level at the project site varies seasonally a few feet depending on rainfall amounts and time of year.

The report concludes that the project can be constructed as planned provided the recommendations presented in the report are incorporated into the project plans and specifications and implemented during construction. Excavations on the order of 2 to 5 feet are anticipated to prepare the underlying soil and construct new foundations and place the building at grade. The report states that a shallow foundation consisting of an interconnected reinforced concrete grid of continuous footings may be used provided either (1) the proposed combined building footprints be overexcavated to a depth of 5 feet and the existing soil is replaced as engineered fill, or (2) the new reinforced concrete grid foundation be supported on drilled displacement columns that extend below the fill and into the competent native soil.

The final building plans would be subject to the approval of the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection. To ensure compliance with all building code provisions regarding structural safety, the department would review the project geotechnical report and building plans and data from past geological and geotechnical investigations to determine the adequacy of necessary engineering and design features. The building department could require that additional site specific soils report(s) be prepared in conjunction with permit applications, as needed. The department's requirement for a geotechnical report and review of the building permit application pursuant to implementation of the building code, and incorporation of the design measures

identified above, would avoid potential damage to structures from geologic hazards. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts from exposure of people and structures to substantial adverse effects from seismic events and geological hazards.

Impact GE-2: The proposed project would not result in substantial loss of topsoil or erosion. (Less than Significant)

The 807 Franklin Street project site is occupied by a two-story-over-basement residential building and an approximately 5,500 sf partially paved surface parking lot; the 635 Fulton Street project site is completely covered with impervious surfaces. Site preparation and excavation activities would create the potential for windborne and waterborne soil erosion. Construction activities are required to follow best management practices that include erosion and sedimentation control measures (see Section E.14, Hydrology and Water Quality). Therefore, the proposed project's short-term construction-related erosion impacts would be less than significant. Similarly, no long-term erosion impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Impact GE-3: The proposed project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table multi-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property. (Less than Significant)

The sandy soils at the sites are not considered expansive, so project foundations would not be at risk from the cracking effects of soil expansion and contraction. Further due to building code requirements that the project applicant include analysis of the potential for soil expansion impacts as part of the design-level geotechnical investigations prepared for the proposed project, potential impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant.

Impact GE-4: The proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. (Less than Significant)

The project sites are already developed, and implementation of the proposed project would not substantially change the topography of the sites. Paleontological resources include fossilized remains or traces of animals, plants, and invertebrates, including their imprints, from a previous geological period. Collecting localities and the geological formations containing those localities are also considered paleontological resources; they represent a limited, nonrenewable, and impact-sensitive scientific and educational resource. There are no unique geologic or physical features at the project sites, and construction activities are not anticipated to encounter any below-grade paleontological resources. Therefore, impacts on topographic, unique geologic, or physical features, and paleontological resources would be less than significant.

Impact C-GE-1: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the site vicinity, would not have a substantial cumulative impact on geology and soils. (Less than Significant)

Environmental impacts related to geology and soils are generally site-specific. Nearby cumulative development projects would be subject to the same seismic safety standards and design review procedures applicable to the proposed project. Compliance with the seismic safety standards and the design review procedures would ensure that the effects from nearby cumulative development projects would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. For these

reasons, the proposed project would not combine with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity to create a significant cumulative impact related to geology and soils.

Topics:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Not Applicable
14. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY — Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

In 2018, the SFPUC developed a Draft 100-Year Storm Flood Risk Map that shows areas of San Francisco where significant flooding from storm runoff is highly likely to occur during a 100-year storm. A “100-year storm” means a storm with a 1 percent chance of occurring in a given year. Neither project site is on the Draft 100-Year Storm Flood Risk Map.¹¹³ At elevations ranging from 85 to 120 feet above mean sea level, the project sites have no potential to be affected by sea level rise by the year 2100 as projected by the City of San Francisco.¹¹⁴ Further, it is not downstream of any levee or dam. The project site therefore is not at risk of flooding from any source. Because of their elevations, distances from the nearest potential sources of flooding and intervening topography, the project sites also are not susceptible to the potential effects of a tsunami or seiche.¹¹⁵ The project sites are also not in or near a designated landslide zone.¹¹⁶ The 807 Franklin Street site is on a 10 percent slope, and the 635 Fulton Street site is flat, and both are mostly paved or covered by buildings; thus, neither site is susceptible to mudflow. For these reasons, there is no potential for project impacts with respect to flood- or landslide-associated events. Therefore, Questions 15g, 15h, 15i, and 15j are not applicable.

Impact HY-1: The proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. (Less than Significant)

The project sites are located within the area of the city served by a combined stormwater and sewer system. Under such a system, wastewater (sewage) and stormwater are collected and comingled in underground piping and tunnels for conveyance to the City’s wastewater treatment

113 San Francisco Water Power Sewer, Draft 100-Year Storm Flood Risk Map. Available at <http://www.sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=1229>. Accessed May 23, 2018. The SFPUC Commission is tentatively scheduled to vote on approving a Final Map in 2018.

114 The City projects a sea level rise of 66 inches by the year 2100 in City and County of San Francisco, 2016, San Francisco Sea Level Rise Action Plan. Available at http://default.sfplanning.org/plans-and-programs/planning-for-the-city/sea-level-rise/160309_SLRAP_Final_ED.pdf. Accessed April 30, 2018.

115 California Emergency Management Agency (CalEMA), Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning, State of California – City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco North Quadrangle, San Francisco South Quadrangle (San Francisco Bay), June 15, 2009. Available at http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geologic_hazards/Tsunami/Inundation_Maps/SanFrancisco/Documents/Tsunami_Inundation_SouthSFNorthSF_PacificCoast_SanFrancisco.pdf. Accessed April 30, 2018.

116 State of California Seismic Hazard Zones, City and County of San Francisco, November 17, 2000, available at <https://sfgov.org/esip/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/10438-California%20Seismic%20Hazard%20Zones%20Map.pdf>. Accessed April 30, 2018. Also, the project sites are not mapped as “Landslide Locations” in Figure 4 of the San Francisco Seismic Safety Investigation report prepared by URS/John A. Blume & Associates, Engineers, June 1974, as cited in San Francisco Building Code section 106A.4.1.4.3 .

plants, operated by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). Under the proposed development, as under existing conditions, stormwater and wastewater from the project sites would be discharged to the underground network that conveys the waters to the San Francisco Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant for treatment. SFPUC holds a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit (regional board Order No. R2-2013-0029)¹¹⁷ (the Bayside NPDES permit) that covers the all of the Bayside wet-weather facilities, including combined sewer discharge structures located along the bayside waterfront from Marina Green to Candlestick Park. Wastewater and stormwater flows collected in the combined sewer system are directed to the city's wastewater treatment plants for primary or secondary treatment and disinfection. During wet weather conditions, when the combined flow may exceed the secondary treatment capacity, the combined flows receive the equivalent of primary treatment in transit, in the conveyance and storage boxes. The portion of the flow that exceeds the storage capacity of the conveyance boxes is then diverted to outfalls on the bay and ocean shore.

New development projects are required to comply with San Francisco's Stormwater Management Ordinance (No. 64-16)¹¹⁸ (San Francisco Public Works Code Article 4.2, Section 147). The intent of this ordinance is to reduce the volume of stormwater entering the city's combined and separate sewer systems—thus reducing the volume of combined wastewater flows, particularly in wet weather, and to protect and enhance the water quality of receiving waters. The SFPUC has developed stormwater management requirements and design guidelines¹¹⁹ in accordance with the requirements of this ordinance.

Construction Water Quality

Stormwater

Construction activities have the potential to result in runoff of surface water that conveys sediments and other pollutants from the site, which could drain into the combined sewer and stormwater system. Stormwater runoff from temporary on-site use and storage of vehicles, fuels, wastes, and building materials could also carry pollutants to receiving waters if improperly managed.

Construction-related stormwater discharges from the project sites to the combined sewer system would be managed in accordance with the Bayside NPDES permit, and site runoff would be subject to the construction site runoff requirements of Public Works Code article 4.2, section 146. This requires any construction activity that would disturb 5,000 sf or more of ground surface (such as both project sites) to obtain a Construction Site Runoff Control Permit and to implement and maintain best management practices to minimize surface runoff, erosion, and sedimentation

117 Regional Water Quality Control Board, Order No. R2-2013-0029. Available at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/board_decisions/adopted_orders/2013/R2-2013-0029.pdf. Accessed November 9, 2017.

118 San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance, No. 64-16. Available at: <http://sfwater.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=9077>. Accessed November 9, 2017.

119 City of San Francisco, Stormwater Management Requirements and Design Guidelines. Available at: <http://www.sfwater.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentID=9026>. Accessed November 6, 2017.

from the construction site. The applications for the permits must also include an erosion and sediment control plan to the SFPUC. Improvements to any existing grading, ground surface or site drainage must also meet the requirements of Article 4.2 for new grading, drainage, and erosion control. A building permit would not be issued until a construction site runoff control permit has been submitted and approved by the SFPUC. In addition, as discussed under Impact HZ-2, below, the proposed project would be required to comply with the Maher Ordinance (Article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code), which requires further site management and reporting requirements for potential hazardous soils.

The provisions of a construction site runoff control permit would require the project sponsor to conduct daily inspections and maintenance of all erosion and sediment controls and to provide inspection and maintenance information to the SFPUC. The SFPUC may also conduct periodic inspections of the sites to ensure compliance with the erosion and sediment control plans. The project sponsor must notify the SFPUC at least two days prior to the start of construction, when the erosion and sediment control measures have been installed, and upon completion of final grading. Thus, stormwater effects during project construction would be less than significant.

Groundwater

807 Franklin Street

The proposed excavation to the bottom of the car stacker pits would be 20 feet below ground surface, and drilled piers would extend to 40 feet below the proposed below-grade parking level. The geotechnical report prepared for the project noted that groundwater was not encountered to a depth of 56.5 feet, which was the extent of the exploration drilling. The geotechnical report further notes that even though the new basement/garage slab should be above the groundwater table, water and water vapor may occasionally be present within the subgrade soil. The report makes the following recommendations for drainage control design: The below-grade concrete walls should be waterproofed by installing a prefabricated drainage panel against the back side of the walls. The drainage panel would lead to a collector pipe and a discharge location (sump).¹²⁰ The specifications for construction dewatering and protection against long-term groundwater intrusion outlined in the geotechnical investigation would be reviewed by the Department of Building Inspection as part of the building permit process.

Any groundwater encountered during construction or operation of the proposed project would be subject to requirements of the City's Sewer Use Ordinance (Ordinance Number 19-92, amended 116-97), as supplemented by Department of Public Works Order No. 158170, and would require a permit from the Wastewater Enterprise Collection System Division of the SFPUC. A permit may be issued only if an effective pretreatment system is maintained and operated. Each permit for such discharge shall contain specified water quality standards and may require the project sponsor to install and maintain meters to measure the volume of the discharge to the combined sewer system.

120 Rollo & Ridley, Geotechnical Investigation, 807 Franklin Street, San Francisco, California, January 8, 2014; and Geotechnical Investigation, 635 Fulton Street, San Francisco, California, July 7, 2017, Section 5.0, Subsurface Conditions, Section 8.10, Drainage and Infiltration, and Section 8.2, Basement Walls.

635 Fulton Street

The project would require excavation of approximately 5.5 feet, and groundwater was encountered at a depth of approximately 18 feet below the site during geotechnical exploration drilling. Thus, groundwater is not anticipated to be encountered during project construction.

For both sites, compliance with regulatory requirements, implementation of the erosion and sediment control plan at 807 Franklin Street, and best management practices during construction activities would render construction impacts to water quality less than significant.

Operational Water Quality

Stormwater

Water quality in stormwater runoff is regulated locally by the San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance, which provides implementation guidance with stormwater management requirements and design guidelines. In accordance with these guidelines, projects that would develop, create, and/or replace 5,000 sf of impervious surface, and would discharge to the combined sewer system, must include implementation of low impact design and best management practices to manage the flow rate and volume of stormwater that enters the combined sewer system. This requirement applies to both project sites. Also, since more than 50 percent of the 807 Franklin Street project site is covered with impervious surfaces under existing conditions, the project would be required to reduce the existing runoff flow rate and volume by 25 percent for a 2-year, 24-hour design storm. This would be accomplished by use of best management practices set forth in the stormwater management requirements. Examples include the incorporation of rainwater harvesting, vegetated roofs, permeable paving, and bio-retention planters in project design, as measures to reduce stormwater discharge through infiltration on site. Alternatively, if site conditions limit the potential for stormwater infiltration, the project sponsor may apply to SFPUC for modified compliance to adjust the amount by which the proposed project must reduce stormwater runoff volume and flow rates as compared to existing conditions.

To minimize water quality impacts, both project sites would need stormwater control plans to be reviewed and approved by the SFPUC. The plans would contain detailed descriptions of site design, source control, and stormwater treatment best management practices as well as a post-construction operations and maintenance plan. The project sponsor also would be required to commit to a maintenance agreement, to ensure that the stormwater controls are maintained in perpetuity. With implementation of low impact design and best management practices, preparation of stormwater control plans, and compliance with San Francisco and state regulatory requirements for water quality standards, the operational water quality impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant.

In summary, in accordance with state and City regulations, the proposed project would prepare and implement erosion and sediment control plans for construction activities; obtain a discharge permit for dewatering activities; incorporate low impact design and best management practices for stormwater management in the project; and implement approved stormwater control plans for post-construction activities. Through the development review process, the City would ensure that the proposed project complies with various statutory requirements necessary to minimize

stormwater and wastewater pollutants. Combined wastewater from the project sites also would be treated pursuant to the City's NPDES permit prior to discharge to receiving waters. Therefore, impacts related to water quality from development of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Impact HY-2: The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering of the local groundwater table. (Less than Significant)

As discussed under Impact HY-1, groundwater may be encountered during the 6.5-month excavation and foundation installation phase of construction at the 807 Franklin Street project site; this has the potential to affect groundwater supplies. The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable regulations, including the San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance. The proposed project would not result in the use of groundwater; and if groundwater were to be encountered, construction dewatering would be required. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, and impacts would be less than significant.

Impact HY-3: The proposed project would not 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 substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding on- or off-site. (Less than Significant)

The project sites do not contain any streams or water courses. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact with respect to altering the course of a stream or river or substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site or area.

Construction activities have the potential to result in erosion and transportation of soil particles off site through excavation and grading activities. However, as discussed under Impact HY-1, the project sponsor would be required to develop and implement erosion and sediment control plans to minimize the potential for on- or off-site erosion or siltation, which would reduce potential impacts from construction related-activities to a less-than-significant level. Stormwater would be routed to the City's combined sewer system. Project design and operation would be required to comply with the City's stormwater management requirements and design guidelines, which require stormwater flows from new development to be reduced by up to 25 percent as compared to existing conditions, and implementation of site design, source control, and stormwater treatment measures for the protection of water quality. Therefore, the project would not result in an increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in substantial erosion, siltation, or on- or off-site flooding, and the project's impact would be less than significant.

Impact HY-4: The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. (Less than Significant)

During construction and operation of the proposed project, wastewater and stormwater runoff from the project sites would be treated at the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant. As discussed under Impact HY-1, treatment would be provided pursuant to the effluent discharge standards contained in the City's NPDES permit for the plant. During construction and operation, the proposed project would be required to comply with all local wastewater discharge, stormwater runoff, and water quality requirements, including stormwater management requirements and design guidelines required under the Stormwater Management Ordinance, described under Impact HY-1. Compliance with stormwater management requirements and design guidelines would ensure that stormwater generated by the proposed project would be managed on-site to reduce the existing runoff flow rate and volume by 25 percent for a two-year 24-hour design storm, such that the proposed project would not contribute additional volumes of polluted runoff to the City's stormwater infrastructure. Compliance with the Stormwater Management Ordinance would ensure that the design of the proposed project would include installation of appropriate stormwater management systems that retain runoff on site, promote stormwater reuse, and limit discharges from the site from entering the City's combined stormwater/sewer system. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Impact C-HY-1: The proposed project, in combination with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects, would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies, alter existing drainages, or otherwise degrade water quality. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project has no potential for impacts with respect to 100-year flood zones, failure of dams or levees, and/or seiche, tsunami, and/or mudflow hazards. Therefore, the project would not contribute to cumulative impacts related to these topics.

The proposed project and all future projects within San Francisco would be required to comply with the water quality and drainage control requirements discussed above that apply to all land use development projects within the city. Since all development projects would be required to follow the same regulations as the proposed project, the implementation of new, conforming development projects, peak stormwater drainage rates and volumes resulting from design storms would be expected to decrease gradually over time relative to existing peak flows. Moreover, all development projects would be required to comply with the same drainage, dewatering, and water quality regulations as the proposed project. As a result, cumulative effects related to drainage patterns, water quality, stormwater runoff, stormwater capacity of the combined sewer system and groundwater supply and quality would be less than significant.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS — Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, nor is it within two miles of a public use airport or a private airstrip. There are no areas that would be classified as wildlands in the project vicinity. The closest heavily vegetated area to either project, Buena Vista Park, is 0.8 mile from the nearer project site and separated from it by extensive urban infrastructure that is not intermixed with wildlands. Therefore, criteria 16e, 16f, and 16h are not applicable.

Impact HZ-1: The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. (Less than Significant)

Neither construction nor operation of the project would involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of significant quantities of hazardous materials. Prior to the Victorian being moved, all utilities would be disconnected. Project operations would entail routine handling, use and disposal of small quantities of commercially available hazardous materials, such as household cleaning and landscaping supplies. However, these materials would not be expected to be used in sufficient quantities or contrary to normal use, and therefore would not pose a threat to human health or the environment.

The impact of the proposed development on the public and the environment related to the routine transport, use, and handling of hazardous materials therefore would be less than significant.

Impact HZ-2: The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the release of hazardous materials. (Less than Significant)

Before the project may obtain building permits, it must comply with the requirements of article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code, which the San Francisco Department of Public Health (the health department) administers. Under article 22A (commonly called “the Maher program”), the project sponsor must retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a site history report (commonly referred to as a phase I environmental site assessment). The site assessment must determine whether hazardous substances may be present at the site at levels that exceed health risk levels or other applicable standards established by California Environmental Protection Agencies, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the Department of Toxics Substances Control (Cal/EPA). If so, the project sponsor is required to conduct soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis under a work plan approved by the health department. The sampling analysis must provide an accurate assessment of hazardous substances present at the site that may be disturbed, or may cause a public health or safety hazard, given the intended use of the site. Where such analysis reveals the presence of hazardous substances that exceed Cal/EPA public health risk levels given the intended use, the project sponsor must submit a site mitigation plan (SMP) to the health department. The SMP must identify the measures that the project sponsor will take to assure that the intended use will not result in public health or safety hazards in excess of the acceptable public health risk levels established by Cal/EPA or other applicable regulatory standards. The SMP also must identify any soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis that it recommends the project sponsor conduct following completion of the measures to verify that remediation is complete. If the project sponsor chooses to mitigate public health or safety hazards from hazardous substances through land use or activity restrictions, the project sponsor must record a deed restriction specifying the land use restrictions or other controls that will assure protection of public health or safety from hazards substances remaining on the site.

To comply with various regulatory requirements, the health department will require the SMP to contain measures to mitigate potential risks to the environment and to protect construction workers, nearby residents, workers, and/or pedestrians from potential exposure to hazardous substances and underground structures during soil excavation and grading activities. The SMP must also contain procedures for initial response to unanticipated conditions such as discovery of underground storage tanks, sumps, or pipelines during excavation activities. Specified construction procedures at a minimum must comply with Building Code section 106A.3.2.6.3 and

Health code article 22B related to construction dust control; and San Francisco Public Works Code section 146 et seq. concerning construction site runoff control. Additional measures would typically include notification, field screening, and worker health and safety measures to comply with Cal/OSHA requirements. The health department would require discovered USTs to be closed pursuant to article 21 of the health code and comply with applicable provisions of chapters 6.7 and 6.75 of the California Health and Safety Code (commencing with Section 25280) and its implementing regulations. The closure of any UST must also be conducted in accordance with a permit from the San Francisco Fire Department.

If remediation is required, it would typically be achieved through one of several methods that include off-haul and disposal of contaminated soils,¹²¹ on-site treatment of soil or groundwater, or a vapor barrier installation. Alternatively or in addition, restriction on uses or activities at the project site may be required along with a recorded deed restriction. Compliance with health code article 22A and the related regulations identified above would ensure that project activities that disturb or release of hazardous substances that may be present at the project site would not expose users of the site to unacceptable risk levels for the intended project uses.

807 Franklin Street

A phase I environmental site assessment was prepared for the subject property.¹²² The subject property has consistently been in residential use since the building was constructed in the 1870s. Per Health Code section 22A.4, the Director of Public Health may waive the requirements of the Maher program if the applicant demonstrates that the property has been continuously zoned as residential under the city planning code since 1921, has been in residential use since that time, and no evidence has been presented to create a reasonable belief that the soil and/or groundwater may contain hazardous substances. The health department reviewed site history and project information and issued a waiver from the Maher ordinance.¹²³ Thus, the proposed project would not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment from the disturbance or release of contaminated soil and/or groundwater, and the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to hazardous materials.

635 Fulton Street

The project sponsor enrolled in the Maher program and submitted to the health department a phase I environmental site assessment.¹²⁴ The site was originally developed in the late 1800s as part of a residential area. It remained residential or vacant until the existing structure was

121 Off-haul and disposal of contaminated materials from the project site would be in accordance with the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and United States Department of Transportation regulations and the California Hazardous Waste Control program (California Health and Safety Code section 21000 et seq.

122 PII Environmental, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 807 Franklin Street, San Francisco, California, October 28, 2013.

123 San Francisco Department of Public Health, Waiver from San Francisco Health Code Article 22A (Maher Ordinance), 807 Franklin Street, SMED No. 1587, July 21, 2017.

124 John Carver Consulting, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 635 Fulton Street, San Francisco, California, June 12, 2017.

constructed. The original use of the building was as an upholstery facility and then a sign printing company. By the 1960s, the present occupant, the Bryant Mortuary, occupied the property along with two residential units on the third floor.

Mortuary use is designated as being involved with medical waste, not considered to be hazardous waste. Medical waste is handled by licensed contractors and is not addressed as part of a phase I environmental site assessment. With the exception of the medical waste involved with the mortuary process, there were no indications seen at the property that there ever has been any use, storage, disposal or generation of hazardous materials, waste or RCRA-regulated substances, and the phase I did not identify any recognized environmental conditions at the site. The San Francisco Department of Public Health Environmental Health recommended submittal of a workplan for site characterization, and a workplan was submitted¹²⁵ and approved by the health department.¹²⁶

The proposed project would be required to remediate potential soil and/or groundwater contamination in accordance with article 22A of the health code. The health department would oversee this process, and various regulations would apply to any disturbance of contaminants in soil or groundwater that would be encountered during construction to assure that no unacceptable exposures to the public would occur. Thus, the proposed project would not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment from the disturbance or release of contaminated soil and/or groundwater and the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact regarding hazardous materials.

Impact HZ-3: The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 miles of an existing or proposed school. (Less than Significant)

Multiple schools are located within approximately 0.25 miles of the two project sites. The closest school to 807 Franklin Street is Sacred Heart Cathedral Preparatory School, at 1055 Ellis Street, located 400 feet from the project site. The closest school to 635 Fulton Street is Laguna Golden Gate Child Care Center, at 1025 Laguna Street, located 850 feet from the project site. The potential presence of hazardous materials in the underlying soils potentially could represent a hazard to children in local school and childcare facilities if hazardous materials were handled or transported without adequate controls, a potentially significant impact. However, any hazardous waste at either project site would be remediated and handled in accordance with local, state and federal law. Furthermore, the proposed project would include the use of common household items in quantities too small to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. This impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

125 John Carver Consulting, Work Plan for Subsurface Investigation, 635 Fulton Street, San Francisco, California, March 7, 2018.

126 San Francisco Department of Public Health Environmental Health, SFHC Article 22A Compliance (work plan approval), 635 Fulton Street, EHB-SAM Case No. 1601, March 9, 2018.

Impact HZ-4: The proposed project is not 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, could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. (No Impact)

The provisions of Government Code section 65962.5 require the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the State Water Resources Control Board, the California Department of Health Services, and the California Integrated Waste Management Board to submit information pertaining to sites associated with solid waste disposal, hazardous waste disposal, and/or hazardous materials releases to the Secretary of Cal/EPA. Based on a review of regulatory databases, the project sites are not listed as hazardous materials sites; therefore, no impact would occur.

Impact HZ-5: The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Less than Significant)

The proposed infill development of existing developed sites would not alter or impede access to existing roads. As discussed in Section E.4, Transportation and Circulation, while construction would entail the use of trucks for delivery of materials, and off-haul of demolition debris and soils, construction-related traffic entering and leaving the site would not be allowed to queue on the public rights of way and therefore would not interfere with traffic, including emergency vehicles. Construction staging would occur primarily on site. The Victorian house moving from 807 Franklin Street to 635 Fulton Street would require about two hours of complete street closure and then about 12 hours of partial street closure in front of 635 Fulton Street. The project sponsor would coordinate with SFMTA to close streets.

Project construction activities therefore would not be expected to pose an obstacle to emergency response vehicles in the project area. Therefore, impacts related to the potential for the proposed project to impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be less than significant.

Impact C-HZ-1: The proposed project, in conjunction with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable project, would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant impacts with respect to hazards to people or the environment. (Less than Significant)

Development in the city is subject to city and state controls designed to protect the public and the environment from risks associated with hazards and hazardous materials, including under upset conditions, and to ensure that emergency access routes are maintained. Any future development in the project vicinity would be subject to these same laws and regulations. For these reasons, the proposed project would not combine with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the project vicinity to create a significant cumulative impact related to hazards and hazardous materials.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
16. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES — Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact ME-1: The proposed project would have no impact with respect to the availability of known or locally important mineral resources. (No Impact)

All land in San Francisco, including the project sites, is designated by the California Geological Survey as Mineral Resource Zone 4 under the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975.¹²⁷ The Zone 4 designation indicates that adequate information does not exist to assign the area to any other zone: the area has not been designed as having significant mineral deposits. Specifically, the project site is underlain by deep sand deposits that have not been designated as important at the state or local level.

The project sites are within a densely developed urban area and have been developed in urban uses since at least the 1880s. Even were the underlying sand considered to contain marketable minerals, it would not be feasible to conduct sand extraction activities in the midst of urban development. The development and operation of the proposed project would not have an impact on any off-site operational mineral resource recovery sites, as there are no such operations in the vicinity, and the project sites are not and has never been used in any way in mineral resources recovery. The proposed project therefore would have no impact with respect to the availability of mineral resources.

Impact ME-2: The proposed project would result in increased energy consumption, but would not encourage activities that result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water or energy or use these in a wasteful manner. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would increase the population and intensity of use of the project sites but would not exceed anticipated growth in the area. The proposed project would be subject to the energy conservation standards included in the San Francisco Green Building Ordinance.

¹²⁷ California Division of Mines and Geology, 1996, Open File Report 96-03 and Special Report 146 Parts I and II.

Documentation showing compliance with the ordinance would be required to be submitted with the applications of the building permits, and compliance would be enforced by the Department of Building Inspection. The project also, by its character, would conserve fuel and energy use because it would provide housing in a transit-oriented area and would provide less than 1:1 vehicle parking (at 807 Franklin Street) or no vehicle parking (at 635 Fulton Street). These project characteristics would tend to reduce the project's per capita energy demand. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a wasteful use of energy, and effects related to use of fuel, water, and energy would be less than significant.

Impact C-ME-1: The proposed project in combination with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects would increase the use of energy, fuel and water resources, but not in a wasteful manner. (Less than Significant)

The demand for energy created by the proposed project would be insubstantial in the cumulative context of citywide demand, and would not require an expansion of power facilities. While overall energy demand in California is increasing commensurate with increasing population, the state also is making concerted energy conservation efforts. While the city produces a substantial demand for energy and fuel, both city and state policies seek to minimize increases in demand through conservation and energy efficiency regulations and policies, such that energy is not used in a wasteful manner. Each project contributing to cumulative development in the area would comply with the city's energy and fuel conservation measures, such that resources would not be used in a wasteful manner and the cumulative impacts with respect to energy and fuel use would be less than significant. Because San Francisco is substantially built out, development in the city's urban core focuses on densification, which effectively reduces per capita use of energy and fuel by concentrating utilities and services in locations where they can be used efficiently. Similarly, the City and County of San Francisco recognizes the need for water conservation and has instituted programs and policies to maximize water conservation. San Francisco has one of the lowest per capita water use rates in the state¹²⁸ and routinely implements water conservation measures through code requirements and policy. Therefore, the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact related to mineral and energy resources.

128 San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Annual Water Report, 2015-2016. Available at <https://view.joomag.com/water-resources-division-annual-report-fy-2015-2016/0871482001480967586?short>. Accessed November 15, 2017.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
----------------	---	---	---	----------------------	---------------------------

17. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

—Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

The project sites are located within an urbanized area of San Francisco. No land in San Francisco County has been designated by the California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program as agricultural land. Because the project sites do not contain agricultural uses and are not zoned for such uses, the proposed project would not require the conversion of any land designated as prime farmland, unique farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. The proposed project would not conflict with any existing agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts, as no lands in San Francisco are zoned agricultural or are under Williamson Act contracts.¹²⁹ No land in San Francisco is designated as forest land or as Timberland Production by the California Public Resources Code or Government Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with zoning for forest land, cause a loss of forest land, or convert forest land to a different use. For these reasons, Questions 18a, 18b, 18c, 18d, and 18e are not applicable to the proposed project.

¹²⁹ San Francisco is identified as "Urban and Built-Up Land" on California Department of Conservation, 2008, Important Farmland in California Map. Available at www.consrv.ca.gov. Accessed October 23, 2017.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE —Would the project:					
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have impacts that would be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

As discussed in the previous sections (E.1 through E.17), impacts as a result of the proposed project are anticipated to be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation in the areas discussed. The foregoing analysis identifies potentially significant impacts related to cultural resources, noise, and air quality, which would be mitigated through implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section F, Mitigation Measures. Each environmental topic area includes an analysis of cumulative impacts, and this initial study concludes that cumulative impacts for all environmental topic areas would be also either be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.

As described in Section E.3, Cultural Resources, the proposed project could result in a substantial adverse change on historic and archeological resources, including tribal cultural resources. In addition, the proposed project could disturb human remains. Implementation of **Mitigation Measures M-CR-1, M-CR-2, M-CR-3, and M-CR-4** would reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact through the elimination of important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory.

As discussed in Section E.5, Noise, the project could result in excessive construction noise, which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-NO-1** at 807 Franklin Street would reduce the project’s construction noise impacts to

a less-than-significant level. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-NO-1** would also reduce potential cumulative construction noise impacts at 807 Franklin Street to less than significant.

As discussed in Section E.6, Air Quality, the 807 Franklin Street project site is located in an area that already experiences poor air quality. Project construction would add new sources of toxic air contaminants within an area already adversely affected by air quality, resulting in a considerable contribution to cumulative health risk impacts on nearby sensitive receptors, which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. However, the implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1** would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level.

F. MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure M-CR-1: Develop and Implement an Interpretive Program. The project sponsor shall develop an interpretive program to commemorate the history of the Silver Rush, as it relates to 807 Franklin Street, and the history of the post-World War II redevelopment of the Western Addition, as it relates to both buildings. Additionally the interpretive program shall commemorate the history of the Bryant Mortuary at 635 Fulton Street and its association with African American history in the Western Addition, using historic photos, and family and business histories as available. Interpretation of the site's histories shall be supervised by a qualified consultant meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Architectural Historian or Historian. Development of these interpretive programs will include outreach to the Western Addition and African American communities in order to involve these communities and to create a broader, more authentic interpretive approach for the project site and neighborhood.

The interpretive program should result, at minimum, in installation of two permanent on-site interpretive displays in publicly accessible locations within or adjacent to the subject buildings, such as a lobby or public street frontage. The permanent on-site interpretive displays should be located at both the current site of 807 Franklin Street (where a new building would be constructed as a component of the project) and at the current site of 635 Fulton Street (where both building would be located following completion of the project) to memorialize the importance and connection of the buildings after they are relocated. The content of the interpretive program should address the loss of original setting of the buildings in the context of the neighborhood. The interpretive program should include information about the significance of the subject buildings and their associations with the Silver Rush and the Redevelopment Agency. In addition, the program should include information about the Bryant Mortuary individually and collectively within the context of African American history and redevelopment history in the Western Addition. The display to be installed at the Franklin Street project site would interpret the significance of the building currently located at 807 Franklin Street; the display to be installed at the Fulton Street project site would interpret the significance of the building currently located at 635 Fulton Street. The interpretive materials may include, but are not limited to, a display of photographs, news articles, oral histories, memorabilia, and video. Historic information

contained in the ICF HRE for 635 Fulton Street and HRE for 807 Franklin Street and in the Planning Department's Draft African American Historic Context Statement may be used for content. Interpretive materials may also include photographs taken for Historic American Building Survey (HABS)-style documentation of the buildings, as described under Mitigation Measure M-CR-3.

A proposal prepared by the qualified consultant, with input from the outreach conducted in the African American and Western Addition communities, describing the general format, materials, locations, and content of the interpretive program, shall be approved by the San Francisco Planning Department preservation staff prior to issuance of the demolition or site permit for the proposed project. The detailed content, media, and other characteristics of the interpretive program shall be reviewed and approved by Planning Department preservation staff prior to issuance of the building demolition permit or architectural addendum of the site permit for the proposed project.

Mitigation Measure M-CR-2: Prepare and Implement a Historic Preservation Plan. The project sponsor shall retain a qualified historical architect who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 61) to prepare historic preservation plans (HPP) for the resources at 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street. The project sponsor shall retain a qualified historical architect who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 61) to prepare historic preservation plans (HPP) for the resources at 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street. ~~The specifications, monitoring schedule, and other supporting documents as specified below shall be incorporated into the building or site permit application plan sets.~~ The site permit and plans should state/reference that a Historic Preservation Plan will be prepared as part of the scope of work. The documentation shall be reviewed and approved by Planning Department preservation staff prior to the issuance of any demolition, site, or building permit or architectural addendum for the proposed project.

The HPP shall incorporate rehabilitation recommendations for protecting character-defining features of the historical resources to be retained during relocation and shall include the following elements:

- **Historic Preservation Protective Measures.** Each HPP shall be prepared and implemented to aid in preserving those portions of the historical resource that would be retained and/or rehabilitated as part of the project. The HPP shall establish measures to protect the retained building façades and character-defining features of the resource (as identified in the 2018 HRER) during relocation, from vibration effects as well as from construction equipment used in the vicinity of the resource. If deemed necessary upon further assessment of the resources' condition, the HPP shall include preliminary stabilization measures to be taken before construction to prevent further deterioration or damage during construction. Specifically, the protection measures shall incorporate construction specifications for the proposed project that require the construction contractor(s) to use all feasible means to avoid damage to historical resources, including but not necessarily limited to the following: staging equipment

and materials as far as possible from historic buildings to limit direct impact or accidental damage; maintaining a buffer zone when possible between heavy equipment and historical resources to avoid accidental damage; appropriately shoring excavation sidewalls to prevent movement of adjacent structures; and ensuring appropriate security to minimize risks of vandalism and fire.

The specifications as specified above shall be ~~incorporated into the building or site permit application plan sets~~ reviewed and approved as part of the demolition, site, or building permit or as part of an architectural addendum.

- **Relocation Plan and Relocation Best Practices for 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street.**

The HPPs shall include a relocation plan to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department to ensure that character-defining features of the buildings will be retained. The Planning Department review shall occur prior to the commencement of any construction activities on the project sites. The relocation plan shall include required qualifications for the building relocation company to ensure that relocation is undertaken by a company that is experienced in moving historic buildings of a similar size and/or structural system as 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street. The relocation plan shall ensure that the buildings will be moved without irreparable damage to the character-defining historic fabric of the buildings. The project sponsor will incorporate into construction specifications for the proposed project a requirement that the construction contractor(s) use all feasible means to avoid damage to 635 Fulton Street and 807 Franklin Street during their relocations, including, but not limited to, relocation methods and relocation activity routes, closures, and timing.

Mitigation Measure M-CR-3: Document 807 Franklin Street and 635 Fulton Street. The project sponsor shall undertake HABS-like documentation of both subject properties and surrounding contexts prior to the commencement of any construction and issuance of a demolition or site permit. The project sponsor shall retain a professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Architectural Historian or Historian (36 CFR, Part 61) and a photographer with demonstrated experience in HABS photography, to prepare written and photographic documentation of 635 Fulton Street and 807 Franklin Street. The documentation shall consist of the following.

- *HABS-Level Photographs:* HABS standard digital photography shall be created to document the buildings and surrounding context prior to construction activities.
 - The scope of the digital photographs shall be reviewed and approved by Planning Department preservation staff, and all digital photography shall be conducted according to the latest National Park Service Standards.
 - Photograph views for the dataset shall include (a) contextual views of existing settings for both buildings; (b) contextual views of each façade of the buildings; (c) façade details of the character-defining exterior features of the 635 Fulton Street building related to its former mortuary use that are proposed for removal; and (d) detailed views of character-

defining interior features of the 635 Fulton Street building related to its former mortuary use that are proposed for removal.

- All views shall be referenced on a key map of the property including each photograph number with an arrow to indicate the direction of the view.
- Draft photograph contact sheets and the key map will be provided to Planning Department preservation staff for review to determine the final number and views of photographs for inclusion in the final dataset.
- Historic photographs identified in previous studies shall also be collected, scanned as high resolution digital files, and reproduced in the dataset.
- *Written HABS-Like Narratives:* For each resource, a written historical narrative shall be prepared in accordance with the HABS Historical Report Guidelines. The HABS narratives should incorporate content that is included in the HREs for 635 Fulton Street and 807 Franklin Street. The HABS narrative for 635 Fulton Street should also incorporate content gathered during community outreach conducted for the site's interpretive program, as described in Mitigation Measure M-CR-1. The full transcripts of any oral histories conducted for the on-site interpretation of 635 Fulton Street will be included in the HABS narrative as an appendix.
- *Format of Final Dataset:* Following the preparation of the HABS photography and narratives, a Print-on-Demand softcover book shall be produced for the subject resources that compiles the historical reports, historical photographs, and HABS photographs. The Print-on-Demand book shall be made available to the public for distribution. The project sponsor shall also provide hard copies of the completed book to the History Room of the San Francisco Public Library, San Francisco Architectural Heritage, the Planning Department, the Northwest Information Center, the San Francisco African American Historical and Cultural Society, the African American Arts and Culture Complex, and the African American Museum and Library at Oakland. Labeled hard copies and/or digital copies of the final book, containing the photograph sets and narrative HABS reports, shall be provided to the repositories in their preferred format.

Mitigation Measure M-CR-4: Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources. The following mitigation measure is required to avoid any potential adverse effect from the proposed project on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) and (c), tribal cultural resources as defined in CEQA Statute Section 21074, and human remains. The project sponsor shall distribute the Planning Department archeological resource "ALERT" sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, pile driving, etc. firms); or utilities firm involved in soils disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils disturbing activities being undertaken each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the "ALERT" sheet is circulated to all field personnel including, machine operators, field crew, pile drivers, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) with a signed

affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the Alert Sheet.

A preconstruction training shall be provided to all construction personnel performing or managing soils disturbing activities by a qualified archaeologist prior to the start of soils disturbing activities on the project. The training may be provided in person or using a video and include a handout prepared by the qualified archaeologist. The video and materials will be reviewed and approved by the ERO. The purpose of the training is to enable personnel to identify archaeological resources that may be encountered and to instruct them on what to do if a potential discovery occurs. Images of expected archeological resource types and archeological testing and data recovery methods should be included in the training.

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

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

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

If human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects are discovered during any soils disturbing activity, all applicable State and Federal Laws shall be followed, 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, Section 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 an 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).

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

Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (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 copy, one unbound copy 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 or interpretive value, the ERO may require an interpretation program or a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise at 807 Franklin Street. 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. Noise attenuation measures could include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:

- Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around the construction site.
- Utilize noise control blankets on the building as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site.
- Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements.
- Post signs on-site with information regarding permitted construction days and hours, complaint procedures, and the name(s) and telephone number(s) of the individual(s) to be contacted in the event of a problem.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Construction Air Quality at 807 Franklin Street. The project sponsor or the project sponsor's contractor shall comply with the following at the 807 Franklin Street project site:

Engine Requirements:

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

Waivers:

- The Planning Department's Environmental Review Officer or designee (ERO) may waive the alternative source of power requirement above if an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site. If the ERO grants the waiver, the Contractor must submit documentation that the equipment used for onsite power generation meets the requirements above.
- The ERO may waive the equipment requirements above if: a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is technically not feasible; the equipment would not produce desired emissions reduction due to expected operating modes; installation of the equipment would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator; or, there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that is not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS. If the ERO grants the waiver, the Contractor must use the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment, according to Table M-AQ-1.

Table M-AQ-1 – Off-Road Equipment Compliance Step-down Schedule

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

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

** Alternative fuels are not a VDECS.

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

- The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase, with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. The description may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For VDECS installed, the description may include: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, ARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, the description shall also specify the type of alternative fuel being used.
- The project sponsor shall ensure that all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into the contract specifications. The Plan shall include a certification statement that the Contractor agrees to comply fully with the Plan.
- The Contractor shall make the Plan available to the public for review on-site during working hours. The Contractor shall post at the construction site a legible and visible sign summarizing the Plan. The sign shall also state that the public may ask to inspect the Plan for the project at any time during working hours and shall explain how to request to inspect the Plan. The Contractor shall post at least one copy of the sign in a visible location on each side of the construction site facing a public right-of-way.
- *Monitoring.* After start of Construction Activities, the Contractor shall submit quarterly reports to the ERO documenting compliance with the Plan. After completion of construction activities and prior to receiving a final certificate of

occupancy, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities, including the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase, and the specific information required in the Plan.

G. PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT

On October 13, 2017, the Planning Department mailed a Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review to owners of properties within 300 feet of the project sites, adjacent occupants, and neighborhood groups. One response came from a resident of 923 Eddy Street, a 24-unit building with its south (rear) lot line abutting 807 Franklin Street's side (north) lot line. The resident expressed concern that the new building would deprive residents at the rear of 923 Eddy Street of light and air and would expose them to increased fumes from vehicles parked below their balconies. The rear balconies of 923 Eddy Street are about 15 feet from the rear property line. Project development would not change existing air circulation conditions to the extent that fumes from vehicles in the neighbor's rear yard would result in air quality impacts.

The resident also expressed concern over roof deck usage by building occupants and guests. The project and its roof deck would be an intensification of use at the project site but would not result in an environmental impact. The resident also noted, "Traffic concerns, bicycle slot {commercial use?} and construction of new condo tower units and water usage." Traffic and circulation issues are addressed in Section E.4. The resident does not specify any environmental effects of 'condo tower units'; however, the project would follow state and local building codes to ensure safety during construction. Water usage is addressed in Section E.10.

H. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial study:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, no further environmental documentation is required.

DATE _____

Lisa Gibson
Environmental Review Officer
for
John Rahaim
Director of Planning

I. INITIAL STUDY PREPARERS

Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco
Environmental Planning Division
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Environmental Review Officer: Lisa Gibson
Deputy Environmental Review Officer: Devyani Jain
Principal Environmental Planner: Joy Navarrete
Senior Environmental Planner: Jeanie Poling
Preservation Planner: Stephanie Cisneros

Environmental Consultant (Historic Resources)
ICF
201 Mission Street, Suite 1588
San Francisco, CA 94105
Project Manager: Gretchen Hilyard
Architectural Historian: Jon Rusch

Project Sponsor
801 Franklin LLC
775 Monterey Blvd.
San Francisco, CA 94127
Owner: Tim Brown

Project Sponsor’s Representative

Kerman Morris Architects LLP
1139 Noe Street
San Francisco, CA 94114
Principal: Toby Morris


property line. Project development would not change existing air circulation conditions to the extent that fumes from vehicles in the neighbor's rear yard would result in air quality impacts.

The resident also expressed concern over roof deck usage by building occupants and guests. The project and its roof deck would be an intensification of use at the project site but would not result in an environmental impact. The resident also noted, "Traffic concerns, bicycle slot {commercial use?} and construction of new condo tower units and water usage." Traffic and circulation issues are addressed in Section E.4. The resident does not specify any environmental effects of 'condo tower units'; however, the project would follow state and local building codes to ensure safety during construction. Water usage is addressed in Section E.10.

H. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial study:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, no further environmental documentation is required.



Lisa Gibson
Environmental Review Officer
for
John Rahaim
Director of Planning

DATE 6/27/18