



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: August 17, 2017
TO: San Francisco Planning Commission
FROM: Jessica Range, Planning Department, EP
Jeanie Poling, Planning Department, EP
RE: Appeal of Community Plan Preliminary Mitigated Negative
Declaration for 77-85 Federal Street, Assessor's Block 3774, Lot
444, Planning Department Case No. 2012.1410E
HEARING DATE: August 24, 2017

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

An appeal has been received concerning a preliminary mitigated negative declaration for the following project:

Case No. 2012.1410E – 77-85 Federal Street: The project site is located on the block bounded by 2nd, Bryant, Delancey, and Brannan Streets in the South of Market neighborhood. With frontages on two dead end alleys accessed from 2nd Street (106-foot frontage along Federal Street and 86-foot frontage along De Boom Street), the project site is occupied by two two-story office buildings constructed in 1948, approximately 30 feet in height, totaling 17,116 square feet (sf) and surface parking for 18 vehicles.

The project would demolish the two existing two-story buildings containing 17,116 sf of office use and construct a five-story-over-basement, approximately 77,000 sf building containing approximately 50,000 sf of office use on floors 2-5; approximately 23,000 sf of retail use proposed to be a fitness center on the ground and basement levels; ground-floor parking for 124 bicycles; and below-grade parking for 26 vehicles in stacker pits. Two service vehicle loading spaces would be provided in the basement parking area.

An approximately 20-foot-long curb cut along De Boom Street would be removed and replaced with a 14-foot-wide curb along De Boom Street that would provide vehicle access to the below-grade garage. The proposed project would include eleven new street trees along the street frontages of the project site. The roof level would be 65 feet in height. An elevator penthouse would extend 4 feet, 11 inches above the roof, and a stair penthouse would extend 6 feet, 2 inches above the roof. Publicly accessible open space would be provided in a 939 sf roof deck on the fourth floor. The project would be constructed on spread footings or a mat foundation. Construction is expected to last approximately 16 months, and would include approximately four months of excavation using heavy equipment. The project would involve approximately 6,300 cubic yards of excavation to a depth of 19 feet below ground surface. No pile driving would be required or is proposed.

This matter is calendared for public hearing on August 24, 2017. Enclosed are the appeal letter, comment letters, the staff response, the community plan mitigated negative declaration, and the draft motion. If you have any questions related to this project's environmental evaluation, please contact me at (415) 575-9072 or jeanie.poling@sfgov.org. Thank you.

Memo



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Appeal of Community Plan Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration Executive Summary

HEARING DATE: August 24, 2017

Date: August 17, 2017
Case No.: 2012.1410E
Project Title: **77-85 Federal Street**
Zoning: MUO (Mixed Use-Office) District
65-X Height and Bulk District
South End Historic District
Block/Lot: 3774/444
Lot Size: 16,070 square feet
Project Sponsor: Adam Franch, 77 Federal Street LLC
(415) 988-1080, adam@aralonproperties.com
Staff Contact: Jeanie Poling – (415) 575-9072, jeanie.poling@sfgov.org

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

COMMISSION ACTION:

Consider whether to uphold staff's decision to prepare a community plan mitigated negative declaration (CP-MND) under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), or whether to overturn that decision and require the preparation of an environmental impact report due to specified potential significant environmental effects of the proposed project.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project site is located on the block bounded by 2nd, Bryant, Delancey, and Brannan Streets in the South of Market neighborhood. With frontages on two dead end alleys accessed from 2nd Street (106-foot frontage along Federal Street and 86-foot frontage along De Boom Street), the project site is occupied by two two-story office buildings constructed in 1948, approximately 30 feet in height, totaling 17,116 square feet (sf) and surface parking for 18 vehicles.

The project would demolish the two existing two-story buildings containing 17,116 sf of office use and construct a five-story-over-basement, approximately 77,000 sf building containing approximately 50,000 sf of office use on floors 2-5; approximately 23,000 sf of retail use proposed to be a fitness center on the ground and basement levels; ground-floor parking for 124 bicycles; and below-grade parking for 26 vehicles in stacker pits. Two service vehicle loading spaces would be provided in the basement parking area.

An approximately 20-foot-long curb cut along De Boom Street would be removed and replaced with a 14-foot-wide curb along De Boom Street that would provide vehicle access to the below-grade garage. The proposed project would include eleven new street trees along the street frontages of the project site. The roof level would be 65 feet in height. An elevator penthouse would extend 4 feet, 11 inches above the

roof, and a stair penthouse would extend 6 feet, 2 inches above the roof. Publicly accessible open space would be provided in a 939 sf roof deck on the fourth floor.

The project would be constructed on spread footings or a mat foundation. Construction is expected to last approximately 16 months, and would include approximately four months of excavation using heavy equipment. The project would involve approximately 6,300 cubic yards of excavation to a depth of 19 feet below ground surface. No pile driving would be required or is proposed.

ISSUES:

The Planning Department published a community plan preliminary mitigated negative declaration (CP-PMND) on May 31, 2017, and received an appeal letter from Sue Hestor of San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth on June 20, 2017, appealing the determination to issue a CP-PMND. The appeal letter states that the CP-PMND fails to adequately address the following issues:

1. The CP-PMND does not adequately describe the existing environmental context with respect to: the project's location along two dead-end streets; steep site topography; and proximity to Academy of Art operations at 60 Federal Street, the Bay Bridge entrance, and other existing and proposed uses on adjacent blocks that contribute to congestion in the area;
2. The CP-PMND relies on the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR, which was adopted in 2008, and the analysis is out of date.

During the CP-PMND appeal period, another appeal of the CP-PMND was received and later withdrawn. Further, an additional comment letter was received after the close of the CP-PMND appeal period. All of the issues raised in the appeal letter have been addressed in the attached materials, which include:

- A draft Motion upholding the decision to issue a CP-MND;
- Exhibit A to draft Motion – Planning Department Response to the Appeal Letter;
- Exhibit A.1 to draft Motion – Photos of the project block
- Exhibit B – Appeal letter;
- Exhibit C – CP-PMND and Initial Study - Community Plan Evaluation.

In addition, two comments were received on the CP-PMND and are included as Appendix A to Exhibit C and have been addressed through amendments to the Initial Study-Community Plan Evaluation shown in ~~strike through~~ and underline in Exhibit C.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the motion to uphold the CP-PMND. The appellant has not demonstrated nor provided substantial evidence to support a claim that the CP-PMND fails to conform to the requirements of CEQA for a community plan evaluation pursuant to CEQA Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, nor has the appellant presented substantial evidence supporting a fair argument that a significant environmental effect may occur as a result of the project that would warrant preparation of an environmental impact report. By upholding the CP-PMND (as recommended), the Planning Commission would not prejudice or restrict its ability to consider whether the proposed project's uses or design is appropriate for the neighborhood.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Motion No. [XXXX]

HEARING DATE: August 24, 2017

Case No.: 2012.1410E
Project Title: 77-85 Federal Street
Zoning: MUO (Mixed Use-Office) District
65-X Height and Bulk District
South End Historic District
Block/Lot: 3774/444
Lot Size: 116,070 square feet
Project Sponsor: Adam Franch, 77 Federal Street LLC
(415) 988-1080, adam@aralonproperties.com
Staff Contact: Jeanie Poling – (415) 575-9072
jeanie.poling@sfgov.org

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATED TO THE APPEAL OF THE COMMUNITY PLAN PRELIMINARY MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, FILE NUMBER 2012.1410E FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ("PROJECT") AT 77-85 FEDERAL STREET.

MOVED, that the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") hereby AFFIRMS the decision to issue a community plan mitigated negative declaration, based on the following findings:

1. On March 22, 2013, pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, the Planning Department ("Department") received an environmental evaluation application for the project, in order that it might conduct an initial evaluation to determine whether the project might have a significant impact on the environment.
2. On May 31, 2017 the Department determined that the project, as proposed, could not have a significant effect on the environment.
3. On May 31, 2017 a notice of availability that a community plan mitigated negative declaration would be issued for the project was duly published in a newspaper of general circulation in the City, and the community plan mitigated negative declaration posted in the Department offices, and distributed all in accordance with law.
4. On June 20, 2017 an appeal of the decision to issue a community plan mitigated negative declaration was timely filed by Sue Hestor of San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth ("the appellant").
5. A staff memorandum, dated August 17, 2017, addresses and responds to all points raised by appellant in the appeal letter. That memorandum is attached as Exhibit A and staff's findings as to those points are incorporated by reference herein as the Commission's own findings. Copies of that memorandum have been delivered to the City Planning Commission, and a copy of that

memorandum is on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1660 Mission Street, Suite 500.

6. On August 24, 2017 the Commission held a duly noticed and advertised public hearing on the appeal of the community plan preliminary mitigated negative declaration, at which testimony on the merits of the appeal, both in favor of and in opposition to, was received.
7. All points raised in the appeal of the community plan preliminary mitigated negative declaration at the August 24, 2017 San Francisco Planning Commission hearing have been responded to either in the memorandum or orally at the public hearing.
8. After consideration of the points raised by appellant, both in writing and at the August 24, 2017 hearing, the San Francisco Planning Department reaffirms its conclusion that the proposed project could not have a significant effect upon the environment.
9. In reviewing the community plan preliminary mitigated negative declaration issued for the project, the Planning Commission has had available for its review and consideration all information pertaining to the project in the Planning Department's case file.
10. The Planning Commission finds that Planning Department's determination on the community plan mitigated negative declaration reflects the Department's independent judgment and analysis.

The San Francisco Planning Commission HEREBY DOES FIND that the proposed Project could not have a significant effect on the environment, as shown in the analysis of the community plan mitigated negative declaration, and HEREBY DOES AFFIRM the decision to issue a community plan mitigated negative declaration, as prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the Planning Commission on August 24, 2017.

Jonas P. Ionin

Commission Secretary

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED:

EXHIBIT A

Planning Department Response to the Appeal Letter



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

Exhibit A to Draft Motion Planning Department Response to Appeal of Community Plan Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration

CASE NO. 2012.1410E – 77-85 FEDERAL STREET CP-PMND PUBLISHED ON MAY 31, 2017

BACKGROUND

An environmental evaluation application (2012.1410E) for the proposed project at 77-85 Federal Street (Assessor's Block 3774, Lot 444) was filed by Clare Hyland of SF Rents¹ on March 22, 2013 for a proposal to demolish two existing two-story buildings containing 17,116 sf of office use and to construct a five-story-over-basement building containing approximately 77,000 sf of commercial use.

The project site is located on the block bounded by 2nd, Bryant, Delancey, and Brannan Streets in the South of Market neighborhood. The parcel has frontages on two dead end alleys accessed from 2nd Street (106-foot frontage along Federal Street and 86-foot frontage along De Boom Street).

The proposed new building would contain approximately 50,000 sf of office use on floors 2-5; approximately 23,000 sf of retail use proposed to be a fitness center on the ground and basement levels; ground-floor parking for 124 bicycles; and below-grade parking for 26 vehicles in stacker pits. Two service vehicle loading spaces would be provided in the basement parking area. An approximately 20-foot-long curb cut along De Boom Street would be removed and replaced with a 14-foot-long curb cut along De Boom Street that would provide vehicle access to the garage. The project would include eleven new street trees along the street frontages of the project site. The roof level would be 65 feet in height. An elevator penthouse would extend 4 feet, 11 inches above the roof, and a stair penthouse would extend 6 feet, 2 inches above the roof. Publicly accessible open space would be provided in a 939 sf roof deck on the fourth floor.

The project would be constructed on spread footings or a mat foundation. Construction is expected to last approximately 16 months, and would include approximately four months of excavation using heavy equipment. The project would involve approximately 6,300 cubic yards of excavation to a depth of 19 feet below ground surface. No pile driving is proposed.

¹ SF Rents changed its name to Aralon Properties in 2016. Adam Franch is now the project sponsor.

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

COMMUNITY PLAN EVALUATION PROCESS

Section 21083.3 of the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., “CEQA”) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 **mandate** that projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified, **shall not** require additional environmental review except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific effects that are peculiar to the project or its site and that were not disclosed as significant effects in the prior EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: (a) are peculiar to the project or parcel on which the project would be located; (b) were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan or community plan with which the project is consistent; (c) are potentially significant off-site and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the underlying EIR; or (d) are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than that discussed in the underlying EIR. Guidelines Section 15183(c) specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for that project solely on the basis of that impact.

In determining the significance of environmental effects caused by a project, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(f) states that the decision as to whether a project may have one or more significant effects shall be based on substantial evidence in the record of the lead agency. If the lead agency determines there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, the lead agency shall prepare a negative declaration. CEQA State Guidelines 15604(f)(5) offers the following guidance: “Argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative, or evidence that is clearly inaccurate or erroneous, or evidence that is not credible, shall not constitute substantial evidence. Substantial evidence shall include facts, reasonable assumption predicated upon facts, and expert opinion supported by facts.”

ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

On May 31, 2017, the Planning Department published a community plan preliminary mitigated negative declaration (CP-PMND) for the proposed project. The CP-PMND documents that the project is consistent with the development density established for the project site in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans, that the project sponsor will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR to mitigate project-related significant effects previously disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The CP-PMND also identified a project-specific significant effect on adjacent historic resources that could occur during construction of the proposed project and was not previously identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The CP-PMND determined that a project-specific mitigation measure, Construction Monitoring Program to Protect Adjacent Historical Resources, would reduce this impact to less than significant.

APPELLANT ISSUES AND PLANNING DEPARTMENT RESPONSES

On June 20, 2017, Sue Hestor of San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (the appellant) filed a letter appealing the CP-PMND. Ms. Hestor's concerns are summarized in two issues: (1) the CP-PMND does not adequately describe the existing environmental context with respect to: the project's location along two dead-end streets; steep site topography; and proximity to Academy of Art operations at 60 Federal Street, the Bay Bridge entrance, and other existing and proposed uses on adjacent blocks that contribute to congestion in the area, and (2) the CP-PMND relies on the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR, which was adopted in 2008, and the analysis is out of date. These issues are cited below and are followed by the Department's responses. The appeal letter is included as Exhibit B within this appeal packet.

CONCERN 1: The CP-PMND does not adequately describe the existing environmental context with respect to the following factors: the project is located in the interior of a block with steep topography; the project is located along two dead-end streets; and the project is near Academy of Art (AAU) operations at 60 Federal Street, the Bay Bridge entrance, AT&T Park, and other existing and proposed uses that contribute to congestion in the area.

RESPONSE 1: The CP-PMND adequately describes the existing environmental context in the project description. The analysis of environmental effects resulting from the proposed project, including the transportation analysis, are based upon the existing conditions at the site its vicinity.

Block Characteristics and Traffic Impacts

The appellant's letter states:

"This is Negative Declaration for office development in the interior of the block bounded by Brannan, 2nd Street, Bryant St and kind of Delancey Street on the east (eastern boundary weird)."

"The description of the block ... must be totally rewritten. Starting with p.4 map. Much of the block itself is obliterated by overlays - especially eastern portion. The 'inset' block is deceptive. There is NOT a hard edge on the east. There is a steep wall to north and there is no connection from Bryant to Delancey Street. Please indicate DIRECTIONS and LIMITATIONS for traffic on interior of this block and surrounding adjacent streets. Circulation on this block is both very unusual and very important. Particularly for proposed office developments on INTERIOR lots."

The appellant requests more information on the topography and circulation within the project block and states that project site is located on a block with unusual circulation.

The CP-PMND project setting on p. 13 describes the project site being a through lot with frontage on two dead-end streets and notes that Federal Street is interrupted mid-block by the five-story building at 60 Federal Street. Dead-end blocks are not an unusual condition, especially in the South of Market area where there are large blocks with smaller internal blocks that can dead end. To further describe existing conditions, the following text is added to p. 13 of the CP-PMND:

The project site can only be accessed from 2nd Street to the west because the 60 Federal Street building divides Federal Street into two distinct and separated streets with no connection. The eastern portion of the block that fronts Brannan, Bryant, and Delancey Streets contains residential, office and retail uses. The eastern portion of Federal and Delancey streets cannot be directly accessed from Bryant Street, due to a change in elevation (see Figure 9, Aerial View and Topography of the Project Vicinity). Similarly, De Boom Street dead ends and extends only about one third of the distance between Second and Delancey Streets. These dead end streets require that vehicles entering from 2nd Street make a three-point turn to then exit back onto 2nd Street.

With regards to topography, a new Figure 9 has been added to p. 15 of the CP-PMND and provides an aerial view and topography of the project site and vicinity. The project site itself is fairly flat, although the topography becomes steep to the north as one approaches Delancey Street from Bryant Street. Exhibit A.1 of this appeal response provides an aerial view, map, and photo documentation circling the project block. As shown in Photos 11 and 12 of Exhibit A.1 of this appeal response, vehicles cannot access Delancey Street from Bryant Street due to a steep grade change at this intersection. Two of the three eastbound lanes of Bryant Street east of 2nd Street are used for access to I-80/the Bay Bridge. A vehicle turning from 2nd Street onto eastbound Bryant Street would have to travel 0.4 mile to the Embarcadero and then travel 0.4 mile back along Brannan Street to 2nd Street to return to the project site. Thus, vehicles would not be likely to use either Bryant or Delancey Streets to access the project site. The appellant has not provided any evidence as to how this lack of connection between Delancey and Bryant Streets is relevant to the project analysis.

Photos 6 and 7 shows the western portion of Federal Street (where the project site is located), and Photo 12 shows the eastern portion of Federal Street. Photos 2, 3 and 4 show De Boom Street. As discussed in the CP-PMND transportation analysis, the proposed project would result in approximately 65 vehicle trips during the PM peak hour, which would exit the site from De Boom Street to access 2nd Street. The CP-PMND further acknowledges that vehicles accessing the site from Federal or De Boom Streets to allow for drop off/pick up would need to make three-point turns to exit back onto 2nd Street and that some drivers may choose to avoid entering these dead-end streets altogether by conducting passenger loading and unloading from 2nd Street. However, the CP-PMND concludes that vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would not be substantial enough to result in potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians or bicyclists. The appellant has provided no evidence of an environmental impact resulting from the proposed project related to the existing circulation conditions on the subject block.

Pedestrian Impacts Related to Proximity to the Bay Bridge Entrance and Increased Activity at AT&T Park

The appellant's letter states:

“There has been recent appeal on 340 Bryant (north side) which was converted from PDR to tech offices. This site is surrounded by BAY BRIDGE itself, HOV access lane coming from west directly onto bridge, HOV counter-flow lane coming from east directly onto bridge. HEAVY DUTY HEAVY VOLUME BRIDGE traffic. Environmental evaluation didn't even discuss needs of pedestrians for secure crosswalks ACROSS HOV LANES HEADING FOR BRIDGE IN RUSH HOUR. Tech workers who often are not the most aware

pedestrians because they are looking at their cell phone. Crosswalk was added because of my own appeal to force discussion after Planning Commission approval. (There was traffic death to bicyclist on Bryant.)”

“Because the freeway cuts through there is disruption particularly during commute hours and when there is ballpark traffic. Totally clogged streets should be discussed.”

“Env Rev has nasty habit of avoid HILLS, Bay bridge access and other impediments to circulation. You cannot take location, plot out 1/4 mile radius and simple state THESE are bus lines, parking lots, etc without taking into account HILLS and OBSTRUCTIONS. To the north of this site is HUGE OBSTRUCTION - running from 2nd Street effectively to Embarcadero. BAY BRIDGE. People cannot walk through it. Please go back and think through bus line discussion. What HILLS have to be forged to walk east to Muni lines?”

The appellant references the 340 Bryant Street appeal and asserts that pedestrians accessing the project site from transit stops would pass through hilly terrain and cross freeway traffic due to that project’s proximity of the I-80/Bay Bridge vehicle entry. The appellant also implies that the area is congested and the project would add more persons to the area, increasing the number of accidents.

The 340 Bryant Street property is one block north of the subject block across Bryant Street, adjacent to the mid-block entry to I-80/the Bay Bridge from both eastbound and westbound directions on Bryant Street. Pedestrians accessing the 77-85 Federal Street project site by transit likely would arrive from stops along 2nd Street, from the light rail stop on The Embarcadero and Brannan Street, or from the Caltrain station on 4th and King Streets; as shown in new Figure 9, Aerial View and Topography of the Project Vicinity, on p. 15 of the CP-PMND, the walking routes between these transit stops and the project site are relatively flat. While the two projects are close in proximity, pedestrian conditions related to 340 Bryant Street are not relevant to those of 77-85 Federal Street, as pedestrians accessing 77-85 Federal Street would be unlikely to use the crosswalk mentioned by the appellant. Pedestrian crosswalks exist on Bryant Street across 2nd Street, which could be used by pedestrians to access the project site, as shown in Photo 8. The appellant has not provided any evidence as to how pedestrian access to the 340 Bryant Street project site is relevant to the environmental analysis of the proposed 77-85 Federal Street project.

The CP-PMND on p. 40 notes that the recently approved Second Street Improvement Project includes pedestrian improvements along 2nd Street in the project vicinity such as widening sidewalks, raising crosswalks, and improving intersection traffic signal phasing for pedestrians. The CP-PMND on p. 40 also notes the recent addition of a pedestrian island near the I-80/Bay Bridge approach east of Bryant Street.

To better describe traffic conditions, the following information is added to p. 38 of the CP-PMND:

Existing traffic conditions in the project vicinity are frequently congested due to the Bay Bridge entrance from both eastbound and westbound Bryant Street, located one block north of the project site, and ballgames and other events at AT&T Park, located two blocks south of the project site. Along 2nd Street, the number of vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians increases substantially during ballgames and other events at AT&T

Park, and vehicle traffic also increases substantially during the PM peak hour. The project's addition of 65 vehicle trips during the PM peak period would not indicate a significant effect on the environment.

The concern from the appellant about the proposed project adding more pedestrians to an area that is congested under existing conditions is a concern regarding the effects of the existing environmental conditions on a proposed project's users. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR acknowledged that growth under the Area Plan would increase conflicts between automobiles, pedestrians, and bicyclists and included mitigation measures to be undertaken by the city, such as funding measures for congestion management programs to fund bicycle and pedestrian improvement programs. The 2nd Street Improvement project, which includes cycle track bicycle facilities, transit boarding islands, sidewalk and crosswalk improvements and intersection traffic signal phasing for pedestrians, is a city project that was funded by Eastern Neighborhoods impact fees. While the appellant is correct that the project would add more persons to the area, the appellant does not identify new substantial information that was not known at the time the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was certified establishing that the project would result in significant impacts that were not discussed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR or in more severe adverse impacts than discussed in the PEIR. Therefore, under CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, additional environmental review is not required to address this concern.

Furthermore, in the California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District case decided in 2015, the California Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require lead agencies to consider how existing environmental conditions might impact a project's occupants, except where the project would significantly exacerbate an existing environmental condition. As discussed above, the CP-PMND finds that the proposed project's addition of 65 vehicle trips during the pm peak hour would not be substantial enough to result in potentially hazardous conditions to pedestrians or bicyclists. The appellant has not provided any evidence that the proposed project would result in hazardous conditions to pedestrians.

Circulation Impacts Related to Proximity to Academy of Art University

The appellant's letter states:

"Besides 340 Bryant environmental evaluation there have been TWO documents dealing with Academy of Art University, occupant of the ADJACENT SITE at 58-60 Federal. The one that BLOCKS Federal. There was the AAU EIR and the AAU ESTM (Existing Sites Technical Memo). The ESTM was necessitated by AAU operating without complying with the Planning Code since 1971. They have occupied Federal - and used it intensively for their also illegal bus operations - since 2005. They never disclosed existence or filed to change legal use to whatever AAU operations happened to be at any given time."

"Describe existing circulation problems caused by disruptive behavior of AAU operations and students including cars being forced to turn around because streets are not through streets. AAU bus operations and traffic on block is disruptive to circulation and to RESIDENTS of this block. Needs discussion."

“Evaluation of Mitigation Measures is affected by the insufficient analysis of housing and circulation – and illegal operations – on this block. Pedestrian circulation is affected by congested streets and outlaw traffic circulation. Private buses that operate ON THIS BLOCK impede traffic without any prior authorization by City.”

The appellant contends that the CP-PMND must address the existing AAU operations at 60 Federal Street and its effects on circulation. The CP-PMND notes existing AAU operations in the project setting on p. 13 and discusses pedestrian impacts resulting from the project based on existing site conditions on p. 40. The presence of the AAU, regardless of the legality of its operations, is considered as existing conditions in the CP-PMND. To further describe existing AAU operations near the project site, the following information is added to p. 13 of the CP-PMND.

The Academy of Art (AAU) building contains classrooms, labs/art studios, offices, an art store, and student and faculty lounges with a maximum capacity of 517 students and a peak-use capacity of 160 students.² On a typical day there are approximately 322 students and 41 faculty/staff members at this site. The building includes a 37-space garage that is accessed from the eastern portion of Federal Street. Pedestrian and loading access is from the western portion of Federal Street. The site is served by AAU Route G, which, as of spring 2015, had a frequency of approximately every 30 minutes in conjunction with class and lab times (generally between the hours of 7 a.m. and midnight). In 2015, the AAU shuttle buses did not have a designated shuttle stop but were observed loading and unloading passengers along the west side of Second Street between Taber Place and Federal Street, using available curb or parking spaces or double parking. In spring 2017, per the request of the Planning Department, AAU adjusted its shuttle fleet to smaller shuttle buses or vans, and the shuttle stop was relocated from Second and Taber Streets to the western portion of Federal Street, immediately adjacent to AAU’s pedestrian entry.^{3, 4, 5} At the end of Federal Street (accessed from 2nd Street) is loading dock access to 60 Federal Street.

The transportation and circulation section of the CP-PMND (pp. 35-41) addresses the project’s anticipated trip generation and its potential effects on transit, pedestrians, bicyclists, loading, and

² Student capacity includes capacity of classroom and any other space where student classes are scheduled in spring semester 2017; graduate studios are not included, as student use is not regularly scheduled. Peak use consists of the highest enrollment for a given class scheduled on Tuesdays in spring 2017.

³ Academy of Art University Project Existing Sites Technical Memorandum, May 4, 2016, Volume 2, pp. 4-581-4-582. Available at http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/2008.0586E_Volume%202%20Final%20AAU%20ESTM.pdf.

⁴ San Francisco Planning Department, Academy of Art University Institutional Master Plan Update, July 20, 2017. Available at <http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcpackets/2017-005439IMP.pdf>.

⁵ Rachel Schuett, Transportation Planner, San Francisco Planning Department, Memo Regarding AAU Operations, August 9, 2017.

construction traffic. Based on the estimated 65 PM peak-hour vehicle trips generated by the project, the Planning Department determined that the proposed project would not result in significant transportation impacts and a transportation impact study would not be required.⁶ The project was also reviewed by the interdepartmental street design advisory team, which considered the presence of AAU and the requirement for three-point turns on the dead end streets, and stated that “the proposed circulation plan is reasonable, as one of the primary functions of streets are for circulation and loading.”⁷ The CP-PMND concluded (on p. 41) that “the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to transportation and circulation that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and the proposed project would not contribute considerably to cumulative transportation and circulation impacts that were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.”

The appellant provides no evidence that AAU operations represent changed circumstances necessitating further environmental review beyond what was conducted in the CP-PMND, nor does the appellant identify specific significant transportation and circulation impacts that would result from the project that were not already analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhood PEIR.

Land Uses

The appellant’s letter states:

“There needs to be more expansive discussion on the number of housing units and residents ON THIS BLOCK and on other side of facing streets.”

“Please provide map showing existing uses on each lot on this block, as well as those facing THIS BLOCK: 2nd Street west side, Bryant Street north, Delancey Street east side, Brannan Street south side. Include amount of parking on each lot. This information will help provide context for 77-85 Federal project.”

“Evaluation of Mitigation Measures is affected by the insufficient analysis of housing and circulation – and illegal operations – on this block.”

The sponsor requests more detailed information on existing land uses and housing in the project area. The CP-PMND on pp. 13-14 describes land uses within the project block and the vicinity, which is a mixed-use high density area. The appellant has not provided any evidence as to how the number of housing units, residents, or parking spaces on each lot is relevant to the environmental analysis. Furthermore, as noted on p. 24 of the CP-PMND, the project qualifies as an infill project in which parking is not considered in the evaluation of project impacts. For informational purposes, new Figure 10, Land Uses in the Project Vicinity, is added to p. 16 of the CP-PMND.

⁶ San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Study Determinations, May 1, 2013 and October 17, 2016.

⁷ Street Design Advisory Team (Planning, Public Works, SFMTA, and SFPUC), Memo regarding 77-85 Federal Street, March 23, 2017.

Map of Cumulative Projects

The appellant's letter states:

"671 Harrison appears to have land-banked 2013 approval. Is there a map of the proposed projects or approved project sites?"

The applicant requests a map of cumulative projects. A list of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable cumulative development projects within a quarter-mile of the project, including 671 Harrison Street, is provided on p. 14 of the CP-PMND. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15130, the CP-PMND includes analysis of the proposed project's potential cumulative impacts. The appellant has not provided any evidence as to how a map of the cumulative projects would provide more information regarding the cumulative analysis, and thus a map of cumulative projects has not been added to the CP-PMND. The appellant does not identify new substantial information that was not known at the time the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was certified establishing that the project would result in significant impacts that were not discussed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR or in more severe adverse impacts than discussed in the PEIR.

Project Approvals

"It is to be the environmental analysis for approval of an office allocation by the Commission but fails to adequately describe the environmental context for 77-85 Federal Street so that the Commission may make an informed decision on whether to approve the office allocation and Large Project Authorization."

The appellant states that the environmental analysis fails to adequately describe the environmental context so that the Planning Commission may make an informed decision on whether to approve the project. The appellant's specific environmental concerns are addressed elsewhere in this appeal response. Where warranted, additional information has been added to the CP-PMND to clarify existing conditions at the project site and its surroundings. By upholding the CP-PMND, the Planning Commission would not prejudice or restrict its ability to consider whether the proposed project's uses or design is appropriate for the neighborhood.

Summary of Issues Related to Existing Conditions

Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, examination of environmental effects for the proposed project, which is consistent with the development density established in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans, shall be limited to those effects that: (a) are peculiar to the project or parcel on which the project would be located; (b) were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan or community plan with which the project is consistent; (c) are potentially significant off-site and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the underlying EIR; or (d) are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than that discussed in the underlying EIR. Additionally, per CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(b), an EIR is prepared if there is substantial evidence that a project either individually or cumulatively may cause a significant effect on the environment. The appellant does not provide substantial evidence that the proposed project would

have a significant impact on the environment necessitating the preparation of an EIR. The CP-PMND provides an accurate characterization of the proposed project as required by CEQA and provides substantial evidence that the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to the environment that were not disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR or could not be mitigated to less than significant levels with implementation of mitigation measures identified in the CP-PMND. Therefore, preparation of an EIR is not required.

CONCERN 2: The CP-PMND relies on the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR, which was adopted in 2008, and the analysis is out of date.

RESPONSE 2: The CP-PMND does not identify new substantial information that was not known at the time the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was certified establishing that the project would result in significant impacts that were not discussed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR or in more severe adverse impacts than discussed in the PEIR, with the exception of the project-specific impact to adjacent historic resources that would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with appropriate mitigation. Therefore, under CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, an additional EIR shall not be prepared for the project.

Reliance the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR

The appellant's letter states the following:

“Discussion of Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan must state period (YEARS) in which underlying environmental analysis done for Area Plan EIR. Plan adopted in 2008. The years which are basis for EIR were EXTREMELY different from booming economy in 2017. We were in recession and ultimately crash of housing and jobs. Yet environmental and planning information developed during recession is basis for this decision.”

The appellant alleges that the Department's determination to issue a CP-PMND for the project is invalid because substantial changes in economic conditions have occurred since 2008, when the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans were adopted. CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 limits future environmental review for projects consistent with the development density established by the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, and lead agencies shall not require additional environmental review except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site and that were not disclosed as significant effects in the prior EIR. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, “this streamlines the review of such projects and reduces the need to prepare repetitive environmental studies.” That is, lead agencies are not to reanalyze impacts that are attributable to the project site being developed consistent with the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, a project-level environmental review was undertaken as documented in the CP-PMND to determine if the 77-85 Federal Street project would result in additional impacts specific to the development proposal and the project site, and to determine if the proposed development would be within the development projections and the 20-year timeframe that was analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, so as to assess whether further environmental review is required.

Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, the CP-PMND evaluated 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 Eastern Neighborhoods 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.

The CP-PMND identifies one project-specific impact on adjacent historic resources and implements a mitigation measure to be applied to the project to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. As discussed in response to Concern 1 and throughout the CP-PMND, the analysis of the proposed project's environmental effects are based on conditions as they exist today and not based on the existing conditions from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The CP-PMND analysis did not identify any other significant impact that was not previously identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and identified three mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR (regarding archeological resources, construction noise, and hazardous materials) that would be applicable to the project. All in all, there are four mitigation measures applicable to the project, three from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and one that emerged during the CP-PMND process.

In summary, project-level environmental review was conducted in accordance with CEQA Guidelines 15183, using existing conditions as the baseline with which to analyze the project's impact on the environment. The appellant has not identified any new significant effects or effects of greater severity as a result of the project that were not disclosed in the PEIR. If anything, the project's environmental review achieves exactly the kind of streamlining benefits that the Legislature envisioned when it adopted CEQA Section 21083.3: "repetitive environmental studies" have been avoided, yet environmental impacts – both those that are peculiar to the project and those that were already identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR – have been identified and mitigated.

Cost of Housing

The appellant's letter states the following:

"Please explain ECONOMY, including cost of housing, average SF income, that underlie the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR. Is it at all comparable to what is assumed in Central SoMa Plan EIR currently under development?"

"Because of current housing prices, where will office workers in this building attempt to gain housing? Is developer aiming only at high-end tech offices?"

The appellant implies that changes in housing costs and income represent substantial changes to the circumstances considered in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The appellant is raising social and economic impacts in this comment. The appellant has provided no substantial evidence as to how and in what way changes in housing costs and income represent substantial changes to the circumstances considered in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR or result in a physical impact on the project's environmental setting.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15131 and 15064(e), economic and social impacts are separate from environmental impacts and generally not studied in environmental analyses unless there is substantial evidence of related physical impacts on the environment. Section 15064(e) states in part:

Economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. Economic or social changes may be used, however, to determine that a physical change shall be regarded as a significant effect on the environment. Where a physical change is caused by economic or social effects of a project, the physical change may be regarded as a significant effect in the same manner as any other physical change resulting from the project.

As discussed in the CP-PMND, under population and housing effects (pp. 27-29 of the CP-PMND), the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR disclosed that adoption of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans could contribute to gentrification and displacement, but did not determine that these potential socioeconomic effects would result in significant adverse physical impacts on the environment. The 77-85 Federal Street project, as cited on p. 28 of the CP-PMND, would add approximately 185 new jobs to the project site. These additional workers would be within the growth projections for the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. As explained in the response to Concern 1 and in the CP-PMND, the environmental analysis of the proposed project is based on existing environmental conditions and considers cumulative projects including the Central SoMa Plan (see CP-PMND page 14). It is unclear how a comparison of cost of housing and average income under the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan and Central SoMa Plan is relevant to the environmental analysis of the proposed project.

The appellant has not provided any evidence that economic changes, including the cost of housing, have resulted in new or substantially more significant impacts on the physical environment than were disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

During the CP-PMND appeal period, the Planning Department received an appeal letter from a resident of at 355 Bryant Street. The appeal, which was subsequently withdrawn, is included as Appendix A to the CP-PMND, which is included as Exhibit C within this appeal packet. The neighbor expressed concerns about the project's construction impacts to 355 Bryant Street, which is an 11-unit live/work building approximately 80 feet northeast of the project site and an identified historic resource. The CP-PMND identified a project-specific potential impact to adjacent historic resources and requires the project to implement a construction monitoring mitigation measure to reduce such impacts to less than significant. To ensure that the historic resource at 355 Bryant Street would not be impacted by construction vibration, Project Mitigation Measure 1 on pp. 33 and 66 of the CP-PMND has been revised as shown in Exhibit C.

After the close of the CP-PMND comment period, the Planning Department received a comment letter from another interested party (also included Appendix A to the CP-PMND [Exhibit C within this appeal packet]) who expressed concern that the proposed garage accessed from De Boom Street would generate significant traffic problems. These concerns are addressed on pp. 35-38 of the CP-PMND.

CONCLUSION

The proposed project's impact on the environment was fully analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and the project-specific CP-PMND. The CP-PMND identified one project-specific mitigation measure and three mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR to reduce impacts to less than significant. The appellant has not provided any evidence that the proposed project would result new or substantially more significant impacts on the physical environmental than were disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR or the CP-PMND. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the motion to uphold the CP-PMND as amended. By upholding the CP-PMND, the Planning Commission would not prejudge or restrict its ability to consider whether the proposed project's uses or design are appropriate for the neighborhood.

EXHIBIT A.1

Site Photos

77-85 Federal Street CP-PMND Appeal Response Exhibit A.1 – Photos of Project Block



Aerial Photo – June 2014. The project site is shaded.



The project site is a through lot fronting two dead end streets.



Photo 1: Bryant and 2nd Streets looking northeast at the project block. De Boom Street is before the blue building.



Photo 2: De Boom Street looking east. The project site is beyond the blue building on the left.



Photo 3: De Boom Street looking west toward 2nd Street. The project site is behind the chain link fence on the right.



Photo 4: Looking east at the dead end of De Boom Street. The side entrance of 270 Brannan Street is straight ahead.



Photo 5: The pedestrian alley that connects the dead ends of Federal and De Boom Streets.



Photo 6: Federal Street looking west toward 2nd Street. The project site is on the left.



Photo 7: Looking east at the dead end of Federal Street. The project site is the white buildings on the right.



Photo 8: 2nd and Bryant Streets looking east. The two left lanes lead to the Bay Bridge entrance.



Photo 9: Bryant Street midblock between 2nd and Delancey Streets looking east. Vehicles approach the Bay Bridge entrance from both east- and westbound Bryant Street.



Photo 10: Pedestrians heading north using the midblock crosswalk on Bryant Street between 2nd and Delancey Streets.



Photo 11: Bryant Street at Delancey Street looking east. The pedestrian stairway leads to Delancey Street.



Photo 12: Delancey Street looking north at the pedestrian stairway that leads to Bryant Street.



Photo 13: Delancey Street looking west at the eastern portion of Federal Street, which dead ends at the 50 Federal Street building.



Photo 14: Bryant Street at Delancey Street looking east toward the Embarcadero.



Photo 15: Bryant Street at Delancey Street looking west. The project block is on the right.

Exhibit B

Appeal Letter from Sue Hestor, June 20, 2017

APPEAL OF Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration
77-85 Federal Street - 2012.1410E
Issued 5/31/17

RECEIVED

JUN 20 2017

CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

This is Negative Declaration for office development in the interior of the block bounded by Brannan, 2nd Street, Bryant St and kind of Delancey Street on the east (eastern boundary weird).

It is to be the environmental analysis for approval of an office allocation by the Commission but fails to adequately describe the environmental context for 77-85 Federal Street so that the Commission may made an informed decision on whether to approve the office allocation and Large Project Authorization.

The description of the block on which it is located AB 3774 must be totally rewritten. Starting with p.4 map. Much of the block itself is obliterated by overlays - especially eastern portion. The "inset" block is deceptive. There is NOT a hard edge on the east. There is a steep wall to north and there is no connection from Bryant to Delancey Street. Please indicate DIRECTIONS and LIMITATIONS for traffic on interior of this block and on surrounding adjacent streets. Circulation on this block is both very unusual and very important. Particularly for proposed office developments on INTERIOR lots.

Please provide map showing existing uses on each lot on this block, as well as those facing THIS BLOCK: 2nd Street west side, Bryant Street north, Delancey Street east side, Brannan Street south side. Include amount of parking on each lot. This information will help provide context for 77-85 Federal project.

There has been recent appeal on 340 Bryant (north side) which was converted from PDR to tech offices. *Thel* This site is surrounded by BAY BRIDGE itself, HOV access lane coming from west directly onto bridge, HOV counter-flow lane coming from east directly onto bridge. HEAVY DUTY HEAVY VOLUME BRIDGE traffic. Environmental evaluation didn't even discuss needs of pedestrians for secure crosswalks ACROSS HOV LANES HEADING FOR BRIDGE IN RUSH HOUR. Tech workers who often are not the most aware pedestrians because they are looking at their cell phone. Crosswalk was added because of my own appeal to force discussion after Planning Commission approval. (There was traffic death to bicyclist on Bryant.)

Besides 340 Bryant environmental evaluation there have been TWO documents dealing with **Academy of Art University, occupant of the ADJACENT SITE at 58-60 Federal**. The one that BLOCKS Federal. There was the AAU EIR and the AAU ESTM (Existing Sites Technical Memo). The ESTM was necessitated by AAU operating without complying with the Planning Code since 1971. They have occupied Federal - and used it intensively for their also illegal bus operations - since 2005. They never disclosed existence or filed to change legal use to whatever AAU operations happened to be at any given time.

Describe existing circulation problems caused by disruptive behavior of AAU operations and students including cars being forced to turn around because streets are not through streets. AAU bus operations and traffic on block is disruptive to circulation and to RESIDENTS of this block. Needs discussion.

There needs to be more expansive discussion on the number of housing units and residents ON THIS BLOCK and on other side of facing streets. Because the freeway cuts through there is disruption particularly during commute hours and when there is ballpark traffic. Totally clogged streets should be discussed.

Page 13 - Env Rev has nasty habit of avoid HILLS, Bay bridge access and other impediments to circulation. You cannot take location, plot out 1/4 mile radius and simply state THESE are bus lines, parking lots, etc without taking into account HILLS and OBSTRUCTIONS. To the north of this site is HUGE OBSTRUCTION - running from 2nd Street effectively to Embarcadero. BAY BRIDGE. People cannot walk through it. Please go back and think through bus line discussion. What HILLS have to be forged to walk east to Muni lines?

Page 14 - 671 Harrison appears to have land-banked 2013 approval. Is there a map of the proposed projects or approved project sites?

Discussion of Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan must state period (YEARS) in which underlying environmental analysis done for Area Plan EIR. Plan adopted in 2008. The years which are basis for EIR were EXTREMELY different from booming economy in 2017. We were in recession and ultimately crash of housing and jobs. Yet environmental and planning information developed during recession is basis for this decision. Please explain ECONOMY, including cost of housing, average SF income, that underlie the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR. Is it at all comparable to what is assumed in Central SoMa Plan EIR currently under development?

Evaluation of Mitigation Measures is affected by the insufficient analysis of housing and circulation - and illegal operations - on this block. Pedestrian circulation is affected by congested streets and outlaw traffic circulation. Private buses that operate ON THIS BLOCK impede traffic without any prior authorization by City. Because of current housing prices, where will office workers in this building attempt to gain housing? Is developer aiming only at high-end tech offices?

Sue Hestor, appellant

870 Market St #1128

SF 94102

Exhibit C

Community Plan – Mitigated Negative Declaration



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Community Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration

Date: May 31, 2017; amended on August 17, 2017 (amendments to the initial study community plan evaluation are shown as deletions in ~~striketrough~~ and additions in double underline)

Case No.: **2012.1410E**

Project Title: **77-85 Federal Street**

BPA No: 201306200082

Zoning: MUO (Mixed Use-Office) District
65-X Height and Bulk District
South End Historic District

Block/Lot: 3774/444

Lot Size: 16,070 square feet

Plan Area: Eastern Neighborhoods (East SoMa)

Project Sponsor: Adam Franch, 77 Federal Street LLC
(415) 988-1080, adam@aralonproperties.com

Lead Agency: San Francisco Planning Department

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

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located on the block bounded by 2nd, Bryant, Delancey, and Brannan Streets in the South of Market neighborhood. With frontages on two dead end alleys accessed from 2nd Street (106-foot frontage along Federal Street and 86-foot frontage along De Boom Street), the project site is occupied by two two-story office buildings constructed in 1948, approximately 30 feet in height, totaling 17,116 square feet (sf) and surface parking for 18 vehicles.

The project would demolish the two existing two-story buildings containing 17,116 sf of office use and construct a five-story-over-basement, approximately 77,000 sf building containing approximately 50,000 sf of office use on floors 2-5; approximately 23,000 sf of retail use proposed to be a fitness center on the ground and basement levels; ground-floor parking for 124 bicycles; and below-grade parking for 26 vehicles in stacker pits. Two service vehicle loading spaces would be provided in the basement parking area.

An approximately 20-foot-long curb cut along De Boom Street would be removed and replaced with a 14-foot-wide curb along De Boom Street that would provide vehicle access to the below-grade garage. The proposed project would include eleven new street trees along the street frontages of the project site. The roof level would be 65 feet in height. An elevator penthouse would extend 4 feet, 11 inches above the roof, and a stair penthouse would extend 6 feet, 2 inches above the roof. Publicly accessible open space would be provided in a 939 sf roof deck on the fourth floor.

The project would be constructed on spread footings or a mat foundation. Construction is expected to last approximately 16 months, and would include approximately four months of excavation using heavy equipment. The project would involve approximately 6,300 cubic yards of excavation to a depth of 19 feet below ground surface. No pile driving would be required or is proposed.

FINDING

This project could not have a significant effect on the environment. This finding is based upon the criteria of the Guidelines of the State Secretary for Resources, Sections 15064 (Determining Significant Effect), 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance), 15070 (Decision to prepare a Negative Declaration), and 15183 (Projects Consistent with a Community Plan or Zoning), and the following reasons as documented in the initial study – community plan evaluation for the project, which is attached.

Mitigation measures are included in this project to avoid potentially significant effects. See pp. 63–65.

cc:	Adam Franch, Project Sponsor	Supervisor Jane Kim, District 6
	Rich Sucre, Current Planning Division	Distribution List
	Natalia Kwiatkowska, Current Planning Division	Virna Byrd, M.D.F.

Initial Study – Community Plan Evaluation 77-85 Federal Street, Case No. 2012.1410E

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Initial Study – Community Plan Evaluation	3
A. Project Description.....	3
Project Approvals.....	3
B. Project Setting	13
C. Community Plan Evaluation Overview	17
D. Summary of Environmental Effects	18
E. Changes in the Regulatory Environment	23
Aesthetics and Parking.....	24
Automobile Delay and Vehicle Miles Traveled.....	24
F. Compatibility with Existing Zoning and Plans	25
G. Evaluation of Environmental Effects.....	26
1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING.....	26
2. POPULATION AND HOUSING.....	27
3. CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	29
4. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION	35
5. NOISE	41
6. AIR QUALITY	44
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.....	47
8. WIND AND SHADOW.....	50
9. RECREATION	51
10. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.....	53
11. PUBLIC SERVICES	54
12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....	55
13. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.....	56
14. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	59
15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	60

16. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES	63
17. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES	64
18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	65
H. Mitigation Measures	66
I. Public Notice and Comment	68
<u>L. Comments in Response to the Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration</u>	<u>68</u>
<u>JK. Determination.....</u>	<u>69</u>
<u>KL. Initial Study – Community Plan Evaluation Preparers</u>	<u>70</u>

APPENDIX A: Comments on the Community Plan Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration

List of Figures	<u>Page</u>
Figure 1: Project Location.....	4
Figure 2: Proposed Site Plan.....	5
Figure 3: Proposed Basement Floor Plan.....	6
Figure 4: Proposed Ground Level/First Floor Plan	7
Figure 5: Typical Second through Fifth Floor Plan	8
Figure 6: Proposed Roof Plan.....	9
Figure 7: Proposed North (Federal Street) and South (De Boom Street) Elevations	10
Figure 8: Proposed East and West Elevations.....	11
<u>Figure 9, Aerial View and Topography of the Project Vicinity.....</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>Figure 10, Land Uses in the Project Vicinity.....</u>	<u>16</u>

List of Tables	<u>Page</u>
Table 1: Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures.....	20
Table 2: Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment	32
Table 3: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled.....	37

Initial Study – Community Plan Evaluation

77-85 Federal Street

Planning Department Case No. 2012.1410E

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located on the block bounded by 2nd, Bryant, Delancey, and Brannan Streets in the South of Market neighborhood (see **Figure 1, Project Location** on p. 4). With frontages on two dead end alleys accessed from 2nd Street (106-foot frontage along Federal Street and 86-foot frontage along De Boom Street), the project site is occupied by two two-story office buildings constructed in 1948, approximately 30 feet in height, totaling 17,116 square feet (sf) and surface parking for 18 vehicles.

The project would demolish the two existing two-story buildings containing 17,116 sf of office use and construct a five-story-over-basement, approximately 77,000 sf building containing approximately 50,000 sf of office use on floors 2-5; approximately 23,000 sf of retail use proposed to be a fitness center on the ground and basement levels; ground-floor parking for 124 bicycles; and below-grade parking for 26 vehicles in vehicle stacker pits. Two service vehicle loading spaces would be provided in the basement parking area.

An approximately 20-foot-long curb cut along De Boom Street would be removed and replaced with a 14-foot-wide curb along De Boom Street that would provide vehicle access to the below-grade garage. The proposed project would include 11 new street trees along the street frontages of the project site. The roof level would be 65 feet in height. An elevator penthouse would extend 4 feet-11 inches above the roof, and a stair penthouse would extend 6 feet-2 inches above the roof. Publicly accessible open space would be provided in a 939 sf roof deck on the fourth floor.

The project would be constructed on spread footings or a mat foundation. Construction is expected to last approximately 16 months, and would include approximately four month of excavation using heavy equipment. The project would involve approximately 6,300 cubic yards of excavation to a depth of 19 feet below ground surface. No pile driving would be required or is proposed.

Figures 2 through 8 on pp. 5 through 11 show the proposed site plan, plans for all floors and elevations.

Project Approvals

The proposed project would require the following approvals (approving bodies noted in parentheses):

- Certificate of Appropriateness pursuant to Planning Code Section 1006. (*Historic Preservation Commission*)
- Large Project Authorization per Planning Code Section 329 (*Planning Commission*)
- Office Development Authorization per Planning Code Section 321 (*Planning Commission*)
- Site Mitigation Plan pursuant to Health Code Article 22A, also known as the Maher Ordinance (*Department of Public Health*)
- Demolition, Site and Building Permits (*Department of Building Inspection*)
- Stormwater Management Plan (*San Francisco Public Utilities Commission*)




Figure 1: Project Location




Figure 2: Proposed Site Plan




Figure 3: Proposed Basement Floor Plan






Figure 5: Typical Second Through Fifth Floor Plan




Figure 6: Proposed Roof Plan





This page is intentionally blank

Approval of the large project authorization per Planning Code Section 329 would constitute the approval action for the proposed project pursuant to Section 31.04 (h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

B. PROJECT SETTING

The project site is located on an irregularly shaped through lot approximately 90 feet east of 2nd Street on the block bounded by 2nd, Bryant, Delancey, and Brannan Streets in the South of Market neighborhood. The project site fronts two 35-foot-wide dead-end streets, Federal and De Boom Streets, which are both accessed from 2nd Street. (Federal Street runs between 2nd Street and Delancey Street but is interrupted mid-block by a five-story (85-foot-tall) building at 60 Federal Street, currently occupied by the Academy of Art University.) The Academy of Art (AAU) building contains classrooms, labs/art studios, offices, an art store, and student and faculty lounges with a maximum capacity of 517 students and a peak-use capacity of 160 students.¹ On a typical day there are approximately 322 students and 41 faculty/staff members at this site. The building includes a 37-space garage that is accessed from the eastern portion of Federal Street. Pedestrian and loading access is from the western portion of Federal Street. The site is served by AAU Route G, which, as of spring 2015, had a frequency of approximately every 30 minutes in conjunction with class and lab times (generally between the hours of 7 a.m. and midnight). In 2015, the AAU shuttle buses did not have a designated shuttle stop but were observed loading and unloading passengers along the west side of Second Street between Taber Place and Federal Street, using available curb or parking spaces or double parking. In spring 2017, per the request of the Planning Department, AAU adjusted its shuttle fleet to smaller shuttle buses or vans, and the shuttle stop was relocated from Second and Taber Streets to the western portion of Federal Street, immediately adjacent to AAU's pedestrian entry.^{2,3,4} At the end of Federal Street (accessed from 2nd Street) is loading dock access to 60 Federal Street. At the end of De Boom Street is a pedestrian entrance to 270 Brannan Street, a six-story (65-foot-tall) office building.

The project site can only be accessed from 2nd Street to the west because the 60 Federal Street building divides Federal Street into two distinct and separated streets with no connection. The eastern portion of the block that fronts Brannan, Bryant, and Delancey Streets contains residential, office and retail uses. The eastern portion of Federal and Delancey Streets cannot be directly accessed from Bryant Street, due to a change in elevation (see Figure 9, Aerial View and Topography of the Project Vicinity). Similarly, De Boom Street dead ends and extends only about one third of the distance between Second and Delancey Streets. These dead end streets require that vehicles entering from 2nd Street make a three-point turn to then exit back onto 2nd Street.

Land uses within the project block include two- to six-story (20- to 85-foot-tall) office/commercial and PDR (Production, Distribution and Repair) uses, three- to eight-story (30- to 80-foot-tall) residential uses,

¹ Student capacity includes capacity of classroom and any other space where student classes are scheduled in spring semester 2017; graduate studios are not included, as student use is not regularly scheduled. Peak use consists of the highest enrollment for a given class scheduled on Tuesdays in spring 2017.

² Academy of Art University Project Existing Sites Technical Memorandum, May 4, 2016, Volume 2, pp. 4-581–4-582. Available at http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/2008.0586E_Volume%202%20Final%20AAU%20ESTM.pdf.

³ San Francisco Planning Department, Academy of Art University Institutional Master Plan Update, July 20, 2017. Available at <http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcpackets/2017-005439IMP.pdf>.

⁴ Rachel Schuett, Transportation Planner, San Francisco Planning Department, Memo regarding AAU Operations, August 9, 2017.

two- to seven-story (20- to 70-foot-tall) office/retail, and PDR uses. West of the project block, across 2nd Street, are one- to six-story (12- to 75-foot-tall) office, PDR, retail, and residential uses surrounding South Park.⁵ South of the project block are two- to 12-story (20- to 150-foot-tall) residential and commercial uses approaching AT&T Park, which is two blocks south and one block west of the project site. Further south is the Mission Bay neighborhood of residential, office, and institutional uses. North of the project block across Bryant Street is the I-80 freeway, with an on-ramp located one block north of Bryant Street, at the intersection of Harrison and Essex Streets. Further north and east of the project site are taller buildings of the downtown and the Rincon Hill Plan Area.

The project site is located within the boundaries of the South End Historic District and the East SoMa Plan Area and building on the site and adjacent to the site (at 533 2nd Street, 543-545 2nd Street, and 563 2nd Street) are contributing historic resources to the South End Historic District.


Within one-quarter mile of the project site, the San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) operates the 10-Townsend and the 12 Folsom/Pacific bus lines and the K-Ingleside/T-Third and N-Judah Muni Metro lines.

The following projects are under review or under construction within one-quarter mile of the project site and are considered in the cumulative analysis:

- The Central SoMa Plan (2011.1356E) is expected to be adopted and implemented in the fall of 2017. The plan area is adjacent to the 77-85 Federal Street project site and is bounded by Market Street, Townsend Street, 2nd Street, and 6th Street. Among other program elements, the plan removes land use restrictions to support a greater mix of uses while also emphasizing office uses in portions of the plan area. A draft Environmental Impact Report for the Central SoMa Plan was published on December 14, 2016.
- 400 2nd Street (2012.1384ENV) – Demolition of four one- to-four story buildings and construction of one or more buildings including a 28-story office building, a 300-room hotel, 400 residences, and 80,000 sf of retail (relies on Central SoMa Plan rezoning, discussed above).
- 350 2nd St (2016-012031ENV) – Construction of a 200-foot-tall, 21-story building with 480 hotel rooms over ground-floor retail (relies on Central SoMa Plan rezoning).
- 462 Bryant St (2015-010219ENV) – A five-story addition of office use to an existing one-story office building (relies on Central SoMa Plan rezoning).
- 525 Harrison Street (2013.0159E) – A 23-story building containing 205 residences over ground-floor commercial uses (under construction).
- 633 Folsom St (2014.1063E) – A five-story addition to an existing seven-story office building (building permit issued in 2017).
- 671 Harrison Street (2011.1437E) – A five-story office building (building permit issued in 2013 but not constructed yet).


⁵ This document uses the convention that Federal Street runs east/west even though it actually runs northeast/southwest.

Figure 9 - 77 Federal Street Aerial View and Topography



0 90 180 360 Feet

Figure 10 - 77 Federal Street - Land Uses in the Vicinity



C. COMMUNITY PLAN EVALUATION OVERVIEW

California Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 provide an exemption from environmental review for projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was certified, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: (a) are peculiar to the project or parcel on which the project would be located; (b) were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan with which the project is consistent; (c) are potentially significant off-site and cumulative impacts that were not discussed in the underlying EIR; or (d) are previously identified in the EIR, but which, as a result of substantial new information that was not known at the time that the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than that discussed in the underlying EIR. Section 15183(c) specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, then an EIR need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact. Section 15183(b) specifies that in approving a project meeting the requirements of Section 15183, a public agency shall limit its examination of environmental effects to those which the agency determines in an initial study or other analysis were not analyzed as significant effects in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan, or zoning action.

After several years of analysis, community outreach, and public review, the Eastern Neighborhoods Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) was adopted in December 2008. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR was adopted in part to support housing development in some areas previously zoned to allow industrial uses, while preserving an adequate supply of space for existing and future PDR employment and businesses.

The Planning Commission held public hearings to consider the various aspects of the proposed Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans and related Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments. On August 7, 2008, the Planning Commission certified the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR by Motion 17659 and adopted the Preferred Project for final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.^{6,7}

In December 2008, after further public hearings, the Board of Supervisors approved and the Mayor signed the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Planning Code amendments. New zoning districts include districts that would permit PDR uses in combination with commercial uses; districts mixing residential and commercial uses and residential and PDR uses; and new residential-only districts. The districts replaced existing industrial, commercial, residential single-use, and mixed-use districts.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR is a comprehensive programmatic document that presents an analysis of the environmental effects of implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, as well as the potential impacts under several proposed alternative scenarios. The Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR evaluated three rezoning alternatives, two community-proposed alternatives which focused largely on the Mission District, and a “No Project” alternative. The alternative selected, or the Preferred

⁶ San Francisco Planning Department. Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E, certified August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>, accessed August 17, 2012.

⁷ San Francisco Planning Department. San Francisco Planning Commission Motion 17659, August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=1268>, accessed August 17, 2012.

Project, represents a combination of Options B and C. The Planning Commission adopted the Preferred Project after fully considering the environmental effects of the Preferred Project and the various scenarios discussed in the PEIR. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR estimated that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan could result in 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) built in the Plan Area throughout the lifetime of the Plan (year 2025). The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR projected that this level of development would result in a total population increase of approximately 23,900 to 33,000 people throughout the lifetime of the plan.⁸

A major issue of discussion in the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning process was the degree to which existing industrially zoned land would be rezoned to primarily residential and mixed-use districts, thus reducing the availability of land traditionally used for PDR employment and businesses. Among other topics, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR assesses the significance of the cumulative land use effects of the rezoning by analyzing its effects on the City's ability to meet its future PDR space needs as well as its ability to meet its housing needs as expressed in the City's General Plan.

As a result of the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning process, the project site's zoning was reclassified from SSO (Service Secondary Office) to MUO (Mixed Use-Office). The MUO District runs predominantly along the 2nd Street corridor and is designed to encourage office uses and housing, as well as small-scale light industrial and arts activities. Office, general commercial, most retail, and PDR uses are principally permitted uses in the MUO District. Dwelling units and group housing are permitted and family-sized housing is encouraged. The 77-85 Federal Street project site is located in the 65-X Height and Bulk District, which allows a building up to 65 feet in height.

Individual projects that could occur in the future under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans will undergo project-level environmental evaluation to determine if they would result in further impacts specific to the development proposal, the site, and the time of development and to assess whether additional environmental review would be required.

D. SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

This initial study – community plan evaluation analyzes the potential project-specific environmental effects of the 77-85 Federal Street project described above, and incorporates by reference information contained in the programmatic EIR for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans (PEIR).⁹ Project-specific studies were prepared for the proposed project to determine if the project would result in any significant environmental impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

This initial study – community plan evaluation 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

⁸ Table 2 Forecast Growth by Rezoning Option Chapter IV of the Eastern Neighborhoods Draft EIR shows 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.

⁹ San Francisco Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E and State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048. Available at <http://sf-planning.org/area-plan-eirs>.

in the PEIR. Such impacts are addressed in this initial study – community plan evaluation. Items checked "Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site" identify topics for which the proposed project would result in a significant impact that is peculiar to the project, i.e., the impact is not identified as significant in the PEIR.

Mitigation measures identified in the PEIR are discussed under each topic area, and the complete text of measures that are applicable to the proposed project are provided in Section H, Mitigation Measures, on p. ~~63~~66.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR included analyses of environmental issues including: land use; plans and policies; visual quality and urban design; population, housing, business activity, and employment (growth inducement); transportation; noise; air quality; parks, recreation and open space; shadow; archeological resources; historic architectural resources; hazards; and other issues not addressed in the previously issued initial study for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans. 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 levels except for those related to land use (cumulative impacts on PDR use), transportation (program-level and cumulative traffic impacts at nine intersections; program-level and cumulative transit impacts on seven Muni lines), cultural resources (cumulative impacts from demolition of historical resources), and shadow (program-level impacts on parks).

The proposed project would demolish two existing two-story buildings containing 17,116 sf of office use and construct a five-story-over-basement, 65-foot-tall, approximately 77,000 sf building containing approximately 50,000 sf of office use, approximately 23,000 sf of retail use, and parking for 124 bicycles and 26 vehicles. The proposed project is in conformance with the with the height, use and density for the site described in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR ^{10, 11} and would represent a small part of the growth that was forecast for the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas.

In regards to significant and unavoidable transportation impacts related to traffic and transit, project-generated vehicle and transit trips would not contribute considerably to significant and unavoidable cumulative traffic and transit impacts identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and would not result in a substantial portion of the overall additional traffic and transit volume anticipated to be generated by Plan Area projects. The proposed project would not contribute to significant and unavoidable plan-level or cumulative shadow impacts or land use impacts related to the loss of PDR building space as the proposed project would not cast new shadow on South Park or any other nearby open space, or remove PDR building space.

This initial study – community plan evaluation concludes that the proposed project would result in a new, significant adverse environmental effect on historic resources that was not disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and a mitigated negative declaration has been prepared to address this significant

¹⁰ San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, Case No. 2012.1410E, 77-85 Federal Street, May 17, 2017.

¹¹ San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, Case No. 2012.1410E, 77-85 Federal Street, January 9, 2017.

project-specific, peculiar impact. This initial study – community plan evaluation analyzes the environmental effects of the proposed project on historic architectural resources and includes a mitigation measure that would reduce this impact to historic architectural resources to a less-than-significant level. (See “Construction Impacts on Historic Architectural Resources” on p. 2931 for this analysis.)

Thus, with the exception of historic architectural resources, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR considered the incremental impacts of the proposed 77-85 Federal Street project. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified feasible mitigation measures to address significant impacts related to noise, air quality, archeological resources, historic resources, hazardous materials and transportation. **Table 1** below lists the mitigation measures identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and states whether each measure would apply to the proposed project.

Table 1: Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
E. Transportation		
E-1: Traffic Signal Installation	Not applicable. Automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis.	Not applicable.
E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not applicable. Automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis.	Not applicable.
E-3: Enhanced Funding	Not applicable. Automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis.	Not applicable.
E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management	Not applicable. Automobile delay removed from CEQA analysis.	Not applicable.
E-5: Enhanced Transit Funding	Not applicable. Plan level mitigation to be implemented by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA).	Not applicable.
E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements	Not applicable. Plan level mitigation to be implemented by the SFMTA.	Not applicable.
E-7: Transit Accessibility	Not applicable. Plan level mitigation to be implemented by the SFMTA.	Not applicable.
E-8: Muni Storage and Maintenance	Not applicable. Plan level mitigation by the SFMTA and the San Francisco County	Not applicable.

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
	Transportation Authority.	
E-9: Rider Improvements	Not applicable. Plan level mitigation to be implemented by the SFMTA.	Not applicable.
E-10: Transit Enhancement	Not applicable. Plan level mitigation to be implemented by the SFMTA.	Not applicable.
E-11: Transportation Demand Management	Not applicable. Plan level mitigation to be implemented by the SFMTA, and in compliance with a portion of this mitigation measure, the City adopted a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management Program for most new development citywide.	Not applicable.
F. Noise		
F-1: Construction Noise – Pile Driving	Not applicable. Project construction would not involve pile driving.	Not applicable.
F-2: Construction Noise	Applicable. Temporary construction noise from use of heavy equipment.	The project sponsor has agreed to develop and implement noise attenuation measures during construction (see Project Mitigation Measure 3).
F-3: Interior Noise Levels	Not applicable. The project does not propose noise sensitive uses.	Not applicable.
F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses	Not applicable. The project does not propose noise-sensitive uses.	Not applicable.
F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses	Not Applicable. The project would not include noise-generating uses.	Not applicable.
F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments	Not Applicable. The project does not propose noise-sensitive uses.	Not applicable.
G. Air Quality		

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
G-1: Construction Air Quality	Not applicable. The project site is not in an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone.	Not applicable.
G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses	Not applicable. The project would not include sensitive land uses.	Not applicable.
G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit Diesel Particulate Matter	Not applicable. The project does not include uses that emit diesel particulate matter.	Not applicable.
G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit Other Toxic Air Contaminants	Not applicable. The project does not include uses that emit toxic air contaminants.	Not applicable.
J. Archeological Resources		
J-1: Properties with Previous Studies	Not Applicable. The project site is not located in an area for which a previous archeological study has been conducted.	Not applicable.
J-2: Properties with no Previous Studies	Applicable. The project site is in an area for which no previous archeological study has been conducted.	The Planning Department conducted a preliminary archeological review, and the project sponsor has agreed to implement a mitigation measure related to the accidental discovery of archeological resources (see Project Mitigation Measure 2).
J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District	Not applicable. The project site is not in the Mission Dolores Archeological District.	Not applicable.
K. Historical Resources		
K-1: Interim Procedures for Permit Review in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area	Not Applicable. Plan-level mitigation completed by the Planning Department.	Not applicable.
K-2: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to Vertical Additions in the South End Historic District (East SoMa)	Not applicable. Plan-level mitigation completed by the Planning Commission.	Not applicable.
K-3: Amendments to Article 10 of the Planning Code Pertaining to	Not applicable. Plan-level mitigation completed by the	Not applicable.

Mitigation Measure	Applicability	Compliance
Alterations and Infill Development in the Dogpatch Historic District (Central Waterfront)	Planning Commission.	
L. Hazardous Materials		
L-1: Hazardous Building Materials	Applicable. The project includes demolition of two existing buildings.	The project sponsor has agreed to remove and properly dispose of any hazardous building materials in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to demolishing the existing building (see Project Mitigation Measure 4).

E. CHANGES IN THE REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT

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

- State legislation amending CEQA to eliminate consideration of aesthetics and parking impacts for infill projects in transit priority areas, effective January 2014 (see “Aesthetics and Parking”);
- State legislation amending CEQA and San Francisco Planning Commission resolution replacing level of service (LOS) analysis of automobile delay with vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis, effective March 2016 (see “Automobile Delay and Vehicle Miles Traveled”);
- San Francisco Bicycle Plan update adoption in June 2009, Better Streets Plan adoption in 2010, Transit Effectiveness Project (aka “Muni Forward”) adoption in March 2014, Vision Zero adoption by various City agencies in 2014, Proposition A and B passage in November 2014, and the Transportation Sustainability Program process (see “Transportation”);
- San Francisco ordinances establishing construction dust control, effective July 2008, and enhanced ventilation requirements for urban infill sensitive use developments, amended December 2014 (see “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 “Recreation”);
- Urban Water Management Plan adoption in 2011 and Sewer System Improvement Program process (see “Utilities and Service Systems”); and
- Article 22A of the Health Code amendments effective August 2013 (see “Hazardous Materials”).

Aesthetics and Parking

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

- a) the project is in a transit priority area;
- b) the project is on an infill site; and
- c) the project is residential, mixed-use residential, or an employment center.

The proposed project meets each of the above criteria. The project site is located within one-half mile of a major transit stop and thus is in a transit priority area. The project site has been previously developed and is surrounded by lots developed with qualified urban uses and thus the project is on an infill site. The project involves the construction of a commercial building with a floor area ratio greater than 0.75¹² thus meets the definition of an employment center. Therefore, this evaluation does not consider aesthetics or parking in determining the significance of project impacts under CEQA.¹³ Project elevations are included in the project description.

Automobile Delay and Vehicle Miles Traveled

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

In January 2016, the OPR published for public review and comment a revised proposal on updates to the CEQA Guidelines on evaluating transportation impacts in CEQA, recommending that transportation impacts for projects be measured using a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) metric.¹⁴ On March 3, 2016, in anticipation of the future certification of the revised CEQA Guidelines, the San Francisco Planning Commission adopted the OPR’s recommendation to use the VMT metric instead of automobile delay to evaluate the transportation impacts of projects.¹⁵ The VMT metric does not apply to the analysis of project impacts on non-automobile modes of travel such as riding transit, walking, and bicycling. Therefore, impacts and mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR associated with automobile delay are not discussed in this evaluation, including PEIR Mitigation Measures E-1: Traffic Signal

¹² The total gross building area of the proposed project is approximately 77,000 gsf, and the area of the project site is 16,070 (0.37 acres). Therefore, the floor area ratio is 4.8, which is greater than 0.75.

¹³ San Francisco Planning Department, Eligibility Checklist for CEQA Section 21099: Modernization of Transportation Analysis for 77-85 Federal Street, December 29, 2016. This document (and all other documents cited in this report, unless otherwise noted) is on file and available for review as part of Case File No. 2012.1410E.

¹⁴ Available at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_sb743.php.

¹⁵ Resolution No. 19579. Available at <http://sf-planning.org/meeting/planning-commission-march-3-2016-minutes>.

Installation, E-2: Intelligent Traffic Management, E-3: Enhanced Funding, and E-4: Intelligent Traffic Management. Instead, a VMT analysis is provided in the Transportation section.

F. COMPATIBILITY WITH EXISTING ZONING AND PLANS

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

Consistency with the Planning Code and General Plan and with the development density established by the Eastern Neighborhoods zoning is addressed in “Community Plan Evaluation Overview” on p. 4417 and in topic 1 on p. 2326. The project requires large project authorization pursuant to Planning Code Section 321 because it would involve new construction of more than 25,000 sf in an Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use District, and it requires office development authorization pursuant to Planning Code Section 321 because it proposes more than 25,000 sf of office use, and it requires.

Due to the infill nature of the proposed project, the project would not conflict with regional plans, such as the following:

- *Plan Bay Area*, a long-range land use and transportation plan prepared by the Association of Bay Area Governments and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission that covers the period from 2010 to 2040. *Plan Bay Area* calls for concentrating housing and job growth around transit corridors, and specifies strategies and investments for maintaining, managing, and improving the region’s multi-modal transportation network.
- The Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s *2017 Clean Air Plan* which implements feasible measures to reduce ozone and provide a control strategy to reduce ozone, particulate matter (PM), air toxics, and greenhouse gas emissions throughout the region; and
- The San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board’s *Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin (Basin Plan)*, which designates beneficial uses and water quality objectives for waters of the state, including surface waters and groundwater, and includes implementation programs to achieve water quality objectives.

Project approvals from other City agencies are listed on p. 3.

G. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
1. LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING—Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The 77-85 Federal Street project proposes new retail (fitness center) and expanded office use on a site that currently contains office use and surface parking. The project would not convert PDR space to non-PDR uses, however it would preclude an opportunity for development of PDR space, given that PDR uses are allowed in the MUO (Mixed Use-Office) Use District. The incremental loss of PDR opportunity would not be considerable due to the size of the project site (0.37 acres), the fact that the project site's previous zoning SLI (Service/Light Industrial) also allowed both PDR and office use, and because there is no existing PDR uses on the site or PDR cluster in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Thus, the project would not contribute to any impact related to loss of PDR uses that was identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

The Citywide Planning and Current Planning Divisions of the Planning Department have determined that the 77-85 Federal Street project is consistent with the development density as envisioned in the East SoMa Plan. The Citywide Division of the Planning Department determined that the project would be consistent with the bulk, density, and land uses as envisioned in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan and would comply with the Mixed Use-Office Zoning District of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan. The Citywide Division further noted that the project takes into consideration many of the principles outlined in the Area Plan, including encouraging mixed-use development, and improving and expanding infrastructure for bicycling.¹⁶ The Current Planning Division of the Planning Department determined that the project is eligible for a community plan evaluation because the five-story office building would be within the allowable floor area ratio (FAR) and the approximately 23,000 sf of ground floor retail space is

¹⁶ San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning and Policy Analysis, 77-85 Federal Street, May 17, 2017.

principally permitted within the MUO District. The 49,832 sf of office space would be subject to an Office Allocation Pursuant to Planning Code Section 321. The project would not exceed the applicable 65-foot height limit, except for certain rooftop features such as open space features, mechanical screens, and stair and elevator penthouses, which are permitted to exceed the height limit per Planning Code Section 260(b). As proposed, the project is permitted in the MUO District and is consistent with the development density as envisioned in the East SOMA Plan.¹⁷

The project site is located in proximity to the proposed Central SoMa Plan. As discussed above, the Draft EIR for the Central SoMa Plan was published on December 14, 2016. The cumulative analysis in the Central SoMa Plan Draft EIR takes into consideration the effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the plan area. The Central SoMa Draft EIR identified significant impacts to land use and land use planning associated with conflicts with plans and policies adopted for the purpose of mitigating an environmental effect, specifically General Plan policies related to traffic-generated noise. The proposed project would not contribute considerably to traffic noise as discussed in in Topic 5, below. Furthermore, the proposed project is consistent with the development density established in the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans. Therefore, 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.

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

One of the objectives of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and 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 assessed how the rezoning actions would affect housing supply and location options for businesses in the Eastern Neighborhoods and compared these outcomes to what would otherwise be expected without the rezoning. The PEIR assumed there would be a continuation of development trends and ad hoc land use changes, such as allowing housing within industrial zones through conditional use authorization, site-specific rezoning to permit housing, and other case-by-case approaches. The PEIR

¹⁷ San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Current Planning Analysis, 77-85 Federal Street, January 9, 2017.

concluded that adoption of the rezoning and area plans “would induce substantial growth and concentration of population in San Francisco.” The PEIR stated that the increase in population that was expected to occur as a result of the proposed rezoning and adoption of the area plans would not in and of itself result in adverse physical effects, and would serve to advance key City policy objectives, such as providing housing in appropriate locations next to downtown and other employment generators and furthering the City’s transit first policies. It was anticipated that the rezoning would result in an increase in both housing development and population in all of the neighborhoods of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Plan Areas. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population and density would not directly result in significant adverse physical effects on the environment; however, it identified significant impacts on the physical environment that would result indirectly from growth afforded under the rezoning and area plans, including impacts on land use, traffic and transportation, air quality, and noise. The PEIR contains detailed analyses of these secondary effects under each of the relevant resource topics and identified mitigation measures to address significant impacts where feasible.

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

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

The 77-85 Federal Street project would replace two buildings containing 17,116 sf of office use and an 18-space surface parking lot with a new approximately 77,000 sf building containing approximately 50,000 sf of office use and 23,000 sf of retail (fitness center) use and parking for 124 bicycles and 26 vehicles. Approximately 185 jobs would be added to the project site.¹⁸ These direct effects of the project would not

¹⁸ Estimated using San Francisco Planning Department’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review, October 2002, Appendix C, Table C-1: 276 gsf per employee for office use and 350 gsf for

result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts on population and housing beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The project's contribution to indirect effects of population growth identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR on land use, traffic and transportation, air quality, and noise are evaluated under each of those topics below. Furthermore, as discussed above, the cumulative analysis in the Central SoMa Plan Draft EIR takes into consideration the effects of past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects. The Draft EIR similarly did not find significant cumulative impacts related to population and housing. Thus, the proposed project would not result in new significant cumulative impacts not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
3. CULTURAL RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5, including those resources listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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 (CRHR) or are identified in a local register of historical resources, such as Articles 10 and 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that future development facilitated through the changes in use districts and height limits under the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans could have substantial adverse changes on the significance of both individual historical resources and on historical districts within the plan areas. The PEIR determined that approximately 32 percent of the known or potential historical resources in the plan areas could potentially be affected under the preferred alternative. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR found this impact to be significant and unavoidable. This impact was addressed in a statement of overriding considerations with findings and adopted as part of the approval of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans on January 19, 2009.

retail use. Proposed use: $(50,000/276) 181 + (23000/350) 66 = 277$ jobs. Existing use: $(17,116/276) = 62$ jobs. $276 - 62 = 185$ jobs.

Impacts to the South End Historic District

The project involves new construction within the South End Landmark District. Based on its location within in a locally designated historic district, the buildings at 77-85 Federal Street are considered Category A historic resources for the purposes of the Planning Department's CEQA review procedures because these buildings are contributors to the South End Landmark District. Planning preservation staff reviewed a historic resource evaluation report prepared for the proposed project¹⁹ and issued a historic resource evaluation response, the findings of which are summarized below.²⁰

The project was evaluated for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Rehabilitation Standard #9 states:

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

Preservation staff finds that the project has been designed to be compatible with several elements of the historic district, including the district's massing, form, scale, materials and features, yet is differentiated by the nature of the project's construction, use and detailing.

The overall form of the project is organized into two distinct masses, which vary depending on the street frontage. The five-story building would be large in bulk with minimal setbacks, and would provide for an appropriate massing and scale relative to the adjacent context and larger landmark district. Along De Boom Street, the project would be three stories tall along the street frontage with a setback incorporated for the upper two floors. This massing would allow for a strong relationship to the two adjacent two-story buildings. Along Federal Street, the building would be two stories tall along the street frontage with a setback incorporated at the third floor and fourth/fifth floor levels. Within the South End Landmark District, the existing buildings are generally one to six stories in height, constructed of a typical warehouse design, large in bulk and regular in overall form. The project's overall form is boxy and rectangular in character, which relates strongly to the boxy and rectangular form and mass of the district's contributing resources, which are primarily brick masonry or reinforced concrete warehouses.

Within the South End Landmark District, the common material palette consists of standard brick masonry and reinforced concrete. The project would incorporate a cement plaster exterior finish and fibre cement panels, which provides for a compatible relationship to the concrete and cement plaster materials of the surrounding warehouses.

Within the South End Landmark District, the contributing properties commonly feature some type of roofline termination, which ranges from a simple projecting cornice to brick corbels. Arches, columns or pilasters with an articulated base are commonly found at the ground floor. In addition, existing buildings within the South End Landmark District feature industrial-sash fenestration that is rhythmically spaced and deeply recessed. The project would provide a regularized façade pattern with cement plaster

¹⁹ Left Coast Architectural History, 77-85 Federal Street Historical Resource Evaluation, January 29, 2014.

²⁰ Rich Sucre, Historic Resource Evaluation Response, 77-85 Federal Street, May 22, 2017.

pilasters and industrial-sash fenestration. This façade pattern would be reflective of and compatible with the fenestration and façade pattern of the district’s contributing resources, which are typically defined by deeply recessed fenestration organized into a regularized or grid pattern.

On the upper two floors, the project would offer a more contemporary facade expression, as opposed to the lower three floors, which would be more referential to the characteristics found within the district. Overall, the exterior façades would incorporate characteristics that draw from the surrounding district, including the use of the vertical bay modulation, deeply recessed fenestration, and modulations in scale and form, as evidenced by the shift in materials between the bottom three floors and the upper two floors.

The HRER determined that the project would not cause a significant adverse impact upon the South End Landmark District such that the significance of the district would be materially impaired. The project would be a compatible infill project within the designated historic district and would not have a significant adverse impact upon historic resources as defined by CEQA. Furthermore, the project, in combination with other past, present and foreseeable future projects, would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on historic architectural resources. Since the project is located within a designated landmark district, all new construction projects are required to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Preservation Commission, and must comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and the criteria outlined in Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code. Department staff has determined that the project would not make a considerable contribution to any cumulative impact on the South End Landmark District.

Construction Impacts on Historic Architectural Resources

The proposed project would demolish the existing two buildings on the project site and involve excavation to an average depth of 8-12 feet and to a depth of 19 feet in the center of the lot for the vehicle stacker pits. Construction activities would require heavy duty construction equipment during the approximately 16 month construction period, which could result in ground-borne vibration at nearby properties. Several different methods are used to quantify vibration. The peak particle velocity (PPV) is defined as the maximum instantaneous peak of the vibration signal in inches per second (in/sec). The PPV is most frequently used to describe vibration impacts to buildings. Typically, ground-borne vibration generated by man-made activities attenuates rapidly with distance from the source of the vibration. Sensitive receptors for vibration from construction activity typically include fragile structures (especially older masonry structures). Three properties that abut the west side of the project site (533, 543-545, and 563 2nd Street) have been identified as individual historic resources and contributors to the South End Historic District and are considered sensitive to ground-borne vibration generated by project construction activities. Typical vibration levels from construction equipment at 25 feet from the vibration source are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

Equipment	Peak Parcel Velocity at 25 feet (inches per second)
Pile driver (impact)	0.644
Pile driver (sonic)	0.170
Large bulldozer	0.089
Hoe ram	0.089
Caisson drilling	0.089
Trucks	0.076
Concrete breaker	0.059
Jackhammer	0.035
Small bulldozer	0.003

Source: Federal Transit Administration. 2006 (May). *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*. Washington, DC. Page 12-2.

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has developed criteria for judging the significance of vibration produced by construction equipment. The FTA establishes the following standards to prevent architectural damage: (1) 0.5 in/sec PPV for reinforced concrete, steel, or timber (no plaster) construction and (2) 0.2 in/sec PPV for fragile buildings (i.e., non-engineered timber or masonry structures).²¹

Construction activity would require the use of typical construction equipment, including but not limited to an excavator, dump truck, and bulldozer. Construction equipment may need to operate directly adjacent to existing known historic resources at 533, 543-545, and 563 2nd Street and therefore vibration levels at those structures would exceed those list in Table 2 and have the potential to exceed the 0.2 PPV and could therefore result in damage to historic resources, which would be a significant impact not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Furthermore, the geotechnical report prepared for the project notes that excavation along the building perimeter would extend below the foundations of the adjacent buildings and would need to be supported with tied-back underpinning within the footprint of these adjoining buildings; this would require the permission of adjacent property owners. If the adjacent property owners choose not to underpin their buildings, then cantilevered tied-back or internally braced temporary shoring could be installed along the boundaries to support the adjacent buildings.²² Therefore, in addition to potential vibration impacts, other construction activities have the potential to damage

²¹ FTA, *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*; see Table 12-3, p. 12-13. Available at https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf

²² Harold Lewis & Associates Geotechnical Consultants, Foundation Investigation, Proposed Commercial Building, 85 Federal Street, San Francisco, California, January 21, 2013.

adjacent historic resources. **Project Mitigation Measure 1**, below, has been identified to reduce this project-specific impact to less than significant.

Project Mitigation Measure 1: Construction Monitoring Program to Protect Adjacent Historical Resources

The project sponsor shall undertake a monitoring program to minimize damage to adjacent historic buildings. The monitoring program shall include the following components at a minimum:

- Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the project sponsor shall engage a preservation consultant who is a historic architect or qualified historic preservation professional to undertake a pre-construction survey of 533, 543-545, and 563 2nd Street and 355 Bryant Street and photograph the preconstruction conditions of these buildings.
- Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the project sponsor shall engage a qualified vibration consultant who shall identify feasible means to avoid damage to 533, 543-545, and 563 2nd Street. Such methods may include using construction techniques that reduce vibration, using appropriate excavation shoring methods to prevent movement of adjacent structures, and providing adequate security to minimize risks of vandalism and fire. Based on the construction activities and equipment to be used and condition of the adjacent resources, the vibration consultant shall also establish a maximum vibration level that shall not be exceeded at each building, based on the building's existing condition, character-defining features, soils conditions, and anticipated construction practices (a common standard is 0.2 inch per second, peak particle velocity or PPV).
- The project sponsor shall incorporate the vibration consultant's recommendations into construction specifications for the proposed project.
- To ensure that vibration levels do not exceed the established standard, the vibration consultant shall monitor ground-disturbing construction activities to ensure that damage to adjacent structures does not occur. Should the potential for damage to occur be observed, construction activities shall be halted and alternative construction techniques put in place (for example, use of smaller or lighter equipment).
- The vibration consultant shall prepare a final report that includes documentation of the pre-construction and post-construction conditions of these buildings and any methods employed during construction to reduce vibration levels to below the established standard.

Significance after Mitigation: Project Mitigation Measure 1: Construction Monitoring Program to Protect Adjacent Historical Resources, would reduce the potential for significant impacts to nearby historic buildings by requiring pre- and post-construction surveys of adjacent historic buildings, establishing a maximum vibration level for each building and monitoring to ensure that those vibration levels are not exceeded. With implementation of Project Mitigation Measure 1, potential project-specific impacts of the proposed project not addressed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR would be reduced to *less than significant*.

Vibration effects are generally localized. None of the reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects would be close enough to the 533, 543-545, and 563 2nd Street buildings to result in cumulative vibration effects, should construction activities overlap with the proposed project.

Archeological Resources

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the rezoning and area plans could result in significant impacts on archeological resources and identified three mitigation measures that would reduce these potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. PEIR Mitigation Measure J-1: Properties with Previous Studies, applies to properties for which a final archeological research design and treatment plan (ARDTP) is on file at the Northwest Information Center and the Planning Department. PEIR Mitigation Measure J-2: Properties with No Previous Studies, 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. PEIR Mitigation Measure J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District, 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 would involve approximately 6,300 cubic yards of excavation to a depth of 19 feet in an area where no previous archeological studies have been prepared. Therefore, the project is subject to Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR 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 (PAR) of the project site in conformance with the study requirements of Mitigation Measure J-2 and determined that the Planning Department's first standard archeological mitigation measure (accidental discovery) would apply to the proposed project.²³ This mitigation measure is identified as **Project Mitigation Measure 2**, p. 64. The PAR and its requirements (i.e., accidental discovery mitigation measure) are consistent with Mitigation Measure J-2 from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Compliance with Project Mitigation Measure 2 would ensure that the proposed project would not result in significant impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR related to archeological resources. Archeological effects are generally site specific. None of the reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects would be close enough to result in cumulative archeological effects.

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

²³ San Francisco Planning Department, Preliminary Archeological Review, San Francisco Planning Department, December 9, 2013. On November 10, 2016, staff archeologist Allison Vanderslice determined that this document is still valid.

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

As discussed above under Aesthetics and Parking, in response to state legislation that called for removing automobile delay from CEQA analysis, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 19579 replacing automobile delay with a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) metric for analyzing transportation impacts of a project. Therefore, impacts and mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR associated with automobile delay are not discussed in this evaluation.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR did not evaluate VMT or the potential for induced automobile travel. The VMT analysis presented below evaluates the project's transportation effects using the VMT metric.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes could result in significant impacts on transit ridership and identified seven transportation mitigation measures, which are discussed below in the "Transit" subsection. Even with mitigation, however, it was anticipated that the significant adverse 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, initial study – community plan evaluation Topic 4c is not applicable to the proposed project.

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis

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

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

The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Transportation Authority) uses the San Francisco Chained Activity Model Process (SF-CHAMP) to estimate VMT by private automobiles and taxis for different land use types. Travel behavior in SF-CHAMP is calibrated based on observed behavior from the California Household Travel Survey 2010-2012, census data regarding automobile ownership rates and county-to-county worker flows, and observed vehicle counts and transit boardings. SF-CHAMP uses a synthetic population, which is a set of individual actors that represents the Bay Area's actual population, who make simulated travel decisions for a complete day. The Transportation Authority uses tour-based analysis for office and residential uses, which examines the entire chain of trips over the course of a day, not just trips to and from the project site. For retail uses, the Transportation Authority uses trip-based analysis, which counts VMT from individual trips to and from the project (as opposed to the entire chain of trips). A trip-based approach, as opposed to a tour-based approach, is necessary for retail projects because a tour is likely to consist of trips stopping in multiple locations, and the summarizing of tour VMT to each location would overestimate VMT.^{24, 25}

²⁴ A tour-based assessment of VMT at a retail site would consider the VMT for all trips in the tour, for any tour with a stop at the retail site. If a single tour stops at two retail locations, for example, a coffee shop on the way to work and a restaurant on the way back home, then both retail locations would be allotted the total tour VMT. A trip-based approach allows for apportionment of all retail-related VMT to retail sites without double-counting.

²⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, Executive Summary: Resolution Modifying Transportation Impact Analysis, Appendix F, Attachment A, March 3, 2016. Available at http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcpackets/Align-CPC%20exec%20summary_20160303_Final.pdf

For office development, regional average daily work-related VMT per employee is 19.1. For retail development, regional average daily retail VMT per employee is 14.9.²⁶ Average daily VMT for these land uses is projected to decrease in future 2040 cumulative conditions. Refer to Table 3: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled, which includes the transportation analysis zone in which the project site is located, 726.

Table 3: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled

Land Use	Existing			Cumulative 2040		
	Bay Area Regional Average	Bay Area Regional Average minus 15%	TAZ 726	Bay Area Regional Average	Bay Area Regional Average minus 15%	TAZ 726
Employment (Office)	19.1	16.2	8.0	17.0	14.5	7.1
Employment (Retail)	14.9	12.6	9.3	14.6	12.4	9.2

A project would have a significant effect on the environment if it would cause substantial additional VMT. As discussed above under "Automobile Delay and Vehicle Miles Traveled", the State OPR's proposed changes to transportation impact guidelines recommend screening criteria to identify types, characteristics, or locations of projects that would not result in significant impacts to VMT.²⁷ If a project meets one of the three screening criteria provided (map-based screening, small projects, and proximity to transit stations), then it is presumed that VMT impacts of the project would be less than significant and a detailed VMT analysis is not required. The map-based screening criterion is used to determine if a project site is located within a TAZ that exhibits low levels of VMT. The small projects criterion applies to those that would generate fewer than 100 vehicle trips per day. The proximity to transit stations criterion applies to projects that are within a half-mile of an existing major transit stop, have a floor area ratio that is equal to or greater than 0.75, have vehicle parking that is less than or equal to that required or allowed by the Planning Code without conditional use authorization, and are consistent with the applicable sustainable communities strategy.

In TAZ 726, where the 77-85 Federal Street project site is located, the existing average daily VMT per office employment is 8.0 and the existing average daily VMT per retail employee is 9.1. In TAZ 726, the future 2040 average daily VMT per office employment would be 7.1, and the future 2040 average daily VMT per retail employee would be 9.2. Given that the project site is located in an area in which the existing and future 2040 office and retail employee VMT would be more than 15 percent below the existing and future 2040 regional averages, the proposed project's office and retail uses would not result

²⁶ Retail travel is not explicitly captured in SF-CHAMP, rather, there is a generic "other" purpose that includes retail shopping, medical appointments, visiting friends or family, and all other non-work, non-school tours. The retail efficiency metric captures all of the "other" purpose travel generated by Bay Area households. The denominator of employment (including retail; cultural, institutional, and educational; and medical employment; school enrollment, and number of households) represents the size, or attraction, of the zone for this type of "other" purpose travel.

²⁷ Available at https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_sb743.php.

in substantial additional VMT, and impacts would be less than significant. Thus, the project meets the map based screening criterion as a transit-oriented infill project.²⁸ The project is located within a half mile of existing major transit stops, it has a floor area ratio greater than 0.75, it would have an amount of parking that is allowed by the Planning Code without conditional use authorization, and it's consistent with the sustainable communities strategy; thus, the project also meets the proximity to transit stations criterion. Therefore, VMT impacts from the proposed project would be less than significant and a detailed VMT analysis is not required.

Trip Generation

The proposed project consists of demolishing two existing buildings and a surface parking lot for 18 vehicles, and constructing an approximately 77,000 sf building containing approximately 50,000 sf of office use, approximately 23,000 sf of retail use proposed to be a fitness center, and parking for 124 bicycles and 26 vehicles.

Localized trip generation of the proposed project was calculated using a trip-based analysis and information in the 2002 Transportation Impacts Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review (SF Guidelines) developed by the San Francisco Planning Department.²⁹ The project would generate an estimated 4,355 person trips (inbound and outbound) on a weekday daily basis, consisting of 1,571 person trips by auto, 900 transit trips, 1,411 walk trips and 473 trips by other modes. During the p.m. peak hour, the project would generate an estimated 387 person trips, consisting of 141 person trips by auto (65 vehicle trips accounting for vehicle occupancy data for this census tract), 89 transit trips, 117 walk trips and 41 trips by other modes.

Existing traffic conditions in the project vicinity are frequently congested due to the Bay Bridge entrance from both eastbound and westbound Bryant Street, located one block north of the project site, and ballgames and other events at AT&T Park, located two blocks south of the project site. Along 2nd Street, the number of vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians increases significantly during ballgames and other events at AT&T Park, and vehicle traffic increases significantly during the PM peak hour. The project's addition of 65 vehicle trips during the PM peak period would not indicate a significant effect on the environment.

Transit

Seven transit-related mitigation measures were included in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR (Mitigation Measures E-5 through E-11) and 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 mitigation measures 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 San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code, referred to as the Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF), which is codified as Planning Code Section 411A

²⁸ San Francisco Planning Department, Eligibility Checklist: CEQA Section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis, 77-85 Federal Street, December 29, 2016.

²⁹ San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Calculations for 77-85 Federal Street, October 19, 2016.

(Ordinance No. 200-154, effective December 25, 2015).³⁰ The fee updated, expanded, and replaced the prior Transit Impact Development Fee, which is in compliance with portions of Mitigation Measure E-5. The proposed project would be subject to the fee. In compliance with a portion of Mitigation Measure E-11: Transportation Demand Management, the city adopted a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management Program for most new development citywide (Ordinance 34-17, effective March 19, 2017). Both the TSF and the transportation demand management efforts are part of the Transportation Sustainability Program.³¹ In compliance with all or portions of Mitigation Measure E-6: Transit Corridor Improvements, Mitigation Measure E-7: Transit Accessibility, Mitigation Measure E-9: Rider Improvements, and Mitigation Measure E-10: Transit Enhancement, the SFMTA is implementing the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP), which was approved by the SFMTA Board of Directors in March 2014. The TEP (now called Muni Forward) includes system-wide review, evaluation, and recommendations to improve service and increase transportation efficiency. Examples of transit priority and pedestrian safety improvements within the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas 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 9 San Bruno bus route (initiation in 2015). In addition, Muni Forward includes service improvements to various routes within the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas (e.g., the implemented new 55 16th Street bus route).

Mitigation Measure E-7 also identified implementing recommendations of the Bicycle Plan and the Better Streets Plan. As part of the Bicycle Plan, adopted in 2009, a series of minor, near-term, and long-term bicycle facility improvements were planned within the Eastern Neighborhoods, including along 2nd, 5th, 17th, Townsend, Illinois, and Cesar Chavez Streets. The Better Streets Plan, adopted in 2010, described a vision for the future of San Francisco's pedestrian realm and called for streets that work for all users. The Better Streets Plan requirements were codified in Planning Code Section 138.1, and new projects constructed in the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas 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 areas 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 77-85 Federal Street project site is well served by public transportation. The K-Ingleside/T-Third and N-Judah Muni Metro lines stop within one-quarter mile of the project site, and eight other Muni transit lines stop within a half mile of the project site. The Caltrain station and three proposed Central Subway stops are also within a half mile of the project site. The project would be expected to generate 900 daily transit trips, including 89 during the p.m. peak hour. Given the wide availability of nearby transit, the addition of 89 p.m. peak-hour transit trips would be accommodated by existing capacity. Thus, the proposed project would not result in unacceptable levels of transit service or cause a substantial increase in delays or operating costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service could result.

³⁰ Two additional files were created at the Board of Supervisors for TSF regarding hospitals and health services, grandfathering, and additional fees for larger projects: see Board File Nos. 151121 and 151257. [add links]

³¹ <http://tsp.sfplanning.org>.

Each of the rezoning options in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts related to increases in transit ridership on Muni lines, with the preferred project having significant impacts on seven lines. The project site is not within one-quarter mile of any of these affected lines and thus would not contribute considerably to these conditions. The 77-85 Federal Street project would also not contribute considerably to 2025 or 2040 cumulative transit conditions (which assume implementation of the Central SoMa Plan) and thus would not result in any significant cumulative transit impacts.

Other Transportation Impacts

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. The PEIR states that in general, the analyses of pedestrian, bicycle, loading, emergency access, and construction transportation impacts are specific to individual development projects, and that project-specific analyses would need to be conducted for future development projects under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans.

The project site fronts two 35-foot-wide dead end streets with 67-foot-wide sidewalks on both sides of the streets. The primary pedestrian entry and access to the project's 124 bicycle parking spaces would be from Federal Street. Vehicle access to the project's 26 vehicle parking spaces and two service loading spaces would be from De Boom Street. Access to the retail/fitness center, which would front De Boom Street, could be from either De Boom or Federal Streets. Additional traffic may occur along both dead-end streets to allow for drop-off/pick-up and deliveries, and vehicles not entering the garage would need to make three-point turns to leave the project site. Drivers may also drop off and pick up passengers on 2nd Street to avoid entering the dead-end alleys. Although the project would result in an increase in vehicles that travel along De Boom and Federal Streets, it would not be substantial enough to create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians or bicyclists. Furthermore, project construction and operation would not alter emergency access and service time ratios.

As part of the recently approved Second Street Improvement Project, pedestrian improvements along 2nd Street in the project vicinity include the widening of sidewalks from 10 feet to 15 feet; raising crosswalks at the intersections of 2nd Street at Federal and De Boom Streets; intersection traffic signal phasing for pedestrians, and pedestrian-scale lighting.³² A recent change near the I-80/Bay Bridge approach east of Bryant Street is the addition of a pedestrian island. This change did not reduce lanes and thus would not result in traffic impacts along 2nd or Bryant Streets that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Pedestrians and bicyclists would access the project site from 2nd Street. Pedestrians accessing the project site by transit would arrive from 2nd Street or from Brannan Street (from the light rail stop on Embarcadero or the Caltrans train station on 4th Street); the walking routes between transit stops and the project site is relatively flat. Transit riders would not need to use the new pedestrian island on Bryant Street to access the project site.

³² Second Street Improvements Project Final Supplemental EIR to the San Francisco Bicycle Plan EIR, certified by the San Francisco Planning Commission on August 13, 2015 (Case No. 2007.0347E).

Parking and travel lane and sidewalk closures during project construction are subject to review and approval by the City's Transportation Advisory Staff Committee (TASC), which consists of representatives of several City departments including SFMTA and the Public Works, Fire, Police, and Planning Departments. The TASC review and approval process takes into consideration other construction projects in the vicinity. Construction activities would be temporary and limited in duration to 16 months; would be conducted in accordance with local, state and federal requirements; would maintain pedestrian and vehicle access to all properties, including retail businesses, at all times; and would maintain ADA-compliant pedestrian access during construction. Therefore, there would be no additional construction-related transportation impacts from the proposed project beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant project-specific or cumulative impacts related to pedestrians, bicyclists, loading, emergency access, and construction beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Conclusion

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

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

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
g) Be substantially affected by existing noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans 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 Rezoning and Area Plans would be less than significant. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified six noise mitigation measures, three of which may be applicable to subsequent development projects.³³ These mitigation measures would reduce noise impacts from construction and noisy land uses to less-than-significant levels.

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, initial study – community plan evaluation Topics 5e and 5f are not applicable.

Construction Noise

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR included two mitigation measures that address impacts from construction noise. PEIR Mitigation Measure F-1: Construction Noise (Pile Driving), addressed noise impacts related to pile driving. The project would be supported by a grid-type foundation of spread footings or a mat foundation. The project sponsor has determined that pile driving would not be used; thus, PEIR Mitigation Measure F-1 would not be applicable to the proposed project. PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2: Construction Noise, requires the development of a noise attenuation plan and the implementation of noise attenuation measures to minimize noise impacts from construction activities. Construction activities would include heavy equipment in proximity to noise sensitive land use; thus PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2 is applicable to the proposed project and is included as **Project Mitigation Measure 3** on p. 65. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce potential construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

³³ Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-3, F-4, and F-6 address the siting of sensitive land uses in noisy environments. In a decision issued on December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require an agency to consider the effects of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project's future users or residents except where a project or its residents may exacerbate existing environmental hazards (*California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District*, December 17, 2015, Case No. S213478. Available at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/3-s213478-resp-reply-answer-pet-rev-101513.pdf>). As noted above, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that incremental increases in traffic-related noise attributable to implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would be less than significant and thus would not exacerbate the existing noise environment. Therefore, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-3, F-4, and F-6 are not applicable. Nonetheless, for all noise sensitive uses, the general requirements for adequate interior noise levels of Mitigation Measures F-3 and F-4 are met by compliance with the acoustical standards required under the California Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations Title 24).

All construction activities during the approximately 16-month construction period would be subject to and required to comply with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Noise Ordinance), which is codified as Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code. The Noise Ordinance regulates construction noise and requires that construction work be conducted in the following manner: (1) noise levels of construction equipment, other than impact tools, must not exceed 80 dBA³⁴ at a distance of 100 feet from the source (the equipment generating the noise); (2) impact tools must have intake and exhaust mufflers that are approved by the Director of San Francisco Public Works (SFPW) or the Director of 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 SFPW authorizes a special permit for conducting the work during that period.

The DBI is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance for private construction projects during normal business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.), and the Police Department is responsible for enforcing the Noise Ordinance during all other hours. Nonetheless, during the approximately 16-month construction period for the proposed project, occupants of nearby properties could be disturbed by construction noise. There may be times when construction noise could interfere with indoor activities in residences and businesses near the project site; however, the increase in project-related construction noise in the project vicinity would not be considered a significant impact of the proposed project because the construction noise would be temporary, intermittent, and restricted in occurrence and level and because the construction contractor would be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance and PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2, which would reduce construction noise impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Construction vibration effects on adjacent historic resources are addressed above under Topic 3. Non-historic structures would not be significantly affected by construction vibration.

Operational Noise

PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses, addresses impacts related to individual development projects that include new noise-generating uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise levels in the respective project vicinities. The 77-85 Federal Street project would result in the development of approximately 50,000 sf of office use and approximately 23,000 sf of retail (fitness center) use on the project site – uses that are not expected to generate noise levels in excess of existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The project would include the installation of mechanical equipment, such as heating and ventilation systems, that could produce operational noise, but this equipment would be required to comply with the standards set forth in the Noise Ordinance. Noise resulting from the project's increase in traffic would not be considered a significant impact of the proposed project; an approximate doubling of traffic volumes in the area would be necessary to produce an increase in ambient noise levels noticeable to most people. The project would not cause a doubling in traffic volumes and therefore would not cause a noticeable increase in the ambient noise level in the project vicinity.

³⁴ The standard method used to quantify environmental noise involves evaluating the sound with an adjustment to reflect the fact that human hearing is less sensitive to low-frequency sound than to mid- and high-frequency sound. This measurement adjustment is called "A" weighting, and the data are reported in A-weighted decibels (dBA).

The proposed project does not include the installation of a backup diesel generator or any other noise generating equipment not addressed by the Noise Ordinance. Therefore, PEIR Mitigation Measure F-5 is not applicable to the proposed project.

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

Other reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects would also be required to comply with the above regulations, including the Noise Ordinance, which limits noise from construction activities and stationary equipment. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant individual or cumulative noise impacts beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR identified potentially significant air quality impacts resulting from construction activities and impacts on sensitive land uses³⁵ as a result of exposure to elevated levels of

³⁵ The Bay Area Air Quality Management District considers sensitive receptors as: children, adults or seniors occupying or residing in: 1) residential dwellings, including apartments, houses, condominiums, 2) schools,

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 Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would be consistent with the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy, which was the applicable air quality plan at that time. All other air quality impacts were found to be less than significant. The air quality analysis herein takes into consideration traffic on I-80 and the Bay Bridge, idling buses, and stationary sources such as emergency generators.

Construction Dust Control

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. Subsequently, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes, generally referred to as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance No. 176-08, effective August 29, 2008). The intent of this 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, to minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by the DBI.

Construction activities related to the 77-85 Federal Street project 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, sweeping streets and sidewalks, and other measures. The regulations and procedures set forth in the Construction Dust Control Ordinance would ensure that construction dust impacts would not be significant. These requirements supersede and are as effective as the dust control provisions of PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1. Therefore, the portion of PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 that addresses dust control is not applicable to the proposed project. Other cumulative projects would similarly be required to comply with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance. Therefore, cumulative fugitive dust impacts would be less than significant.

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 stated, “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 [Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s] quantitative thresholds for individual projects.”³⁶ The BAAQMD’s CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (Air Quality Guidelines) provide screening criteria for determining whether a project’s criteria air pollutant emissions would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air

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, p. 12.

³⁶ San Francisco Planning Department, Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, p. 346. Available at http://sf-planning.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/4003-EN_Final-EIR_Part-7_Trans-Noise-AQ.pdf.

pollutants.³⁷ Pursuant to the Air Quality Guidelines, projects that meet the screening criteria do not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants.

The 77-85 Federal Street project, with approximately 50,000 sf of office use and approximately 23,000 sf of retail use, is below both the construction screening criteria and the operational screening criteria for “general office building” and “strip mall” land use types.³⁸ Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact related to criteria air pollutants either individually or cumulatively, and a detailed air quality assessment is not required.

Health Risk

Since certification of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes (Ordinance No. 224-14, effective December 7, 2014), generally referred to as Health Code Article 38: Enhanced Ventilation Required for Urban Infill Sensitive Use Developments (Article 38). The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone (APEZ), as defined in Article 38, consists of areas that, based on modeling of all known air pollutant sources, exceed health protective standards for cumulative PM_{2.5} (fine particulate matter) concentration and cumulative excess cancer risk. The APEZ incorporates health vulnerability factors and proximity to freeways. For sensitive use projects within the APEZ, the ordinance requires that the project sponsor submit an enhanced ventilation proposal for approval by the Department of Public Health (DPH) that achieves protection from PM_{2.5} equivalent to that associated with a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value 13 filtration. The DBI will not issue a building permit without written notification from the Director of the DPH that the applicant has an approved enhanced ventilation proposal.

The 77-85 Federal Street project site is not within the APEZ and the project would not include sensitive uses; thus, the project sponsor is not required to enroll in the DPH Article 38 program.

Construction

The project site is not located within an identified APEZ; therefore, the ambient health risk to sensitive receptors from air pollutants is not considered substantial, and the portion of PEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 that requires the minimization of construction exhaust emissions is not applicable to the proposed project. Since the APEZ includes modeling of all known sources of DPM and PM_{2.5}, the proposed project’s construction emissions would also not contribute considerably to cumulative health risks.

Siting New Sources

The proposed project would not be expected to generate 100 truck trips per day or 40 refrigerated truck trips per day, so PEIR Mitigation Measure G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM, is not applicable. The proposed project would not include a backup diesel generator or any other source of TACs, so PEIR Mitigation Measure G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit Other TACs, is not applicable.

Conclusion

³⁷ Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, updated May 2011, pp. 3-2 to 3-3.

³⁸ *Ibid.* The screening criteria for “strip mall” land use (which most closely approximates gym use) is 99,000 sf for operational and 277,000 sf for construction. The screening criteria for “general office building” is 364,000 for operational and 277,000 for construction.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant individual or cumulative air quality impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR assessed the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that could result from rezoning of the East SoMa subarea of the Eastern Neighborhoods 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 carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂E) per service population, respectively.³⁹ The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR concluded that the resulting GHG emissions from the three rezoning options would be less than significant. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

Proposed Project

GHG emissions and global climate change represent cumulative impacts. GHG emissions cumulatively contribute to the significant adverse environmental impacts of global climate change. No single project could generate enough GHG emissions to noticeably change the global average temperature; instead, the combination of GHG emissions from past, present, and future projects have contributed and will continue to contribute to global climate change and its associated environmental impacts. The BAAQMD has prepared guidelines and methodologies for analyzing GHG emissions. These guidelines are consistent with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.4 and 15183.5, which address the analysis and determination of significant impacts from a proposed project's GHG emissions and allow for projects that are consistent with an adopted GHG reduction strategy to conclude that the project's GHG impact would be less than significant. San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions⁴⁰ presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that collectively represent

³⁹ San Francisco Planning Department, Greenhouse Gas Analysis 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 estimates GHG emissions using a service population (equivalent of total number of residents and employees) metric.

⁴⁰ San Francisco Planning Department, Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions in San Francisco, November 2010. Available at http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/GHG_Reduction_Strategy.pdf.

San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy in compliance with the BAAQMD and CEQA guidelines. These GHG reduction actions have resulted in a 23.3 percent reduction in GHG emissions in 2012 compared to 1990 levels,⁴¹ exceeding the year 2020 reduction goals outlined in the BAAQMD's 2010 Clean Air Plan,⁴² Executive Order S-3-05,⁴³ B-30-15,^{44,45} and Senate Bill (SB) 32.^{46,47} In addition, San Francisco's GHG reduction goals are consistent with, or more aggressive than, the long-term goals established under Executive Orders S-3-05⁴⁸ and B-30-15.^{49,50} Therefore, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy would not result in GHG emissions that would have a significant effect on the environment and would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations.

The 77-85 Federal Street project would increase the intensity of use of the project site by introducing a five-story, 65-foot-tall building with approximately 77,000 sf of office use and 23,000 sf of retail use and 26 vehicle parking spaces to replace two two-story buildings with 17,116 sf of office use and a surface parking lot for 18 vehicles. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to annual long-term increases in GHGs as a result of commercial operations that result in an increase in energy use, water use,

⁴¹ ICF International, Technical Review of the 2012 Community-wide GHG Inventory for the City and County of San Francisco, January 21, 2015. Available at http://sfenvironment.org/sites/default/files/fliers/files/icf_verificationmemo_2012sfecommunityinventory_2015-01-21.pdf.

⁴² Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Clean Air Plan, September 2010. Available at <http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/air-quality-plans/current-plans>.

⁴³ Office of the Governor, Executive Order S-3-05, June 1, 2005. Available at <https://www.gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=1861>.

⁴⁴ Office of the Governor, *Executive Order B-30-15*, April 29, 2015. Available at <https://www.gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=18938>, accessed March 3, 2016. Executive Order B-30-15 sets a state GHG emissions reduction goal of 40 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2030.

⁴⁵ San Francisco's GHG reduction goals are codified in Section 902 of the Environment Code and include: (i) by 2008, determine City GHG emissions for year 1990; (ii) by 2017, reduce GHG emissions by 25 percent below 1990 levels; (iii) by 2025, reduce GHG emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels; and by 2050, reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels.

⁴⁶ Senate Bill 32 amends California Health and Safety Code Division 25.5 (also known as the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006) by adding Section 38566, which directs that statewide greenhouse gas emissions to be reduced by 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

⁴⁷ Senate Bill 32 was paired with Assembly Bill 197, which would modify the structure of the State Air Resources Board; institute requirements for the disclosure of greenhouse gas emissions criteria pollutants, and toxic air contaminants; and establish requirements for the review and adoption of rules, regulations, and measures for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

⁴⁸ Executive Order S-3-05 sets forth a series of target dates by which statewide emissions of GHGs need to be progressively reduced, as follows: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels (approximately 457 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO₂E)); by 2020, reduce emissions to 1990 levels (approximately 427 million MTCO₂E); and by 2050, reduce emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels (approximately 85 million MTCO₂E). Because of the differential heat absorption potential of various GHGs, GHG emissions are frequently measured in "carbon dioxide-equivalent," which present a weighted average based on each gas's heat absorption (or "global warming") potential.

⁴⁹ Office of the Governor, Executive Order B-30-15, April 29, 2015. Available at <https://www.gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=18938>. Executive Order B-30-15 sets a state GHG emissions reduction goal of 40 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2030.

⁵⁰ San Francisco's GHG reduction goals are codified in Section 902 of the Environment Code and include: (i) by 2008, determine City GHG emissions for year 1990; (ii) by 2017, reduce GHG emissions by 25 percent below 1990 levels; (iii) by 2025, reduce GHG emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels; and by 2050, reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels.

wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal. Construction activities would also result in temporary increases in GHG emissions.

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

Compliance with the City's commuter benefits and transportation management programs, bicycle, fuel-efficient vehicle, and carpool parking requirements, and payment of the transportation sustainability fee would reduce the proposed project's transportation-related GHG emissions. These regulations reduce GHG emissions from single-occupancy vehicles by promoting the use of alternative transportation modes with zero or lower GHG emissions on a per capita basis.

The project would be required to comply with the energy efficiency requirements of the City's Green Building Code, stormwater management, and water-efficient irrigation, and light pollution reduction requirements, which would promote energy and water efficiency, thereby reducing the project's energy-related GHG emissions.⁵¹ Additionally, the project would be required to meet the renewable energy criteria of the Green Building Code, further reducing the project's energy-related GHG emissions.

The project's waste-related emissions would be reduced through compliance with the City's requirements for mandatory recycling and composting and construction and demolition debris recovery. These regulations reduce the amount of materials sent to a landfill, reducing GHGs emitted by landfill operations. These regulations also promote reuse of materials, conserving their embodied energy⁵² and reducing the energy required to produce new materials.

Compliance with the City's street tree planting requirements would serve to increase carbon sequestration. Regulations that prohibit chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), halons, and inefficient refrigeration and those requiring low-emitting finishes would reduce volatile organic compounds (VOCs).⁵³

In conclusion, the proposed project was determined to be consistent with San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy,⁵⁴ and the proposed project's GHG emissions would not conflict with state, regional, and local GHG reduction plans and regulations. Furthermore, the proposed project is within the scope of the development evaluated in the PEIR and would not result in impacts associated with GHG emissions beyond those disclosed in the PEIR. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant GHG emissions that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

⁵¹ Compliance with water conservation measures reduce the energy (and GHG emissions) required to convey, pump and treat water required for the project.

⁵² Embodied energy is the total energy required for the extraction, processing, manufacture, and delivery of building materials to the building site.

⁵³ While not a GHG, VOCs are precursor pollutants that form ground-level ozone. Increased ground-level ozone is an anticipated effect of future global warming that would result in added health effects locally. Reducing VOC emissions would reduce the anticipated local effects of global warming.

⁵⁴ San Francisco Planning Department, Greenhouse Gas Analysis: Compliance Checklist for 77-85 Federal Street, December 15, 2016.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
8. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:				
a) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Wind

The height limits enacted under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans generally did not exceed 80 feet. A few locations throughout the plan areas already had height limits of 130 feet, but no new locations with height limits of 130 feet were proposed. For these reasons, the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that, at a programmatic level, the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in significant wind impacts. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR. Individual development projects proposed under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans must still be assessed to ensure that they would not result in significant project-level wind impacts.

For the 77-85 Federal Street project, the proposed 65-foot-tall building (71 feet, 2 inches at its tallest point, the top of the stair penthouse) would be similar in height to existing buildings in the surrounding area: across Federal Street from the project site is the 85-foot-tall 501 2nd Street building; at the end of Federal Street (where the 2nd Street access dead ends) is the 85-foot-tall 60 Federal Street building; across De Boom Street from the project site is the 75-foot-tall 274 Brannan Street building; and at the end of De Boom Street is the 65-foot-tall 270 Brannan Street building.

Based upon experience of the Planning Department in reviewing wind analyses and expert opinion on other projects, it is generally the case that projects under 80 feet in height do not have the potential to generate significant wind impacts. For this reason, and because the proposed project would not be substantially taller than surrounding buildings, the proposed project is not anticipated to cause significant impacts related to wind or result in a considerable contribution to cumulative ground level wind impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

Shadow

Planning Code Section 295 generally prohibits new structures above 40 feet in height that would cast additional shadows on open space that is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, at any time of the year, unless that shadow would not result in a significant adverse effect on the use of the open space. Under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, some sites surrounding parks could be redeveloped with taller buildings, because some parks are not subject to the provisions of Section 295 (i.e., some parks are under the jurisdiction of agencies other than the Recreation and Park Commission or are privately owned). The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR could not conclude if the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would result in less-than-significant shadow impacts because the feasibility of complete mitigation for potential new shadow impacts of unknown development proposals could not be

determined at that time. Therefore, the PEIR determined that the shadow impacts would be significant and unavoidable. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

Implementation of the 77-85 Federal Street project would result in the construction of a five-story, 65-foot-tall building (71 feet, 2 inches at its tallest point). The Planning Department prepared a preliminary shadow fan analysis and determined that the project would not cast shadow on South Park or any other nearby open space.⁵⁵

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

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant shadow impacts, either individually or cumulatively, beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Physically degrade existing recreational resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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 PEIR. However, the PEIR identified Improvement Measure H-1: Support for Upgrades to Existing Recreation Facilities. This improvement measure calls for the City to implement funding mechanisms for an ongoing program to repair, upgrade, and adequately maintain park and recreation facilities to ensure the safety of users.

As part of the adoption of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, the City adopted impact fees for development in Eastern Neighborhoods that go toward funding recreation and open space. Since

⁵⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, 77-85 Federal Street Shadow Fan, October 24, 2016.

certification of the PEIR, the voters of San Francisco passed the 2012 San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond, providing the Recreation and Park Department an additional \$195 million to continue capital projects for the renovation and repair of park, recreation, and open space assets. This funding is being utilized for improvements and expansion to Garfield Square, South Park, the Potrero Hill Recreation Center, Warm Water Cove Park, and the Pier 70 Parks Shoreline within the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas. 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 areas for acquisition and locations where new open spaces and open space connections should be constructed, consistent with PEIR Improvement Measure H-2: Support for New Open Space. Two of these open spaces, Daggett Park and at 17th and Folsom Streets, are both set to open within the next two years. In addition, the amended ROSE identifies the role of both the Better Streets Plan and the Green Connections Network in open space and recreation. Green Connections are 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 areas: Mission to Peaks (Route 6); Noe Valley to Central Waterfront (Route 8), a portion of which has been conceptually designed; Tenderloin to Potrero (Route 18); Downtown to Mission Bay (Route 19); Folsom, Mission Creek to McLaren (Route 20); and Shoreline (Route 24).

Furthermore, the Planning Code requires a specified amount of new usable open space: 1 sf of open space for each 250 sf of retail use and 1 sf of open space per each 50 sf of office use. The project would comply with these requirements by providing a 939 sf roof deck on the fourth floor.⁵⁶ The Planning Code open space requirements would help offset some of the additional open space needs generated by increased population in the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas, and this usable open space would help alleviate the demand for recreational facilities.

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and the Central SoMa Plan Draft EIR both take into consideration the effects of past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects and both documents did not find significant individual or cumulative effects related to recreational facilities. As the project does not degrade recreational facilities and is consistent with the development density established under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional individual or cumulative impacts on recreation beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

⁵⁶ Project open space requirements: (retail: 19,493/250 = 78) + (office: 43,055/50 = 861) = 939 sf.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
10. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

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 citywide demand projections to the year 2035, compares available water supplies to meet demand, and presents water demand management measures to reduce long-term water demand. Additionally, the UWMP update includes a discussion of the conservation requirement set forth in Senate Bill 7, passed in November 2009, mandating a statewide 20 percent reduction in per capita water use by 2020. The UWMP includes a quantification of the SFPUC's water use reduction targets and plans 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 areas, including at the

Southeast Treatment Plant, the Central Bayside System, and green infrastructure projects, such as the Mission and Valencia Green Gateway.

A 2015 update to the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan was prepared for the Central SoMa Plan Draft EIR to evaluate water demand based on updated growth projections. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and the Central SoMa Plan Draft EIR both take into consideration the effects of past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, and both documents did not find significant individual or cumulative effects related to water supply and facilities. As the 77-85 Federal Street project is consistent with the development density established under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional individual or cumulative impacts on utilities and service systems beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
11. PUBLIC SERVICES—Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services such as fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered public services, including fire and police protection and public schools. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

The Central SoMa Plan Draft EIR also takes into consideration the effects of past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, and does not find significant individual or cumulative effects related to public services. As the 77-85 Federal Street project is consistent with the development density established under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, the project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts on the physical environment associated with the provision of public services beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

As discussed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, the Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas are 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 areas that could be affected by the development anticipated under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans. In addition, development envisioned under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not substantially interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory wildlife species. For these reasons, the PEIR concluded that implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in significant impacts on biological resources, and no mitigation measures were identified.

The 77-85 Federal Street project site is located within the East SoMa subarea of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Areas and does not support habitat for any candidate, sensitive or special status species, and does not contain wetlands or sensitive natural communities. The nearest park is South Park, approximately 300 feet west of the project site, and is not defined as an urban bird refuge (open space two acres or larger dominated by vegetation). Therefore, the project would not affect the movement of any resident or migratory birds.

Four New Zealand Christmas trees grow along the De Boom Street frontage of the project site, and six Italian cypress trees grow along the Federal Street frontage. All existing trees would be removed and 11 new street trees would be planted along the two frontages in compliance with the Urban Forestry Ordinance (Section 806 of the Public Works Code), which requires one street tree for each 20 feet of street frontage). Should the existing street trees support native nesting birds, construction activities could result in nest destruction or injury or mortality of nestlings. However, compliance with the requirements of the California Fish and Game Code and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MTBA) would ensure that there would be no loss of active nests or bird mortality and no significant effects would occur. To comply with the California Fish and Game Code or the MTBA, the project sponsor may:

- Undertake tree removal during the non-breeding season (i.e., September through February) to avoid nesting birds or preconstruction surveys may be conducted for work scheduled during the breeding season (March through August);
- Conduct preconstruction surveys by a qualified biologist no more than 15 days prior to the start of work during the nesting season to determine if any birds are nesting in or in the vicinity of the vegetation to be removed or construction to be undertaken;
- Avoid any nests identified and establish (by a qualified biologist) a construction-free buffer zone, to be maintained until nestlings have fledged.

Because the project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan area, which doesn't support habitat for any candidate, sensitive, or special status species, does not contain wetlands or sensitive natural communities, and because the proposed project and other cumulative projects would be required to comply with the California Fish and Game Code and MTBA, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts, either individually or cumulatively, on biological resources beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
13. GEOLOGY AND SOILS—Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

A geotechnical report was prepared for the 77-85 Federal Street project to assess the geologic conditions underlying the project site and to provide design and construction recommendations.⁵⁷ The report's findings and recommendations are summarized below.

Three exploratory test pits were excavated to a depth of 21 feet on the project site, and the results of nine previous exploratory test pits on the project site were evaluated. Generally, all twelve exploratory test pits encountered bedrock materials below minor depths of residual soil and/or heterogeneous fill materials.

The proposed below-grade parking level and stacker pits would require excavations to 19 feet in depth, and the required cuts would also extend comparable depths below portions of adjacent commercial

⁵⁷ Harold Lewis & Associates Geotechnical Consultants, Foundation Investigation, Proposed Commercial Building, 85 Federal Street, San Francisco, California, January 21, 2013.

structures to the east and west. Due to the depth of excavation and the close proximity of the adjacent buildings, underpinning and temporary shoring would be required to support the adjacent structures and city streets to the north and south. Temporary slopes may be utilized in the interior portions of the proposed excavation, and minor grading and placement of limited fill materials may also be required to establish a building pad and to provide surface drainage gradients.

An alternative to hand-excavated piers is slant drilled reinforced concrete friction or end-bearing piers. Slant drilled underpinning piers could be constructed within the footprint of the adjoining buildings by installing steel I-beams beneath the adjacent foundations. To reduce the size of the I-beams, the underpinned piers should be "tied back." Written permission must be obtained from adjacent property owners to install temporary tie-backs on their lots. If permission cannot be obtained to install the tie backs, then cantilevered, tied-back or internally braced temporary shoring (steel soldier beams and timber lagging) should be installed along the eastern and western boundaries to support the adjacent buildings. To provide adequate support for the adjoining parking lot and Federal and De Boom Streets, appropriate temporary shoring should be used during the excavation operations and construction of retaining walls. Temporary shoring should be used around the internal perimeters of the garage stacker pits and entrance ramp excavations to limit the amount of soil to be excavated and the amount of compacted wall backfill required.

The geotechnical report recommends the following measures: (1) prior to construction activities, the project sponsor should visually document, with annotated photographs, the preconstruction condition of existing adjoining buildings, which may be sensitive to heavy equipment vibrations, (2) underpinning and/or temporary shoring should be installed by a professional contractor experienced in such work, and (3) underpinning, excavation, installation of temporary shoring, and construction of retaining walls should be performed during the dry months of the year (May through October). The report concludes that the site is suitable for the proposed construction provided that the report's recommendations are incorporated into the building's design and construction. The protection of the existing adjacent buildings that are historic resources is addressed in the historic resource discussion on p. 29 and included in Project Mitigation Measure 1, Construction Monitoring Program to Protect Adjacent Historical Resources on p. 63.

The proposed project would be required to conform to the San Francisco Building Code, which ensures the safety of all new construction in the City. Decisions about appropriate foundation and structural design are considered as part of the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) permit review process. DBI would review background information including geotechnical and structural engineering reports to ensure that the security and stability of adjoining properties and the subject property is maintained. Therefore, potential damage to structures from geologic hazards on the project site would be addressed through the DBI requirement for a geotechnical report and review of the building permit application pursuant to its implementation of the Building Code and implementation of Project Mitigation Measure 1. Other cumulative projects would also be subject to the requirements of the San Francisco Building Code.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts, either individually or cumulatively, related to geology and soils beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and no new mitigation measures beyond Project Mitigation Measure 1 are necessary.

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

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 would be within the population projections of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, so it would not exceed the capacity of the stormwater system. In addition, the project site is completely paved, so implementation of the proposed project would not increase the area of impervious surfaces. In accordance with the City's Stormwater Management Ordinance (No. 83-10), the project would be subject to low impact design approaches, such as landscape solutions designed to capture stormwater runoff, and stormwater management systems would be required to comply with the stormwater design guidelines. As a result, the project would not increase stormwater runoff.

The Central SoMa Plan Draft EIR evaluated increases in the City's combined stormwater/wastewater system based on updated growth projections. The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and the Central SoMa Plan Draft EIR both take into consideration the effects of past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, and both documents did not find significant individual or cumulative effects related to stormwater. Other cumulative projects would similarly be required to comply with various regulations that limit stormwater runoff.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts, either individually or cumulatively, related to hydrology and water quality beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS—Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR noted that implementation of any of the Eastern Neighborhoods rezoning options would encourage construction of new development within the plan areas. The PEIR found that there is a high potential to encounter hazardous materials during construction activities in many parts of the plan areas 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, underground storage tank closure, and investigation and cleanup of soil and groundwater would ensure that workers and the community would be protected from exposure to hazardous materials during construction. In addition, businesses that use or generate hazardous substances (cleaners, solvents, etc.) would be subject to existing regulations that protect workers and the community from exposure to hazardous materials during operations. Furthermore, compliance with existing building and fire codes would reduce impacts related to potential fire hazards, emergency response, and evacuation hazards to less-than-significant levels.

Hazardous Building Materials

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

local regulations prior to the start of renovation. In addition, mercury and other hazardous materials that are identified before or during construction shall be removed and/or abated in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations. Because the proposed project includes the demolition of two existing buildings, PEIR Mitigation Measure L-1, identified as **Project Mitigation Measure 4** on p. 6566, is applicable to the proposed project. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts related to hazardous building materials to a less-than-significant level.

Soil and Groundwater Contamination

The 77-85 Federal Street project site is located in the Maher zone, an area that it is known or suspected to contain contaminated soil and/or groundwater.⁵⁸ In addition, the project would require excavation to a depth of 19 feet below ground surface and the disturbance of 6,300 cubic yards of soil. For these reasons, the proposed project is subject to Health Code Article 22A (also known as the Maher Ordinance), which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH). The project sponsor is required to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I environmental site assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6.

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

Accordingly, a Phase I ESA was prepared to assess the potential for site contamination.⁵⁹ Per the Phase I ESA, the property was developed by the 1880s with residences and a small business. After the area was destroyed by the 1906 earthquake and fire, the site was rebuilt with a soap factory by approximately 1913. A licorice factory occupied the site by at least 1941. Historical property uses also included an elevator company, lithography, and offices.

In compliance with the Maher Ordinance, the project sponsor enrolled in DPH's Maher program. DPH reviewed the Phase I ESA and requested a subsurface investigation work plan to the proposed maximum depth of excavation to assess potential contaminants in the soil, groundwater, and soil vapor.⁶⁰ The sponsor submitted to DPH a work plan for subsurface investigation.⁶¹ The work plan proposed the installation of five borings at the site, outside the current buildings, specified soil sampling and groundwater collection requirements, and proposed sampling for total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPH-g), total petroleum hydrocarbons as diesel (TPH-d), total extractable petroleum hydrocarbons (TEPH), volatile organic compounds including benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylene (BTEX), naphthalene, and methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), California Administrative Manual (CAM) 17 metals, semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), cyanides, pH,

⁵⁸ San Francisco Planning Department, Expanded Maher Area Map, March 2015. Available online at http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/library_of_cartography/Maher%20Map.pdf.

⁵⁹ John Carver Consulting, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 77, 77, 85 Federal Street, San Francisco, California, September 16, 2010.

⁶⁰ San Francisco Department of Public Health Environmental Health Section, Request for Work Plan, 77-85 Federal Street, San Francisco, March 4, 2014.

⁶¹ John Carver Consulting, Work Plan for Subsurface Investigation, 75-85 Federal Street, January 26, 2015.

asbestos, and flammable gases. DPH approved the work plan, noted that additional soil sampling may be required to address the soils beneath the buildings, and requested submittal of a dust control plan for the demolition.⁶²

The proposed project is required to remediate contaminated soil and ground water in compliance with the Maher Ordinance. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to contaminated soil and/or groundwater beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Other cumulative projects would be subject to the same federal, state, and local regulations addressing hazardous materials. Implementation of Project Mitigation Measure 4 and compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations would ensure that the project would not result in significant impacts, either individually or cumulatively, related to hazards or hazardous materials beyond those identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
16. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR determined that the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans 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 the Department of Building Inspection. The plan areas do 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 Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans would not result in a significant impact on mineral and energy resources. No mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR.

As the proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans, there would be no additional impacts, either individually or cumulatively, on mineral and energy resources beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

⁶² San Francisco Department of Public Health Environmental Health Section, Development, 77-85 Federal Street, San Francisco, February 4, 2015.

<i>Topics:</i>	<i>Significant Impact Peculiar to Project or Project Site</i>	<i>Significant Impact not Identified in PEIR</i>	<i>Significant Impact due to Substantial New Information</i>	<i>No Significant Impact not Previously Identified in PEIR</i>
17. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:—Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

As the proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans and there are no agricultural or forest resources on the site, there would be no additional impacts, either individually or cumulatively, on agriculture and forest resources beyond those analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

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

a) As described in Section G.12, biological resources, the proposed project would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

As described in Section G.3, Cultural Resources, the proposed project could result in a substantial adverse change on historic resources; however, implementation of Project Mitigation Measure 1, Construction Monitoring Program to Protect Adjacent Historical Resources, would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Project Mitigation Measure 2, Archeological Accidental Discovery, would reduce the impact to archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. As discussed in Section E.13, Geology and Soils, implementation of the proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in the elimination of important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory.

b) As disclosed in this initial study – community plan evaluation, the proposed project would not have any significant impact not previously identified in the PEIR. Furthermore, this analysis also considered the proposed project in combination with other cumulative projects, such as the proposed Central SoMa Plan. This initial study - community plan evaluation finds that the project would not have any significant cumulative impacts to which the proposed project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution.

c) As discussed in Section E.5, Noise, compliance with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance and implementation of Project Mitigation Measure 3, Construction Noise, would reduce construction noise impacts to less-than-significant levels. As described in Section G.15, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to demolishing the existing buildings, plus implementation of Mitigation Measure 4, Hazardous Building Materials, would reduce hazardous

materials impacts to a less-than-significant level. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

H. MITIGATION MEASURES

Project Mitigation Measure 1: Construction Monitoring Program to Protect Adjacent Historical Resources.

The project sponsor shall undertake a monitoring program to minimize damage to adjacent historic buildings. The monitoring program shall include the following components at a minimum:

- Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the project sponsor shall engage a preservation consultant who is a historic architect or qualified historic preservation professional to undertake a pre-construction survey of 533, 543-545, and 563 2nd Street and 355 Bryant Street and photograph the preconstruction conditions of these buildings.
- Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the project sponsor shall engage a qualified vibration consultant who shall identify feasible means to avoid damage to 533, 543-545, and 563 2nd Street. If the vibration consultant deems it necessary, such measures will also be applied to 355 Bryant Street. Such methods may include using construction techniques that reduce vibration, using appropriate excavation shoring methods to prevent movement of adjacent structures, and providing adequate security to minimize risks of vandalism and fire. Based on the construction activities and equipment to be used and condition of the adjacent resources, the vibration consultant shall also establish a maximum vibration level that shall not be exceeded at each building, based on the building's existing condition, character-defining features, soils conditions, and anticipated construction practices (a common standard is 0.2 inch per second, peak particle velocity or PPV).
- The project sponsor shall incorporate the vibration consultant's recommendations into construction specifications for the proposed project.
- To ensure that vibration levels do not exceed the established standard, the vibration consultant shall monitor ground-disturbing construction activities to ensure that damage to adjacent structures does not occur. Should the potential for damage to occur be observed, construction activities shall be halted and alternative construction techniques put in place (for example, use of smaller or lighter equipment).
- The vibration consultant shall prepare a final report that includes documentation of the pre-construction and post-construction conditions of these buildings and any methods employed during construction to reduce vibration levels to below the established standard.

Project Mitigation Measure 2: Archeological Accidental Discovery (PEIR Mitigation Measure J-2)

The following mitigation measure is required to avoid any potential adverse effect from the proposed project on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources as defined in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(a) and (c). The project sponsor shall distribute the Planning Department archeological resource "ALERT" sheet to the project prime contractor; to any project subcontractor (including demolition, excavation, grading, foundation, etc. firms); or utilities firm involved in soils-disturbing activities within the project site. Prior to any soils-disturbing activities being undertaken, each contractor is responsible for

ensuring that the “ALERT” sheet is circulated to all field personnel, including machine operators, field crew, supervisory personnel, etc. The project sponsor shall provide the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) with a signed affidavit from the responsible parties (prime contractor, subcontractor(s), and utilities firm) to the ERO confirming that all field personnel have received copies of the Alert Sheet.

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

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

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

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

Copies of the Draft FARR shall be sent to the ERO for review and approval. Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy, and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Environmental Planning Division of the Planning Department shall receive one bound copy, one unbound copy and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on CD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest or interpretive value, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

Project Mitigation Measure 3: Construction Noise (PEIR Mitigation Measure F-2)

The project sponsor shall develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be

submitted to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. These attenuation measures shall include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:

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

Project Mitigation Measure 4: Hazardous Building Materials (PEIR Mitigation Measure L-1)

The project sponsor shall ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or di (2 ethylhexyl) phthalate (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.

I. PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT

A “Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review” was mailed on June 19, 2014, and on October 20, 2016, to adjacent occupants and owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site and to interested parties. In response to the notifications, six commenters raised environmental concerns. These concerns were over air quality (from traffic on I-80 and the Bay Bridge, and from idling buses and an emergency generator on Federal Street), traffic (congestion on Federal Street, 2nd Street, and approaches to the Bay Bridge), emergency access, historic resources, construction impacts on nearby businesses, and noise, shading, and thermal efficiency effects on a nearby building. These concerns were taken into consideration during environmental review and are addressed in the appropriate topical areas above. Non-CEQA related comments that concern project design and Planning Code compliance were forwarded to the planner reviewing the entitlement application, who is taking these comments into consideration during project review.

J. COMMENTS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO THE PRELIMINARY MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

During the CP-PMND appeal period, the Planning Department received an appeal letter from a resident of at 355 Bryant Street. The appeal, which was subsequently withdrawn, is included as Appendix A to this document. The neighbor expressed concerns about the project’s construction impacts to 355 Bryant Street, which is an 11-unit live/work building approximately 80 feet northeast of the project site and an

identified historic resource. To ensure that the historic resource at 355 Bryant Street would not be impacted by construction vibration, Project Mitigation Measure 1 on pp. 33 and 66 has been revised.

After the close of the CP-PMND comment period, the Planning Department received a comment letter from another interested party who expressed concern that the proposed garage accessed from De Boom Street would generate significant traffic problems (see Appendix A). The transportation analysis on pp. 35-41 considers the proposed project's vehicle trip generation and garage access from De Boom Street and concludes that the project's 65 pm peak hour vehicle trips would not result in significant transportation impacts.

The 355 Bryant Street resident also expressed concerns about pedestrian and cyclist safety along Federal and De Boom Streets and made several recommendations:

- Open the alley between the ends of Federal and De Boom Streets to vehicles.
- Redesign the project to allow for a parking set back or pull-in along the Federal Street entrance to the site.
- Construct an alley between the project site and the adjacent site to the west, also owned by the same owner of 77-85 Federal Street.

The alley between the ends of Federal and De Boom Streets (referenced in the first bullet point above) is privately owned paved open space that is part of the 60 Federal Street (Academy of Art) and 274 Brannan Street (historic warehouse) properties. Used as an outdoor recreational area with benches, chairs, tables, and an umbrella, pedestrians may pass between the ends of Federal and De Boom Streets but the paved area is not a public right-of-way that could be made accessible to vehicles.

Vehicles would approach the 77-85 Federal Street project site from either Federal Street or from De Boom Street (where the project's 26 vehicle parking spaces and two commercial loading spaces would be accessed). A passenger zone along Federal Street would not reduce the number of vehicles accessing Federal Street. The dead end street that requires a three-point turn to exit is an existing condition that would continue with or without the project. As discussed on p. 40, the increase in vehicles that travel along De Boom and Federal Streets would not be substantial enough to create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians or bicyclists. Therefore, such measures as suggested by the commenter are not required to reduce any environmental impact to less than significant. CEQA does not require, or allow for, an agency to impose mitigation measures for environmental impacts that are less than significant.

K. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial study – community plan evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project is consistent with the development density established for the project site in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans, the project sponsor will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR to mitigate project-related significant effects, and the project would not result in environmental effects not already identified as significant effects in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. A CERTIFICATE OF DETERMINATION-COMMUNITY PLAN EVALUATION will be prepared.

- ☒ I find that the proposed project is consistent with the development density established for the project site in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans, the project sponsor will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR to mitigate project-related significant effects, and although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment not previously identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project is consistent with the development density established for the project site in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans, the project sponsor will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR to mitigate project-related significant effects, and at least one effect of the project has not been previously identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR and is either 1) peculiar to the project or the project site, 2) is a potentially significant off-site or cumulative impact, or 3) is a significant effect resulting from substantial new information that was not known at the time the PEIR was certified and would be more a more severe effect than was analyzed and disclosed in the PEIR. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Lisa Gibson
Environmental Review Officer
for
John Rahaim
Director of Planning

DATE _____

L. INITIAL STUDY – COMMUNITY PLAN EVALUATION PREPARERS

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

Environmental Review Officer: Lisa Gibson
Senior Environmental Planner: Jessica Range
Environmental Planner: Jeanie Poling

Appendix A to CP-PMND

Comment Letters

Appendix A to CP-PMND - Comment Letters

From: shellstar rocks
To: [Poling, Jeanie \(CPC\)](#)
Cc: [matt frinzi](#)
Subject: Re: 2012.1410E / Appeal of Community Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration
Date: Tuesday, June 20, 2017 4:44:32 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

Hello Jeanie—

Thank you for taking the time to discuss the points of my appeal with respect to the proposed 77-85 Federal Street.

After careful consideration, I have decided not to submit an official appeal, however, based on our conversation, would like to see the following points addressed in the PMND.

- Inclusion of the 355 Bryant Street building as a Historic Architectural Resource with potential construction impact
- Inclusion of the 355 Bryant Street building in the Mitigation Measures / Construction Monitoring Program to Protect Adjacent Historical Resources
- Reporting of Vibration Study prior, during and after construction to 355 Bryant Street owners on a pre-determined schedule
- Addition of a white curb / no standing zone along the south side of Federal street to deter vehicular connection from front entrance pick up and drop off

Please keep me updated on meetings pertaining to the Historic Preservation and Planning meetings as the project progresses.

Best,
Shelley

From: Poling, Jeanie (CPC) <jeanie.poling@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2017 11:23 AM
To: shellstar rocks
Subject: RE: 2012.1410E / Appeal of Community Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration

Hi Shelley,

I don't have your phone number, but I'd like to speak with you over the phone to address your concerns. Please feel free to call me. I also forwarded your email and appeal letter to the project sponsor, Adam Franch of Aralon Properties, so you'll likely be hearing from him too.

Thanks,
Jeanie Poling
Environmental Planner
Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415-575-9072 **Fax:** 415-558-6409
Email: jeanie.poling@sfgov.org
Web: www.sfplanning.org



Planning Information Center (PIC): 415-558-6377 or pic@sfgov.org
Property Information Map (PIM): <http://propertymap.sfplanning.org>

From: Gibson, Lisa (CPC)
Sent: Monday, June 19, 2017 6:00 PM
To: shellstar rocks
Cc: Poling, Jeanie (CPC); matt frinzi; Range, Jessica (CPC); Jain, Devyani (CPC)
Subject: Re: 2012.1410E / Appeal of Community Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration

Dear Ms. Parsons:

Thank you for this message. I encourage you to please speak with Jeanie Poling and the project sponsor to explore whether your concerns can be addressed without a PMND appeal, although it is your right should you wish to proceed.

Best,

Lisa Gibson
Environmental Review Officer/
Director of Environmental Planning

On Jun 19, 2017, at 4:22 PM, shellstar rocks <shellstar_rocks@hotmail.com> wrote:

Dear Lisa—

In response to SF Planning Communication I recently received, I am writing to you to appeal the Intent to Adopt a Community Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration for Case: 2012.1410E.

Per the appeal process, I have attached my letter to this email and will bring the required check and printed letter to SF Planning offices tomorrow.

I also plan on attending the public hearing on Thursday, June 22.

Best,
Shelley Parsons

<APPEAL_2012.1401E_CP-PMND_06112017.pdf>

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission St
Suite 400
San Francisco CA 94103-2479

Shelley Parsons
355 Bryant Street
#104
San Francisco 94107

11 June 2017

**Appeal of Community Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration
Case No. 2012.1410E
77-85 Federal Street**

Dear Sir/Madam—

I am writing to the San Francisco Planning Department to officially appeal the Intent to Adopt a Community Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration (PMND) for **Case 2012.1410E / 77-85 Federal Street**.

My appeal highlights three serious concerns that represent a significant environmental effect by the proposed project, concerns that refute the findings published in the PMND and require additional evaluation through a comprehensive Environmental Impact Review, and modification to the proposed project. These include:

1. **Construction Impact on Historic Architectural Resources**
2. **Increase of Hazardous Conditions / Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety Along Federal and De Boom Streets**
3. **Increase of Hazardous Conditions / Vehicular Congestion Along Federal Street and Impingement on Private Property**

1. Construction Impact on Historic Architectural Resources

Point 1 focuses on the highlighted area of the PMND section titled “Construction Impact on Historic Architectural Resources”. The report reveals two significant concerns;

- a) The potential and irreparable damage to historic resources identified
- b) The exclusion of an historic architectural resource at 355 Bryant Street, a building that is approximately 30 feet from the proposed project site and subject to the negative impact of construction.

The report states:

The Three properties that abut the west side of the project site (533, 543- 545, and 563 2nd Street) have been identified as individual historic resources and contributors to the South End Historic District and are considered sensitive to ground-borne vibration generated by project construction activities. Construction activity would require the use of typical construction equipment, including but not limited to an excavator, dump truck, and bulldozer... Construction equipment may need to operate directly adjacent to existing known historic resources at 533, 543-545, and 563 2nd Street and therefore vibration levels at those structures would exceed those list in Table 2 and have the potential to exceed the 0.2 PPV and could therefore result in damage to historic resources, which would be a significant impact not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. Furthermore, the geotechnical report prepared for the project notes that excavation along the building perimeter would extend below the foundations of the adjacent buildings and would need to be supported with tied-back underpinning within the footprint of these adjoining buildings; this would require the permission of adjacent property owners. If the adjacent property owners choose not to underpin their buildings, then cantilevered tied-back or internally braced temporary shoring could be installed

along the boundaries to support the adjacent buildings.¹⁸ Therefore, in addition to potential vibration impacts, other construction activities have the potential to damage adjacent historic resources.

Appeal Summary:

- a)
 - The report clearly states that the construction of the proposed project has the potential to damage historic resources along 2nd Street
 - The proposed mitigation plan is one of “watch, wait and hope for the best” and lacks a proactive approach to construction and planning
- b)
 - The historic brick and timber building at 355 Bryant Street, identified as an Historic Architectural Resource by San Francisco Planning, has been excluded from the Environmental study
 - 355 Bryant Street is built on a site between Bryant and Federal Streets, and is approximately 30 feet from the site and must be protected from the negative impact of construction
 - Any construction that has even the slightest possibility of irreparably damaging, defacing, or destroying the historic resources that make up the South Beach/East Soma neighborhood must not be allowed to proceed without further engineering/geological impact and review

Conclusion: The project must be modified to eliminate the underground parking structure, thus mitigating the potential catastrophic effects on the surrounding historic buildings and their environment

2. Increase of Hazardous Conditions / Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety Along Federal and De Boom Streets

Points #2 and #3 focus on the highlighted area of the PMND section titled “Other Transportation Impacts”. The proposed project plans to expand the building capacity from 17,116 sq ft to over 77,000 sq ft, representing a 450% increase to the current occupancy and hazardous conditions for pedestrians and cyclists in the vicinity of the site. The environmental impact of such a significant increase on these factors is substantial, and their bearing on pedestrian and cyclist safety must not be overlooked.

The report states:

The project site fronts two 35-foot-wide dead end streets with 6-foot-wide sidewalks on both sides of the streets. The primary pedestrian entry and access to the project's 124 bicycle parking spaces would be from Federal Street. Vehicle access to the project's 26 vehicle parking spaces and two service loading spaces would be from De Boom Street. Access to the retail/fitness center, which would front De Boom Street, could be from either De Boom or Federal Streets. Additional traffic may occur along both dead-end streets to allow for drop-off/pick-up and deliveries, and vehicles not entering the garage would need to make three-point turns to leave the project site. Drivers may also drop off and pick up passengers on 2nd Street to avoid entering the dead-end alleys. Although the project would result in an increase in vehicles that travel along De Boom and Federal Streets, it would not be substantial enough to create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians or bicyclists. Furthermore, project construction and operation would not alter emergency access and service time ratios.

Appeal Summary:

- Both Federal and De Boom Streets are narrow, dead-end streets with narrow sidewalks that are accessible only via Second Street
- Federal Street is a high-risk street, with a high volume of pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles competing for thoroughfare, which will increase significantly if the project capacity is approved as proposed

- The increase of Lyft and Uber vehicles on Federal Street has created dangerous conditions for pedestrians and cyclists, and will only surge if the project is approved with a Federal Street pick-up and drop-off address and no curb pull-in or setback
- Federal Street is a 24-hour pedestrian and cycle route for The Academy of Art students who will be further at-risk due to the increase in traffic
- A 23,000 sq ft gym will significantly increase the volume of pedestrians and vehicular drop-off/pick-up on Federal Street

Conclusion: The project must include a parking set back or pull-in on the Federal Street entrance to the site, allowing cars to safely pull in and out, and thus not contributing further to the hazardous for pedestrians and cyclists

3. Increase of Hazardous Conditions / Vehicular Congestion Along Federal Street and Infringement on Private Property

Appeal Summary:

- Both Federal and De Boom Streets are narrow, two-way, dead-end streets that are accessible only via Second Street
- Federal Street provides the only access for resident parking of 355 Bryant Street, 501 2nd Street, employees, tenants and shuttles, The Academy of Art students and shuttles, 75 Federal Street employees, as well as regular delivery and waste removal services
- The increase of Uber and Lyft vehicles servicing these buildings has grown exponentially in recent years, resulting in a significant rise in vehicular accidents, inaccessibility by emergency vehicles and increased danger to pedestrians and cyclists
- Vehicles do not "travel" along Federal or De Boom streets, they enter and then get stuck at the dead-end causing congestion and hazardous conditions as they reverse or turn around
- Vehicles "not entering the garage would need to make three-point turns to leave the project site" is a misrepresentation, vehicles are impinging on a private parking easement owned by 355 Bryant Street & 501 2nd Street to turn, an action which should not be endorsed by SF Planning Department
- As a result, Federal Street is heavily-trafficked during both weekdays and weekends and cannot cope with the significant increase in vehicular volume that would arise from the proposed project

Conclusions:

- Make Federal and De Boom streets one-way, and re-open the alley in front of The Academy of Art to promote the flow of traffic around the site, reduce hazards and mitigate congestion
- The project be modified to include construction of a new alley on the site between Block 444 and 070 to increase traffic flow between Federal and De Boom streets, reduce hazards and mitigate congestion

In conclusion, the above points highlight the significant environmental effects on the neighborhood posed by the proposed project at 77-85 Federal Street. As such, the plan to adopt a Community Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration must be denied and further evaluation with a comprehensive EIR necessary.

As a concerned resident of the South Beach/East SoMa neighborhood, thank you for your consideration and support of this appeal. I would welcome further discussion with yourself or the developer at any time.

Yours truly,

Shelley Parsons

From: [Kwiatkowska, Natalia \(CPC\)](#)
To: [Martin Harband](#)
Cc: [Poling, Jeanie \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: RE: 77-85 Federal
Date: Thursday, June 22, 2017 2:21:32 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image009.png](#)
[image010.png](#)
[image011.png](#)
[image012.png](#)
[image013.png](#)
[image014.png](#)
[image015.png](#)
[image016.png](#)
[image017.png](#)
[image018.png](#)
[image019.png](#)
[image020.png](#)
[image021.png](#)
[image022.png](#)

Hi Martin,

Please contact the environmental planner, Jeanie Poling, cc'd on this email, with any questions in regards to traffic and the environmental analysis.

Best,

Natalia Kwiatkowska

Planner/Preservation Specialist, SE Quadrant, Current Planning

Direct: 415-575-9185 | **Fax:** 415-558-6409



1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

SF Planning

Department

[Hours of Operation](#) | [Property Information Map](#)



From: Martin Harband [mailto:mharband@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 2:16 PM

To: Kwiatkowska, Natalia (CPC)

Subject: Re: 77-85 Federal

Hi Natalia -

Thank you for your prompt response !

At what step in the process may we ask the decision-makers to evaluate traffic conflicts on De Boom ?

Martin Harband

On Thu, Jun 22, 2017 at 12:24 PM, Kwiatkowska, Natalia (CPC)

<natalia.kwiatkowska@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Martin,

The Environmental Analysis for the project was appealed. Therefore, the Appeal will be scheduled for a Planning Commission hearing, of which there will be notice. Following that, the project will be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission and then Planning Commission again for entitlements. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best,

Natalia Kwiatkowska

Planner/Preservation Specialist, SE Quadrant, Current Planning

Direct: 415-575-9185 | **Fax:** 415-558-6409



1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

**SF Planning
Department**

[Hours of Operation](#) | [Property Information Map](#)



From: Martin Harband [mailto:mharband@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 11:16 AM

To: Kwiatkowska, Natalia (CPC)

Subject: 77-85 Federal

I am writing concerning the project proposed at 77-85 Federal.

If the project includes a garage on De Boom, it will generate significant traffic problems,

What is the status of the project in the planning process ?

Thank you.

--

Martin Harband
mharband@gmail.com

--

Martin Harband
mharband@gmail.com