PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located on a corner lot bounded by Folsom Street to the north, Harrison Street to the south, Hawthorne Street to the east, Third Street to the west, and within the South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood (See Figure 1, Location Map). The proposed project would include the demolition of an existing 33-foot-tall, 2-story, approximately 13,400-square-foot, commercial building (no basement) on the project site. The existing building on the project site is currently used as a restaurant and was constructed in 1910. The site is not located within a historic district. The project site was included in the South of Market Historic Resource Survey and was rated “6Z” (Ineligible for National, State, or Local designation through survey evaluation).

The proposed project includes the construction of a new 14-story, approximately 130-foot-tall building (with an additional 16 feet in height for a mechanical penthouse), with 14 levels and a basement on the project site (See Figure 2, Site Plans). The project would include an additional 16 feet in height for a mechanical penthouse. Figures 7 and 8 provide elevations, as well as a rendering of the finished building. The proposed structure would be approximately 89,000 square feet (sq ft) with 89 dwelling units, 2,300 sq ft for ground-floor commercial space along Folsom Street, and a below-grade parking garage for 36 vehicles (35 spaces in stackers). The project would also provide 97 bicycle parking spaces in an at-grade bicycle storage room (89 Class I and eight Class II bicycle parking spaces) (See Figure 3, Floor Plans). There are no existing curb cuts located along the Folsom Street and Hawthorne Street frontages of the project site. The proposed basement level would be accessed through a new curb cut located along the Hawthorne Street frontage of the project. In addition, the proposed 97 bicycle parking spaces for use by residents would be accessed through the residential lobby entrance at Hawthorne Street and visitors utilizing bicycle racks located on the sidewalk along Folsom and Hawthorne streets.

As shown on Figure 3, the retail space would be accessed the Folsom Street frontage. The residential units located on floors two through 14 would be accessed from a residential lobby located on Hawthorne Street. Figures 4 and 5 provide floor plans of the proposed residences. Additionally, there would be approximately 3,260 sq ft of usable open space located on a rooftop terrace (See Figure 6, Roof Plan and Landscaping Plans).
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The proposed 655 Folsom Street project would require the following approvals:

**Actions by the Planning Commission**
- Approval of a Large Project Authorization from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 329 for the new construction of a building greater than 25,000 gross square feet

**Actions by other City Departments**
- Department of Building Inspection (DBI). Approval of demolition, grading, building and occupancy permits for demolition of the existing structures and new construction.
- Department of Public Health (DPH). Approval of a Site Mitigation Plan pursuant to the Maher Ordinance prior to the commencement of any excavation work, and approval of a Soil Mitigation Plan and Dust Control Plan prior to construction-period activities.
- San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA). Approval of all proposed changes in curb cuts and parking zones pursuant to the SFMTA Color Curb Program. Coordination with the SFMTA Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation to coordinate temporary construction-related changes to the transportation network.
- San Francisco Public Works Department (Public Works), Bureau of Streets and Mapping. Approval of modifications to public sidewalks, street trees, curb cuts, and bulb out extensions.
- San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). Approval of a stormwater control plan and an erosion and sediment control plan prior to commencing construction.

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

This Community Plan Exemption (CPE) Checklist evaluates whether the environmental impacts of the proposed project are addressed in the Programmatic Environmental Impact Report for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR). The CPE Checklist indicates whether the proposed project would result in significant impacts that: (1) are peculiar to the project or project site; (2) were not identified as significant project-level, cumulative, or off-site effects in the PEIR; or (3) are previously identified significant effects, which as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the PEIR. Such impacts, if any, will be evaluated in a project-specific Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report. If no such impacts are identified, the proposed project is exempt from further environmental review in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.

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

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

---

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

The proposed project would include the demolition of an existing 2-story commercial building. The project would also include the construction of a new 14-story, 89,000 sq-ft building with 89 dwelling units and 2,300 sq ft for ground-floor commercial space along Folsom Street. As discussed below in this checklist, the proposed project would not result in new, significant environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already analyzed and disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

**CHANGES IN THE REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT**

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

- State statute regulating Aesthetics and Parking Impacts for Transit Priority Infill, effective January 2014 (see associated heading below);
- San Francisco ordinance establishing Noise Regulations Related to Residential Uses Near Places of Entertainment effective June 2015 (see Checklist section “Noise”);
- San Francisco ordinances establishing Construction Dust Control, effective July 2008, and Enhanced Ventilation Required for Urban Infill Sensitive Use Developments, effective December 2014 (see Checklist section “Air Quality”);
- 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 Checklist section “Recreation”);
- Urban Water Management Plan adoption in 2011 and Sewer System Improvement Program process (see Checklist section “Utilities and Service Systems”); and

**CHANGES IN THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT**

Since the certification of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR in 2008, as evidenced by the volume of development applications submitted to the Planning Department since 2012, the pace of development activity has increased in the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR projected that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan could result in a substantial amount of
growth within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area, resulting in an increase of approximately 7,400 to 9,900 net dwelling units and 3,200,000 to 6,600,000 square feet of net non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) through throughout the lifetime of the Plan (year 2025). The growth projected in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was based on a soft site analysis (i.e., assumptions regarding the potential for a site to be developed through the year 2025) and not based upon the created capacity of the rezoning options (i.e., the total potential for development that would be created indefinitely).

As of July 31, 2015, projects containing 8,559 dwelling units and 2,231,595 square feet of non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) have completed or are proposed to complete environmental review within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area. These estimates include projects that have completed environmental review (4,885 dwelling units and 1,472,688 square feet of non-residential space) and foreseeable projects, including the proposed project (3,674 dwelling units and 758,907 square feet of non-residential space). Foreseeable projects are those projects for which environmental evaluation applications have been submitted to the San Francisco Planning Department. Of the 4,885 dwelling units that have completed environmental review, building permits have been issued for 3,710 dwelling units, or approximately 76 percent of those units (information is not available regarding building permit non-residential square footage). An issued building permit means the buildings containing those dwelling units are currently under construction or open for occupancy.

Within the East SoMa subarea, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR projected that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan could result in an increase of 2,300 to 3,100 net dwelling units and 1,000,000 to 1,600,000 net non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) through the year 2025. As of July 31, 2015, projects containing 2,114 dwelling units and 1,041,289 square feet of non-residential space (excluding PDR loss) have completed or are proposed to complete environmental review within the East SoMa subarea. These estimates include projects that have completed environmental review (1,306 dwelling units and 328,018 square feet of non-residential space) and foreseeable projects, including the proposed project (89 dwelling units and 2,300 square feet of non-residential space). Of the 808 dwelling units that have completed environmental review, building permits have been issued for 745 dwelling units, or approximately 92 percent of those units.

2 Tables 12 through 16 of the Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR and Table C&R-2 in the Comments and Responses show projected net growth based on proposed rezoning scenarios. A baseline for existing conditions in the year 2000 was included to provide context for the scenario figures for parcels affected by the rezoning, not projected growth totals from a baseline of the year 2000. Estimates of projected growth were based on parcels that were to be rezoned and did not include parcels that were recently developed (i.e., parcels with projects completed between 2000 and March 2006) or have proposed projects in the pipeline (i.e., projects under construction, projects approved or entitled by the Planning Department, or projects under review by the Planning Department or Department of Building Inspection). Development pipeline figures for each Plan Area were presented separately in Tables 5, 7, 9, and 11 in the Draft EIR. Environmental impact assessments for these pipeline projects were considered separately from the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning effort.


4 For this and the Land Use and Land Use Planning section, environmental review is defined as projects that have or are relying on the growth projections and analysis in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR for environmental review (i.e., Community Plan Exemptions or Focused Mitigated Negative Declarations and Focused Environmental Impact Reports with an attached Community Plan Exemption Checklist).
Growth that has occurred within the Plan area since adoption of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR has been planned for and the effects of that growth were anticipated and considered in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Although the reasonably foreseeable growth in the residential land use category is approaching the projections within the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, the non-residential reasonably foreseeable growth is between approximately 34 and 69 percent of the non-residential projections in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR utilized the growth projections to analyze the physical environmental impacts associated with that growth for the following environmental impact topics: Land Use; Population, Housing, Business Activity, and Employment; Transportation; Noise; Air Quality; Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Utilities/Public Services; and Water. The analysis took into account the overall growth in the Eastern Neighborhoods and did not necessarily analyze in isolation the impacts of growth in one land use category, although each land use category may have differing severities of effects. Therefore, given the growth from the reasonably foreseeable projects have not exceeded the overall growth that was projected in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, information that was not known at the time of the PEIR has not resulted in new significant environmental impacts or substantially more severe adverse impacts than discussed in the PEIR.

AESTHETICS AND PARKING IMPACTS FOR TRANSIT PRIORITY INFILL DEVELOPMENT

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

a) The project is in a transit priority area;

b) The project is on an infill site; and

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

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

1. **LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING**—Would the project:

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

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that adoption of the Area Plans would result in an unavoidable significant impact on land use due to the cumulative loss of PDR. The proposed project would not remove any existing PDR uses and would therefore not contribute to any impact related to loss of PDR uses that was identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. In addition, the project site was zoned Residential Service District (RSD), which promotes mixed-use developments. Prior to the rezoning of Eastern Neighborhoods, the RSD zoning district is related to residential and commercial uses and is not intended to encourage PDR uses. Subsequent to the rezoning of the Eastern Neighborhoods, the existing RSD district was designated as Mixed Use Residential (MUR) and continued to emphasize residential as a required component of all new development. The rezoning of the project site did not contribute to the significant impact as no PDR uses existed on the site.

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

The Citywide Planning and Current Planning Divisions of the Planning Department have determined that the proposed project is permitted in the MUR District and is consistent with the height, bulk, density and land uses envisioned in the East SoMa Area Plan. The project is within the 130-G Height and Bulk District (130-foot maximum height, with bulk limits beyond 80 feet in height). The project falls within the Folsom Street Corridor and Mixed Use generalized zoning district. The Folsom Street Corridor district strengthens the role of Folsom Street as the key neighborhood-serving boulevard in SoMa by requiring housing as part of all new developments, with limited office and retail allowed. The MUR district acknowledges and maintains the mixed character of the area by encouraging PDR, small office, and residential uses. As a primarily residential project with limited retail uses, the proposed development is consistent with this designation.  

---

6 Adam Varat, Citywide Planning, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 655 Folsom Street, February 2016. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0253E.

7 Jeff Joslin, Current Planning, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 655 Folsom Street, February 2016. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0253E.
Because the proposed project is consistent with the development density established in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and area Plans, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to land use and land use planning, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Further, the proposed project would not contribute in a cumulatively considerable way to divide an established community; conflict with plans, policies, and regulations; or change neighborhood character. Therefore, the project would not result in any significant cumulative land use impacts.

<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><strong>2. POPULATION AND HOUSING—</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, 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 Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans was to identify appropriate locations for housing in the City’s industrially zoned land to meet the citywide demand for additional housing. The PEIR concluded that an increase in population in the Plan Areas is expected to occur as a secondary effect of the proposed rezoning and that any population increase would not, in itself, result in adverse physical effects, but would serve to advance key City policy objectives, such as providing housing in appropriate locations next to Downtown and other employment generators and furthering the City’s Transit First policies. It was anticipated that the rezoning would result in an increase in both housing development and population in all of the Area Plan neighborhoods. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population and density would not result in significant adverse physical effects on the environment. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The proposed project would demolish the existing on-site two-story commercial building and construct a new 14-story mixed-use building containing 89 dwelling units and 2,300 sq ft of ground-floor commercial space with 36 vehicle parking spaces. The increase in housing would also result in an increase in demand for jobs, though not all residents would seek employment within the Eastern Neighborhoods area. No displacement of existing housing would occur, as there is no housing present on the project site. With implementation of the proposed project, 89 new dwelling units would be added to San Francisco’s housing stock. As stated in the “Changes in the Physical Environment” section above, these direct effects of the proposed project on population and housing are within the scope of the population growth anticipated under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans and evaluated in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.
For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on population and housing that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

Historic Architectural Resources

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

The project site is currently occupied by an existing two-story commercial building (restaurant) that was constructed in 1910 and is not considered a historic resource, nor is it located within a designated historic district. The project site was included in the South of Market Historic Resource Survey and was rated “6Z” (Ineligible for National, State, or Local designation through survey evaluation). The proposed project would not result in the demolition or alteration of a historic resource. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to the significant historic resource impact identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and no historic resource mitigation measures would apply to the proposed project.

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

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

The project site is one of the properties subject to Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR Mitigation Measure J-2. Mitigation Measure J-2 states any project resulting in soils disturbance for which no archeological assessment report has been prepared or for which the archeological document is incomplete or inadequate shall be required to conduct a preliminary archeological sensitivity study prepared by a qualified archeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. Based on the study, a determination shall be made if additional measures are needed to reduce potential effects of a project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. The Planning Department’s archeologist conducted a preliminary archeological review of the project site in conformance with the study requirements of Mitigation Measure J-2: the results are summarized below.

Based on the Preliminary Archeological Review, it has been determined that the Planning Department’s third standard archeological mitigation measure (testing) would apply to the proposed project. The Preliminary Archeological Review and its requirements (e.g., testing) are consistent with Mitigation Measure J-2 from the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. With implementation of this project mitigation measure, impacts related to archeological resources would be less than significant. In accordance with the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR requirements, the project sponsor has agreed to implement Project Mitigation Measure 1, as described in page 41 below.

With compliance with Project Mitigation Measure 1, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to archeological resources. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on archeological resources that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

---

8 Randall Dean, Staff Archeologist, San Francisco Planning Department, Preliminary Archeological Review, May 28, 2015.
4. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION—
Would the project:

<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>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 Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes would not result in significant impacts related to pedestrians, bicyclists, loading, emergency access, or construction. As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on pedestrians, bicyclists, loading, emergency access, or construction beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

However, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes could result in significant impacts on traffic and transit ridership, and identified 11 transportation mitigation measures, which are described further below in the Traffic and Transit sub-sections. Even with mitigation, however, it was anticipated that the significant adverse cumulative traffic impacts and the cumulative impacts on transit lines could not be fully mitigated. Thus, these impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable.

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

**Trip Generation**

The proposed project would include the demolition of an existing, two-story, commercial building with no on-site parking. The project also includes the construction of a new mixed-use building with 89
dwelling units and 2,300 sq ft for ground-floor commercial uses. The proposed project would include 36 vehicle parking spaces (34 in stackers) within a basement-level garage and 97 bicycle parking spaces (89 Class I and eight Class II spaces) within a ground-floor bicycle storage room. The proposed garage would be accessed from an entrance/exit located on Hawthorne Street. The proposed commercial spaces would be accessed from Folsom Street and the proposed dwelling units would be accessed from a residential lobby located on Hawthorne Street.

Trip generation of the proposed project was calculated using 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 1,105 person trips (inbound and outbound) on a weekday daily basis, consisting of 352 person trips by auto, 227 transit trips, 456 walk trips and 70 trips by other modes, including bicycles. During the p.m. peak hour, the proposed project would generate an estimated 42 vehicle trips (accounting for vehicle occupancy data for this Census Tract).

Traffic

Mitigation Measures E-1 through E-4 in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR were adopted as part of the Plan with uncertain feasibility to address significant traffic impacts. These measures are not applicable to the proposed project, as they are plan-level mitigations to be implemented by City and County agencies. Since certification of the PEIR, SFMTA has been engaged in public outreach regarding some of the parking-related measures identified in Mitigation Measures E-2 and E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management, although they have not been implemented. Measures that have been implemented include traffic signal installation at Rhode Island/16th streets as identified in Mitigation Measure E-1 and enhanced funding as identified in Mitigation Measure E-3 through San Francisco propositions A and B passed in November 2014. Proposition A authorized the City to borrow $500 million through issuing general obligation bonds in order to meet some of the transportation infrastructure needs of the City. These funds are allocated for constructing transit-only lanes and separated bikeways, installing new boarding islands and escalators at Muni/BART stops, installing sidewalk curb bulb-outs, raised crosswalks, median islands, and bicycle parking and upgrading Muni maintenance facilities, among various other improvements. Proposition B, which also passed in November 2014, amends the City Charter to increase the amount the City provided to the SFMTA based on the City’s population, with such funds to be used to improve Muni service and street safety. Some of this funding may be applied to transportation projects within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area.

The proposed project’s vehicle trips would travel through the intersections surrounding the project block. Intersection operating conditions are characterized by the concept of Level of Service (LOS), which ranges from A to F and provides a description of an intersection’s performance based on traffic volumes, intersection capacity, and vehicle delays. LOS A represents free flow conditions, with little or no delay, while LOS F represents congested conditions, with extremely long delays; LOS D (moderately high delays) is considered the lowest acceptable level in San Francisco. The intersections near the project site (within approximately 800 feet) include Folsom/Hawthorne, Folsom/Second, /Folsom/Third, Harrison/Hawthorne, Harrison/Second, and Harrison/Third, and Harrison/Fourth. Table 1 provides

---

9 San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Calculations for 655 Folsom Street, January 2016. These calculations are available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0253E.
existing and cumulative LOS data gathered for these intersections, based on the most recent data available (Transit Center District Plan Final EIR).10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing LOS (2008)</th>
<th>Cumulative LOS (2030)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Folsom / Hawthorne</td>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>LOS F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom / Third</td>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>LOS F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom / Second</td>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>LOS F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison / Third</td>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>LOS F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison / Hawthorne</td>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>LOS F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison / Second</td>
<td>LOS E</td>
<td>LOS F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison / Fourth</td>
<td>LOS E</td>
<td>LOS F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Transit Center District Plan and Transit Tower Final EIR (Planning Case No. 2007.0558E/2008.0789E).

The proposed project would generate an estimated 42 new p.m. peak hour vehicle trips that could travel through surrounding intersections. This amount of new p.m. peak hour vehicle trips would not substantially increase traffic volumes at these or other nearby intersections, would not substantially increase average delay that would cause intersections that currently operate at acceptable LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable LOS, or would not substantially increase average delay at intersections that currently operate at unacceptable LOS.

The proposed project would not contribute considerably to LOS delay conditions as its contribution of an estimated 42 new p.m. peak-hour vehicle trips would not be a substantial proportion of the overall traffic volume or the new vehicle trips generated by Eastern Neighborhoods’ Plan projects. The proposed project would also not contribute considerably to 2025 cumulative conditions and thus, the proposed project would not have any significant cumulative traffic impacts.

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

Transit

Mitigation Measures E-5 through E-11 in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR were adopted as part of the Plan with uncertain feasibility to address significant transit impacts. These measures are not applicable to the proposed project, as they are plan-level mitigations to be implemented by City and County agencies. In compliance with a portion of Mitigation Measure E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding, the City adopted impact fees for development in Eastern Neighborhoods that goes towards funding transit and complete streets. In addition, the City is currently conducting outreach regarding Mitigation Measures E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding and Mitigation Measure E-11: Transportation Demand Management as part of the Transportation Sustainability Program.11 In compliance with all or portions of Mitigation Measure E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements, Mitigation Measure E-7: Transit Accessibility, Mitigation Measure E-9: Rider Improvements, and Mitigation Measure E-10: Transit Enhancement, the SFMTA is implementing the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP), which was approved by the SFMTA Board of Directors in March 2013.

10 Transit Center District Plan and Transit Tower Final EIR (Planning Case No. 2007.0558E/2008.0789E) documents are available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of the case file number above.
11 http://tsp.sfplanning.org
2014. The TEP (now called Muni Forward) includes system-wide review, evaluation, and recommendations to improve service and increase transportation efficiency. Examples of transit priority and pedestrian safety improvements within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area as part of Muni Forward include the 14 Mission Rapid Transit Project, the 22 Fillmore Extension along 16th Street to Mission Bay (expected construction between 2017 and 2020), and the Travel Time Reduction Project on Route 9 San Bruno (initiation in 2015). In addition, Muni Forward includes service improvements to various routes with the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area; for instance the implemented new Route 55 on 16th Street.

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

The project site is located within a quarter mile of several local transit lines including Muni lines 8/8AX/8BX Bayshore, 10 Townsend, 12 Folsom/Pacific, 25 Treasure Island, 30 Stockton, 41 Union, 45 Union/Stockton, and 91 Owl. The proposed project would be expected to generate 227 daily transit trips, including 34 during the p.m. peak hour. Given the wide availability of nearby transit, the addition of 34 p.m. peak hour transit trips would be accommodated by existing capacity. As such, the proposed project would not result in unacceptable levels of transit service or cause a substantial increase in delays or operating costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service could result.

Each of the rezoning options in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts relating to increases in transit ridership on Muni lines, with the Preferred Project having significant impacts on seven lines. Of those lines, the project site is located within a quarter-mile of Muni lines 10 Townsend and 12 Folsom/Pacific. The proposed project would not contribute considerably to these conditions as its minor contribution of 34 p.m. peak hour transit trips would not be a substantial proportion of the overall additional transit volume generated by Eastern Neighborhood projects. The proposed project would also not contribute considerably to 2025 cumulative transit conditions and thus would not result in any significant cumulative transit impacts.

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

As discussed above, the proposed project would not result in significant cumulative impacts related to traffic and transit. Also, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR did not identify significant cumulative impacts related to pedestrians, bicyclists, loading, emergency access, or construction beyond those analyzed in the
Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts and would not contribute considerably to 2025 cumulative transportation conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics:</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. NOISE—Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>For a project located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, in an area within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>For a project located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Be substantially affected by existing noise levels?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 relate to construction noise. Mitigation Measure F-1 addresses individual projects that include pile-driving, but would not apply to the proposed project, as the project would not include pile-driving. Mitigation Measure F-2 addresses individual projects that include particularly noisy construction procedures (including pile-driving). The proposed project would require excavation up to 22 feet below existing grade in order to construct a basement-level garage that would cover the entire footprint of the project site, as well as placement of a mat foundation. The proposed project would not include the use of pile-driving and therefore, Mitigation F-1 would not apply to the proposed project. The proposed project could involve noisy construction activities in proximity to residential uses. The nearest sensitive receptors (residences) are located approximately 400
feet to the southeast from the project site on Hawthorne Street. Thus, Mitigation Measure F-2, which requires use of site-specific construction noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant, is applicable to the proposed project at 655 Folsom Street. The project sponsor has agreed to implement Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2 as Project Mitigation Measure 2 (full text provided in the “Mitigation Measures” section below), which requires use of site-specific construction noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. In addition, the proposed project would not involve construction methods that would expose nearby residences and other uses to excessive vibration during construction of the project. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to construction noise and vibration.

In addition, all construction activities for the proposed project (approximately 15 to 18 months) would be subject to and would comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code) (Noise Ordinance). Construction noise is regulated by the Noise Ordinance. The Noise Ordinance requires that construction work be conducted in the following manner: (1) noise levels of construction equipment, other than impact tools, must not exceed 80 dBA at a distance of 100 feet from the source (the equipment generating the noise); (2) impact tools must have intake and exhaust mufflers that are approved by the Director of the Department of Public Works (DPW) or the Director of the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) to best accomplish maximum noise reduction; and (3) if the noise from the construction work would exceed the ambient noise levels at the site property line by 5 dBA, the work must not be conducted between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. unless the Director of DPW authorizes a special permit for conducting the work during that period.

DBI is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance for private construction projects during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.). The Police Department is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance during all other hours. Nonetheless, during the construction period for the proposed project of approximately 15 to 18 months, occupants of the nearby properties could be disturbed by construction noise. Times may occur when noise could interfere with indoor activities in nearby residences and other businesses near the project site. The increase in noise in the project area during project construction would not be considered a significant impact of the proposed project, because the construction noise would be temporary, intermittent, and restricted in occurrence and level, as the contractor would be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance and Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2, which would reduce construction noise impacts to a less than significant level.

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-3 and F-4 require that a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements be conducted for new development that includes noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn) or near existing noise-generating uses. Since certification of the PEIR, San Francisco adopted Noise Regulations Relating to Residential Uses Near Places of Entertainment (Ordinance 70-15, effective June 19, 2015). The intent of the regulations is to address noise conflicts between residential uses and in noise critical areas, such as in proximity to highways, country roads, city streets, railroads, rapid transit lines, airports, nighttime entertainment venues or industrial areas. Residential structures to be located where the day-night average sound level (Ldn) or community noise equivalent level (CNEL) exceeds 60 decibels shall require an acoustical analysis with the application of a building permit showing that the proposed design will limit exterior noise to the 45 decibels in any habitable room. Furthermore, the regulations require the Planning Department and Planning Commission to consider the compatibility of uses when approving residential uses adjacent to or near existing permitted places of entertainment and take all reasonably available means through the City’s design review and approval processes to ensure that the design of such new
residential development projects take into account the needs and interests of both the places of entertainment and the future residents of the new development.

The regulations and procedures set forth by the San Francisco Noise Regulations Relating to Residential Uses Near Places of Entertainment are consistent with the provisions of PEIR Mitigation Measure F-3 and F-4. In accordance with PEIR Mitigation Measures F-3 and F-4, the project sponsor has conducted an environmental noise study demonstrating that the proposed project can feasibly attain acceptable interior noise levels. The proposed project would add noise-sensitive uses (residences) in an area where street noise levels exceed 60 dBA (Ldn). The proposed project would comply with Title 24 standards for interior noise and would incorporate recommendations described in the noise study, including the installation of windows with noise reduction ratings of up to STC 43. Therefore, Mitigation Measures F-3 and F-4 apply to the proposed project, and have been agreed to by the project sponsor as Project Mitigation Measures 3 and 4, respectively (full text provided in the “Mitigation Measures” section below). Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to noise impacts on future residences or other noise-sensitive uses.

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5 addresses impacts related to individual projects that include new noise-generating uses, such as PDR, entertainment, retail, or other non-residential uses, that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise in the proposed project site vicinity. The proposed project does not include noise-generating land uses, so Mitigation Measure F-5 is not applicable.

Mitigation Measure F-6 addresses impacts from existing ambient noise levels on open space required under the Planning Code for new development that includes noise sensitive uses. The proposed project includes open space on a roof-top terrace. Mitigation Measure F-6 is therefore applicable to the proposed project, and has been agreed to by the project sponsor as Project Mitigation Measure 5 (full text provided in the “Mitigation Measures” section below). As part of Mitigation Measure F-6 (Project Mitigation Measure 5), the noise study prepared for the project addressed future noise levels at the proposed rooftop open space and demonstrated that it would be adequately shielded from ambient noise by intervening buildings and the proposed a shielding effect created by the building itself. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to noise levels at open spaces provided by the project.

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

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

---

12 Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc., 655 Folsom Street Residences, San Francisco, CA - Environmental Noise Assessment. August 19, 2015. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0253E.
Topics:

6. **AIR QUALITY—Would the project:**

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

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
   
   ![☐ ☐ ☐ ☒]

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
   
   ![☐ ☐ ☐ ☒]

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
   
   ![☐ ☐ ☐ ☒]

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?
   
   ![☐ ☐ ☐ ☒]

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

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 addresses air quality impacts during construction, PEIR Mitigation Measure G-2 addresses the siting of sensitive land uses near sources of TACs and PEIR Mitigation Measures G-3 and G-4 address proposed uses that would emit DPM and other TACs.

**Construction Dust Control**

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

---

13 The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) considers sensitive receptors as: children, adults or seniors occupying or residing in: 1) residential dwellings, including apartments, houses, condominiums, 2) schools, colleges, and universities, 3) daycares, 4) hospitals, and 5) senior care facilities. BAAQMD, Recommended Methods for Screening and Modeling Local Risks and Hazards, May 2011, page 12.
to avoid orders to stop work by DBI. Project-related construction activities would result in construction dust, primarily from ground-disturbing activities. In compliance with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance, the project sponsor and contractor responsible for construction activities at the project site would be required to control construction dust on the site through a combination of watering disturbed areas, covering stockpiled materials, street and sidewalk sweeping and other measures.

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

Criteria Air Pollutants

While the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that at a program-level the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in significant regional air quality impacts, the PEIR states that “Individual development projects undertaken in the future pursuant to the new zoning and area plans would be subject to a significance determination based on the BAAQMD’s quantitative thresholds for individual projects.”\(^\text{14}\) The BAAQMD’s CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (Air Quality Guidelines) provide screening criteria\(^\text{15}\) for determining whether a project’s criteria air pollutant emissions would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. Pursuant to the Air Quality Guidelines, projects that meet the screening criteria do not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants. Criteria air pollutant emissions during construction and operation of the proposed project would meet the Air Quality Guidelines screening criteria. The proposed project would add 89 dwelling units and 2,300 sq ft of ground-floor commercial space, which is below the residential screening criterion of 240 dwelling units and the most restrictive retail criterion of 5,000 square feet. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants, and a detailed air quality assessment is not required.

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

The proposed project would include development of residential uses and is considered a sensitive land use for purposes of air quality evaluation. As discussed above, the ambient health risk to sensitive receptors from air pollutants is not considered substantial because the project is not located with the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone and Article 38 is not applicable to the proposed project. Therefore, PEIR Mitigation Measure G-2 Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses is not applicable to the proposed project, and impacts related to siting of new sensitive land uses would be less than significant.

Typical odor sources of concern include wastewater treatment plants, sanitary landfills, transfer stations, composting facilities, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing facilities,

---


\(^\text{15}\) Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, updated May 2011. See pp. 3-2 to 3-3.
fiberglass manufacturing facilities, auto body shops, rendering plants, and coffee roasting facilities. During construction, diesel exhaust from construction equipment would generate some odors. However, construction-related odors would be temporary and would not persist upon project completion. Observations conducted by Planning Department Staff indicate that the project site is not substantially affected by sources of odors. Additionally, the proposed project includes the demolition of an existing two-story commercial building and the construction of a new 14-story, mixed-use, building, and would therefore not create a significant sources of new odors. Therefore, odor impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project would not be expected to generate 100 trucks per day or 40 refrigerated trucks per day. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-3 is not applicable. However, the proposed project would include a backup diesel generator, which would emit DPM, a TAC. Therefore, Project Mitigation Measure 7 Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators has been identified for the project to implement the portions of Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-4 related to siting of facilities that emit TACs by requiring the engine to meet higher emission standards. Project Mitigation Measure 7 Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators would reduce DPM exhaust from stationary sources by 89 to 94 percent compared to uncontrolled stationary sources. Project impacts resulting in new sources of health risk would be less than significant through implementation of Project Mitigation Measure 7 Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators. The full text of Project Mitigation Measure 7 is provided in the Mitigation Measures Section below.

For the above reasons, the construction exhaust emissions portion of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR air quality mitigation measure G-1, as well as PEIR air quality mitigation measure G-4 regarding diesel generators, are applicable to the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in significant air quality impacts that were not identified in the PEIR. Further, the proposed project’s construction and operational emissions would not exceed the project-level thresholds for criteria air pollutants, the proposed project would not be considered to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional air quality impacts. Therefore, cumulative air quality impacts would be considered less than significant.
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS—Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR assessed the GHG emissions that could result from rezoning of the East SoMa Area Plan under the three rezoning options. The Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning Options A, B, and C are anticipated to result in GHG emissions on the order of 4.2, 4.3 and 4.5 metric tons of CO₂E\(^{16}\) per service population, respectively. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that the resulting GHG emissions from the three options analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans would be less than significant. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The proposed project was determined to be consistent with San Francisco’s GHG Reduction Strategy, which is comprised of regulations that have proven effective in reducing San Francisco’s overall GHG emissions; GHG emissions have measurably reduced when compared to 1990 emissions levels, demonstrating that the City has met and exceeded Executive Order S-3-05, AB 32, and the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan GHG reduction goals for the year 2020.\(^{18}\) Other existing regulations, such as those implemented through Assembly Bill (AB) 32, will continue to reduce a proposed project’s contribution to climate change. Therefore, the proposed project’s GHG emissions would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations, and thus 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 the proposed project is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on greenhouse gas emissions beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

\(^{16}\) CO₂E, defined as equivalent Carbon Dioxide, is a quantity that describes other greenhouse gases in terms of the amount of Carbon Dioxide that would have an equal global warming potential.

\(^{17}\) Memorandum from Jessica Range to Environmental Planning staff, Greenhouse Gas Analyses for Community Plan Exemptions in Eastern Neighborhoods, April 20, 2010. This memorandum provides an overview of the GHG analysis conducted for the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and provides an analysis of the emissions using a service population (equivalent of total number of residents and employees) metric.

\(^{18}\) 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.
8. WIND AND SHADOW—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) 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**

Based on the height and location of the proposed approximately 130-foot-tall building (with an additional 16 feet for a mechanical penthouse), a pedestrian wind assessment ("Wind Assessment") was prepared by a qualified wind consultant for the proposed project.\(^{19}\) The objective of the Wind Assessment was to provide a qualitative evaluation of the potential wind impacts of the proposed development, which provides a screening-level estimation of the potential wind impact. Pedestrian-level wind speeds were measured at 13 selected locations around the project site as it presently exists, and analyzed with the proposed building in place, to quantify resulting pedestrian-level winds.

Under existing conditions, average wind speeds measured at all 13 test points around the project area is 11.1 miles per hour (mph), and wind speeds ranged from 8 mph to 14 mph. The highest wind speeds (14 mph) occur on the south side of Folsom Street, just west of the intersection with Hawthorne Street. Under existing conditions, the Planning Code wind hazard criterion was not observed to be exceeded at any of the 13 test point locations.

With the proposed project, wind conditions in the area would be similar to existing wind conditions. Wind speeds would continue to range between 8 to 14 mph and average wind speeds would be 11.1 mph. Compared to existing conditions, the project would result in wind speed changes of ±1 mph or less at 12 of the 13 test locations. Wind speeds would decrease by 2 mph at one location across from the project site, at the intersection of Folsom and Hawthorne Streets. The Wind Assessment concluded that changes in wind speeds of ±2 mph (or less) would not be considered a substantial change to the wind environment. The Wind Assessment also found that the proposed building would not cause winds that would reach or exceed the 26-mile-per-hour wind hazard criterion at all pedestrian areas on and around the proposed development and that wind speeds at building entrances and public sidewalks would be suitable for the intended pedestrian usage.

Based on the above, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to wind that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

**Shadow**

Planning Code Section 295 generally prohibits new structures above 40 feet in height that would cast additional shadows on open space that is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, at any time of the year, unless

\(^{19}\) Charles Bennett / Rachael Larson, Environmental Science Associates, Potential Planning Code Section 148 Wind Impacts, 655 Folsom Street Project, San Francisco, CA. February 5, 2016. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, as part of Case File No. 2013.0253E.
that shadow would not result in a significant adverse effect on the use of the open space. Under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, sites surrounding parks could be redeveloped with taller buildings without triggering Section 295 of the Planning Code because certain parks are not subject to Section 295 of the Planning Code (i.e., under jurisdiction of departments other than the Recreation and Parks Department (SFRPD) or privately owned). The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR could not conclude if the rezoning and community plans would result in less-than-significant shadow impacts because the feasibility of complete mitigation for potential new shadow impacts of unknown proposed proposals could not be determined at that time. Therefore, the PEIR determined shadow impacts to be significant and unavoidable. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The proposed project would construct a 130-foot-tall building with an additional 16 feet in height for a mechanical penthouse; therefore, the Planning Department prepared a preliminary shadow fan analysis to determine whether the project would have the potential to cast new shadow on nearby parks. In addition, shadow analysis was conducted for the proposed project to further analyze potential shadows cast by the proposed project on nearby open spaces. The shadow fan indicated that project shadows could not reach any site under Recreation and Park Commission jurisdiction. However, the shadow fan indicates that the proposed project could cast shadows on Moscone Plaza, 611 Folsom Street Plaza, and 303 Second Street Plaza, all of which are publicly accessible open spaces that are not under the jurisdiction of the SFRPD. The shadow fan does not take into account the presence of intervening buildings or shadow already cast on these facilities. In considering existing buildings adjacent to the project site, the existing 14-story office building immediately across the street from the project site at 680 Folsom Street, as well as the nine-story mixed use building on the project block at 1 St. Francis Place, already cast shadows Moscone Plaza, 611 Folsom Street Plaza, and 303 Second Street Plaza; thus, the proposed project would not cast any net new shadow on these properties.

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

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

---

20 Christopher Espiritu, San Francisco Planning Department, Preliminary Shadow Fan Analysis. January 2016. This document is available for public review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, San Francisco, as part of Case No. 2013.0253E
21 Arquitectonica, Shadow Analysis, 655 Folsom Street, February 8, 2015. This document is available for public review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, San Francisco, as part of Case No. 2013.0253E
9. RECREATION—Would the project:

a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Physically degrade existing recreational resources?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in substantial or accelerated deterioration of existing recreational resources or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may have an adverse effect on the environment. No mitigation measures related to recreational resources were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

An update of the Recreation and Open Space Element (ROSE) of the General Plan was adopted in April 2014. The amended ROSE provides a 20-year vision for open spaces in the City. It includes information and policies about accessing, acquiring, funding, and managing open spaces in San Francisco. The amended ROSE identifies areas within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area for acquisition and the locations where proposed new open spaces and open space connections should be built, consistent with PEIR Improvement Measure H-2: Support for New Open Space. Two of these open spaces, Daggett Park and at 17th and Folsom, are both set to open in 2016. In addition, the amended ROSE identifies the role of both the Better Streets Plan (refer to “Transportation” section for description) and the Green Connections Network in open space and recreation. Green Connections are special streets and paths that connect people to parks, open spaces, and the waterfront, while enhancing the ecology of the street environment. Six routes identified within the Green Connections Network cross the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area: Mission to Peaks (Route 6); Noe Valley to Central Waterfront (Route 8), a portion of which has been conceptually designed; Tenderloin to Potrero (Route 18); Downtown to Mission Bay (Route 19); Folsom, Mission Creek to McLaren (Route 20); and Shoreline (Route 24).
The proposed project is located adjacent to the boundaries of the Transit Center District Plan (TCDP), as well as the Rincon Hill Plan Area. While the development of the proposed project would create additional demand for recreational uses in the vicinity, such as Yerba Buena Gardens, Rincon Park, Justin Herman Plaza, and South Park, the respective EIR analysis conducted under the TCDP and Rincon Hill Area Plan did not identify significant and unavoidable impacts on recreational facilities. Thus, development of the proposed project would not result in additional impacts to recreational facilities identified in the TCDP and Rincon Hill Area Plan EIR. As the proposed project would not degrade recreational facilities and is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on recreation beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</th>
<th>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</th>
<th>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</th>
<th>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that would serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact to the provision of water, wastewater collection and treatment, and solid waste collection and disposal. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

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

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

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

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact to 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 development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on public services beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.
12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:

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

   ☑

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

   ☑

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

   ☑

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?

   ☑

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

   ☑

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?

   ☑

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

The project site is located within East SoMa Plan area of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan and therefore, does not support habitat for any candidate, sensitive or special status species. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to biological resources not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.
### 13. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—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) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

A geotechnical investigation was prepared for the proposed project. Soil samples (borings) collected from the project site were observed to contain bedrock and the report noted that the soils beneath the

---

22 Rockridge Geotechnical, *Geotechnical Investigation Proposed Residential Building 655 Folsom Street, San Francisco, CA.* October 21, 2014. This document is available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File No. 2013.0253E
proposed basement level were primarily comprised of bedrock. Soil samples collected indicated that the project site was underlain by approximately four feet of fill materials, consisting of loose to medium dense sand with gravel, brick, with concrete fragments. Beneath the fill material was underlain by medium dense clayey sand overlying very dense sand that extends to a depth of about 16 feet below ground surface. Beyond 16 feet below ground surface and to the maximum depth explored (59 feet) the project site was underlain by Franciscan Complex sedimentary rocks (bedrock). Groundwater was encountered at approximately nine feet below ground surface. The report concluded that the proposed building may be adequately supported by a mat foundation system since the bedrock at the foundation level will have relatively high bearing capacity and low compressibility. The report recognized that the project site is located in a seismic hazard zone (liquefaction zone), and concluded that the proposed mat foundation system would adequately address the risk of liquefaction. Further, analysis of soil samples indicated that since groundwater was encountered approximately at nine feet below ground surface, the basement floor level and retaining walls should be thoroughly waterproofed and designed as undrained structures that would be able to resist full hydrostatic pressures.

The project is required to conform to the San Francisco Building Code, which ensures the safety of all new construction in the City. DBI will review the project-specific geotechnical report during its review of the building permit for the project. In addition, DBI may require additional site specific soils report(s) through the building permit application process, as needed. The DBI requirement for a geotechnical report and review of the building permit application pursuant to DBI’s implementation of the Building Code would ensure that the proposed project would have no significant impacts related to soils, seismic or other geological hazards.

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

---

**Topics:**

**Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site** | **Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR** | **Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information** | **No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR**
---

14. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY—Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
### Topics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d)</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The project site is fully covered by the existing two-story commercial building. The proposed building would fully cover the project site. Therefore, no increase or decrease of the impervious surface coverage on the project site would occur. Further, the project site is not located in an area that is subject to flooding. As a result, the proposed project would not increase stormwater runoff.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.
The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR noted that implementation of any of the proposed project’s rezoning options would encourage construction of new development within the project area. The PEIR found that there is a high potential to encounter hazardous materials during construction activities in many parts of the project area because of the presence of 1906 earthquake fill, previous and current land uses associated with the use of hazardous materials, and known or suspected hazardous materials cleanup cases. However, the PEIR found that existing regulations for facility closure, Under Storage Tank (UST) closure, and investigation and cleanup of soil and groundwater would ensure implementation of measures to protect workers and the community from exposure to hazardous materials during construction.

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, within two miles of a public airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, topic 15e and f from the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G is not applicable.

**Hazardous Building Materials**

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

**Soil and Groundwater Contamination**

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

The proposed project would have a basement level and would require greater than 50 cubic yards of soil disturbance on a site with known former industrial uses. Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH). The Maher Ordinance requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA) for the project site 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 project. Based on that information, the project sponsor may be required to conduct soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis. Where such analysis reveals the presence of hazardous substances in excess of state or federal standards, the project sponsor is required to submit a site mitigation plan (SMP) to the DPH or other appropriate state or federal agency(ies), 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 has submitted a Maher Application to DPH and a Phase I ESA has been prepared to assess the potential for site contamination. The ESA noted that prior to the construction of the building on-site, the property was occupied by residential buildings and a small carpenters shop in 1887, residential buildings in 1899, and a lodging building in 1913. A review of historic records and Fire Insurance Maps noted that the project site was occupied by various commercial tenants, including a welding equipment company, a printing and typography facility, an electrical equipment manufacturer, and offices, from at least 1953 until at least 1970. Between 1970 and 1980, the project site was occupied by a commercial bank. The current restaurant use on the project site was documented to have been occupied the site since at least 1990. During site reconnaissance, the Phase I ESA noted that the hazardous materials consisting of one ten-gallon container of hydraulic oil and one

---

23 AEI Consultants, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 655 Folsom Street, San Francisco, California 94131*, August 23, 2012. This document is available for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 as part of Case File No. 2013.0253E.
ten-gallon container of oily rags were observed in connection with the property maintenance activities conducted on site. No hazardous materials or evidence of prior inappropriate storage of hazardous materials were found at the site during the Phase I analysis. No records of underground fuel storage tanks were found, and the existing building’s foundation was found to be intact with no evidence of hazardous materials seeping into the soil or groundwater.

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

As described above, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or involve the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The project site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing school and would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Also, the project is not listed on the Cortese list (pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5). Finally, the project would not impair the implementation of (or physically interfere with) an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, nor expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires.

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

Impacts from hazardous materials are generally site-specific and typically do not result in cumulative impacts. Any identified hazards at nearby sites would be subject to the same safety or remediation requirements discussed for the proposed project above, which would reduce any hazard effects to less-than-significant levels. As such, the proposed project would not combine with other project to cause cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project would have less than significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

---

**Topics:**

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

**16. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES—**

Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
  - ☐
  - ☐
  - ☐
  - ☒

- 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?
  - ☐
  - ☐
  - ☐
  - ☒

- c) Encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?
  - ☐
  - ☐
  - ☐
  - ☒

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

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

<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>17. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:—Would the project:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

As the proposed project is within the development projected under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts on agriculture and forest resources beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.
MITIGATION MEASURES

Archeological Resources

Project Mitigation Measure 1 – Archeological Mitigation Measure III (Testing)

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

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

Archeological Testing Program. The archeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archeological testing plan (ATP). The archeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The

---

24 By the term “archeological site” is intended here to minimally include any archeological deposit, feature, burial, or evidence of burial.

25 An “appropriate representative” of the descendant group is here defined to mean, in the case of Native Americans, any individual listed in the current Native American Contact List for the City and County of San Francisco maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission and in the case of the Overseas Chinese, the Chinese Historical Society of America. An appropriate representative of other descendant groups should be determined in consultation with the Department archaeologist.
purpose of the archeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA. At the completion of the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archeological testing program the archeological consultant finds that significant archeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the archeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archeological testing, archeological monitoring, and/or an archeological data recovery program. No archeological data recovery shall be undertaken without the prior approval of the ERO or the Planning Department archeologist. If the ERO determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

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

**Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.** The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner’s determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archeological consultant, project sponsor, ERO, and MLD shall have up
to but not beyond six days of discovery to make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects with appropriate dignity (CEQA Guidelines, Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recording, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. Nothing in existing State regulations or in this mitigation measure compels the project sponsor and the ERO to accept recommendations of an MLD. The archeological consultant shall retain possession of any Native American human remains and associated or unassociated burial objects until completion of any scientific analyses of the human remains or objects as specified in the treatment agreement if such an agreement has been made or, otherwise, as determined by the archeological consultant and the ERO. Final Archeological Resources Report. The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound, one unbound and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recording forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest in or the high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

Noise

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

Where environmental review of a development project undertaken subsequent to the adoption of the proposed zoning controls determines that construction noise controls are necessary due to the nature of planned construction practices and the sensitivity of proximate uses, the Planning Director shall require that the sponsors of the subsequent development project develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:

• Erect temporary plywood noise barriers around a construction site, particularly where a site adjoins noise-sensitive uses;

• Utilize noise control blankets on a building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site;
• Evaluate the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings housing sensitive uses;

• Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements;

• Post signs on-site pertaining to permitted construction days and hours and complaint procedures and who to notify in the event of a problem, with telephone numbers listed.

Project Mitigation Measure 3 – Interior Noise Levels (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-3)

For new development including noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn), as shown in EIR Figure 18, where such development is not already subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the project sponsor shall conduct a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements. Such analysis shall be conducted by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering. Noise insulation features identified and recommended by the analysis shall be included in the design, as specified in the San Francisco General Plan Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise to reduce potential interior noise levels to the maximum extent feasible.

Project Mitigation Measure 4 – Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-4)

To reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors, for new development including noise-sensitive uses, the Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-generating uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes), prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 standards, where applicable, can be met, and that there are no particular circumstances about the proposed project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. Should such concerns be present, the Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action, in order to demonstrate that acceptable interior noise levels consistent with those in the Title 24 standards can be attained.

Project Mitigation Measure 5 – Open Space in Noisy Environments (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-6)

To minimize effects on development in noisy areas, for new development including noise-sensitive uses, the Planning Department shall, through its building permit review process, in conjunction with noise analysis required pursuant to Mitigation Measure F-4, require that open space required under the Planning Code for such uses be protected, to the maximum feasible extent, from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space. Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, site design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise...
sources, construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-family dwellings, and implementation would also be undertaken consistent with other principles of urban design.

**Air Quality**

*Project Mitigation Measure 6 – Construction Air Quality (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure G-1)*

The City shall condition approval of individual development proposals under the proposed project upon implementation of an appropriate dust abatement program, patterned after the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) approach described below.

The BAAQMD approach to dust abatement, as put forth in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, calls for “basic” control measures that should be implemented at all construction sites, “enhanced” control measures that should be implemented at construction sites greater than four acres in area, and “optional” control measures that should be implemented on a case-by-case basis at construction sites that are large in area, located near sensitive receptors or which, for any other reason, may warrant additional emissions reductions.

Elements of the “basic” dust control program for project components that disturb less than four acres shall include, but not necessarily be limited to the following:

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily. Watering should be sufficient to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency may be necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible.
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., the minimum required space between the top of the load and the top of the trailer).
- Pave, apply water (reclaimed if possible) three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- Sweep streets (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads.

Elements of the “enhanced” dust abatement program for project components that disturb four or more acres are unlikely to be required, in that no sites anticipated for development in the Plan area are as large as four acres. Should a site this size be proposed for development, dust control shall include all of the “basic” measures in addition to the following measures to be implemented by the construction contractor(s):

- Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for one month or more).
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).
- Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.
- Limit the amount of the disturbed area at any one time, where possible.
- Pave all roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
- Designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the BAAQMD prior to the start of construction.

The “optional” dust-control measures supplement the “basic” and “enhanced” programs to address site-specific issues. They include:
- Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site.
- Install windbreaks, or plant tree/vegetative wind breaks at windward side(s) of construction areas.
- Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.

Ordinance 175-91, passed by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors on May 6, 1991, requires that non-potable water be used for dust control activities. Therefore, project sponsors would require that construction contractors obtain reclaimed water from the Clean Water Program for this purpose.

The City would also condition project approval such that each subsequent project sponsor would require the contractor(s) to maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions of particulates and other pollutants, by such means as a prohibition on idling motors when equipment is not in use or when trucks are waiting in queues, and implementation of specific maintenance programs to reduce emissions for equipment that would be in frequent use for much of the construction period.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure G-1 would reduce construction-related air quality effects to a less-than-significant level.

**Project Mitigation Measure 7 – Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators (Implementing Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-4)**

The project sponsor shall ensure that the backup diesel generator meet or exceed one of the following emission standards for particulate matter: (1) Tier 4 certified engine, or (2) Tier 2 or Tier 3 certified engine that is equipped with a California Air Resources Board (ARB) Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS). A non-verified diesel emission control strategy may be used if the filter has the same particulate matter reduction as the identical ARB verified model and if the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) approves of its use. The project sponsor shall submit documentation of compliance with the BAAQMD New Source Review permitting process (Regulation 2, Rule 2, and Regulation 2, Rule 5) and the
emission standard requirement of this mitigation measure to the Planning Department for review and approval prior to issuance of a permit for a backup diesel generator from any City agency.

**Hazardous Materials**

*Project Mitigation Measure 8 – Hazardous Building Materials (Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure L-1)*

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