Initial Study – Community Plan Evaluation
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Project Sponsor: Philip Lesser, representing TNN Properties, (650) 346-2903
Staff Contact: Don Lewis – (415) 575-9168
don.lewis@sfgov.org

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The triangular-shaped project site is located on the north side of Division Street between 10th and 11th streets adjacent to the elevated Highway 101 in the South of Market neighborhood (see Figure 1, Project Location). The project site is occupied by an approximately 12-foot-tall, one-story, 1,400-square-foot, office building (constructed in 1952) and a surface parking lot with four spaces (see Figure 2, Proposed Site Plan). The proposed project would involve the demolition of the existing building and construction of a 40-foot-tall (49 feet including the stair penthouse), four-story, 17,040-square-foot building. The current and proposed use of the project site is trade shop with accessory office. A construction and engineering business is the current and proposed business on the project site. The building would include a total of approximately 6,510 square feet of trade shop use (Production, Distribution, and Repair [PDR] use) on the second and third floors, consisting of general contracting services, and approximately 3,260 square feet of accessory office space on the fourth floor (see Figure 4, Proposed Upper Floor). The ground-floor level would include three vehicle parking spaces, two Class I bicycle parking spaces, four Class II bicycle parking spaces, and storage space for the trade shop use (see Figure 3, Proposed Ground Floor). Showers and clothes lockers would be provided on the ground floor. The proposed project would relocate the existing 16-foot-wide curb cut on Division Street to the west by approximately ten feet. The proposed project would plant four new street trees on Division Street in front of the project site. During the approximate 12-month construction period, the proposed project would require excavation to approximately nine feet below ground surface for the proposed elevator pit and foundation and 350 cubic yards of soil would be removed from the project site. The proposed building would be supported by a mat foundation on improved soils; impact piling driving is not proposed.

PROJECT APPROVAL

The proposed project at 340 Division Street would require a site permit from the Department of Building Inspections (DBI) for the demolition of the existing building and construction of the proposed building. The issuance of the building permit by DBI is the Approval Action. The Approval Action date establishes the start of the 30-day appeal period for this CEQA exemption determination pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

This initial study evaluates whether the environmental impacts of the proposed project are addressed in the programmatic environmental impact report for the *Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, and 350 Eighth Street Project (Western SoMa PEIR).* 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 Western SoMa PEIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the PEIR. Such impacts, if any, will be evaluated in a project-specific, focused mitigated negative declaration or environmental impact report. If no such topics are identified, no additional environmental review shall be required for the project beyond that provided in the Western SoMa 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 initial study.

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

The proposed project would involve the demolition of an existing office building and construction of a 40-foot-tall, four-story, 17,040-square-foot building including 6,510 square feet of trade shop use and 3,260 square feet of accessory office space. As discussed 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 Western SoMa PEIR.

**CHANGES IN THE REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT**

Since the certification of the Western SoMa PEIR in 2012, 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 Western SoMa plan area. As discussed in each topic area referenced below, these policies, regulations, statutes, and funding measures have
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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).
- 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).
- 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).
- 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 criteria. The project site is an infill site in a transit priority area because the project site has been previously developed and is located within one-half mile of a major transit stop. The proposed project meets the definition of an employment center use because the project site is zoned for commercial uses with a floor area ratio of no less than 0.75 and located within a transit priority area. Therefore, this initial study does not consider aesthetics or parking in determining the significance of project impacts under CEQA. Project elevations are included in the project description (See Figures 5 and 6).

---

2 The total gross building area of the proposed building is 17,040 square feet, and the area of the project site is 4,255 square feet. Therefore, the Floor Area Ratio is 4.0, which is greater than 0.75.

3 San Francisco Planning Department, *Eligibility Checklist for CEQA Section 21099: Modernization of Transportation Analysis*, 340 Division Street, January 17, 2017.
Automobile Delay and Vehicle Miles Traveled

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

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

<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>1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

As a result of the Western SoMa Community Plan, the project site was rezoned from SLI (Service/Light Industrial) to SALI (Service/Arts/Light Industrial) and the height and bulk district remained 40-X. The

---

4 This document is available online at: [https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_sb743.php](https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_sb743.php).
SALI district, which is largely comprised of low-scale buildings with PDR uses, is designed to protect and facilitate the expansion of existing general commercial, manufacturing, home and business service, and light industrial activities, with an emphasis on preserving and expanding arts activities. The Citywide Planning and Current Planning divisions of the Planning Department have determined that the proposed project is permitted in the SALI zoning districts and is consistent with the height, density, and land uses as specified in the Western SoMa Community Plan.\(^5\)\(^6\)

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that implementation of the Area Plan would not create any new physical barriers in the Plan Area because the rezoning and Area Plan do not provide for any new major roadways, such as freeways, that would divide the project area or isolate individual neighborhoods within it.

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

<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>2. POPULATION AND HOUSING— Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the objectives of the Western SoMa Community Plan is to identify appropriate locations for housing to meet the citywide demand for additional housing. The Western SoMa PEIR concluded that an increase in population in the Plan Area is expected to occur as a secondary effect of the proposed rezoning and that any population increase would not, in and of itself, result in adverse physical effects but would serve to advance key City policy objectives, such as providing housing in appropriate locations next to Downtown and other employment generators and furthering the City’s Transit First policies. It was anticipated that the rezoning would result in an increase in both housing development and population throughout the Plan Area. The Western SoMa PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population and density would not result in significant adverse physical effects on the environment. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

---

5 San Francisco Planning Department, *Community Plan Evaluation Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning Analysis, 340 Division Street*, March 6, 2017.

The proposed project would involve the demolition of an existing office building and construction of a 40-foot-tall, four-story, 17,040-square-foot building including 6,510 square feet of trade shop use and 3,260 square feet of accessory office space. This amount of PDR and office use is not anticipated to attract a substantial amount of new employees to San Francisco and it can be anticipated that most of the employees would live in San Francisco (or nearby communities). Therefore, the project would not generate substantial demand for new housing for the potential employees. These direct effects of the proposed project on population and housing are within the scope of the population and housing growth anticipated under the Western SoMa Community Plan and are evaluated in the Western SoMa PEIR.

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

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

Historic Architectural Resources

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.5(a)(1) and 15064.5(a)(2), historical resources are buildings or structures that are listed, or are eligible for listing, in the California Register of Historical Resources or are identified in a local register of historical resources, such as Articles 10 and 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code. The Western SoMa PEIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts related to causing a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource through demolition.

The subject building was constructed in 1952 as a one-story, wood-frame, office building with no discernable style. The rectangular-plan building is clad in composite wood siding and capped by a flat roof. As part of the adopted Showplace Square/Northeast Mission Historic Resource Survey and the South of Market Area Historic Resource Survey, the subject property 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

---

7 Based on the Planning Department’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review, 28 total employees are assumed for 6,510 square feet of trade shop use and 3,260 square feet of accessory office use.
evaluation.” As such, the project site would not be considered a historic resource pursuant CEQA and the proposed demolition would not result in a significant impact. Therefore, PEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-1a: Documentation of a Historical Resource, PEIR Mitigation Measures M-CP-1b: Oral Histories, and M-CP1c: Interpretive Program do not apply to the proposed project.

Furthermore, the project site is neither located within a known or eligible historic district nor immediately adjacent to any historic building. Therefore, Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measures M-CP-7a: Protect Historical Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities and M-CP-7b: Construction Monitoring Program for Historical Resources do not apply to the proposed project.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant project-level or cumulative impacts on historic architectural resources that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

Archeological Resources

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that implementation of the Plan could result in significant impacts on archeological resources and identified two mitigation measures that would reduce these potential impacts to a less than-significant level. Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a: Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment and M-CP-4b: Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources apply to projects involving any soils-disturbing or soils-improving activities including excavation to a depth of five or more feet below grade. The proposed project would involve approximately nine feet of excavation below ground surface and approximately 350 cubic yards of soil disturbance. Therefore, Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a would apply to the project.

As part of implementation of Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a, the Planning Department’s archeologists conducted a Preliminary Archeology Review (PAR) for the proposed project and determined that the proposed project would be subject M-CP-4b: Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources. The project sponsor has agreed to implement M-CP-4b, as Project Mitigation Measure 1 (full text provided in the “Mitigation Measures” section below). Project Mitigation Measure 1 would avoid any potential adverse effect on accidentally discovered historical archeological resources by requiring the project sponsor or project head foreman to immediately notify the Environmental Review Officer of the Planning Department and immediately suspending any soil-disturbing activities should any indication of an archeological resource be encountered. Therefore, the project would not result in significant impacts related to archeological resources with implementation of this mitigation measure.

Paleontological Resources

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that implementation of the Plan would have low potential to uncover unique or significant fossils as geological materials that would be disturbed by construction excavations in the Plan area would have little to no likelihood of containing unique or significant fossils. Therefore, the PEIR found less-than-significant impacts on paleontological resources.

---

10 Randall Dean, San Francisco Planning Department, Archeological Log.
The proposed project would involve excavation of approximately nine feet below ground surface, and the project site is underlain by seven to 15 feet of undocumented sand/silty sand fill. Therefore, the project site has low sensitivity for unique paleontological resources.

For the reasons above, the proposed project would not result in either project-level or cumulative significant impacts on cultural and paleontological resources that were not identified in the Western SoMa 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>4. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION—Would the project:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

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

Vehicle Miles Traveled (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 trip-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.12,13

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

---

12 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.

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 the purpose of project analysis, the proposed PDR space was considered to be an office development because the proposed trade shop use with accessory office space would generate work trips similar to those of an office development. For office development under the existing condition, the regional average daily VMT per employee is 19.1. Under the future cumulative condition (Year 2040), the regional average daily VMT per employee for office development is 17.1. Refer to Table 1: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled, which includes the traffic analysis zone (TAZ) in which the project site is located, 569.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use (Office)</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>Employment</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1 above, the existing average daily VMT per employee for office uses in TAZ 569 is 10 miles. This is approximately 48 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per employee of 19.1. The future average daily VMT per employee for office uses in TAZ 569 in year 2040 is 8.3 miles. This is approximately 51 percent below the existing regional average daily VMT per employee of 17.1.

Given that the project site is located in an area where existing VMT is more than 15 percent below the existing regional average, the project’s proposed uses would not result in substantial additional VMT, and the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to VMT. Furthermore, the project site meets the Proximity to Transit Stations and the Small Projects screening criterion, which also indicates that the proposed project would not cause substantial additional VMT.14

**Induced Automobile Travel Analysis**

A 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. OPR’s Proposed Transportation Impact Guidelines includes a list of transportation project types that would not likely lead to a substantial or measureable increase in VMT. If a project fits within the general types of projects (including combinations

---

of types), then it is presumed that VMT impacts would be less than significant and a detailed VMT analysis is not required.

The proposed project is not a transportation project. However, the proposed project would include Class II bicycle parking with showers and lockers on site. In addition, the proposed project would remove the existing surface parking lot with four spaces and would provide three vehicular parking spaces at the ground-floor level of the proposed building. These features fit within the general types of projects that would not substantially induce automobile travel, and the impacts would be less than significant.\(^{15}\)

**Trip Generation**

The proposed project would involve the demolition of the existing building and construction of a 40-foot-tall, four-story, 17,040-square-foot building. The building would include 6,510 square feet of trade shop use on the second and third floors and 3,260 square feet of accessory office space on the fourth floor. The ground-floor level would include three vehicle parking spaces, two Class I bicycle parking spaces, four Class II bicycle parking spaces, and storage space for the trade shop use.

Localized trip generation of the proposed project was calculated using a trip-based analysis and information in the 2002 *Transportation Impacts Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review* (SF Guidelines) developed by the San Francisco Planning Department. The proposed project would generate an estimated 174 person trips (inbound and outbound) on a weekday daily basis, consisting of 108 person trips by auto (64 vehicle trips accounting for vehicle occupancy data for this Census Tract), 33 transit trips, 22 walk trips and 11 trips by other modes (bike, etc.). During the PM peak hour, the proposed project would generate an estimated 15 person trips, consisting of 10 person trips by auto (8 vehicle trips accounting for vehicle occupancy data for this Census Tract), 3 transit trips, 1 walk trip and 1 trip by other modes. The loading demand would be approximately 0.12 peak-hour truck trips, with an average hour of 0.09 truck trips. According to the project sponsor, no vehicles larger than a pick-up truck are anticipated as there would be no large material deliveries to the project site. Deliveries to the project site would only be for material samples.

**Transit**

The project site is well served by public transportation. Within one-quarter mile of the project site, the San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) operates the following bus lines: 8-Bayshore, 9-San Bruno, 9R-San Bruno Rapid 12-Folsom/Pacific, 14-Mission, 14R-Mission Rapid19-Polk, 22-Fillmore, 27-Bryant, 33-Ashbury/18th, 47-Van Ness, 55-16th Street, 83X-Mid-Market Express, and 90-San Bruno Owl. The closest bus stops are approximately 350 feet away from the project site near the intersection of Division and Bryant streets. These bus stops serve the 9-San Bruno, 27-Bryant, and 90-San Bruno Owl bus lines.

According to the *Western SoMa Community Plan Transportation Impact Study*, all of the transit lines serving the Plan Area at the time of the study were currently operating well-below Muni’s capacity utilization (the number of passengers on board a transit vehicle relative to the total capacity) of 85 percent.\(^{16}\) The proposed project would generate a total of 33 daily transit trips and 3 PM peak-hour transit trips, which would be distributed among the multiple transit lines serving the project vicinity. These 33 daily and

\(^{15}\) *Ibid.*

\(^{16}\) LCW Consulting, *Western SoMa Community Plan Transportation Impact Study*, Table 4, June 2012.
3 PM peak-hour transit trips represent a minor contribution to overall transit demand in the Plan Area that would be accommodated by existing transit capacity. The proposed project would not result in unacceptable levels of transit service or cause an increase in transit service delays or operating costs.

In addition, as mentioned above, the Western SoMa PEIR found that adoption of the Western SoMa Community Plan could result in significant cumulative impacts on transit. The PEIR identified mitigation measure M-C-TR-2: Impose Development Impact Fees to Offset Transit Impacts. As part of the Plan adoption, the Planning Code was amended to implement development impact fees in the Western SoMa Area as called for in the mitigation measure. Thus, the mitigation measure M-C-TR-2 has been superseded by the imposition of Eastern Neighborhoods development impact fees specified in Section 423 as applicable to the Western SoMa Plan Area. The proposed project would be subject to Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee - Tier 1, a portion of which would be allocated to fund transit improvements as specified in Table 423.5. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on transit.

**Bicycle**

In the project vicinity, there are bicycle lanes along Division and 11th street. As stated above, the proposed project would generate an estimated 11 daily trips by “other” modes, which includes bike trips. Bicycle trips from the proposed project would be sufficiently accommodated within these facilities and would not interfere with bicycle accessibility to the site and adjoining areas. Although the proposed project would result in an increase in the number of vehicles in the vicinity of the project site, this anticipated increase would not be substantial enough to create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on bicycles.

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

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. NOISE—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Western SoMa PEIR identified potential conflicts related to residences and other noise-sensitive uses in proximity to noise-generating uses such as PDR, retail, entertainment, office, and cultural/institutional/educational uses. In addition, the Western SoMa PEIR noted that implementation of the Western SoMa Community Plan would incrementally increase traffic-generated noise on some streets in the Plan Area and would result in construction noise impacts from pile driving and other construction activities. The Western SoMa PEIR identified six noise mitigation measures that would reduce noise impacts to less-than-significant levels; three of these mitigation measures may be applicable to subsequent development projects.17

PEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-1c addresses impacts related to individual development projects containing land uses that could generate noise that exceeds ambient noise levels in their respective vicinities. The project site is located in an urbanized area with ambient noise levels typical of those in San Francisco neighborhoods. The existing traffic noise levels on Division Street is above 70 dBA (Ldn).18,19,20

---

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


19 The dBA, or A-weighted decibel, refers to a scale of noise measurement that approximates the range of sensitivity of the human ear to sounds of different frequencies. On this scale, the normal range of human hearing extends from about 0 dBA to about 140 dBA. A 10-dBA increase in the level of a continuous noise represents a perceived doubling of loudness.

20 The DNL or Ldn is the Leq, or Energy Equivalent Level, of the A-weighted noise level over a 24-hour period with a 10 dB penalty applied to noise levels between 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. Leq is the level of a steady noise which would have the same energy as the fluctuating noise level integrated over the time period of interest.
The proposed project includes trade shop use with accessory office use. A construction and engineering business is the current and future business of the project site. The second and third floors would contain space for general contracting services and the fourth floor would provide office space for structural engineers. No pre-fabrication activities would be conducted at the project site. Since the project does not include noise-generating uses, PEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-1c is not applicable.

The proposed project would be subject to the California Building Standards Code (Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations), which establishes uniform noise insulation standards. The Title 24 acoustical standards for nonresidential structures are incorporated into the San Francisco Green Building Code. Title 24 allows the project sponsor to choose between a prescriptive or performance-based acoustical standard for nonresidential structures. Pursuant to the Title 24 acoustical standards, all building wall, floor/ceiling, and window assemblies are required to meet certain sound transmission class or outdoor-indoor sound transmission class ratings to ensure that adequate interior noise levels are achieved. In compliance with Title 24, DBI would review the final building plans to ensure that the building wall, floor/ceiling, and window assemblies meet Title 24 acoustical requirements. If determined necessary by the DBI, a detailed acoustical analysis of the exterior wall and window assemblies may be required.

PEIR Mitigation Measures M-NO-2a: General Construction Noise Control Measures and M-NO-2b: Noise Control Measures During Pile Driving require implementation of noise controls during construction in order to reduce construction-related noise impacts. The proposed project consists of the demolition of the existing building and the construction of a new four-story building, which would generate construction noise in proximity to noise sensitive uses (residential uses) that exist approximately 400 feet north of the project site. Therefore, PEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a (Project Mitigation Measure 2) is applicable to the proposed project (full text provided in the “Mitigation Measures” section below). The proposed building would be supported by a mat foundation on improved soils; pile driving is not required. Since the building foundation would avoid vibration effects typically generated by pile-driving activities, PEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b is not applicable to the proposed project.

In addition, all construction activities for the proposed project, which would occur over the course of approximately 12 months, are subject to and would comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Noise Ordinance). The Noise Ordinance requires that construction work be conducted in the following manner: (1) noise levels of construction equipment, other than impact tools, must not exceed 80 dBA (L_{den})\(^{21,22}\) at a distance of 100 feet from the source (the equipment generating the noise); (2) impact tools must have intake and exhaust mufflers that are approved by the Director of San Francisco Public Works (SFPW) or the Director of DBI to best accomplish maximum noise reduction; and (3) if the noise from the construction work would exceed the ambient noise level by 5 dBA at the project site’s property line, the work must not be conducted between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. unless the Director of SFPW authorizes a special permit for conducting the work during that period.

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

\(^{22}\) The $L_{eq}$ is the $L_{eq}$, or Energy Equivalent Level, of the A-weighted noise level over a 24-hour period, obtained after the addition of 10 dB to sound levels during nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m). The $L_{eq}$ is the level of a steady noise which would have the same energy as the fluctuating noise level integrated over the time period of interest.
The DBI is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance for private construction projects during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.), and the Police Department is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance during all other hours. Nonetheless, during the approximately 12-month construction period for the proposed project, occupants of nearby properties could be disturbed by construction noise. There may be times when construction noise could interfere with indoor activities in residences and businesses near the project site and be perceived as an annoyance by the occupants of nearby properties. The increase in project-related construction noise in the project vicinity would not be considered a significant impact of the proposed project, because the construction noise would be temporary (approximately 12 months), intermittent, and restricted in occurrence and level, as the contractor is subject to and would comply with the Noise Ordinance and Project Mitigation Measure 2. Compliance with the Noise Ordinance and Project Mitigation Measure 2 would reduce any construction-related noise effects on nearby residences to the greatest extent feasible.

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, within two miles of a public airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, topics 5e and 5f are not applicable to the proposed project.

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

<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>6. AIR QUALITY—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Western SoMa PEIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts related to violation of an air quality standard, uses that emit Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM), and construction emissions. The Western SoMa PEIR identified five mitigation measures that would help reduce air quality impacts; however, they would not be able to reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.
Construction Dust Control

To reduce construction dust impacts, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes, generally referred to as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 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 avoid orders to stop work by DBI. Project-related construction activities would result in construction dust, primarily from ground-disturbing activities. The proposed project would disturb less than a half of an acre. Therefore, a dust control plan per the Dust Control Ordinance is not required. However, 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. Compliance with the regulations and procedures set forth by the San Francisco Dust Control Ordinance would ensure that construction dust impacts would not be significant.

Criteria Air Pollutants

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (Air Quality Guidelines)\(^23\) provide screening criteria for determining whether a project’s criteria air pollutant emissions would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. Pursuant to the Air Quality Guidelines, projects that meet the screening criteria do not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants. The proposed project, which involves the construction of a four-story building with 6,510 square feet of trade shop use and 3,260 square feet of accessory office use, would meet the Air Quality Guidelines criteria air pollutant screening levels for operation and construction.\(^24\) Since construction of the proposed project would generate criteria air pollutant emissions below applicable thresholds, PEIR Mitigation Measures M-AQ-6: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Criteria Air Pollutants would not apply to the proposed project. The project would not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants, and a detailed air quality assessment is not required.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2: Transportation Demand Management Strategies for Future Development Projects is required for projects generating more than 3,500 vehicle trips resulting in excessive criteria pollutant emissions. The proposed project would generate approximately 64 daily vehicle trips. Therefore, Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2 would not apply to the proposed project.

\(^{23}\) Bay Area Air Quality Management District. CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. Updated May 2011.

\(^{24}\) Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, Updated May 2011. Table 3-1. Criteria air screening sizes for a General Light Industry Building is 541,000 square feet for operational and 259,000 square feet for construction and a General Office Building is 346,000 square feet for operational and 277,000 square feet for construction.
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 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. For sensitive use projects within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, the ordinance requires that the project sponsor submit an Enhanced Ventilation Proposal for approval by the Department of Public Health (DPH) that achieves protection from PM$_{2.5}$ (fine particulate matter) equivalent to that associated with a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value 13 filtration. DBI will not issue a building permit without written notification from the Director of Public Health that the applicant has an approved Enhanced Ventilation Proposal. Although the project site is located within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, the project does not include sensitive uses, and therefore Article 38 does not apply.

**Construction**

PEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Health Risks and Hazards require projects to maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions of particulates and other pollutants. For projects with construction activities located in an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, such as the proposed project, compliance with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7 would require submittal of a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan to the Environmental Review Officer for review and approval. Construction activities from the proposed project would result in DPM and other TACs from equipment exhaust, construction-related vehicular activity, and construction worker automobile trips. Construction would last approximately 12 months, and diesel-generating equipment would be required for the duration of the proposed project’s construction phase. Since the project site is located within an identified Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7 (Project Mitigation Measure 3) would apply to the proposed project (full text provided in the “Mitigation Measures” section below). Project Mitigation Measure 3 would reduce DPM exhaust from construction equipment by 89 to 94 percent compared to uncontrolled construction equipment. Compliance with this mitigation measure would result in less-than-significant health risk impacts from project-related construction vehicles and equipment.

---

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

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4: Siting of Uses that Emit PM2.5 or DPM and Other TACs involves the siting of commercial, industrial, or other uses that emit TACs as part of everyday operations. The proposed project includes the construction of a four-story building with 6,510 square feet of trade shop use and 3,260 square feet of accessory office space. The project would not generate more than 10,000 vehicle trips per day, 1,000 truck trips per day, or include a new stationary source, such as a diesel emergency generator, that would emit TACs as part of everyday operations. Therefore, Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4 is not applicable to the proposed project, and project operations would not result in significant health risk impacts.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on air quality that were not identified in the Western SoMa 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>

Western SoMa PEIR

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has prepared guidelines and methodologies for analyzing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. These guidelines are consistent with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.4 and 15183.5, which address the analysis and determination of significant impacts from a proposed project’s GHG emissions and allow for projects that are consistent with a GHG reduction strategy to conclude that the project’s GHG impact is less than significant. San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions26 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,27 exceeding the year 2020 reduction goals outlined in the BAAQMD’s Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan, Executive Order S-3-05, and Assembly Bill 32 (also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act).28,29 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, 30, B-30-1531,32, and Senate Bill (SB) 32,33,34 Therefore, projects that are consistent with San Francisco’s GHG Reduction Strategy would not result in GHG emissions that would have a significant effect on the environment and would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations.

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

The proposed project would increase the intensity of use by replacing the existing 1,394-square-foot office building with a 17,040-square-foot building that includes 6,512 square feet of trade shop use and 3,256 square feet of accessory office use. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to annual long-term increases in GHGs as a result of increased vehicle trips (mobile sources) and the proposed trade shop with accessory office operations that result in an increase in energy use, water use, wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal. Construction activities would also result in temporary increases in GHG emissions.

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

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

29 Executive Order S-3-05, Assembly Bill 32, and the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan set a target of reducing GHG emissions to below 1990 levels by year 2020.
30 Executive Order S-3-05, sets forth a series of target dates by which statewide emissions of GHGs need to be progressively reduced, as follows: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels (approximately 457 million MTCO2E); by 2020, reduce emissions to 1990 levels (approximately 427 million MTCO2E); and by 2050 reduce emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels (approximately 85 million MTCO2E).
32 San Francisco’s GHG Reduction Goals are codified in Section 902 of the Environment Code and include: (i) by 2008, determine City GHG emissions for year 1990; (ii) by 2017, reduce GHG emissions by 25 percent below 1990 levels; (iii) by 2025, reduce GHG emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels; and by 2050, reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels.
33 Senate Bill 32 amends California Health and Safety Code Division 25.5 (also known as the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006) by adding Section 38566, which directs that statewide greenhouse gas emissions to be reduced by 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.
34 Senate Bill 32 was paired with Assembly Bill 197, which would modify the structure of the State Air Resources Board; institute requirements for the disclosure of greenhouse gas emissions, criteria pollutants, and toxic air contaminants; and establish requirements for the review and adoption of rules, regulations, and measures for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.
The proposed project would be required to comply with the energy efficiency requirements of the City’s Green Building Code and Stormwater Management Ordinance, which would promote energy and water efficiency and reduce the proposed project’s energy-related GHG emissions. The proposed project’s waste-related GHG emissions would be reduced through compliance with the City’s Recycling and Composting Ordinance, Construction and Demolition Debris Recovery Ordinance, and Green Building Code requirements. These regulations reduce the amount of materials sent to a landfill, reducing GHGs emitted by landfill operations. These regulations also promote reuse of materials, conserving their embodied energy and reducing the energy required to produce new materials.

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

Therefore, the proposed project’s GHG emissions would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations, and the proposed project’s contribution to GHG emissions would not be cumulatively considerable or generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment. As such, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact with respect to GHG emissions. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts beyond those identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

### Topics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:</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) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wind

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that implementation of the Western SoMa Community Plan would have a potentially significant impact related to the alteration of wind in a manner that would substantially affect public areas. However, the PEIR determined that this impact could be reduced to a

---

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

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

37 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.

38 San Francisco Planning Department, Greenhouse Gas Analysis: Compliance Checklist for 340 Division Street, November 30, 2016.
less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-WS-1: Screening-Level Wind Analysis and Wind Testing, which would require a wind analysis for any new structures within the Plan area that have a proposed height of 80 feet or taller.

Based upon experience of the Planning Department in reviewing wind analyses and expert opinion on other projects, it is generally the case that projects under 80 feet in height would not have the potential to generate significant ground-level wind impacts. The proposed 40-foot-tall building (49 feet including the stair penthouse) would be approximately 20 feet taller than the existing building immediately adjacent to the east of the project site. The proposed project would not contribute to the significant wind impact identified in the Western SoMa PEIR because the proposed structure would not rise substantially above nearby buildings and would not exceed 80 feet in height. Therefore, Mitigation Measure M-WS-1 would not apply to the proposed project.

For the above reasons, the proposed project is not anticipated to cause significant impacts that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR related to wind.

**Shadow**

Planning Code Section 295 generally prohibits new structures above 40 feet in height that would cast additional shadows on open space that is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, at any time of the year, unless that shadow would not result in a significant adverse effect on the use of the open space. The Western SoMa PEIR determined that implementation of the Western SoMa Community Plan would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to the creation of new shadows in a manner that would substantially affect outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The proposed project would construct a 40-foot-tall (49 feet including the stair penthouse) building. The Planning Department conducted a preliminary shadow fan analysis to determine whether the proposed project would have the potential to cast new shadow on nearby parks. The results of the shadow fan analysis showed that the project does not have the potential to cast shadow on a park or other nearby open space.39, 40

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

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

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

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that implementation of the Western SoMa Community Plan would not result in substantial or accelerated deterioration of existing recreational resources or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may have an adverse effect on the environment. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

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

As the proposed project would not degrade recreational facilities and is within the scope of development projected under the Western SoMa Community Plan, there would be no additional impacts on recreation beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.
## 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>
<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 Western SoMa PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact on the provision of water, wastewater collection and treatment, and solid waste collection and disposal. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

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

## 11. PUBLIC SERVICES—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) 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Western SoMa PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact on public services, including fire protection, police protection, and public schools. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

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

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

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that the Western SoMa Community Plan would result in significant but mitigable impacts on special-status birds and bats that may be nesting in trees or roosting in vacant buildings that are proposed for removal/demolition as part of an individual project. As identified in the PEIR, Mitigation Measures M-BI-1a: Pre-Construction Special-Status Bird Surveys and M-BI-1b: Pre-Construction Special-Status Bat Surveys would reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

PEIR Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a requires that building permits issued for construction of projects within the Plan Area include conditions of approval requiring pre-construction special-status bird surveys when trees would be removed or buildings would be demolished as part of an individual project. Pre-construction special-status bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist between February 1 and August 15 if tree removal or building demolition is scheduled to take place during that period. The proposed project, which involves demolition of a building, is subject to PEIR Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a, which is identified as Project Mitigation Measure 4 (full text provided in the “Mitigation Measures” section below).

PEIR Mitigation Measure M-BI-1b requires pre-construction special-status bat surveys by a qualified bat biologist when large trees (those with trunks over 12 inches in diameter) are to be removed, or when vacant buildings or buildings used seasonally or not occupied, especially in the upper stories, are to be demolished. The proposed project would not remove any trees and the existing building that is proposed for demolition does not contain vacant areas. For these reasons, demolition of the existing building would not contribute to the impact on bats identified in the Western Soma PEIR and PEIR Mitigation Measure M-BI-1b is not applicable.

As the proposed project includes the mitigation measure discussed above and is within the geographic area of the Western SoMa Community Plan, there would be no additional impacts on biological resources beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa 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. GEOLGY 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>
</tbody>
</table>
The Western SoMa PEIR concluded that implementation of the Western SoMa Community Plan would indirectly increase the population that would be subject to geologic hazards, including earthquakes, seismically induced ground shaking, liquefaction, and landslides. The PEIR also noted that new development is generally safer than comparable older development due to improvements in building codes and construction techniques. Compliance with applicable codes and recommendations made in project-specific geotechnical analyses would not eliminate earthquake risk, but would reduce them to an acceptable level given the seismically active characteristics of the San Francisco Bay Area. Therefore, the PEIR concluded that implementation of the Western SoMa Community Plan would not result in significant impacts related to geologic hazards. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

A geotechnical investigation was conducted to assess the geologic conditions underlying the project site and provide recommendations related to the proposed project’s design and construction. The findings and recommendations are summarized below.\(^{41}\)

The geotechnical investigation included the drilling of three test borings on the project site to depth of up to 50 feet below ground surface (bgs). Based on the soil samples, the project site is generally underlain by seven to 15 feet of undocumented sand/silty sand fill. The undocumented fill is underlain by a stiff clay layer. At the time of investigation, groundwater was encountered at a depth of five feet bgs. There are no known active earthquake faults that run underneath the project site or in the project vicinity; the closest active fault to the project site is the San Andreas Fault, which is about seven miles to the southwest. The project site is located in a liquefaction zone, and layers of potentially liquefiable soil is estimated to between three to 27 feet bgs. The proposed project could be supported by a mat foundation on improved soil. Drilled displacement sand-cement columns or soil-cement columns would be the most appropriate

---

\(^{41}\) Rockridge Geotechnical, Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Commercial Building, 340 Division Street, San Francisco, California, April 15, 2016.
soil improvement methods for the proposed project. Impact piling driving is not required or proposed. Due to the relatively shallow groundwater at the project site, excavation for the proposed elevator pit has the potential to encounter groundwater. The proposed elevator pit would be waterproofed to prevent groundwater seepage and constructed to withstand the hydrostatic pressure of the groundwater.42

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

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

<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>14. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY—Would the project:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42 Waterproofing of the proposed mat foundation is not required since the building would be at-grade.
 Topics:
  g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map?

  h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

  i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

  j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

The Western SoMa PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact related to hydrology and water quality, including the combined sewer system and the potential for combined sewer outflows. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

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

Groundwater is relatively shallow throughout the project site at approximately five feet below grade, and excavation for the proposed elevator pit has the potential to encounter groundwater, which could impact water quality. Any groundwater encountered during construction of the proposed project would be subject to requirements of the City’s Sewer Use Ordinance (Ordinance Number 19-92, amended 116-97), as supplemented by San Francisco Public Works Order No. 158170, requiring a permit from the Wastewater Enterprise Collection System Division of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. A permit may be issued only if an effective pretreatment system is maintained and operated. Each permit for such discharge shall contain specified water quality standards and may require the project sponsor to install and maintain meters to measure the volume of the discharge to the combined sewer system. If dewatering is required during construction, any effects related to lowering the water table would be temporary and would not be expected to substantially deplete groundwater resources. The proposed project would not require long-term, continuous dewatering following construction. Therefore, the project would not adversely affect water quality and groundwater supply.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.
### 15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS—

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) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Hazardous Building Materials**

The proposed project would involve demolition of the existing building on the project site, which was constructed in 1952. Because this structure was built before the 1970s, hazardous building materials such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), mercury, asbestos and lead-based paint are likely to be present in this structure. Demolishing the existing structure could expose workers or the community to hazardous building materials. In compliance with the Western SoMa PEIR, the proposed project would be required to implement PEIR Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2: Hazardous Building Materials Abatement, identified as Project Mitigation Measure 5 (full text provided in the “Mitigation Measures” section below). Project Mitigation Measure 5 would require the project sponsor to ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or mercury, such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of demolition.
Project Mitigation Measure 5 would reduce potential impacts related to hazardous building materials to a less-than-significant level.

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

**Handling of Potentially Contaminated Soils**

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

Subsequently, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors amended Health Code Article 22A (also known as the Maher Ordinance), which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH). Amendments to the Maher Ordinance became effective August 24, 2013 and require that sponsors for projects that disturb more than 50 cubic yards of soil retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. PEIR Mitigation Measure M-HZ-3, related to contaminated soil and groundwater, is therefore superseded by the Maher Ordinance.

The project site is located in a Maher Area, meaning that it is known or suspected to contain contaminated soil and/or groundwater. The proposed project would require excavation to a depth of nine feet bgs and the disturbance of 350 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. Based on the Phase I ESA, the project site is occupied by an office building that was constructed in 1952 on land previously occupied by the San Francisco Fire Department, a pipe storage yard, and a warehouse. The project site was used as a restaurant from 1952 to late 1990s and then the use changed to professional offices (the current use). The Phase I ESA found no indications that there have been industrial, manufacturing, or automotive related-facilities at the project site. There have been various businesses, including a one-time gasoline station adjacent to the project site at 590 10th Street and

---


44 John Carver Consulting, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment at 340 Division Street, San Francisco, CA*, February 27, 2008.

45 Csarina Tabora, SFDPH, email to Don Lewis, 340 Division Street, January 17, 2017.
light manufacturing in the project vicinity, which may be environmental concerns to the project site. The proposed project would be required to remediate potential soil and/or groundwater contamination described above in accordance with Article 22A of the Health Code.

As discussed above, implementation of Project Mitigation Measure 5 and compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations would ensure that the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics: MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES— Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

As the proposed project is located within the Western SoMa Community Plan area, there would be no additional impacts on mineral and energy resources beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.

---

46 The gasoline service station received a Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) case closure from the DPH.
17. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:—Would the project:

- Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
- ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

- Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526)?
- ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

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

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

As the proposed project is located within the Western SoMa Community Plan area, there would be no additional impacts on agriculture and forest resources beyond those analyzed in the Western SoMa PEIR.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Project Mitigation Measure 1 – Accidental Discovery

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

The project sponsor shall distribute the San Francisco Planning Department archeological resource “ALERT” sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, etc. firms); and to utilities firms involved in soils-disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils-disturbing activities being undertaken, each contractor is responsible for ensuring that the “ALERT” sheet is circulated to all field personnel, including machine operators, field crew, and supervisory personnel. The project sponsor shall provide the ERO with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firms) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the “ALERT” sheet.
Should any indication of an archeological resource be encountered during any soils-disturbing activity of the project, the project head foreman and/or project sponsor shall immediately notify the ERO and shall immediately suspend any soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the discovery until the ERO has determined what additional measures should be undertaken.

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

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

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

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

**Project Mitigation Measure 2 – General Construction Noise Control Measures**

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

- The project sponsor shall require the general contractor to ensure that equipment and trucks used for project construction use the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers,
equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible).

- The project sponsor shall require the general contractor to locate stationary noise sources (such as compressors) as far from adjacent or nearby sensitive receptors as possible, to muffle such noise sources, and to construct barriers around such sources and/or the construction site, which could reduce construction noise by as much as 5 dBA. To further reduce noise, the contractor shall locate stationary equipment in pit areas or excavated areas, if feasible.

- The project sponsor shall require the general contractor to use impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) that are hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. Where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used, along with external noise jackets on the tools, which could reduce noise levels by as much as 10 dBA.

- The project sponsor shall include noise control requirements in specifications provided to construction contractors. Such requirements could include, but not be limited to: performing all work in a manner that minimizes noise to the extent feasible; undertaking the most noisy activities during times of least disturbance to surrounding residents and occupants, as feasible; and selecting haul routes that avoid residential buildings inasmuch as such routes are otherwise feasible.

- Prior to the issuance of each building permit, along with the submission of construction documents, the sponsor shall submit to the San Francisco Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection (DBI) a list of measures to respond to and track complaints pertaining to construction noise. These measures shall include: (1) a procedure and phone numbers for notifying DBI, the Department of Public Health, and the Police Department (during regular construction hours and off-hours); (2) a sign posted on-site describing noise complaint procedures and a complaint hotline number that shall be answered at all times during construction; (3) designation of an on-site construction complaint and enforcement manager for the project; and (4) notification of neighboring residents and non-residential building managers within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 30 days in advance of extreme noise-generating activities (defined as activities generating noise levels of 90 dBA or greater) about the estimated duration of the activity.

**Project Mitigation Measure 3 – Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Health Risks and Hazards**

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

A. *Engine Requirements.*

1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 hp and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall have engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or California Air Resources Board (ARB) Tier 2 off-road emission standards, and have been retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy. Equipment with engines meeting Tier 4 Interim or Tier 4 Final off-road emission standards automatically meet this
2. Where access to alternative sources of power are available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited.

3. Diesel engines, whether for off-road or on-road equipment, shall not be left idling for more than two minutes, at any location, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment (e.g., traffic conditions, safe operating conditions). The Contractor shall post legible and visible signs in English, Spanish, and Chinese, in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two-minute idling limit.

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

B. Waivers.

1. The Planning Department’s Environmental Review Officer (ERO) or designee may waive the alternative source of power requirement of Subsection (A)(2) if an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site. If the ERO grants the waiver, the Contractor must submit documentation that the equipment used for on-site power generation meets the requirements of Subsection (A)(1).

2. The ERO may waive the equipment requirements of Subsection (A)(1) if: a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is technically not feasible; the equipment would not produce desired emissions reduction due to expected operating modes; installation of the equipment would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator; or, there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that is not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS. If the ERO grants the waiver, the Contractor must use the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment, according to the table below.

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

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

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

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

2. The project sponsor shall ensure that all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into the contract specifications. The Plan shall include a certification statement that the Contractor agrees to comply fully with the Plan.

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

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

**Project Mitigation Measure 4 – Pre-Construction Special-Status Bird Surveys**

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

**Project Mitigation Measure 5 – Hazardous Building Materials Abatement**

The project sponsor shall ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or mercury, such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tube fixtures, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed intact and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.