Initial Study – Community Plan Evaluation

Case No.: 2014-003160ENV
Project Address: 3314 Cesar Chavez Street
Zoning: Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit District
65-X Height and Bulk District
Calle 24 Special Use District
Block/Lot: 6571/012
Lot Size: 13,529 square feet
Plan Area: Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan (Mission)
Project Sponsor: Drake Gardner, Zone Design Development, (415) 377-6694
Staff Contact: Don Lewis, (415) 575-9168, don.lewis@sfgov.org

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located on the north side of Cesar Chavez between South Van Ness Avenue and Capp Street in the Mission neighborhood. The project site is occupied by a 17-foot-tall, one-story light industrial building (constructed in 1950) approximately 13,800 square feet in size with 12 off-street vehicle parking spaces. The project site is currently used as an office and equipment storage for an owner-occupied construction company (“Alpha Bay Builders”). The project sponsor proposes the demolition of the existing light industrial building, and construction of a 65-foot-tall (74-foot-tall including elevator penthouse), six-story, mixed-use building approximately 57,715 square feet in size. The proposed building would include 58 dwelling units, 1,300 square feet of ground-floor commercial use, and 28 off-street parking spaces located at the basement level accessed from Cesar Chavez Street. The proposed mix of units would include one-bedroom and two-bedroom units. The project would include a total 62 Class I bicycle spaces (56 at the ground floor and six at the basement level) and five Class II bicycle spaces would be located on the sidewalk in front of the project site.

The project would include an approximately 700-square-foot mural on the west elevation of the proposed building at the fifth and sixth floors. The project would remove the two existing street trees in front of the project site and would plant five new street trees. The project would include a total of 10,600 square feet of common open space, comprised of a 2,600-square-foot rear yard at the ground floor, two inner courtyards at the ground floor totaling 1,900 square feet, and a 6,100-square-foot roof deck. In addition, the project would provide a total of 640 square feet of private open space, comprised of four 160-square-foot private patios at the ground floor.

The two existing curb cuts with widths of 17 and 15 feet would be removed and standard sidewalk and curb dimensions restored. The proposed project would create a new 10-foot-wide curb cut for access to the basement level garage. Because the width of the driveway would only accommodate one vehicle traveling in the inbound or outbound direction at a given time, the driveway and garage ramp would include specific management controls for two-way traffic. Sensors would be installed at the gated driveway ramp and at the driveway entrance/exit lane (at the intersection of Cesar Chavez Street) to detect inbound or outbound vehicles within the driveway and ramp area. Upon exiting the parking garage, vehicles traveling up the garage ramp and approaching the gate would activate an electronic sign
or signal at the driveway entrance to notify any inbound drivers, pedestrians, or bicyclists along westbound Cesar Chavez Street of exiting vehicles. A separate sensor at the parking garage driveway entrance would trigger an electronic sign or signal to notify any outbound vehicles within the parking garage of approaching inbound vehicles. In the event of inbound vehicles accessing the project driveway and garage ramp, outbound vehicles would be required to wait at the bottom of the ramp and allow the inbound vehicle to enter the garage and clear the ramp before proceeding. In addition to the electronic signal notifying outbound vehicles of approaching inbound vehicle use of the garage ramp, the proposed project would include signage directing outbound vehicles to yield to inbound vehicles within the garage ramp.

Traffic calming and safety treatments would be installed within the parking driveway area, and signage would be installed to notify drivers exiting the parking driveway to slow, stop, and yield to any pedestrians walking along the sidewalk on Cesar Chavez Street (e.g., “Caution: Pedestrian Crossing,” “Watch for Pedestrians,” “Exit Slowly,” “STOP,” etc.). Diagonal mirrors would be installed to ensure that drivers exiting the parking garage and pedestrians on the sidewalk along the project frontage could see each other. The project would include rumble strips or similar traffic calming devices to maintain slow speeds for vehicles within the parking garage ramp.

The project sponsor would apply to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Color Curb Program for the conversion of three parking spaces (60 feet total length) along the project frontage on Cesar Chavez Street, with two spaces (40 feet) dedicated to commercial loading use, and one space (20 feet) for passenger loading use. In order to manage deliveries within this proposed commercial loading zone, building management would coordinate with delivery companies to institute safe loading procedures that do not conflict with the adjacent westbound class II bicycle lane on Cesar Chavez Street, including but not limited to conditions for loading companies not to double park in the bicycle lane.

During the approximately 18-month construction period, the proposed project would require up to approximately 25 feet of excavation below ground surface for the proposed basement level and car stackers, resulting in approximately 6,000 cubic yards of soil removal. The proposed building would be supported by a mat foundation on improved soil; impact piling driving is not proposed or required.

---

1 The SFMTA Color Curb Program: [https://www.sfmta.com/getting-around/parking/curb-colors](https://www.sfmta.com/getting-around/parking/curb-colors)
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PROJECT APPROVALS

The proposed 3314 Cesar Chavez Street project would require the following approvals:

Actions by the Planning Commission

- Approval of conditional use authorization from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code section 121.1 for the new construction on a lot that is larger than 10,000 square feet.

Actions by other City Departments

- Approval of a site mitigation plan from the San Francisco Department of Public Health prior to the commencement of any excavation work.
- Approval of building permits from the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection for demolition and new construction.
- Approval of designated color curbs for on-street commercial and passenger loading from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency.

The approval of the conditional use authorization would be the approval action for the project. The approval action date establishes the start of the 30-day appeal period for this CEQA determination pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

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

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

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified significant impacts related to land use, transportation, cultural resources, shadow, noise, air quality, and hazardous materials. Additionally, the PEIR identified

---

significant cumulative impacts related to land use, transportation, and cultural resources. Mitigation measures were identified for the above impacts and reduced all impacts to less-than-significant except for those related to land use (cumulative impacts on Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) use), transportation (program-level and cumulative traffic impacts at nine intersections; program-level and cumulative transit impacts on seven Muni lines), cultural resources (cumulative impacts from demolition of historical resources), and shadow (program-level impacts on parks).

The proposed project would include demolition of the existing light industrial building and construction of six-story mixed-use building with 58 residential units and 1,300 square feet of ground-floor retail. As discussed below in this initial study, the proposed project would not result in new, significant environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already analyzed and disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

**CHANGES IN THE REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT**

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

- State legislation amending CEQA to eliminate consideration of aesthetics and parking impacts for infill projects in transit priority areas, effective January 2014.
- State legislation amending CEQA and San Francisco Planning Commission resolution replacing level of service (LOS) analysis of automobile delay with vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis, effective March 2016 (see “CEQA Section 21099” heading below).
- The adoption of 2016 interim controls in the Mission District requiring additional information and analysis regarding housing affordability, displacement, loss of PDR and other analyses, effective January 14, 2016 through January 14, 2018.
- San Francisco Bicycle Plan update adoption in June 2009, Better Streets Plan adoption in 2010, Transit Effectiveness Project (aka “Muni Forward”) adoption in March 2014, Vision Zero adoption by various City agencies in 2014, Proposition A and B passage in November 2014, and the Transportation Sustainability Program (see initial study Transportation section).
- San Francisco ordinance establishing Noise Regulations Related to Residential Uses near Places of Entertainment effective June 2015 (see initial study Noise section).
- San Francisco ordinances establishing Construction Dust Control, effective July 2008, and Enhanced Ventilation Required for Urban Infill Sensitive Use Developments, amended December 2014 (see initial study Air Quality section).
- San Francisco Clean and Safe Parks Bond passage in November 2012 and San Francisco Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan adoption in April 2014 (see initial study Recreation section).
- Urban Water Management Plan adoption in 2011 and Sewer System Improvement Program process (see initial study Utilities and Service Systems section).
- Article 22A of the Health Code amendments effective August 2013 (see initial study Hazardous Materials section).

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

a) The project is in a transit priority area;

b) The project is on an infill site; and

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

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

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

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

---

3 San Francisco Planning Department. Eligibility Checklist: CEQA Section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for 3314 Cesar Chavez Street, August 28, 2017. This document (and all other documents cited in this report, unless otherwise noted), is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 as part of Case File No. 2014-003160ENV.

4 This document is available online at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_sb743.php.
1. **LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING—Would the project:**
   
   a) Physically divide an established community? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
   
   b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
   
   c) Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that adoption of the rezoning and area plans would result in an unavoidable significant impact on land use due to the cumulative loss of PDR. Development of the proposed project would result in the net loss of approximately 13,800 square feet of PDR building space. The project site was zoned NCD (Neighborhood Commercial District) prior to the rezoning of Eastern Neighborhoods, which did not encourage PDR uses and the rezoning of the project site to Mission Street NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit) was not included as part of the long-term PDR land supply loss that was considered a significant cumulative impact in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Moreover, the project site does not appear to be part of a larger PDR cluster and existing non-PDR uses (residential and commercial) are the predominant land use in the project vicinity. Therefore, the conversion of the existing PDR use to a mixed-use residential use would not contribute to the significant and unavoidable cumulative land use impact identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

The Citywide Planning and Current Planning divisions of the planning department have determined that the proposed project is permitted in the Mission NCT District and is consistent with applicable zoning, height and bulk limits, land use plans, policies, and regulations.5,6

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

---

5 San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 3314 Cesar Chavez Street, April 5, 2016.
6 San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 3314 Cesar Chavez Street, June 29, 2016.
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)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
   b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
   c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

One of the objectives of the Eastern Neighborhoods area plans is to identify appropriate locations for housing in the City’s industrially zoned land to meet the citywide demand for additional housing. The PEIR assessed how the rezoning actions would affect housing supply and location options for businesses in the Eastern Neighborhoods and compared these outcomes to what would otherwise be expected without the rezoning, assuming a continuation of development trends and ad hoc land use changes (such as allowing housing within industrial zones through conditional use authorization on a case-by-case basis, site-specific rezoning to permit housing, and other similar case-by-case approaches). The PEIR concluded that adoption of the rezoning and area plans: “would induce substantial growth and concentration of population in San Francisco.” The PEIR states that the increase in population expected to occur as a result of the proposed rezoning and adoption of the area plans would not, in itself, result in adverse physical effects, and would serve to advance key City policy objectives, such as providing housing in appropriate locations next to Downtown and other employment generators and furthering the City’s transit first policies. It was anticipated that the rezoning would result in an increase in both housing development and population in all of the area plan neighborhoods. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population and density would not directly result in significant adverse physical effects on the environment. However, the PEIR identified significant cumulative impacts on the physical environment that would result indirectly from growth afforded under the rezoning and area plans, including impacts on land use, transportation, air quality, and noise. The PEIR contains detailed analyses of these secondary effects under each of the relevant resource topics, and identifies mitigation measures to address significant impacts where feasible.

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

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

Implementation of the proposed project would result in 58 new residential units with approximately 1,300 square feet of retail use which would increase the number of residents and employees within the Mission Area Plan area. These direct effects of the proposed project on population and housing would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts on the physical environment beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The project’s contribution to indirect effects on the physical environment attributable to population growth are evaluated in this initial study under land use, transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, recreation, utilities and service systems, and public services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5, including those resources listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

7 Based on the Planning Department’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review, four total employees are assumed for 1,300 square feet of retail space.
### Topics:

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

### Historic Architectural Resources

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

The existing building on the project site was previously evaluated in the South Mission Historic Resource Survey and was assigned a California Historic Resource Status Code (CHRSC) of “6Z,” which designates this property as “ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Places, or Local Designation through survey evaluation.”

As such, the project site is not considered a historic resource pursuant CEQA. Additionally, the project site is not located in a historic district or immediately adjacent to a historic resource. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to the significant historic resource impact identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and no historic resource mitigation measures would apply to the proposed project.

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

### Archeological Resources

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

---

The proposed project at 3314 Cesar Chavez Street would involve excavation of approximately 25 feet below ground surface, resulting in 6,000 cubic yards of soil disturbance in an area where no previous archaeological studies have been prepared. The proposed project would be subject to Mitigation Measure J-2 (Project Mitigation Measure 1). In accordance with Mitigation Measure J-2, a preliminary archeological review (PAR) was conducted by Planning Department staff archeologists, which determined that the proposed project has the potential to adversely affect CEQA-significant archeological resources.\footnote{Sally Morgan, San Francisco Planning Department, Preliminary Archeological Review, 3314 Cesar Chavez Street, San Francisco, CA November 9, 2017.} The PAR determined that the potential of the project to adversely affect archeological resources may be avoided by implementation of archeological testing. In accordance with Project Mitigation Measure 1, the project sponsor would be required to prepare an archeological testing program to more definitively identify the potential for California register-eligible archeological resources to be present within the project site and determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effect of the project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. The project sponsor has agreed to implement the requirements of the Planning Department’s third standard archeological mitigation measure (archeological testing), as Project Mitigation Measure 1 (full text provided in the “Mitigation Measures” section below).

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

\begin{tabular}{lcccc}
\hline
Topics: & Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site & Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR & Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information & No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR \\
\hline
4. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION—Would the project: & & & & \\
\hline
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? & & & & \checkmark \\
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? & & & & \checkmark \\
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels, obstructions to flight, or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks? & & & & \checkmark \\
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses? & & & & \checkmark \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes would not result in significant impacts related to pedestrians, bicyclists, loading, or construction traffic. The PEIR states that in general, the analyses of pedestrian, bicycle, loading, emergency access, and construction transportation impacts are specific to individual development projects, and that project-specific analyses would need to be conducted for future development projects under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans.

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

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

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

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

This section relies substantially on a transportation memorandum that was prepared for the proposed project in accordance with the San Francisco Planning Department’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review.10

**Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis**

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

---

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

The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Transportation Authority) uses the San Francisco Chained Activity Model Process (SF-CHAMP) to estimate VMT by private automobiles and taxis for different land use types. Travel behavior in SF-CHAMP is calibrated based on observed behavior from the California Household Travel Survey 2010-2012, Census data regarding automobile ownership rates and county-to-county worker flows, and observed vehicle counts and transit boardings. SF-CHAMP uses a synthetic population, which is a set of individual actors that represents the Bay Area’s actual population, who make simulated travel decisions for a complete day. The Transportation Authority uses tour-based analysis for office and residential uses, which examines the entire chain of trips over the course of a day, not just trips to and from the project. For retail uses, the Transportation Authority uses trip-based analysis, which counts VMT from individual trips to and from the project (as opposed to entire chain of trips). A trip-based approach, as opposed to a tour-based approach, is necessary for retail projects because a tour is likely to consist of trips stopping in multiple locations, and the summarizing of tour VMT to each location would over-estimate VMT.11,12

The proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would cause substantial additional VMT. State Office of Planning and Research’s (OPR) Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (“Proposed Transportation Impact Guidelines”) recommend screening criteria to identify types, characteristics, or locations of projects that would not result in significant impacts to VMT. If a project meets one of the three screening criteria provided (Map-Based Screening, Small Projects, and Proximity to Transit Stations), then it is presumed that VMT impacts would be less than significant for the project and a detailed VMT analysis is not required. Map-Based Screening is used to determine if a project site is located within a transportation analysis zone (TAZ) that exhibits low levels of VMT; Small Projects are projects that would generate fewer than 100 vehicle trips per day; and the Proximity to Transit Stations criterion includes projects that are within a half mile of an existing major transit stop, have a floor area ratio of greater than or equal to 0.75, vehicle parking that is less than or equal to that required or allowed by the Planning Code without conditional use authorization, and are consistent with the applicable Sustainable Communities Strategy.

For residential development, the existing regional average daily VMT per capita is 17.2.13 For retail development, regional average daily retail VMT per employee is 14.9.14 Average daily VMT for these land

---

11 To state another way: a tour-based assessment of VMT at a retail site would consider the VMT for all trips in the tour, for any tour with a stop at the retail site. If a single tour stops at two retail locations, for example, a coffee shop on the way to work and a restaurant on the way back home, then both retail locations would be allotted the total tour VMT. A trip-based approach allows us to apportion all retail-related VMT to retail sites without double-counting.
13 Includes the VMT generated by the households in the development and averaged across the household population to determine VMT per capita.
uses is projected to decrease in future 2040 cumulative conditions. Refer to Table 1: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled, which includes the transportation analysis zone in which the project site is located, 130.

Table 1: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Cumulative 2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bay Area Regional Average</td>
<td>Bay Area Regional Average minus 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bay Area Regional Average</td>
<td>Bay Area Regional Average minus 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households (Residential)</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (Retail)</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1, the proposed project’s residential and retail uses would be located in a TAZ where existing VMT for residential and retail uses are more than 15 percent below regional averages. The existing average daily VMT per capita is 7.0, which is 59 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per capita of 17.2. Future 2040 average daily VMT per capita is 6.2, which is 61 percent below the future 2040 regional average daily VMT per capita of 16.1. The existing average daily VMT per retail employee is 9.5, which is 36 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per retail employee of 14.9. Future 2040 average daily VMT per retail employee is 9.6, which is 34 percent below the future 2040 regional average daily work-related VMT per retail employee of 14.6.

Given that the project site is located in an area where existing VMT is more than 15 percent below the existing regional average, the proposed project’s residential and retail uses would not result in substantial additional VMT. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to VMT. The project site also meets the Proximity to Transit Stations screening criterion, which also indicates that the proposed project’s residential and retail uses would not cause substantial additional VMT.

Induced Automobile Travel Analysis

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

---

14 Retail travel is not explicitly captured in SF-CHAMP, rather, there is a generic “Other” purpose which includes retail shopping, medical appointments, visiting friends or family, and all other non-work, non-school tours. The retail efficiency metric captures all of the “Other” purpose travel generated by Bay Area households. The denominator of employment (including retail; cultural, institutional, and educational; and medical employment; school enrollment, and number of households) represents the size, or attraction, of the zone for this type of “Other” purpose travel.

15 San Francisco Planning Department, Eligibility Checklist: CEQA Section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for 3314 Cesar Chavez Street, August 28, 2017.

16 Ibid.
The proposed project is not a transportation project. However, the proposed project would include features that would alter the transportation network. The two existing curb cuts with widths of 17 and 15 feet would be removed and standard sidewalk and curb dimensions restored. The proposed project would create a new 10-foot-wide curb cut for access to the basement level garage. Additionally, five Class 2 bicycle spaces would be located on the sidewalk in front of the project site. These features fit within the general types of projects that would not substantially induce automobile travel, and the impacts would be less than significant.17

Travel Demand
The project sponsor proposes the demolition of the existing building and construction of a six-story, mixed-use building approximately 57,715 square feet in size. The proposed building would include 58 dwelling units, 1,300 square feet of ground-floor commercial use, and 28 off-street vehicular parking spaces located at the basement level accessed from Cesar Chavez Street. The project would include a total 62 Class I bicycle spaces (56 at the ground floor and six at the basement level) and five Class II bicycle spaces would be located on the sidewalk in front of the project site.

Trip generation of the proposed project was calculated using a trip-based analysis and information in the Transportation Impacts Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review (SF Guidelines) developed by the San Francisco Planning Department as detailed in the transportation memorandum.18 The proposed project would generate an estimated 700 person trips (inbound and outbound) on a weekday daily basis, consisting of 260 person trips by auto (188 vehicle trips accounting for vehicle occupancy data for this Census Tract), 252 transit trips, 97 walk trips and 91 trips by other modes.19 During the p.m. peak hour, the proposed project would generate an estimated 104 person trips, consisting of 33 person trips by auto (26 vehicle trips accounting for vehicle occupancy data), 41 transit trips, 13 walk trips and 15 trips by other modes.

The proposed project would generate up to 1.22 freight and service vehicle trips per day, which would result in a demand of 0.05 loading spaces during the average hour and 0.07 loading spaces during the peak hour of loading activities. Similarly, the retail use would generate up to 0.31 freight and service vehicle trips per day, which would result in a demand for 0.01 loading spaces during the average hour and 0.02 loading spaces during the peak hour of loading activities.20 Combined, the two land uses would generate 1.54 freight and service vehicle trips per day, with a demand of 0.07 and 0.09 loading spaces in the average and peak hour of loading activities, respectively.

Traffic Hazards
On weekdays, the proposed project is expected to generate approximately 188 daily vehicle trips, including 26 trips during the p.m. peak hour. Access to the proposed parking garage would be via a 10-foot-wide (single lane) ramp and a new 10-foot-wide curb cut on Cesar Chavez Street. Of the 26 p.m. peak hour vehicle trips, 16 would be inbound trips, which would result in approximately one vehicle entering

---

17 Ibid
19 Trip credit was not given for the trips generated by the existing use on the project site.
20 Given that the retail tenant has not yet been identified, this calculation was based on a composite retail loading demand rate. It should be noted the freight loading needs associated with retail uses varies by retail use type.
the garage every three to four minutes. Ten vehicle trips would be outbound trips, which would result in approximately one vehicle exiting the garage every six minutes. Based on the low volume of inbound and outbound trips during the p.m. peak hour, there would be a low likelihood of coinciding inbound and outbound trips. In the event of coinciding inbound and outbound trips, any vehicles queuing within the public right-of-way would wait along the north side of westbound Cesar Chavez Street, either within available on-street parking spaces adjacent to the project driveway, the proposed on-street loading zone (if approved), or within the northern westbound travel lane on Cesar Chavez Street. However, in the event of coinciding inbound and outbound vehicle trips, the inbound trips would be prioritized based on sensor technology at the entrance of the project garage driveway and resulting queues would be more likely to occur inside the project garage. As a result, no queuing is anticipated to occur adjacent to the proposed project’s driveway along Cesar Chavez Street.

Potential conflicts between vehicles and transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians would be avoided due to the proposed project’s active management controls for the one lane driveway, as well as clear site lines at the project driveway. Additionally, the proposed curb cut would only be 10 feet wide, which would reduce vehicle speeds entering and exiting the project’s driveway and garage ramp, and thus, reduce potential conflicts between vehicles and transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians at the proposed project’s driveway. Therefore, driveway and garage operations would result in a less-than-significant impact on traffic hazards.

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

---

21 Two additional files were created at the Board of Supervisors for TSF regarding hospitals and health services, grandfathering, and additional fees for larger projects: see Board file nos. 151121 and 151257.
22 http://tsp.sfplanning.org
along 16th Street to Mission Bay (expected construction between 2017 and 2020), and the Travel Time Reduction Project on Route 9 San Bruno (initiation in 2015). In addition, Muni Forward includes service improvements to various routes with the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area; for instance the implemented new Route 55 on 16th Street.

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

The project site is located within a quarter mile of several local transit lines including Muni lines 12, 14, 14R, 27, 36, 49, and 67. The nearest Muni bus stops are approximately 215 feet to the east and 550 feet to the west along Cesar Chavez Street. Additionally, the nearest Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) regional rail station is located approximately 0.4 miles north at 24th and Mission streets. The proposed project would be expected to generate 252 daily transit trips, including 41 during the p.m. peak hour. Given the location of the project site, the 41 p.m. peak hour transit trips would likely be spread over multiple routes, with the majority of trips occurring in the non-peak direction during the p.m. peak hour and would not be anticipated to cause a substantial increase in transit demand for any particular route that could not be accommodated by existing capacity. Additionally, because there is no transit-only lane located along westbound Cesar Chavez Street adjacent to the proposed driveway, and because the number of vehicle trips generated by the project and the number of p.m. peak hour trips accessing the project driveway are both minimal, the project would not result in any impacts to transit delay.

Vehicles entering or exiting the proposed project’s garage would use the driveway on Cesar Chavez Street. These vehicle trips would not conflict with the operation of Muni routes along Cesar Chavez Street, as the 16 inbound vehicle trips during the p.m. peak hour would not result in substantial queuing along Cesar Chavez Street adjacent to the proposed driveway entrance. However, even if one or two vehicles were queued in the northernmost westbound mixed-flow travel lane, westbound Cesar Chavez consists of two travel lanes, providing the option for buses to move around any potential vehicle stoppages in the northernmost travel lane. Further, the potential for conflicts between private vehicles and transit along Cesar Chavez Street would be reduced due to the clear site lines to and from the project driveway, and the slow speeds encouraged by the 10-foot width of the proposed driveway curb cut.

As a result, the proposed project would not cause a substantial increase in transit delays or operating costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service levels could result. Given that the proposed project would not substantially affect the capacity utilization on local or regional transit lines, and would
not substantially affect the operations of the adjacent and nearby bus transit routes, the impacts of the proposed project to transit would be less than significant.

Each of the rezoning options in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts relating to increases in transit ridership on Muni lines, with the Preferred Project having significant impacts on seven lines. Of those lines, the project site is located within a quarter-mile of Muni lines 27 and 49. The proposed project would not contribute considerably to these conditions as its minor contribution of 41 p.m. peak hour transit trips would not be a substantial proportion of the overall additional transit volume generated by Eastern Neighborhood projects. The proposed project would also not contribute considerably to 2040 cumulative transit conditions and thus would not result in any significant cumulative transit impacts.

**Pedestrians**

Pedestrian trips generated by the proposed project would include walking trips to and from transit stops, and nearby businesses and commercial uses. Overall, the proposed project would add up to 54 pedestrian trips to the surrounding streets (this includes 41 transit trips and 13 walk trips) during the weekday p.m. peak hour. The proposed project would maintain the existing 10-foot sidewalk width along the project frontage on Cesar Chavez Street. No overcrowding was observed along the sidewalk or at local transit stops in the study area.\(^{23}\) As a result, the 54 new p.m. peak-hour pedestrian person trips generated by the proposed project would be accommodated within the existing sidewalks and would not result in any substantial overcrowding along sidewalks or at nearby transit stops. Although the proposed project would result in an increase in the number of vehicles in the vicinity of the project site, this increase would be incremental and would not create potential conflicts for pedestrians or otherwise substantially interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the site and adjoining areas.

The proposed project would remove two existing curb cuts on Cesar Chavez Street with widths of 17 and 15 feet, and would install a new, narrower curb cut with a width of 10 feet. The new curb cut would act as a traffic calming device, reducing the speeds of vehicles entering or exiting the driveway. As a result, the design and operations of the new driveway at this potential conflict point would not result in a hazard for pedestrians. The proposed project would not increase overcrowding on public sidewalks, interfere with local pedestrian circulation, or create hazardous conditions for pedestrians. As such, impacts to pedestrians would be less-than-significant

**Bicycles**

In the vicinity of the project site, there is a bicycle route that runs along Cesar Chavez Street and there are also bicycle routes on Folsom Street between 24th and Cesar Chavez streets. The bicycle route along Cesar Chavez Street was observed to have relatively low bicycle volumes during the p.m. peak hour.\(^{24}\) The proposed project would also place five Class II bicycle parking spaces along the existing sidewalk on Cesar Chavez Street adjacent to the project site.

---


\(^{24}\) Ibid
The proposed project would generate approximately 91 daily “other” person trips of which 15 trips would occur during the p.m. peak hour. The proposed project would not introduce any design features that would reduce or impede access to these existing bicycle routes near the project site. Thus, the proposed project would maintain bicycle accessibility to the project site.

The proposed project would result in up to 26 new p.m. peak hour vehicle trips that would cross the bicycle lane on Cesar Chavez Street while accessing the project driveway. However, potential conflicts between vehicles and bicyclists would be reduced or avoided due to the proposed project’s active driveway controls, clear lines of site at the project driveway, and slow vehicle speeds encouraged by the 10-foot-wide driveway and curb cut. Although the proposed project would increase the number of vehicles in the vicinity of the project site, this increase would not create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the site and adjoining areas. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on bicycle travel within the study area.

Commercial Loading
The proposed project would generate up to two daily freight and service vehicle trips, which corresponds to a demand of up to one loading space during both the average and peak loading hours. The proposed project would not provide an off-street loading space to meet this demand and no existing on-street loading spaces are located within a convenient distance of the project site. Therefore, it is possible that commercial vehicle drivers would stop in the vehicular or bicycle travel lane along Cesar Chavez Street (i.e. double-parking) or in available on-street vehicular parking space to make deliveries. While stopping in the vehicular travel lane or bicycle lane may be inconvenient for private vehicles and bicyclists, this would not be a traffic hazard given the infrequency of occurrence, and the adequate sightlines to/from the project’s driveway and delivery reception area (i.e. front door). Similarly, given the infrequency of this event potentially occurring, and the number of travel lanes available for transit vehicles, no delays affecting transit would occur. Therefore, commercial loading impacts would be less-than-significant.

To reduce this less-than-significant impact associated with unmet demand for freight loading space, the project sponsor has agreed to implement Improvement Measure I-TR-1: Application to SFMTA Color Curb Program for Curbside Commercial (Yellow Curb) Loading Space. This improvement measure would require the retail tenant (once known) to apply to the SFMTA Color Curb Program to convert existing on-street parking along the project site’s Cesar Chavez Street frontage to a 40-foot commercial loading space. The application would be reviewed by SFMTA staff, who would apply loading demand thresholds based on the type of retail use being proposed. If SFMTA determines that the commercial loading demand for the retail use warrants a yellow curb, the application would be approved, the yellow curb would be installed, and the proposed project’s loading demand would be met by a convenient on-street commercial loading supply. If the SFMTA determines that the commercial loading demand does not warrant a new yellow curb the application would be denied.

---

25 For a conservative analysis, all of the “other” trips generated are assumed to be bicycle trips.
26 Under Planning Code section 152.1, residential land uses of less than 100,000 square feet and retail land uses of less than 10,000 square feet are not required to provide any off-street freight loading spaces.
27 SFMTA Color Curb Program: [https://www.sfmta.com/getting-around/parking/curb-colors](https://www.sfmta.com/getting-around/parking/curb-colors)
28 This preliminary recommendation is based on personal communication between Planning Department staff and Paul Kniha, SFMTA Color Curb Program, July 2017.
Passenger Loading
Given the 58 proposed residential units associated with the project, the demand for passenger loading spaces may be up to one vehicle per hour in both the average and peak hour of loading activities.\(^2\) If no curbside passenger loading is provided, it is possible that motorists driving private vehicles would stop in a mixed-flow travel lane along Cesar Chavez Street or in available on-street vehicle parking spaces for pick-up/drop-off activities. While stopping in the mixed-flow travel lane may be temporarily inconvenient for other people driving private vehicles, this would not create a traffic hazard given the adequate sightlines east and west on Cesar Chavez Street, the infrequency of passenger loading activities, and the duration of those events (e.g., less than one minute). Given the infrequency of passenger loading events occurring, and their limited duration, any unmet demand for passenger loading spaces would not create potentially hazardous conditions affecting bicycles, transit vehicles or pedestrians. Therefore, passenger loading impacts would be less-than-significant.

To reduce this less-than-significant impact, the project sponsor has agreed to implement Improvement Measure I-TR-2: Application to SFMTA Color Curb Program for Curbside Passenger Loading (White Curb) Space, which specifies that the project sponsor would apply to the SFMTA Color Curb program to create a new passenger loading space along the project site’s Cesar Chavez Street frontage. If SFMTA determines that the passenger loading demand warrants a white curb, the application would be approved, the white curb would be installed, and the proposed project’s passenger loading demand would be met. If the SFMTA determines that the passenger loading demand does not warrant a new white curb the application would be denied.

Construction
Construction is anticipated to occur over approximately 18 months. Detailed plans for construction activities have not yet been finalized, but throughout the construction period, there would be construction-related trucks entering and exiting the site. The impact of construction truck traffic would be a temporary reduction to the capacities of the local streets due to the size, slower acceleration, and larger turning radii of trucks, which may temporarily affect traffic and transit operations and increase potential traffic, pedestrian, and bicycle conflicts near the project site. The 5 to 10 daily construction workers would be encouraged to use public transit. Workers driving personal vehicles to the site would likely park on the street.

Construction staging and work areas would generally be confined to within the project site footprint, but periodically may require sidewalk and curbside parking lane closure along Cesar Chavez Street. In this case, pedestrians would be re-routed around the closed sidewalk using the closed parking lane as a temporary walking path, protected by barrier. Any temporary sidewalk, parking, or traffic lane closures would be coordinated with City agencies in order to minimize the impacts on traffic. In general, lane and sidewalk closures or diversions are subject to review and approval by the City’s Transportation Advisory Staff Committee (“TASC”), which consists of representatives from the Fire Department, Police Department, SFMTA Traffic Engineering Division, and Public Works. In addition, the contractor is required to follow “Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets” (the Blue Book), including required

\(^2\) Given the project’s size, off-street passenger loading is not required under the Planning Code. As such the proposed project does not include any off-street passenger loading spaces.
permits for working in or modifying the public right-of-way.\textsuperscript{30} The project sponsor and/or contractor would be required to meet with the TASC to present their construction management plan which would determine feasible measures to reduce traffic congestion, including transit disruption and pedestrian circulation impacts during construction of individual development projects. Therefore, the proposed project’s construction impacts related to transportation were determined to be less-than-significant.

Conclusion

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. NOISE—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, in an area within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Be substantially affected by existing noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would result in significant noise impacts during construction activities and due to conflicts between noise-sensitive uses in proximity to noisy uses such as PDR, retail, entertainment,

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

Construction Noise

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 relate to construction noise. Mitigation Measure F-1 addresses individual projects that include pile-driving, and Mitigation Measure F-2 addresses individual projects that include particularly noisy construction procedures (including pile-driving). The proposed building would be supported by a stiffened mat foundation on improved soil. Since construction of the proposed building would not require impact pile driving, Mitigation Measure F-1 is not applicable. Since heavy equipment would be required during construction, Mitigation Measures F-2 is applicable. Project Mitigation Measure 2 would reduce construction noise by requiring the sponsor to develop and implement a set of noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. The project sponsor has agreed to implement Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2 as Project Mitigation Measure 2 (full text provided in the “Mitigation Measures” section below).

In addition, all construction activities for the proposed project (approximately 18 months) would be subject to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code) (Noise Ordinance). Construction noise is regulated by the Noise Ordinance. The Noise Ordinance requires construction work to be conducted in the following manner: (1) noise levels of construction equipment, other than impact tools, must not exceed 80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the source (the equipment generating the noise); (2) impact tools must have intake and exhaust mufflers that are approved by the Director of Public Works (PW) or the Director of the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) to best accomplish maximum noise reduction; and (3) if the noise from the construction work would exceed the ambient noise levels at the site property line by 5 dBA, the work must not be conducted between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. unless the Director of PW authorizes a special permit for conducting the work during that period.

DBI is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance for private construction projects during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.). The Police Department is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance during all other hours. Nonetheless, during the construction period for the proposed project of

31 Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-3, F-4, and F-6 address the siting of sensitive land uses in noisy environments. In a decision issued on December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require an agency to consider the effects of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project’s future users or residents except where a project or its residents may exacerbate existing environmental hazards (California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, December 17, 2015, Case No. S213478. Available at: http://www.courts.ca.gov/opinions/documents/S213478.PDF). As noted above, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that incremental increases in traffic-related noise attributable to implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and Rezoning would be less than significant, and thus would not exacerbate the existing noise environment. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measures F-3, F-4, and F-6 are not applicable. Nonetheless, for all noise sensitive uses, the general requirements for adequate interior noise levels of Mitigation Measures F-3 and F-4 are met by compliance with the acoustical standards required under the California Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations Title 24).
approximately 18 months, occupants of the nearby properties could be disturbed by construction noise. Times may occur when noise could interfere with indoor activities in nearby residences and other businesses near the project site. The increase in noise in the project area during project construction would not be considered a significant impact of the proposed project, because the construction noise would be temporary, intermittent, and restricted in occurrence and level, as the contractor would be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance and Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2, which would reduce construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Operational Noise**

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5 addresses impacts related to individual projects that include uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise in the project vicinity. The proposed project involves the construction of a six-story, mixed-use building with 58 dwelling units and 1,300 square feet of ground-floor retail use. Since the proposed project would not be expected to generate excessive noise levels, Mitigation Measure F-5 is not applicable.

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

Additionally, the proposed project would be subject to the Noise Regulations Relating to Residential Uses Near Places of Entertainment (Ordinance 70-15, effective June 19, 2015). The intent of these regulations is to address noise conflicts between residential uses in noise critical areas, such as in proximity to highways and other high-volume roadways, railroads, rapid transit lines, airports, nighttime entertainment venues or industrial areas. In accordance with the adopted regulations, residential structures to be located where the day-night average sound level (Ldn) or community noise equivalent level (CNEL) exceeds 60 decibels shall require an acoustical analysis with the application of a building permit showing that the proposed design would limit exterior noise to 45 decibels in any habitable room.

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

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant noise impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.
### 6. AIR QUALITY—Would the project:

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

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified potentially significant air quality impacts resulting from construction activities and impacts to sensitive land uses\(^{32}\) as a result of exposure to elevated levels of diesel particulate matter (DPM) and other toxic air contaminants (TACs). The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified four mitigation measures that would reduce these air quality impacts to less-than-significant levels and stated that with implementation of identified mitigation measures, the Area Plan would be consistent with the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy, the applicable air quality plan at that time. All other air quality impacts were found to be less than significant.

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 addresses air quality impacts during construction, and PEIR Mitigation Measures G-3 and G-4 address proposed uses that would emit DPM and other TACs,\(^{33}\)

#### Construction Dust Control

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 Construction Air Quality requires individual projects involving construction activities to include dust control measures and to maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions of particulates and other pollutants. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors subsequently approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes, generally referred to as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008). The intent of the Construction Dust Control Ordinance is to reduce the quantity of fugitive dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of on-site workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and

---

\(^{32}\) The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) considers sensitive receptors as: children, adults or seniors occupying or residing in: 1) residential dwellings, including apartments, houses, condominiums, 2) schools, colleges, and universities, 3) daycares, 4) hospitals, and 5) senior care facilities. BAAQMD, Recommended Methods for Screening and Modeling Local Risks and Hazards, May 2011, page 12.

\(^{33}\) The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR also includes Mitigation Measure G-2, which has been superseded by Health Code Article 38, as discussed below, and is no longer applicable.
to avoid orders to stop work by DBI. Project-related construction activities would result in construction dust, primarily from ground-disturbing activities. In compliance with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance, the project sponsor and contractor responsible for construction activities at the project site would be required to control construction dust on the site through a combination of watering disturbed areas, covering stockpiled materials, street and sidewalk sweeping and other measures.

The regulations and procedures set forth by the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance would ensure that construction dust impacts would not be significant. These requirements supersede the dust control provisions of PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1. Therefore, the portion of PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 Construction Air Quality that addresses dust control is no longer applicable to the proposed project.

**Criteria Air Pollutants**

While the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that at a program-level the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in significant regional air quality impacts, the PEIR states that “Individual development projects undertaken in the future pursuant to the new zoning and area plans would be subject to a significance determination based on the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) quantitative thresholds for individual projects.”\(^{34}\) The BAAQMD’s *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* (Air Quality Guidelines) provide screening criteria\(^{35}\) for determining whether a project’s criteria air pollutant emissions would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. Pursuant to the Air Quality Guidelines, projects that meet the screening criteria do not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants. The proposed mixed-use development involves the construction of 58 dwelling units and 1,300 square feet of retail use, which would meet the Air Quality Guidelines criteria air pollutant screening levels for operation and construction.\(^{36,37}\) Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants, and a detailed air quality assessment is not required.

**Health Risk**

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

---


\(^{35}\) Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, updated May 2011. See pp. 3-2 to 3-3.

\(^{36}\) Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2017 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. Table 3-1. Criteria air pollutant screening sizes for an Apartment, Low-Rise Building is 451 dwelling units for operational and 240 dwelling units for construction. Criteria air pollutant screening sizes for a Regional Shopping Center is 99,000 square feet for operational and 277,000 square feet for construction.
Pollutant Exposure Zone require special consideration to determine whether the project’s activities would expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations or add emissions to areas already adversely affected by poor air quality.

**Construction**

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

**Siting New Sources**

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

**Conclusion**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR assessed the GHG emissions that could result from rezoning of the Mission Area Plan under the three rezoning options. The Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning Options A, B, and C are anticipated to result in GHG emissions on the order of 4.2, 4.3 and 4.5 metric tons of CO2E38 per service population, respectively. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that the resulting GHG

---

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

39 Memorandum from Jessica Range to Environmental Planning staff, Greenhouse Gas Analyses for Community Plan Exemptions in Eastern Neighborhoods, April 20, 2010. This memorandum provides an overview of the GHG analysis conducted for the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and provides an analysis of the emissions using a service population (equivalent of total number of residents and employees) metric.
emissions from the three options analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans would be less than significant. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The BAAQMD has prepared guidelines and methodologies for analyzing GHGs. These guidelines are consistent with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.4 and 15183.5 which address the analysis and determination of significant impacts from a proposed project’s GHG emissions and allow for projects that are consistent with an adopted GHG reduction strategy to conclude that the project’s GHG impact is less than significant. San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions40 presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco’s GHG reduction strategy in compliance with the BAAQMD and CEQA guidelines. These GHG reduction actions have resulted in a 23.3 percent reduction in GHG emissions in 2012 compared to 1990 levels,41 exceeding the year 2020 reduction goals outlined in the BAAQMD’s 2010 Clean Air Plan,42 Executive Order S-3-0543, and Assembly Bill 32 (also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act).44,45 In addition, San Francisco’s GHG reduction goals are consistent with, or more aggressive than, the long-term goals established under Executive Orders S-3-05,46 B-30-15,47,48 and Senate Bill (SB) 32.49,50 Therefore, projects that are consistent with San Francisco’s GHG Reduction Strategy would not result in GHG emissions that would have a significant effect on the environment and would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations.

The proposed project would increase the intensity of use of the project site by introducing residential uses (58 dwelling units) and including 1,300 square feet of commercial space. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to annual long-term increases in GHGs as a result of increased vehicle trips (mobile sources) and residential and commercial operations that result in an increase in energy use, water use,
wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal. Construction activities would also result in temporary increases in GHG emissions.

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

Compliance with the City’s transportation sustainability fee, and bicycle parking and car share 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 applicable energy efficiency requirements of the City’s Green Building Code, Stormwater Management Ordinance, Water Conservation Ordinance, and Energy Conservation Ordinance, which would promote energy and water efficiency, thereby reducing the proposed project’s energy-related GHG emissions.51

The proposed project’s waste-related emissions would be reduced through compliance with the City’s Recycling and Composting Ordinance, Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Ordinance, and Green Building Code requirements. These regulations reduce the amount of materials sent to a landfill, reducing GHGs emitted by landfill operations. These regulations also promote reuse of materials, conserving their embodied energy52 and reducing the energy required to produce new materials.

Compliance with the City’s Street Tree Planting requirements would serve to increase carbon sequestration. Regulations requiring low-emitting finishes would reduce volatile organic compounds (VOCs).53 Thus, the proposed project was determined to be consistent with San Francisco’s GHG reduction strategy.54

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

---

51 Compliance with water conservation measures reduce the energy (and GHG emissions) required to convey, pump and treat water required for the project.
52 Embodied energy is the total energy required for the extraction, processing, manufacture and delivery of building materials to the building site.
53 While not a GHG, VOCs are precursor pollutants that form ground level ozone. Increased ground level ozone is an anticipated effect of future global warming that would result in added health effects locally. Reducing VOC emissions would reduce the anticipated local effects of global warming.
54 San Francisco Planning Department, Greenhouse Gas Analysis: Compliance Checklist for 3314 Cesar Chavez Street, March 8, 2017.
8. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:

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

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

Wind

Based upon experience of the planning department in reviewing wind analyses and expert opinion on other projects, it is generally the case that projects less than 80 feet in height would not have the potential to generate significant wind impacts. Although the proposed 65-foot-tall (74-foot-tall including the elevator penthouse) six-story building would be two to three stories (approximately 20 to 30 feet) taller than the three- to four-story buildings located in the project vicinity, the proposed project would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas because the building would not exceed 80 feet in height. Therefore, the proposed building would not cause or contribute to a ground-level exceedance of the wind hazard criterion of the Planning Code in the project vicinity. For the above reasons, the proposed project is not anticipated to cause significant impacts related to wind that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Shadow

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

The proposed project would construct a 65-foot-tall building (74-foot-tall with elevator penthouse); therefore, the planning department prepared a preliminary shadow fan analysis to determine whether the project would have the potential to cast new shadow on nearby parks. The preliminary shadow fan showed that the proposed building would not cast new shadow on any parks in the area, and therefore, would not generate any shadow impacts.

55 San Francisco Planning Department, Shadow Fan Analysis, 3314 Cesar Chavez Street, August 28, 2017.
The proposed project would shade portions of nearby streets and sidewalks and private property at times within the project vicinity. Shadows upon streets and sidewalks would not exceed levels commonly expected in urban areas and would be considered a less-than-significant effect under CEQA. Although occupants of nearby 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 the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to shadow that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

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

As part of the Eastern Neighborhoods adoption, the City adopted impact fees for development in Eastern Neighborhoods that goes towards funding recreation and open space. Since certification of the PEIR, the voters of San Francisco passed the 2012 San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond providing the Recreation and Parks Department an additional $195 million to continue capital projects for the renovation and repair of parks, recreation, and open space assets. This funding is being utilized for improvements and expansion to Garfield Square, South Park, Potrero Hill Recreation Center, Warm Water Cove Park, and Pier 70 Parks Shoreline within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area. The impact fees and the 2012 San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond are funding measures similar to that described in PEIR Improvement Measure H-1: Support for Upgrades to Existing Recreation Facilities.

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

Furthermore, the Planning Code requires a specified amount of new usable open space (either private or common) for each new residential unit. Some developments are also required to provide privately owned, publicly accessible open spaces. The Planning Code open space requirements would help offset some of the additional open space needs generated by increased residential population to the project area.

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

---

### 10. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that would serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact to the provision of water, wastewater collection and treatment, and solid waste collection and disposal. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

Since certification of the PEIR, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) adopted the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) in June 2011. The UWMP update includes city-wide demand projections to the year 2035, compares available water supplies to meet demand and presents water demand management measures to reduce long-term water demand. Additionally, the UWMP update includes a discussion of the conservation requirement set forth in Senate Bill 7 passed in November 2009 mandating a statewide 20 percent reduction in per capita water use by 2020. The UWMP includes a quantification of the SFPUC’s water use reduction targets and plan for meeting these objectives. The UWMP projects sufficient water supply in normal years and a supply shortfall during prolonged droughts. Plans are in place to institute varying degrees of water conservation and rationing as needed in response to severe droughts.

In addition, the SFPUC is in the process of implementing the Sewer System Improvement Program, which is a 20-year, multi-billion dollar citywide upgrade to the City’s sewer and stormwater infrastructure to ensure a reliable and seismically safe system. The program includes planned improvements that will serve development in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area including at the Southeast Treatment Plant, the Central Bayside System, and green infrastructure projects, such as the Mission and Valencia Green Gateway.

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

### 11. PUBLIC SERVICES—Would the project:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered public services, including fire protection, police protection, and public schools. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

A geotechnical investigation that included two test borings was prepared for the proposed project. The borings encountered very hard yellow brown sandy clay underlain by stiff gray brown sandy clay to a maximum depth explored of 17 feet below grade. Groundwater was encountered during site investigation at nine feet below grade. The project site is not located in an area of liquefaction. The geotechnical investigation concluded that the proposed structure could be supported upon a stiffened mat foundation founded on the underlying re-compacted material.

The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act (seismic hazard act, located in Public Resources Code 2690 et seq), enacted in 1990, protects public safety from the effects of strong ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, or other ground failures or hazards caused by earthquakes. The California Geological Survey designates the project site as within an area that may be prone to earthquake-induced ground failure during a major earthquake due to liquefaction hazard. Because of this, site design and construction must comply with the seismic hazard act, its implementing regulations, and the California Department of Conservation’s guidelines for evaluating and mitigating seismic hazards. In addition to the seismic hazard act, adequate investigation and mitigation of failure-prone soils is also required by the mandatory provisions of the California Building Code (state building code, California Code of Regulations, Title 24). The San Francisco Building Code has adopted the state building code with certain local amendments. The regulations implementing the seismic hazard act include criteria for approval of projects within seismic hazard zones that require a project be approved only when the nature and severity of the seismic hazards at the site have been evaluated in a geotechnical report and appropriate mitigation measures have been proposed and incorporated into the project, as applicable.

The proposed project is required to conform to the local building code, which ensures the safety of all new construction in the City. In particular, Chapter 18 of state building code, Soils and Foundations, provides the parameters for geotechnical investigations and structural considerations in the selection, design and installation of foundation systems to support the loads from the structure above. Section 1803 sets forth the basis and scope of geotechnical investigations conducted. Section 1804 specifies considerations for excavation, grading and fill to protect adjacent structures and prevent destabilization of slopes due to erosion and/or drainage. In particular, Section 1804.1, Excavation near foundations, requires that adjacent foundations be protected against a reduction in lateral support as a result of project excavation. This is typically accomplished by underpinning or protecting said adjacent foundations from detrimental lateral or vertical movement, or both. Section 1807 specifies requirements for foundation walls, retaining walls, and embedded posts and poles to ensure stability against overturning, sliding, and


57 In the context of the seismic hazard act, “mitigation” refers to measures that reduce earthquake hazards, rather than the Mitigation Measures that were identified in the programmatic EIR, which are required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to reduce or avoid environmental impacts of a proposed project.
excessive pressure, and water lift including seismic considerations. Sections 1808 (foundations) and 1809 (shallow foundations) specify requirements for foundation systems such that the allowable bearing capacity of the soil is not exceeded and differential settlement is minimized based on the most unfavorable loads specified in Chapter 16, Structural, for the structure’s seismic design category and soil classification at the project site. DBI will review the project-specific geotechnical report during its review of the building permit for the project. In addition, DBI may require additional site specific soils report(s) through the building permit application process, as needed. The DBI requirement for a geotechnical report and review of the building permit application pursuant to DBI’s implementation of the Building Code, local implementing procedures, and state laws, regulations and guidelines would ensure that the proposed project would have no significant impacts related to soils, seismic or other geological hazards.

In light of the above, the proposed project would not result in a significant effect related to seismic and geologic hazards. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to geology and soils that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and no mitigation measures are necessary.
The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact on hydrology and water quality, including the combined sewer system and the potential for combined sewer outflows. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The amount of impervious surface coverage on the project site would not increase with implementation of the proposed project as the project site is currently covered with the existing building and the adjacent asphalt parking area. The proposed project would not change this coverage and would not substantially increase runoff from the site. In accordance with the City’s Stormwater Management Ordinance (Ordinance No. 83-10), the proposed project would be subject to Low Impact Design approaches, such as landscape solutions designed to capture stormwater runoff, and stormwater management systems would be required to comply with the Stormwater Design Guidelines. As a result, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact on water quality from increased stormwater runoff.

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

### 15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS—Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
Topics: | Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site | Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR | Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information | No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR |
---|---|---|---|---|
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

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

**Hazardous Building Materials**

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that future development in the Plan Area may involve demolition or renovation of existing structures containing hazardous building materials. Some building materials commonly used in older buildings could present a public health risk if disturbed during an accident or during demolition or renovation of an existing building. Hazardous building materials addressed in the PEIR include asbestos, electrical equipment such as transformers and fluorescent light ballasts that contain PCBs or di (2 ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), fluorescent lights containing mercury vapors, and lead-based paints. Asbestos and lead based paint may also present a health risk to existing building occupants if they are in a deteriorated condition. If removed during demolition of a building, these materials would also require special disposal procedures. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified a significant impact associated with hazardous building materials including PCBs, DEHP, and mercury and determined that that Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials, as outlined below, would reduce effects to a less-than-significant level. Because the proposed development includes demolition of an existing building, Mitigation Measure L-1, identified as Project Mitigation Measure 3,
would apply to the proposed project. Project Mitigation Measure 3 would require the project sponsor to ensure that any equipment containing PCBs or mercury, such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of demolition.

**Soil and Groundwater Contamination**

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

The project site is located in a Maher area, meaning that it is known or suspected to contain contaminated soil and/or groundwater.\(^{58}\) The proposed project would require excavation to a depth of approximately 25 feet below ground surface and the removal of 6,000 cubic yards of soil. Therefore, the project sponsor is required to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a phase I ESA that meets the requirements of Health Code section 22.A.6.

The phase I ESA would determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the proposed project. Based on that information, the project sponsor may be required to conduct soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis. Where such analysis reveals the presence of hazardous substances in excess of state or federal standards, the project sponsor is required to submit a site mitigation plan (SMP) to DPH or other appropriate state or federal agencies and to remediate any site contamination in accordance with an approved SMP prior to the issuance of any building permit.

In compliance with the Maher Ordinance, the project sponsor submitted a Maher application and a phase I ESA to DPH.\(^{59,60}\) Based on the phase I ESA, the project site was used as a leather warehouse in 1886 and by 1900 it was used as a brewery. From 1950 to 2005, the property was a telephone facility primarily used as a garage. In 2005, the project site was used for office space and equipment storage for a construction company, which is the current use. The phase I ESA concluded that the project site may have been impacted by hydrocarbons from a former leaking underground storage tank (LUST). The LUST was located at the gasoline station that is located immediately east of the project site at 3300 Cesar Chavez Street. While the LUST received a case closure from DPH, it is possible that the soil and groundwater beneath the project site, particularly near the common boundary, has been impacted. The phase I ESA recommends the collection of soil and groundwater samples to assess the potential presence of petroleum contaminants.

---


59 PIERS Environmental Services, Inc., *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment*, 3314 Cesar Chavez Street, San Francisco, CA, September 2014.

60 Czarina Tabora, SFDPH, email to Don Lewis, 3314 Cesar Chavez Street, August 28, 2017.
hydrocarbons and metals. The proposed project would be required to remediate potential soil and groundwater contamination described above in accordance with article 22A of the Health Code.

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

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

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

As the proposed project is located in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans area, there would be no additional impacts on mineral and energy resources beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.
### 17. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:—Would the project:

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

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

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

### MITIGATION MEASURES

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

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

Consultation with Descendant Communities: On discovery of an archeological site\(^6\) associated with
descendant Native Americans, the Overseas Chinese, or other potentially interested descendant group an
appropriate representative\(^2\) of the descendant group and the ERO shall be contacted. The representative
of the descendant group shall be given the opportunity to monitor archeological field investigations of
the site and to offer recommendations to the ERO regarding appropriate archeological treatment of the
site, of recovered data from the site, and, if applicable, any interpretative treatment of the associated
archeological site. A copy of the Final Archaeological Resources Report shall be provided to the
representative of the descendant group.

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

At the completion of the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant shall submit a
written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archeological testing program the archeological
consultant finds that significant archeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the
archeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that
may be undertaken include additional archeological testing, archeological monitoring, and/or an
archeological data recovery program. No archeological data recovery shall be undertaken without the
prior approval of the ERO or the Planning Department archeologist. If the ERO determines that a
significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the
proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:

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

---

\(^6\) By the term “archeological site” is intended here to minimally include any archeological deposit,
feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

\(^2\) An “appropriate representative” of the descendant group is here defined to mean, in the case of Native
Americans, any individual listed in the current Native American Contact List for the City and County
of San Francisco maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission and in the case
of the Overseas Chinese, the Chinese Historical Society of America. An appropriate representative of
other descendant groups should be determined in consultation with the Department archeologist.
B) A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.

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

- The archeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine what project activities shall be archeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils-disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archeological resources and to their depositional context;
- The archeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archeological resource;
- The archeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with project archeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archeological deposits;
- The archeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis;
- If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. The archeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.

Whether or not significant archeological resources are encountered, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.

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

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

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

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

**Final Archeological Resources Report.** The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.
Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound, one unbound and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest in or the high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

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

The project sponsor is required to develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:

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

Project Mitigation Measure 3 – Hazardous Building Materials (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure L-1)

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

Project Improvement Measure I-TR-1 – Application to SFMTA Color Curb Program for Commercial Curbside Loading Spaces

To reduce the potential for unmet commercial loading demand at the project site, it shall be the responsibility of the project sponsor/property owner to require the retail tenant (once known) to apply to the SFMTA Color Curb Program to potentially convert two existing on-street parking spaces along the project site’s frontage on Cesar Chavez Street to a 40-foot-long commercial loading space.63

Project Improvement Measure I-TR-2 – Application to SFMTA Color Curb Program for Curbside Passenger Loading (White Curb) Space

To reduce the potential for unmet passenger loading demand at the project site, it shall be the responsibility of the project sponsor/property owner to apply to the SFMTA Color Curb Program to potentially convert one existing on-street parking space along the project site’s frontage on Cesar Chavez Street to a 20-foot-long passenger loading space.

63 This recommendation is based on personal communication between Planning Department staff and Paul Kniha, SFMTA Color Curb Program, July 2017.