SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Certificate of Determination
EXEMPTION FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Case No.:	**2011.0895E**
Project Title:	**460 – 462 Bryant Street**
Zoning/Plan Area:	MUO (Mixed Use-Office); 45-X Height and Bulk District Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan
Block/Lot:	3763/015A and 3763/015C
Lot Size:	23,280 square feet (0.53 acre)
Project Sponsor	Sierra Maestra Properties (415) 922-7100
Staff Contact:	Wade Wietgrefe – (415) 575-9050 Wade.Wietgrefe@sfgov.org

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project site consists of two existing buildings (460 Bryant Street and 462 Bryant Street). Both properties are through lots that can be accessed at Bryant Street and Stillman Street, between 2nd Street and 3rd Street, in the South of Market neighborhood. The proposed project would renovate the two existing buildings and convert them into one space from industrial use to office use. In addition, the proposed project would include approximately 1,420 square feet of new space at 462 Bryant Street. Implementation of the proposed project would include 60,280 square feet of office area and 14,810 square feet of other areas (discussed in more detail later). No increase to the exterior dimensions of the buildings is proposed.

[continued on next page]

EXEMPT STATUS:

Exempt per Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and California Public Resources Code Section 21083.3

DETERMINATION:

I do hereby certify that the above determination has been made pursuant to State and Local requirements.

Bill Wycko
Environmental Review Officer

June 14, 2012
Date

cc: **Sierra Maestra Properties,** Project Sponsor
Andrew Junius, Project Contact
Tara Sullivan, Preservation Planner
Supervisor **Jane Kim,** District **6**
Virna Byrd, M.D.F.
Historic Preservation Distribution List

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (continued):

The dominant land uses in the surrounding area are one- to three-story commercial and industrial uses, with some mixed-use residential above these ground-floor uses. Land uses adjacent to the project site include three-story industrial to the northeast, two-story industrial and commercial across Bryant Street to the southeast, two-story industrial to the southwest, and elevated Interstate 80, with a parking lot beneath it, across Stillman Street to the northwest.

The approximately 23,280-square-foot project site is occupied by two existing buildings: 460 Bryant Street and 462 Bryant Street. 460 Bryant Street is a 48-foot tall, three-story over basement, approximately 46,840 square-foot building. 462 Bryant Street is a 27.5-foot tall, one-story over basement (plus mezzanine level), approximately 26,730 square-foot building. An existing interior opening provides access between the two buildings on the ground floor. A 14-foot, six-inch curb cut exists at Stillman Street and a 15-foot curb cut exists at Bryant Street for 460 Bryant Street. A 14-foot curb cut exists at Stillman Street and an 11-foot, nine-inch curb cut exists at Bryant Street for 462 Bryant Street. Both buildings were constructed in 1907 and have generally served as warehouse uses. Both buildings were occupied as recently as 2010.

Both buildings are brick masonry industrial buildings designed in the 20th-Century Industrial style. The rectangular-plan buildings, clad in brick, are capped by a flat built-up roof. The 462 Bryant Street building also has molded stucco on the ground floor. The foundations are not visible. The primary façades face south and include four structural bays for each building. Entrances include a fully-glazed paired metal door with sidelights and a glazed transom, a roll-up metal garage door, and a partially-glazed wood door with sidelights and a glazed transom at 460 Bryant Street and recessed, paired, paneled wood doors, a recessed flush metal door, and a metal roll-up door at 462 Bryant Street. Ground floor fenestration (or openings into the buildings) consists of double-hung wood-sash windows or plate-glass aluminum-sash windows at 460 Bryant Street and double-hung wood-sash windows at 462 Bryant Street. The upper stories at 460 Bryant Street feature fixed divided-light double-hung wood-sash windows and a fire escape. In addition, a two-sided general advertising sign exists on the roof of 460 Bryant Street, under separate ownership from the buildings. This sign is in compliance with the City's General Advertising Sign Rules and Regulations as outlined in the Planning Code.

As noted above, the proposed project would renovate the two existing buildings and convert them into one space from industrial use to office use. In addition, the proposed project would include approximately 1,420 square feet of new space at 462 Bryant Street. Implementation of the proposed project would include 60,280 square feet of office area and 14,810 square feet of other areas, including vehicle access (from Stillman Street), mechanical, parking, and showers (refer to Table 1 below). Parking spaces would include up to 72 wall rack bicycle spaces, up to 12 Class 2 bicycle spaces, up to 13 vehicle parking spaces, and two service vehicle loading spaces. In addition, four showers and eight lockers would be provided. The proposed project would also include renovations to the facades of the existing buildings including: relocating the main entrance door for pedestrians on the Bryant Street façade from 460 Bryant Street to 462 Bryant Street; removal of an existing storefront, a roll-down door, and a loading dock and replacement with new double-hung wood-sash windows on both buildings facades and at both streets; removal of existing fire escape at 460 Bryant Street; and widening (to approximately 14-feet) an existing roll-down door for vehicular access on the Stillman Street façade at 462 Bryant Street. The

proposed project would modify (without widening) the existing 14-foot wide curb cut at Stillman Street to provide vehicular access to the 462 Bryant Street basement level garage. In addition, the proposed project would remove the other three curb cuts. The proposed project would not expand the existing buildings' exterior dimensions or make changes to the existing general advertising sign.

TABLE 1
460 – 462 BRYANT STREET PROPOSED FLOOR AREA (SQUARE FEET)

Stories	460 Bryant	462 Bryant
Basement	12,150 (10,820 office and 1,330 mechanical)	11,945 (7,939 mechanical, storage, bicycle parking, showers, and service parking and 4,006 vehicle parking)
First	11,440 (11,045 office and 395 stairs)	11,390 (10,250 office and 1,140 vehicle access)
Mezzanine Level	100 office	4,815 office
Second	11,625 office	--
Third	11,625 office	--
Total	*46,940 (45,215 office and 1,725 other)*	*28,150 (15,065 office and 13,085 other)*
Grand Total	**60,280 office and 14,810 other = 75,090**	

Construction would last approximately eight months, assuming work would occur five days per week. Diesel-generating equipment would be required for approximately 23 days. Interior work would be the majority of the construction (interior demolition, seismic strengthening, plumbing, electrical, etc.), but some exterior work would be required for the above-mentioned façade renovations, access improvements, and mechanical equipment installation. Some of the interior work would require below-ground surface construction for new seismic braces (e.g., footings) and a new elevator pit, to a maximum depth of four feet. In addition, eight-inch micropiles may also be required to approximately 20 to 30 feet below the bottom of the proposed and existing foundations.

The proposed project would require an Office Allocation from the Planning Commission because the proposed project would create over 25,000 square feet of new office space.

REMARKS

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) State Guidelines Section 15183 provides 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 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 which were not discussed in the underlying EIR, and (d) are previously identified in the EIR, but which 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 that project solely on the basis of that impact.

This Certificate of Determination (determination) evaluates the topics for which a significant impact is identified in the final programmatic EIR, *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final EIR* (Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR – Case No. 2004.0160E; State Clearinghouse No. 2005032048) and evaluates whether the proposed project would result in impacts that would contribute to the impact identified in the FEIR. Mitigation measures identified in the FEIR applicable to the proposed project are identified in the text of the determination under each topic area. The Community Plan Exemption Checklist (Attachment A) identifies the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project and indicates whether such impacts are addressed in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR.

This determination assesses the proposed project's potential to cause environmental impacts and concludes that the proposed project would not result in new, peculiar environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already analyzed and disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. This determination does not identify new or additional information that would alter the conclusions of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. This determination also identifies mitigation measures contained in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR that would be applicable to the proposed project at 460 – 462 Bryant Street. Relevant information pertaining to prior environmental review conducted for the Eastern Neighborhoods is included below, as well as an evaluation of potential environmental effects.

Background

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR included analyses of the following environmental issues: 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 project. The proposed project at 460 – 462 Bryant Street is in conformance with the height, use, and density for the site described in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR and would represent a small part of the growth that was forecast for the Eastern Neighborhoods. Thus, the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR considered the incremental impacts of the proposed 460 – 462 Bryant Street project. As a result, the proposed project would not result in any new or substantially more severe impacts than were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR.

Potential Environmental Effects

The following discussion demonstrates that the 460 – 462 Bryant Street proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified or a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR, including proposed project-specific impacts related to land use and planning, cultural and paleontological resources, transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, shadow, hazards and hazardous materials, and forest resources.

Land Use and Planning

The Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan (Area Plan) rezoned much of the city's industrially zoned land. The goals of the Area Plan were to reflect local values, increase housing, maintain some industrial land supply, and improve the quality of all existing areas with future development. A major issue discussed

in the Area Plan 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 (Production, Distribution, and Repair) employment and businesses.

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR evaluated three land use alternatives. Option A retained the largest amount of existing land that accommodated PDR uses and converted the least amount of industrially zoned land to residential use. Option C converted the most existing land accommodating PDR uses to residential and mixed uses. Option B fell between Options A and C.

While all three options were determined to result in a decline in PDR employment, the loss of PDR jobs was determined to be greatest under Option C. The alternative ultimately selected – the 'Preferred Project' – represented a combination of Options B and C. Because the amount of PDR space to be lost with future development under all three options could not be precisely gauged, the FEIR determined that the Preferred Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact on land use due to the cumulative loss of PDR use in the Area Plan. This impact was addressed in a Statement of Overriding Considerations with CEQA Findings and adopted as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans approval on January 19, 2009.

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR included one mitigation measure, Mitigation Measure A-1, for land use controls in Western SoMa that could incorporate, at a minimum, no net loss of land currently designated for PDR uses, restrict non-PDR uses on industrial (or other PDR-designated) land, and incorporate restrictions on potentially incompatible land uses proximate to PDR zones. The measure was judged to be infeasible, because the outcome of the community-based Western SoMa planning process could not be known at the time, and the measure was seen to conflict with other City policy goals, including the provision of affordable housing. The project site is not located in Western SoMa; therefore this mitigation measure is not applicable.

The project site consists of two existing buildings both serving as industrial uses. Industrial uses are PDR uses. Although the proposed project would convert the two existing buildings from industrial use to office use, rather than a PDR use, office uses in the MUO District were anticipated and are consistent both with the policies of the Area Plan and the specific zoning adopted pursuant to the Area Plan for this particular location. In addition, because the proposed project would include over 25,000 square feet of new office space, the project sponsor would be subject to and need to comply with Section 321 of the Planning Code to get an allocation of office space prior to occupying the space for office.

Furthermore, the Citywide Planning and Neighborhood Planning Divisions of the Planning Department have determined that the proposed project is consistent with the MUO Zoning and satisfies the requirements of the General Plan and the Planning Code. [1,2]

[1] Mat Snyder, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Citywide Planning Section, 460 – 462 Bryant Street, February 24, 2012. This document is on file and available for review as part of Case File No. 2011.0895E.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to land use and planning.

Cultural Resources

Archeological Resources

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

The Planning Department's archeological technical specialist conducted an archeological assessment review of the project site and the proposed project.[3] The project site is a property within the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR Mitigation Measure J-1 (Archeological Mitigation Zone A). Mitigation Measure J-1 states that any project resulting in soils-disturbance of 2.5 feet or greater below existing grade proposed within Archeological Mitigation Zone A shall be required to submit to the Environmental Review Officer for review and approval an addendum to the respective ARD/TP prepared by a qualified archeological consultant with expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The respective ARD/TP for the project site is *San Francisco – Oakland Bay Bridge: Archeological Research Design and Treatment Plan* (July 2000).

The project site is in the vicinity of several recorded prehistoric and historical archeological sites: two prehistoric shell midden deposits to the southwest of the project site and as many as 10 historical archeological features determined to be National Register of Historic Places eligible within the same block as the project site. Both of the midden sites were located on alluvial deposits.

The project site is underlain by alluvial deposits that reach at least 14 feet in depth. The deeper portions of the alluvium could be from the Colma Formation. In the late 1890s and early 1900s, the project site contained a wine company building with a basement whose coverage is not documented. The existing buildings on the project site also have basements (although site coverage of the basements is unknown).

---

[2] Kelley Amdur, San Francisco Planning Department, Community Plan Exemption Eligibility Determination, Neighborhood Analysis, 460-462 Bryant Street, April 20, 2012. This document is on file and available for review as part of Case File No. 2011.0895E.

[3] Environmental Planning Preliminary Archeology Review: checklist for 460 – 462 Bryant Street from Randall Dean, June 6, 2012. This document is on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, as part of Case File 2011.0895E.

Installation of the existing and previous basements on the project site probably removed the upper surface of the alluvial deposits that covered the project site.

The proposed project would result in below-ground surface construction for new seismic braces and a new elevator pit, to a maximum depth of four feet. In addition, eight-inch micropiles may also be required to approximately 20 to 30 feet below the bottom of the proposed and existing foundations. In light of the geological formation and archeological sensitivity of the project vicinity, there is a clear likelihood that prehistoric deposits could be present within the alluvial sediments within the project site. However, if that is so, these deposits, which in all likelihood would have been no greater than three to four feet in thickness, were removed in the process of the installation of the basement in the late 19th century or the basements currently present beneath the existing buildings. Because of the age of deeper portions of the alluvium, which could be the Colma Formation, potential affects from installation of new footings, potential deepening of existing footings, and potential installation of micropiles would affect sediments deposited well before humans were first believed to be present. In the light of the low potential for an effect, the requirement of preparation of the ARD/TP Addendum in Mitigation Measure J-1 is not applicable. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to archeological resources.

Paleontological Resources

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR did not analyze the effects on paleontological resources.

The project site is underlain by alluvial deposits that reach at least 14 feet in depth and in all likelihood to a depth greater than that. Based on two geoarcheological studies within the vicinity of the project site,[4,5] it is likely that the alluvial deposits that lie beneath the project site date from the late Pleistocene to early Holocene or late Holocene periods. These geological periods are too recent for paleontological deposits to be present. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to paleontological resources.

Historic Architectural Resources

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR anticipated that program implementation may result in demolition of buildings identified as historical resources, and found this impact to be significant and unavoidable. This impact was addressed in a Statement of Overriding Considerations with findings and adopted as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans approval on January 19, 2009.

Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR Mitigation Measure K-1, Interim Procedures for Permit Review in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, required certain projects to be presented to the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (now the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC)). This mitigation measure is no longer relevant, because the Inner Mission North Historic Resource Survey was completed and adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission on June 1, 2011. Mitigation Measures K-2 and K-3, which amended Article 10 of the Planning Code to reduce potential adverse effects to contributory structures within the South End Historic District (East SoMa) and the Dogpatch Historic District (Central

[4] Brian F. Byrd, et al., *Archaeological Research Design and Treatment Plan for the Transit Center District Plan Area, San Francisco*, 2010.

[5] Anthropological Studies Center, *Archaeological Monitoring Plan 222 Fremont Street*, May 2012.

Waterfront), do not apply the proposed project because the project site is not located within the South End or Dogpatch Historic Districts.

The project site contains two existing buildings. The 460 Bryant Street building has been assigned a California Register of Historical Resources status code of "5S3," and appears to be individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation. Therefore, for the purposes of the CEQA, the building is a historic resource. The 462 Bryant Street building has been assigned a California Register of Historical Resources status code of "6L," and is determined ineligible for local listing or designation through local government review process. Therefore, for the purposes of CEQA, the building is not a historic resource. The proposed project would include interior alterations, brick and mortar repair, and replacement of windows in-kind that would be consistent with the Planning Department's Window Replacement Standards. The proposed work was found to retain character-defining features, replace non-historic features, and be consistent with the *Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to historic architectural resources.

Transportation and Circulation

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR anticipated that growth resulting from the zoning changes could result in significant impacts on traffic and transit ridership. Thus, the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified 11 transportation mitigation measures, including implementation of traffic management strategies, transit corridor improvements, enhancements of transit funding, promotion of alternative means of travel, and parking management to discourage driving – all measures to be implemented by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, San Francisco Planning Department, or the San Francisco County Transportation Authority. Even with mitigation, however, it was anticipated that the significant adverse effects at certain local intersections and the cumulative impacts on certain transit lines could not be fully mitigated. Thus, these impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable. The traffic and transit mitigation measures identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR are not applicable to the proposed project because City and County agencies and not the sponsors of individual private development projects are responsible for the implementation of these mitigation measures.

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, topic 5c from the Community Plan Exemption Checklist is not applicable.

<u>Trip Generation</u>

Trip generation of the proposed project was calculated using information in the 2002 Transportation Impacts Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review (SF Guidelines) developed by the San Francisco Planning Department.[6] The project site is located in the City's Superdistrict 1 traffic analysis area. Although the project site was recently used as an industrial use, the following analysis assumes that the project site is vacant and the proposed project would result in an increase of 60,280 square feet of office use. Therefore, the following analysis provides for a more conservative approach in evaluating potential

[6] San Francisco Planning Department, "Transportation Calculations," January 30, 2012. These calculations are available for review as part of Case File No. 2011.0953E.

project-generated transportation impacts, in that the analysis does not give credit to the existing industrial use.

Based on the SF Guidelines, an additional 60,280 square feet of office space would generate 1,091 daily person-trips, of which 404 would be automobile trips, 380 would be transit trips, 252 would be pedestrian, and 55 would be other (e.g., bicycle). Of the projected total daily person-trips, the proposed project would generate 93 PM peak hour person-trips, of which 36 would be automobile trips, 44 would be transit trips, 10 would be pedestrian, and 3 would be other.

Traffic

The proposed project's automobile person-trips would travel through the intersections surrounding the project block. Intersection operating conditions are characterized by the concept of Level of Service (LOS), which ranges from A to F and provides a description of an intersection's performance based on traffic volumes, intersection capacity, and vehicle delays. LOS A represents free flow conditions, with little or no delay, while LOS F represents congested conditions with extremely long delays. LOS D (moderately high delays) is considered the lowest acceptable level in San Francisco. According to available LOS intersection data, intersections within 2 blocks of the project site currently operate during the weekday PM peak hour at LOS B (Brannan Street/2nd Street intersection), LOS D (Bryant Street/3rd Street and Harrison/3rd Street intersections), and LOS E (Bryant Street/2nd Street and Harrison/2nd Street intersections).[7] The proposed project would generate 36 new PM peak hour automobile person-trips to surrounding intersections. This amount of new PM peak hour automobile person-trips is not anticipated to substantially increase traffic volumes at these or other nearby intersections, substantially increase average delay that would cause intersections that currently operate at acceptable LOS to deteriorate to unacceptable LOS, or substantially increase average delay at intersections that currently operate at unacceptable LOS.

The nearest East SoMa intersection in which the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified a significant impact under 2025 (cumulative) weekday PM peak hour conditions was at Third Street/King Street (two and half blocks east of the project site) which operated at LOS D under existing (baseline) conditions and would deteriorate to LOS F under 2025 weekday PM peak hour operating conditions under Options B and C. The other East SoMa intersections in which the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified a significant impact under 2025 weekday PM peak hour conditions were Sixth Street/Brannan Street (four and half blocks southwest of the project site) and Seventh Street/Harrison Street (five and half blocks southwest of the project site) under Options B and C. It is anticipated that the proposed project would contribute automobile person-trips to these intersections during the PM peak hour. However, the proposed project's contribution of 36 PM peak hour automobile person-trips would not be a substantial proportion of the overall traffic volume generated by Eastern Neighborhoods projects, should the projects be approved, and would be within the scope of the Eastern Neighborhood FEIR analysis. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to traffic.

[7] LOS for Brannan Street/Second Street (year 2007) is from San Francisco Planning Department, *San Francisco Bicycle Plan FEIR*, August 2009, Case File No. 2007.0347E. LOS for the other intersections (year 2008) is from San Francisco Planning Department, *Transit Center District Plan and Transit Tower DEIR*, September 2011, Case File No. 2007.0558E and 2008.0789E.

Transit

The project site is located within a quarter-mile of several local transit lines including Muni lines 8A, 8B, 8X, 10, 12, 30, 45, 47, 80X, 81X, 82X, 91, and 108. The proposed project would generate 44 PM peak hour transit person-trips to the surrounding transit lines. Because of the wide availability of nearby transit, this amount of new PM peak hour transit person-trips are not anticipated to cause a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity, resulting in unacceptable levels of transit service; or cause a substantial increase in delays or operating costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service levels could result.

Each of the rezoning options in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts relating to increases in transit ridership on Muni lines, with 2025 No-Project Alternative significantly affecting 12 lines, with Option A significantly affecting two lines, Option B significantly affecting three lines, and Option C significantly affecting seven lines. Of those Muni lines significantly affected, the project site is located within a quarter-mile of Muni lines 10, 12, and 47. It is anticipated that the proposed project would contribute transit person-trips to these transit lines during the PM peak hour. However, the proposed project's contribution of 44 PM peak hour transit person-trips would not be a substantial proportion of the overall transit volume generated by Eastern Neighborhoods projects, should the projects be approved, and would be within the scope of the Eastern Neighborhood FEIR analysis. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to transit.

Pedestrian

The proposed project would not include sidewalk narrowing, roadway widening, or removal of center medians; each conditions that can negatively impact pedestrians. The proposed project would modify (without widening) an existing 14-foot curb cut at Stillman Street to provide vehicular access to 462 Bryant Street basement level garage, but Stillman Street is not identified in the General Plan as a "Citywide Network Pedestrian Street," "Neighborhood Commercial Street," or "Neighborhood Network Connection Street" and the frequency of vehicles entering and exiting the project site from the proposed project would not be substantial enough to cause a hazard to pedestrians or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the project site and adjoining areas. Furthermore, the proposed project would remove three existing curb cuts; thereby decreasing potential hazards between pedestrians and vehicles. The proposed project would generate approximately 10 PM peak hour pedestrian person-trips. Therefore, pedestrian activity would increase as a result of the proposed project, but not to a degree that would result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to pedestrians.

Bicycle

The proposed project would not substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the project site or adjoining areas because no bikeways exist along the project site's adjacent streets. Implementation of the proposed project could encourage more existing users to bring their bicycle to the project site (approximately 3 PM peak hour bicycle person-trips) as the proposed project would provide new bicycle parking (e.g., bicycle racks). The fact that more persons would be bringing their bicycles to the project

site would not create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists because Muni bus stops and bikeways exist within one block of the project site; therefore users could walk their bicycles safely along sidewalks from nearby Muni bus stops or bikeways to the project site. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to land use and planning.

Loading

The proposed project would generate the need for one loading space based on the building's size and use in the MUO zoning district pursuant to the Planning Code. Based on the SF Guidelines, the proposed project would generate an average loading demand of 0.73 truck-trips during the peak hour. The proposed project would provide two loading spaces. Therefore, the proposed project would be able to accommodate the loading demand during the peak hour. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to loading.

Emergency Access

The proposed project would not close off any existing streets or entrances to public uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to emergency access or peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to emergency access.

Construction

The proposed project's construction activities would last approximately eight months and would include mostly interior construction. Although construction activities would result in additional vehicle trips to the project site from workers, soil hauling, and equipment deliveries, these activities would be limited in duration. Therefore, the proposed project's construction would not result in a substantial impact to transportation or peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to transportation.

Parking

San Francisco does not consider parking supply as part of the permanent physical environment and therefore, does not consider changes in parking conditions to be environmental impacts as defined by CEQA. The San Francisco Planning Department acknowledges, however, that parking conditions may be of interest to the public and the decision makers. Therefore, this section presents a parking analysis for information purposes.

Parking conditions are not static, as parking supply and demand varies from day to day, from day to night, from month to month, etc. Hence, the availability of parking spaces (or lack thereof) is not a permanent physical condition, but changes over time as people change their modes and patterns of travel. Parking deficits are considered to be social effects, rather than impacts on the physical environment as defined by CEQA. Under CEQA, a project's social impacts need not be treated as significant impacts on the environment. Environmental documents should, however, address the secondary physical impacts that could be triggered by a social impact (CEQA Guidelines § 15131(a)). The social inconvenience of parking deficits, such as having to hunt for scarce parking spaces, is not an environmental impact, but there may be secondary physical environmental impacts, such as increased traffic congestion at

intersections, air quality impacts, safety impacts, or noise impacts caused by congestion. In the experience of San Francisco transportation planners, however, the absence of a ready supply of parking spaces, combined with available alternatives to auto travel (e.g., transit service, taxis, bicycles or travel by foot) and a relatively dense pattern of urban development, induces many drivers to seek and find alternative parking facilities, shift to other modes of travel, or change their overall travel habits. Any such resulting shifts to transit service in particular, would be in keeping with the City's "Transit First" policy. The City's Transit First Policy, established in the City's Charter Article 8A, Section 8A.115 provides that "parking policies for areas well served by public transit shall be designed to encourage travel by public transportation and alternative transportation." As stated above, the project site is served by Muni (metro and bus) and bicycle lanes and sidewalks are prevalent in the vicinity.

The transportation analysis accounts for potential secondary effects, such as cars circling and looking for a parking space in areas of limited parking supply, by assuming that all drivers would attempt to find parking at or near the project site and then seek parking farther away if convenient parking is unavailable. Moreover, the secondary effects of drivers searching for parking is typically offset by a reduction in vehicle trips due to others who are aware of constrained parking conditions in a given area. Hence, any secondary environmental impacts which may result from a shortfall in parking in the vicinity of the proposed project would be minor, and the traffic assignments used in the transportation analysis, as well as in the associated air quality, noise and pedestrian safety analyses, reasonably addresses potential secondary effects.

In summary, changes in parking conditions are considered to be social impacts rather than impacts on the physical environment. Accordingly, the following parking analysis is presented for informational purposes only.

According to the Planning Code, up to seven percent of parking area of the gross floor area is allowed and no off-street parking is required in the MUO zoning district for the proposed use. The permissible parking area for the proposed use would be approximately 4,219 square feet (60,280 square feet * 0.07). The proposed project would provide approximately 4,006 square feet of vehicle parking area, thereby meeting the gross floor area regulation. Based on the SF Guidelines, the proposed project would generate the need for 77 parking spaces. The proposed project would provide up to 13 off-street parking spaces. Therefore, the proposed project would have an unmet parking demand of 64 parking spaces. However, on-street parking is available on both Bryant Street and Stillman Street and off-street parking is available at several nearby lots. Furthermore, the unmet demand of parking spaces is considered a social effect, rather than a physical impact on the environment as defined by CEQA.

Noise

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified potential conflicts related to residences and other noise-sensitive uses in proximity to noisy uses such as PDR, retail, entertainment, cultural/institutional/educational uses, and office uses. In addition, the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR noted that the Area Plan would incrementally increase traffic-generated noise on some streets in the Area Plan and result in construction noise impacts from pile driving and other construction activities. The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified six noise mitigation measures that would reduce noise impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR Mitigation Measure F-1 requires individual projects that include pile-driving within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan and within proximity to noise-sensitive uses to ensure that piles be pre-drilled, wherever feasible, to reduce construction-related noise and vibration. The proposed project would not include pile-driving; therefore this mitigation measures is not applicable.

Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR Mitigation Measure F-2 requires individual projects that include particularly noisy construction procedures (including pile-driving) in proximity to sensitive land uses to submit a site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. The project site is adjacent to noise sensitive land uses (residential) to the west. As stated above, the proposed project would not include pile-driving. Proposed project construction activities would include mostly interior work and would last approximately eight months. None of these activities would constitute particularly noisy construction procedures; therefore this mitigation measure is not applicable.

Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR Mitigation Measures F-3, F-4, and F-6 have additional requirements for individual projects that include new noise-sensitive uses. The proposed project's use, office, would not include a new noise-sensitive use; therefore this mitigation measure is not applicable.

Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR Mitigation Measure F-5 requires individual projects that include new noise-generating uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise in the project site vicinity to submit an acoustical analysis that demonstrates the proposed use would comply with the General Plan and Police Code Section 2909. Ambient noise levels in San Francisco are largely influenced by traffic-related noise. Figure V.G-2 and Figure V.G-3 in the San Francisco 2004 and 2009 Housing Element Draft EIR identifies roadways within San Francisco with traffic noise levels exceeding 60 L_{dn} and 75 L_{dn},[8] respectively. The proposed project would be located along two streets, Stillman Street and Bryant Street, and adjacent to an elevated highway, Interstate 80, identified in the Housing Element EIR Figure V.G-3 with noise levels above 75 L_{dn}. An approximate doubling in traffic volumes in the area would be necessary to produce an increase in ambient noise levels barely perceptible to most people (3 decibel increase). The proposed project would not double traffic volumes because the proposed project would include approximately 404 new daily automobile person-trips in the project vicinity and Interstate 80 had an average daily traffic volume of approximately 181,000 in 2010.[9] In addition, the proposed project would not include any other constant noise sources (e.g., diesel generator) that would be perceptible in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

[8] Ldn refers to the day-night average level or the average equivalent A-weighted sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after the addition of 10 decibels to sound levels in the night after 10 p.m. and before 7 a.m. A decibel is a unit of measurement describing the amplitude of sound, equal to 20 times the logarithm to the base 10 of the ratio of the pressure of the sound measured to the reference pressure, which is 20 micropascals.

[9] Bay Area Air Quality Management District. "Highway Screening Analysis Tool" (Google Earth data), April 29, 2011.

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area, within two miles of a public airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, topic 6e and f Community Plan Exemption Checklist is not applicable.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to noise.

Air Quality

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified potentially significant air quality impacts related to construction activities that may cause wind-blown dust and pollutant emissions; roadway-related air quality impacts on sensitive land uses; and the siting of uses that emit diesel particulate matter (DPM) and toxic air contaminants (TACs) as part of everyday operations. The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified four mitigation measures that would reduce air quality impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR Mitigation Measure G-1 requires individual projects that include construction activities to include dust control measures and maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions of particulates and other pollutants. This mitigation measure was identified in the Initial Study. Subsequent to the Initial Study, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes, generally referred to as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008). The intent of the Construction Dust Control Ordinance is to reduce the quantity of dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of on-site workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection.

Also subsequent to the Initial Study, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) provided studies which provided new methodologies for analyzing air quality impacts, including construction activities. The BAAQMD studies provide screening criteria for lead agencies and project applicants with a conservative indication of whether a proposed project could result in potentially significant air quality impacts. If all of the screening criteria are met by a proposed project, then the lead agency or applicant would not need to perform a detailed air quality assessment of their proposed project's air pollutant emissions and construction or operation of the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant air quality impact.

Construction activities from the proposed project may result in dust, primarily from ground-disturbing activities outside the existing structures (e.g., modifications to curb cuts and driveways). The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with the Construction Dust Control Ordinance, therefore the portions of Mitigation Measure G-1 that deal with dust control are not applicable to the proposed project.

Construction activities from the proposed project would also result in the emission of criteria air pollutants and DPM from equipment exhaust, construction-related vehicular activity, and construction worker automobile trips. Construction would last approximately eight months, assuming work would occur five days per week. Diesel-generating equipment would be required for approximately 23 days (4 –

5 weeks). Interior work would be the majority of the construction (interior demolition, seismic strengthening, plumbing, electrical, etc.), but some exterior work would be required for façade renovations, access improvements, and mechanical equipment installation. The project site is approximately 110 feet from the nearest sensitive receptor (residences). The Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment does not recommend an evaluation of cancer risk from projects lasting less than two months.[10] Because the proposed project would utilize diesel-generating equipment for approximately 23 days, of which some would be used for interior construction, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to construction health risk. In addition, the proposed project meets the screening criteria provided in the BAAQMD studies for construction-related criteria air pollutants. Therefore, the remainder of Mitigation Measure G-1 that deals with maintenance and operation of construction equipment is not applicable to the proposed project.

Mitigation Measure G-2 requires new residential development near high-volume roadways and/or warehousing and distribution centers to include an analysis of diesel particulate matter (DPM) and/or toxic air contaminants (TAC), and, if warranted, to incorporate upgraded ventilation systems to minimize exposure of future residents to DPM and other pollutant emissions, as well as odors. The proposed project would not include the addition of residential units. Therefore, Mitigation Measure G-2 is not applicable to the proposed project.

Mitigation Measure G-3 minimizes potential exposure of sensitive receptors to DPM by requiring that uses generating substantial DPM emissions, including warehousing and distribution centers, commercial, industrial, or other uses that would be expected to be served by at least 100 trucks per day or 40 refrigerated trucks per day, be located no less than 1,000 feet from residential units and other sensitive receptors. The proposed project would renovate the two existing buildings and convert them into one space from industrial use to office use and it is not expected to generate substantial DPM emissions or be served by 100 trucks per day or 40 refrigerator trucks per day. Therefore, Mitigation Measure G-3 is not applicable to the proposed project.

Measure G-4 involves the siting of commercial, industrial, or other uses that emit TACs as part of everyday operations. The proposed project would renovate the two existing buildings and convert them into one space from industrial use to office use and would not generate more than 10,000 vehicle trips per day or 1,000 truck trips per day or include a new stationary source, items that would emit TACs as part of everyday operations. Therefore, Mitigation Measure *G*-4 is not applicable to the proposed project.

The proposed project would result in an increase in operational-related criteria air pollutants including from the generation of daily vehicle trips and energy demand. The proposed project meets the screening criteria provided in the BAAQMD studies for operational-related criteria air pollutants.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to air quality.

[10] Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, *Air Toxics Hot Spot Program Risk Assessment Guidelines, Technical Support Document for Exposure Assessment and Stochastic Analysis, Scientific Review Panel Draft*, February 2012.

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 Area Plan, sites surrounding parks could be redeveloped with taller buildings without triggering Section 295 of the Planning Code because certain parks are not subject to Section 295 of the Planning Code (i.e., under jurisdiction by departments other than the Recreation and Parks Department or privately owned). The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR could not conclude if the rezoning and community plans would result in less-than-significant shadow impacts because the feasibility of complete mitigation for potential new shadow impacts of unknown proposed proposals could not be determined at that time. Therefore, the FEIR determined shadow impacts to be significant and unavoidable. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

The project site contains two existing buildings. The proposed project would not make any height changes to the two existing buildings. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to shadow.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials
The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR determined that the rezoning of currently zoned industrial (PDR) land to residential, commercial, or open space uses in the Eastern Neighborhoods would result in the incremental replacement of some of the existing non-conforming business with development of these other land uses. Development may involve demolition or renovation of existing structures that may contain hazardous building materials, such as transformers and fluorescent light ballasts that contain polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or di (2 ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP) and fluorescent lights containing mercury vapors, that were commonly used in older buildings and which could present a public health risk if disturbed during an accident or during demolition or renovation. The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified a mitigation measure to reduce this impact to less than significant.

Because the project site buildings were constructed in 1907 and the proposed project's interior renovations may involve the removal of transformers, fluorescent light ballasts, and fluorescent lights, the proposed project could present a public health risk. Therefore, Mitigation Measure L-1, Hazardous Building Materials, from the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR would apply to the proposed project. With implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts related to hazardous building materials would be less than significant. In accordance with the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR requirements, the project sponsor has agreed to implement Project Mitigation Measure 1, below.

With compliance with hazardous materials regulations and Project Mitigation Measure 1, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified or a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to hazards and hazardous materials.

> **Project Mitigation Measure 1 – Hazardous Building Materials (Mitigation Measure L-1 of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR).** The City shall condition future development approvals to require that the subsequent project sponsors ensure that any equipment containing PCBs or DEPH, such as

fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to the applicable federal, state, and local laws.

Forest Resources
The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR did not analyze the effects on forest resources.

The proposed project would not convert any forest land or timberland to non-forest use. Forest land is defined as "land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits" (Public Resources Cod Section 12220(g)). Timberland is defined as "land, other than land owned by the federal government and land designated by the board (State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection) as experimental forest land, which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of any commercial species uses to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees. Commercial species shall be determined by the board on a district basis after consultation with the district committees and others." The proposed project would not involve tree removal and the project site does not contain forest lands or timberland as defined above. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to forest resources.

Public Notice and Comment
A "Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review" was mailed on February 21, 2012, to owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site, adjacent occupants, and neighborhood groups. No comments regarding physical environmental effects were received.

Conclusion
The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR incorporated and adequately addressed all potential impacts of the proposed project at 460 – 462 Bryant Street. As described above, the 460 – 462 Bryant Street project would not have any additional or peculiar significant adverse effects not examined in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR, nor has any new or additional information come to light that would alter the conclusions of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. Thus, the proposed project at 460 – 462 Bryant Street would not result in any environmental impacts substantially greater than described in the FEIR. No mitigation measures previously found infeasible have been determined to be feasible, nor have any new mitigation measures or alternatives been identified but rejected by the project sponsor. Therefore, in addition to being exempt from environmental review under Section 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project is also exempt under Section 21083.3 of the California Public Resources Code.

Attachment A
Community Plan Exemption Checklist

Case No.:	2011.0895E
Project Title:	460 – 462 Bryant Street
Zoning:	MUO (Mixed Use-Office) Use District 45-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot:	3763/015A and 3763/015C
Lot Size:	23,280 square feet (0.53 acre)
Plan Area:	Eastern Neighborhoods
Staff Contact:	Wade Wietgrefe – (415) 575-9050 Wade.Wietgrefe@sfgov.org

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located at Bryant Street, between 2nd Street and 3rd Street, in the South of Market neighborhood. The proposed project would renovate two existing buildings (460 Bryant Street and 462 Bryant Street) and convert them into one space from industrial use to office use. In addition, the proposed project would include approximately 1,420 square feet of new space at 462 Bryant Street. Implementation of the proposed project would include 60,280 square feet of office area and 14,810 square feet of other areas (e.g., vehicle access (from Stillman Street), mechanical, parking). No increase to the exterior dimensions of the buildings is proposed.

The proposed project would require an Office Allocation from the Planning Commission because the proposed project would create over 25,000 square feet of new office space.

B. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

This Community Plan Exemption Checklist examines the potential environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project and indicates whether any such impacts are addressed in the applicable final Programmatic EIR (FEIR) for the plan area.[1] Items checked "Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR" identify topics for which a significant impact is identified in the FEIR. In such cases, the analysis considers whether the proposed project would result in impacts that would contribute to the impact identified in the FEIR. If the analysis concludes that the proposed project would contribute to a significant impact identified in the FEIR, the item is checked "Proj. Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR." Mitigation measures identified in the FEIR applicable to the proposed project are identified in the text of the Certificate of Determination under each topic area.

Items checked "Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact" identify topics for which the proposed project would result in a significant impact that is peculiar to the proposed project, i.e., the impact is not

[1] The FEIR also refers to any Initial Study that may have been conducted for the FEIR.

identified as significant in the FEIR. If any item is checked as this in a topic, these topics will be addressed in a separate Focused Initial Study or EIR.

Any item that was not addressed in the FEIR is discussed in the Certificate of Determination. For any topic that was found in the FEIR and for the proposed project to be less than significant (LTS) or would have no impacts, the topic is marked LTS/No Impact and is discussed in the Checklist below.

Topics:		*Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR*	*Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR*	*Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact*	*LTS/ No Impact*
1.	**LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING— Would the project:**				
a)	Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity?	☒	☐	☐	☐

For a discussion on Topic 1c, please see the Certificate of Determination.

FEIR

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR determined that the rezoning and community plans is a regulatory program, not a physical development project; therefore, the rezoning and community plans would not create any new physical barriers in the Eastern Neighborhoods. Furthermore, the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR determined that the rezoning would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

No Peculiar Impacts

The proposed project would not create any new physical barriers in the Eastern Neighborhoods. The project site contains two existing buildings. Consequently, the proposed project would not physically disrupt or divide the project area or individual neighborhoods or subareas.

The project site is in the East SoMA Area Plan of the San Francisco General Plan. The project site is in the Mixed Use – Office (MUO) District, which is intended to encourage office and housing, as well as small-scale light industrial and arts activities. Allowed uses within the MUO District include office, general commercial, and most retail and PDR uses. The proposed project's use, office, is consistent with uses permitted within the MUO District.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to land use.

Topics:		Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	LTS/ No Impact
2.	**AESTHETICS—Would the project:**				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and other features of the built or natural environment which contribute to a scenic public setting?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or which would substantially impact other people or properties?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR determined that implementation of the design policies of the area plans would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the area, have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, substantially damage scenic resources that contribute to a scenic public setting, or create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or which would substantially impact other people or properties. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

No Peculiar Impacts

The existing character of the project site and surroundings is dominated by uses typical in an urban setting, mostly one-to-three-story commercial and industrial uses and mixed-use industrial and commercial/residential uses. Public viewpoints in the project vicinity are dominated by these existing nearby buildings, the elevated Interstate 80, approximately 75 feet north of the project site, and 489 Harrison Street (One Rincon Hill), approximately 0.25 mile northeast of the project site. No scenic vistas or scenic resources that contribute to a scenic public setting exist in the project vicinity. The project site contains two existing buildings: 460 Bryant Street is a 48-foot tall, three-story over basement, approximately 46,840 square-foot building and 462 Bryant Street is a 27.5-foot tall, one-story over basement (plus mezzanine level) 26,730 square-foot building. Both buildings are brick masonry industrial buildings designed in the 20th-Century Industrial style.

The proposed project would renovate the two existing buildings and convert them into one space from industrial use to office use. The proposed project would also include renovations to the facades of the existing buildings including: relocating the main entrance door for pedestrians on the Bryant Street façade from 460 Bryant Street to 462 Bryant Street; removal of an existing storefront, a roll-down door, and a loading dock and replacement with new double-pane wood windows on both buildings facades and at both streets; and widening (to approximately 14-feet) an existing roll-down door for vehicular access on the Stillman Street façade at 462 Bryant Street.

Although the proposed project renovations would change the visual appearance of the project site, it would not substantially degrade its visual character or quality. Therefore, the proposed project would not obstruct longer-range views from various locations in the Area Plan and the City as a whole. Furthermore, as described in the Certificate of Determination, the proposed project changes meet Planning Code requirements for Mixed Use-Office zoning district.

The proposed project would not introduce a new source of light and glare.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to aesthetics.

Topics:	*Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR*	*Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR*	*Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact*	*LTS/ No Impact*
3. POPULATION AND HOUSING— Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population and density would not result in significant adverse physical effects on the environment. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

No Peculiar Impacts

The proposed project does not involve the development of residential use or the displacement of people. No housing would be removed; therefore the construction of replacement housing would not be necessary. In addition, the proposed project would not add any new infrastructure that would indirectly induce population growth.

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR concluded that an increase in population in the Area Plan was expected to occur as a secondary effect of the proposed rezoning and that would not, in itself, result in adverse physical effects, but would serve to advance some key City policy objectives, such as providing housing in appropriate locations next to Downtown and other employment generators and furthering the City's Transit First policies. It was anticipated that the rezoning would result in an increase in both housing development and population in all of the Area Plan neighborhoods. The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR estimated that approximately 9,500 to 12,500

new jobs would be added in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area between 2000 and 2025. Although the project site was recently used as an industrial use, the following analysis assumes that the project site is vacant and the proposed project would result in an increase of 60,280 square feet of office use. Therefore, the following analysis provides for a more conservative approach in evaluating potential project-generated impacts, in that the analysis does not give credit to the existing industrial use. The proposed project would result in 268 employees (one employee per 225 square feet of office space, assuming 60,280 square feet at the project site would be used for office use).[2] These new jobs would be among those anticipated to be added in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. The additional housing demand generated by the Area Plan would be offset by the provision of additional housing development in the Area Plan. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to population and housing.

Topics:		*Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR*	*Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR*	*Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact*	*LTS/ No Impact*
4.	**CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES—Would the project:**				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5, including those resources listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the San Francisco *Planning Code*?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Please see the Certificate of Determination for discussion of this topic.

[2] One employee per 225 square feet of office space is taken from estimates provided in San Francisco Planning Department, "San Francisco Eastern Neighborhoods Nexus Study," May 2008, prepared by Seifel Consulting.

Topics:		Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	LTS/ No Impact
5.	**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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Please see the Certificate of Determination for discussion of this topic.

Topics:		Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	LTS/ No Impact
6.	**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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b)	Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c)	Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d)	Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Topics:		Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	LTS/ No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g)	Be substantially affected by existing noise levels?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Please see the Certificate of Determination for discussion of this topic.

Topics:		Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	LTS/ No Impact
7.	**AIR QUALITY** Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. **Would the project:**				
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal, state, or regional ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☒	☐	☐	☐
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Please see the Certificate of Determination for discussion of this topic.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	LTS/ No Impact
8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS—Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Environmental and Regulatory Setting

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are referred to as greenhouse gases (GHGs) because they capture heat radiated from the sun as it reflected back into the atmosphere, much like a greenhouse does. The accumulation of GHG's has been implicated as the driving force for global climate change. The primary GHGs are carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), ozone, and water vapor. While the presence of the primary GHGs in the atmosphere are naturally occurring, CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O are largely emitted from human activities, accelerating the rate at which these compounds occur within earth's atmosphere. Emissions of CO_2 are largely by-products of fossil fuel combustion, whereas CH_4 results from off-gassing associated with agricultural practices and landfills. Other GHGs include hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride, and are generated in certain industrial processes. GHG are typically reported in "carbon dioxide-equivalent" measures (CO_2E).[3]

In 2006, the California legislature passed Assembly Bill No. 32 (California Health and Safety Code Division 25.5, Sections 38500, et seq., or AB 32), also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act. AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to design and implement emission limits, regulations, and other measures, such that feasible and cost-effective statewide GHG emissions are reduced to 1990 levels by 2020 (representing a 25 percent reduction in emissions).

Pursuant to AB 32, ARB adopted a Scoping Plan in December 2008, outlining measures to meet the 2020 GHG reduction limits. In order to meet these goals, California must reduce its GHG emissions by 30 percent below projected 2020 business as usual emissions levels, or about 15 percent from existing (2006) levels.[4] The Scoping Plan estimates a reduction of 174 million metric tons (MMT) CO_2E from the transportation, energy, industry, forestry, and high global warming potential sectors, see Table 1, below. ARB has identified an implementation timeline for the GHG reduction strategies in the Scoping Plan.[5] Some measures may require new legislation to

[3] Because of the differential heat absorption potential of various GHGs, GHG emissions are frequently measured in "carbon dioxide-equivalents," which present a weighted average based on each gas's heat absorption (or "global warming") potential.

[4] California Air Resources Board (ARB), "California's Climate Plan: Fact Sheet." Available online at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/facts/scoping_plan_fs.pdf. Accessed March 4, 2010.

[5] California Air Resources Board (ARB). "California's Climate Plan, Key Strategies in the AB 32 Scoping Plan." Available Online at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/facts/scoping_plan_fs.pdf. Accessed January 3, 2012.

implement, some will require subsidies, some have already been developed, and some will require additional effort to evaluate and quantify. Additionally, some emissions reductions strategies may require their own environmental review under CEQA or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Table 1
GHG Reductions from the AB 32 Scoping Plan Sectors[6]

GHG Reduction Measures By Sector	GHG Reductions ($MMTCO_2E$)
Transportation Sector	62.3
Energy	49.7
Industry	1.4
Recycling and Waste (landfill methane capture)	1.0
Sustainable Forests	5.0
High Global Warming Potential Gas Measures	20.2
Additional Reductions Necessary to Achieve the Cap	34.4
Total	**174**
Other Recommended Measures	**GHG Reductions ($MMT\ CO_2E$)**
Government Operations	1 - 2
Methane Capture at Large Dairies	1
Water	4.8
Green Buildings	26
Recycling and Waste (other measures) • Commercial Recycling • Composting • Anaerobic Digestion • Extended Producer Responsibility • Environmentally Preferable Purchasing	9
Total	**41.8-42.8**

AB 32 also anticipates that local government actions will result in reduced GHG emissions. ARB has identified a GHG reduction target of 15 percent from current levels for local governments themselves and notes that successful implementation of the plan relies on local governments' land use planning and urban growth decisions because local governments have primary authority to plan, zone, approve, and permit land development to accommodate population growth and the changing needs of their jurisdictions.

The Scoping Plan relies on the requirements of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) to implement the carbon emission reductions anticipated from land use decisions. SB 375 was enacted to align local land use and transportation planning to further achieve the State's GHG reduction goals. SB 375 requires regional transportation plans, developed by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), to incorporate a "sustainable communities strategy" in their regional transportation plans (RTPs) that would achieve GHG emission reduction targets set by ARB. SB 375 also includes provisions for streamlined CEQA review for some infill projects such as transit-oriented

[6] *Ibid.*

development. SB 375 would be implemented over the next several years and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's 2013 RTP would be its first plan subject to SB 375.

Senate Bill 97 (SB 97) required the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to amend the State CEQA guidelines to address the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions or the effects of GHGs. In response, OPR amended the CEQA guidelines to provide guidance for analyzing GHG emissions. Among other changes to the CEQA Guidelines, the amendments add a new section to the CEQA Checklist (CEQA Guidelines Appendix G) to address questions regarding a project's potential to emit GHGs.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is the regional agency with jurisdiction over the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (Air Basin). BAAQMD is responsible for attaining and maintaining air quality in the Air Basin within federal and State air quality standards. Specifically, BAAQMD has the responsibility to monitor ambient air pollutant levels throughout the Air Basin and to develop and implement strategies to attain the applicable federal and State standards. The BAAQMD assists CEQA lead agencies in evaluating the air quality impacts of projects and plans proposed in the Air Basin. Subsequent to the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR, the BAAQMD provided studies which provided new methodologies for analyzing air quality impacts, including GHG emissions. The BAAQMD studies provide screening criteria for lead agencies and project applicants with a conservative indication of whether a proposed project could result in potentially significant GHG impacts.[7] If all of the screening criteria are met by a proposed project, then the lead agency or applicant would not need to perform a detailed assessment of their proposed project's GHG emissions emissions and construction or operation of the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant GHG impact. OPR's amendments to the CEQA Guidelines as well as BAAQMD's studies have been incorporated into the proposed project level analysis accordingly.

No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR assessed the GHG emissions that could result from rezoning of the East SoMa Area Plan under the three rezoning options. The Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning Options A, B, and C are anticipated to result in GHG emissions on the order of 4.2, 4.3 and 4.5 metric tons of CO_2E per service population,[8] respectively.[9] The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR concluded that the resulting GHG emissions from the three options analyzed in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans would be less than significant. The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR adequately addressed GHG emissions and the resulting emissions were determined to be less than significant. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

No Peculiar Impacts

---

[7] Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines*, updated May 2011, pages 3-1 to 3-5.

[8] SP= Service Population. Service population is the equivalent of total number of residents + employees.

[9] Memorandum from Jessica Range, MEA to MEA staff, *Greenhouse Gas Analyses for Community Plan Exemptions in Eastern Neighborhoods*, April 20, 2010. This memorandum provides an overview of the GHG analysis conducted for the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning EIR and provides an analysis of the emissions using a service population metric.

The proposed project would renovate two existing buildings and convert them into one space from industrial use to office use. The proposed project would contribute to the cumulative effects of climate change by emitting GHGs during construction and operational phases. Construction of the proposed project is estimated at approximately eight months. Project operations would generate both direct and indirect GHG emissions. Direct operational emissions include GHG emissions from vehicle trips and area sources (natural gas combustion). Indirect emissions include emissions from electricity providers, energy required to pump, treat, and convey water, and emissions associated with landfill operations. The project site is located within the East SoMa Area Plan analyzed under the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR.

As discussed above, the BAAQMD studies provide methodologies for analyzing GHGs, one of which is a determination of whether the proposed project is consistent with a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, as defined in the BAAQMD's studies. On August 12, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Department submitted a draft of San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* to the BAAQMD.[10] This document presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco's Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy in compliance with the BAAQMD's studies.

The BAAQMD reviewed San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* and concluded that the strategy meets the criteria for a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy as outlined in BAAQMD's studies and stated that San Francisco's "aggressive GHG reduction targets and comprehensive strategies help the Bay Area move toward reaching the State's AB 32 goals, and also serve as a model from which other communities can learn."[11]

Based on the BAAQMD's studies, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* would result in a less than significant impact with respect to GHG emissions. Furthermore, because San Francisco's strategy is consistent with AB 32 goals, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's strategy would also not conflict with the State's plan for reducing GHG emissions. As discussed in San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, new development and renovations/alterations for private projects and municipal projects are required to comply with San Francisco's ordinances that reduce GHG emissions. Applicable requirements for the proposed project are shown below in Table 2.

Table 2
Greenhouse Gas Regulations Applicable to 460 – 462 Bryant Street

Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
Transportation Sector			
Transportation	Requires new buildings or additions	☒ Project Complies	The project site is located

[10] San Francisco Planning Department, *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions in San Francisco*, 2010. The final document is available online at: http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=1570.

[11] Letter from Jean Roggenkamp, BAAQMD, to Bill Wycko, San Francisco Planning Department. October 28, 2010. This letter is available online at: http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=1570. Accessed November 12, 2010.

Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
Management Programs (San Francisco Planning Code, Section 163)	over a specified size (buildings >25,000 sf or 100,000 sf depending on the use and zoning district) within certain zoning districts (including downtown and mixed-use districts in the City's eastern neighborhoods and south of market) to implement a Transportation Management Program and provide on-site transportation management brokerage services for the life of the building.	☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	within the MUO district and proposes to convert at least 25,000 square feet of existing space to office use, and is therefore subject to the Transportation Management Program requirement of Section 163. Prior to the issuance of a temporary permit of occupancy for the project, the project sponsor will execute an agreement with the Planning Department for the provision of on-site transportation brokerage services and preparation of a transportation management program, per Section 163.
Transit Impact Development Fee (San Francisco Administrative Code, Chapter 38)	Establishes the following fees for all commercial developments. Fees are paid to the SFMTA to improve local transit services.	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with this regulation.
Jobs-Housing Linkage Program (San Francisco Planning Code Section 413)	The Jobs-Housing Program found that new large scale developments attract new employees to the City who require housing. The program is designed to provide housing for those new uses within San Francisco, thereby allowing employees to live close to their place of employment. The program requires a developer to pay a fee or contribute land suitable for housing to a housing developer or pay an in-lieu fee.	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with this regulation.
Bicycle parking in parking garages (San Francisco Planning Code, Section 155.2)	(C) Garages with more than 500 automobile spaces shall provide 25 spaces plus one additional space for every 40 automobile spaces over 500 spaces, up to a maximum of 50 bicycle parking spaces.	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	The project proposes an automobile parking garage with at least 10 automobile spaces (and less than 120 automobile spaces), and is therefore subject to Section 155.2. The proposed project would provide up to 84 bicycle parking spaces, including 12 Class 2 bicycle spaces.
San Francisco Green Building Requirements (San Francisco Building	Requires New Large Commercial projects, New High-rise Residential projects and Commercial Interior projects to provide designated parking	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not	The proposed would be subject to and would comply with this regulation by providing at least one space

Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
Code, Chapter 13C.106.5 and 13C.5.106.5)	for low-emitting, fuel efficient, and carpool/van pool vehicles. Mark 8% of parking stalls for such vehicles.	Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	as outlined in the section.
Parking requirements for San Francisco's Mixed-Use zoning districts (San Francisco Planning Code Section 151.1)	The Planning Code has established parking maximums for many of San Francisco's Mixed-Use districts.	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	Section 151.1 principally permits off-street parking for office uses in the MUO district up to 7% of the gross floor area of the office area. The project proposes 60,280 square feet of office area and therefore is permitted up to 4,219 square feet of off-street parking space. The project proposes 4,006 square feet of off-street parking space and therefore is within the 7% limit. The project would also comply with the pricing conditions of Section 155(g).
Energy Efficiency Sector			
San Francisco Green Building Requirements for Energy Efficiency (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C.5.201.1.1)	New construction of non-residential buildings requires the demonstration of a 15% energy reduction compared to 2008 California Energy Code, Title 24, Part 6.	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with this regulation.
Commissioning of Building Energy Systems (LEED prerequisite, EAp1)	Requires Fundamental Commissioning for New High-rise Residential, Commercial Interior, Commercial and Residential Alteration projects	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with this regulation.
San Francisco Green Building Requirements for Energy Efficiency (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C)	Commercial buildings greater than 5,000 sf will be required to be a minimum of 14% more energy efficient than Title 24 energy efficiency requirements. As of 2008 large commercial buildings are required to have their energy systems commissioned, and as of 2010, these large buildings are required to provide enhanced commissioning in compliance with LEED® Energy and Atmosphere Credit 3. Mid-sized commercial buildings are required to have their systems commissioned by 2009, with enhanced commissioning as of 2011.	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with this regulation.

Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
Indoor Water Efficiency (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C sections 13C.5.103.1.2, 13C.4.103.2.2,13C.303.2.)	**If meeting a LEED Standard;** Reduce overall use of potable water within the building by a specified percentage – for showerheads, lavatories, kitchen faucets, wash fountains, water closets and urinals. New large commercial and New high rise residential buildings must achieve a 30% reduction. Commercial interior, commercial alternation and residential alteration should achive a 20% reduction below UPC/IPC 2006, et al. **If meeting a GreenPoint Rated Standard:** Reduce overall use of potable water within the building by 20% for showerheads, lavatories, kitchen faucets, wash fountains, water closets and urinals.	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with this regulation.
San Francisco Water Efficient Irrigation Ordinance	Projects that include 1,000 square feet (sf) or more of new or modified landscape are subject to this ordinance, which requires that landscape projects be installed, constructed, operated, and maintained in accordance with rules adopted by the SFPUC that establish a water budget for outdoor water consumption. Tier 1: 1,000 sf <= project landscape < 2,500 sf Tier 2: Project landscape area is greater than or equal to 2,500 sf. Note; Tier 2 compliance requires the services of landscape professionals. See the SFPUC Web site for information regarding exemptions to this requirement. www.sfwater.org/landscape	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with this regulation.
Commercial Water Conservation Ordinance (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13A)	Requires all existing commercial properties undergoing tenant improvements to achieve the following minimum standards: 1. All showerheads have a maximum flow of 2.5 gallons per minute (gpm) 2. All showers have no more than one	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with this regulation.

Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
	showerhead per valve 3. All faucets and faucet aerators have a maximum flow rate of 2.2 gpm 4. All Water Closets (toilets) have a maximum rated water consumption of 1.6 gallons per flush (gpf) 5. All urinals have a maximum flow rate of 1.0 gpf 6. All water leaks have been repaired.		
Waste Reduction Sector			
Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance (San Francisco Environment Code, Chapter 19) and San Francisco Green Building Requirements for solid waste (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C)	All persons in San Francisco are required to separate their refuse into recyclables, compostables and trash, and place each type of refuse in a separate container designated for disposal of that type of refuse. Pursuant to Section 1304C.0.4 of the Green Building Ordinance, all new construction, renovation and alterations subject to the ordinance are required to provide recycling, composting and trash storage, collection, and loading that is convenient for all users of the building.	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with this regulation.
San Francisco Green Building Requirements for construction and demolition debris recycling (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C)	Projects proposing demolition are required to divert at least 75% of the project's construction and demolition debris to recycling.	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with this regulation.
Environment/Conservation Sector			
Street Tree Planting Requirements for New Construction (San Francisco Planning Code Section 138.1)	Planning Code Section 138.1 requires new construction, significant alterations or relocation of buildings within many of San Francisco's zoning districts to plant one 24-inch box tree for every 20 feet along the property street frontage.	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with this regulation.
Light Pollution Reduction (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C5.106.8)	For nonresidential projects, comply with lighting power requirements in CA Energy Code, CCR Part 6. Requires that lighting be contained within each source. No more than .01 horizontal lumen footcandles 15 feet beyond site, or meet LEED credit SSc8.	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with this regulation.

Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
Construction Site Runoff Pollution Prevention for New Construction (San Francisco Building Code, Chapter 13C)	Construction Site Runoff Pollution Prevention requirements depend upon project size, occupancy, and the location in areas served by combined or separate sewer systems. Projects meeting a LEED® standard must prepare an erosion and sediment control plan (LEED® prerequisite SSP1). Other local requirements may apply regardless of whether or not LEED® is applied such as a stormwater soil loss prevention plan or a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). See the SFPUC Web site for more information: www.sfwater.org/CleanWater	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with this regulation.
Low-emitting Adhesives, Sealants, and Caulks (San Francisco Building Code, Chapters 13C.5.103.1.9, 13C.5.103.4.2, 13C.5.103.3.2, 13C.5.103.2.2, 13C.504.2.1)	**If meeting a LEED Standard:** Adhesives and sealants (VOCs) must meet SCAQMD Rule 1168 and aerosol adhesives must meet Green Seal standard GS-36. (Not applicable for New High Rise residential) **If meeting a GreenPoint Rated Standard:** Adhesives and sealants (VOCs) must meet SCAQMD Rule 1168.	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with this regulation.
Low-emitting Paints and Coatings (San Francisco Building Code, Chapters 13C.5.103.1.9, 13C.5.103.4.2, 13C.5.103.3.2, 13C.5.103.2.2 13C.504.2.2 through 2.4)	**If meeting a LEED Standard:** Architectural paints and coatings must meet Green Seal standard GS-11, anti-corrosive paints meet GC-03, and other coatings meet SCAQMD Rule 1113. (Not applicable for New High Rise residential) **If meeting a GreenPoint Rated Standard:** Interior wall and ceiling paints must meet <50 grams per liter VOCs regardless of sheen. VOC Coatings must meet SCAQMD Rule 1113.	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with this regulation.
Low-emitting Flooring, including carpet (San Francisco Building	**If meeting a LEED Standard:** Hard surface flooring (vinyl, linoleum, laminate, wood, ceramic, and/or	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not	The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with this regulation.

Regulation	Requirements	Project Compliance	Discussion
Code, Chapters 13C.5.103.1.9, 13C.5.103.4.2, 13C.5.103.3.2, 13C.5.103.2.2, 13C.504.3 and 13C.4.504.4)	rubber) must be Resilient Floor Covering Institute FloorScore certified; carpet must meet the Carpet and Rug Institute (CRI) Green Label Plus; Carpet cushion must meet CRI Green Label; carpet adhesive must meet LEED EQc4.1. (Not applicable for New High Rise residential) **If meeting a GreenPoint Rated Standard:** All carpet systems, carpet cushions, carpet adhesives, and at least 50% of resilient flooring must be low-emitting.	Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	
Low-emitting Composite Wood (San Francisco Building Code, Chapters 13C.5.103.1.9, 13C.5.103.4.2, 13C.5.103.3.2, 13C.5.103.2.2 and 13C.4.504.5)	**If meeting a LEED Standard:** Composite wood and agrifiber must not contain added urea-formaldehyde resins and must meet applicable CARB Air Toxics Control Measure. **If meeting a GreenPoint Rated Standard:** Must meet applicable CARB Air Toxics Control Measure formaldehyde limits for composite wood.	☒ Project Complies ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Project Does Not Comply	The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with this regulation.

Depending on a proposed project's size, use, and location, a variety of controls are in place to ensure that a proposed project would not impair the State's ability to meet statewide GHG reduction targets outlined in AB 32, nor impact the City's ability to meet San Francisco's local GHG reduction targets. Given that: (1) San Francisco has implemented regulations to reduce GHG emissions specific to new construction and renovations of private developments and municipal projects; (2) San Francisco's sustainable policies have resulted in the measured success of reduced GHG emissions levels; (3) San Francisco has met and exceeded AB 32 GHG reduction goals for the year 2020; (4) current and probable future state and local GHG reduction measures will continue to reduce a project's contribution to climate change; and (5) San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* meet BAAQMD's requirements for a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's regulations would not contribute significantly to global climate change. The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with these requirements. In addition, the proposed project was determined to be consistent with San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions.*[12]

[12] San Francisco Planning Department, Greenhouse Gas Analysis: Compliance Checklist, June 4, 2012. This document is on file and available for public review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400.

For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in any peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to GHG emissions.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	LTS/ No Impact
9. WIND AND SHADOW—Would the project:				
a) Alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas?	☒	☐	☐	☐

For a discussion on Topic 9b, please see the Certificate of Determination.

FEIR

Wind impacts are directly related to building design and articulation and the surrounding site conditions. The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR determined the rezoning and community plans would not result in a significant impact to wind because the Planning Department, in review of specific future projects, would continue to require analysis of wind impacts, where deemed necessary, to ensure that project-level wind impacts mitigated to a less-than-significant level. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

No Peculiar Impacts

Based upon experience of the Planning Department in reviewing wind analyses and expert opinion on other projects, it is generally (but not always) the case that projects under 80 feet in height do not have the potential to generate significant wind impacts. The project site contains two existing buildings, with heights of 48 feet and 27.5 feet, respectively. The proposed project would not make any height changes to the two existing buildings. For the above reasons, the proposed project is not anticipated to cause peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to wind.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	LTS/ No Impact
10. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	LTS/ No Impact
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Physically degrade existing recreational resources?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in substantial or accelerated deterioration of existing recreational resources or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

No Peculiar Impacts

The proposed project would result in 268 new jobs. As discussed further in Population and Housing above, these new jobs would be among those anticipated to be added in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to recreational resources.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	LTS/ No Impact
11. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS—Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	LTS/ No Impact
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR

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

No Peculiar Impacts

The proposed project would result in 268 new jobs. As discussed further in Population and Housing above, these new jobs would be among those anticipated to be added in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to utility and service systems.

Topics:	Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	LTS/ No Impact
12. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR determined that the anticipated increase in population would not result in a significant impact to public services, including fire protection, police protection, and public schools. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR. Impacts on parks and recreation are discussed under Topics 9 and 10.

No Peculiar Impacts

The proposed project would result in 268 new jobs. As discussed further in Population and Housing above, these new jobs would be among those anticipated to be added in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to public services.

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

No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR

The Eastern Neighborhoods project area is almost fully developed with buildings and other improvements such as streets and parking lots. Most of the project area consists of structures that have been in industrial use for many years. As a result, landscaping and other vegetation is sparse, except for a few parks. Because future development projects in the Eastern Neighborhoods would largely consist of new construction of housing in these heavily built-out former industrial neighborhoods, vegetation loss or disturbance of wildlife other than common urban species would be minimal. Therefore, the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR concluded that the project would not result in any significant effects related to biological resources. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

No Peculiar Impacts

The project site contains two existing buildings. Similar to the rest of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, the project site does not support or provide habitat for any rare or endangered wildlife species, animal, or plant life or habitat. Ten street trees exist adjacent to the project site. The proposed project would not remove any of these existing trees. Because the proposed project

would add parking, the proposed project would be subject to and would comply with Planning Code Section 138.1, which includes the planting of street trees. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting trees. Furthermore, the proposed project would be subject to and would comply with the City's Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings so that the renovations to the existing buildings would not include a feature-related hazard to birds. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in any peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to biological resources.

Topics:	*Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR*	*Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR*	*Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact*	*LTS/ No Impact*
14. GEOLOGY AND SOILS— Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR concluded that the project would indirectly increase the population that would be subject to an earthquake, including seismically induced groundshaking, liquefaction, and landslides. The FEIR also noted that new development is generally safer than comparable older development due to improvements in building codes and

construction techniques. Compliance with applicable codes and recommendations made in project-specific geotechnical analyses would not eliminate earthquake risk, but would reduce them to an acceptable level, given the seismically active characteristics of the Bay Area. Therefore, the FEIR concluded that the project would not result in significant impacts to geology. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

No Peculiar Impacts

A geotechnical investigation was prepared for the proposed project.[13] The following discussion relies on the information provided in the geotechnical investigation.

The topography of the project site slopes upward from the southwest corner (elevation 11 feet, San Francisco City Datum (SFCD)) to the northeast corner (elevation 31 feet SFCD). Both existing buildings are connected at the basement level and the elevation of the basement levels is approximately seven feet SFCD (referred to as ground surface below). A geotechnical soil boring was excavated to a maximum depth of approximately 14 feet below ground surface. Seven test pits were excavated to a depth ranging from approximately six inches to three and a half feet below top of the adjacent floor or ground surface. Four dynamic core penetrometer tests (DCPTs) were advanced to depths ranging from approximately two to three feet below the adjacent floor or ground surface. Based on the soil analysis of the borings and tests pits, the soil profile was: top layer of concrete slab (basement) to approximately five inches below ground surface; second layer of sandy clay soils to approximately seven and half feet below ground surface; and a third layer of clayey sand to the maximum explored depth at 14 feet below ground surface. Groundwater was encountered for the geotechnical boring (and previous investigations) at approximately 7 to 10 feet below ground surface.

The project site does not lie within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone as defined by the California Division of Mines and Geology. No known active faults cross the project site. The closest mapped active fault in the vicinity of the project site is the San Andreas Fault, located approximately 8 miles west from the project site. The proximity would likely result in strong to very strong earthquake shaking at the project site.

Using the results of the on-site boring (and previously performed borings) and DCPTs, the geotechnical investigation evaluated the potential for liquefaction, lateral spreading, and settlement from different compaction. Based on the previously performed borings, the soil encountered below the groundwater table is either adequately dense or contains sufficient clay content to prevent liquefaction. In addition, the project site is not located within a liquefaction potential zone as mapped by the California Division of Mines and Geology for the City and County of San Francisco. Therefore, the potential for liquefaction-induced settlement and lateral spreading is very low. Based on the field investigations, the sandy soil encountered above the groundwater level is either adequately dense or contains sufficient fines to prevent differential compaction from occurring. Therefore, the potential for differential compaction below the

[13] Rollo & Ridley, "Geotechnical Investigation, 460 – 462 Bryant Street, San Francisco, California," February 29, 2012. This document is on file and available for public review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400.

structure is low. Loose to medium dense sand may be present below the surrounding streets and sidewalks; differential compaction may occur there and are predicted to be between ½ inch and one-inch during a major earthquake.

The geotechnical investigation concluded the potential hazard associated with landsliding to not be significant at the project site because nothing was observed to indicate surficial evidence of historical landsliding and no published mapping was found to indicate historical landsliding at the project site.

The geotechnical investigation provided recommendations for the proposed project's construction. These recommendations include, but are not limited to, construct new interconnected (continuous) footings which are tied to and match the depth of the existing foundation system and that are founded in the alluvial deposits which underlie the existing foundation system. In addition, eight-inch micropiles may also be required by the structural engineer to approximately 20 to 30 feet below the bottom of the proposed and existing foundations. The recommendations would be intended to further reduce seismic hazards.

Based on the above-noted recommendations, the geotechnical investigation concluded that the proposed project would not cause significant geology and soil impacts. The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with the recommendations of the geotechnical investigation by incorporating the recommendations into the final building design, including new footings and new foundations to approximately the same depth below ground surface as existing footings and foundations and installation of micropiles, if required. Furthermore, the proposed project would be subject to the building permit review process. The Department of Building Inspection, through the process, would ensure that the proposed project would comply with the geotechnical recommendations. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in any peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to geology and soils.

Topics:	*Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR*	*Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR*	*Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact*	*LTS/ No Impact*
15. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY— Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Topics:		Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR	Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact	LTS/ No Impact
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 of siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR

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

No Peculiar Impacts

The project site contains two existing buildings. The proposed project would renovate the two existing buildings and convert them into one space from industrial use to office use. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase the amount of impervious surface area on the project site. Because the proposed project would add parking, the proposed project would be subject to comply with Planning Code Section 132, which includes requirements for 50% of surfaces in the front yard to be permeable. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect runoff and drainage. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to hydrology and water quality.

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

For a discussion on Topic 16c, please see the Certificate of Determination.

FEIR

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR determined that the rezoning of currently zoned industrial (PDR) land to residential, commercial, or open space uses in the Eastern Neighborhoods would result in the incremental replacement of some of the existing non-conforming business with development of these other land uses. This could result in exposure to the public or the environment to hazards, but existing regulations would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels, with the exception of those hazardous materials and waste addressed in the Certificate of Determination. In addition, the FEIR determined that the rezoning and community plans would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires. Lastly, the FEIR determined that the project area 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, the rezoning and community plans would have no adverse effects in terms of air safety.

No Peculiar Impacts

A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA)[14] conducted at the project site notes that historic land use activities on the project site include residential, industrial, and commercial tenancies. The Phase 1 ESA revealed no evidence of the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on the project site. The Phase 1 ESA did not recommend further investigations. However, the Phase 1 ESA did recommend that repairs be made to prevent water intrusion and drainage into the basement of 460 Bryant Street to prevent mold growth; an asbestos survey be conducted prior to future building renovations; and that the property owner consult with a certified Lead Risk Assessor to determine options for control of possible lead-based paint hazards prior to future building renovations. These recommendations would be subject to federal, state, and local regulations related to mold, asbestos containing building materials, and lead-based paint. Therefore, regulations would ensure that potential project-related impacts due to exposure to these hazardous materials would be less-than-significant. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in any peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Topics:	*Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR*	*Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR*	*Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact*	*LTS/ No Impact*
17. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES— Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Encourage activities which result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR determined that the project 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 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

[14] AEI Consultants, "Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, 460 – 462 Bryant Street," October 20, 2011. This document is on file and available for review as part of Case File No. 2011.0895E.

energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations enforced by DBI. The project area does not include any natural resources routinely extracted and the rezoning does not result in any natural resource extraction programs. Therefore, the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR concluded that the project would not result in a significant impact to mineral and energy resources. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

No Peculiar Impacts

No operational mineral resource recovery sites exist in the project area whose operations or accessibility would be affected by the proposed project. The energy demand for the proposed project would be typical for such project and would meet, or exceed, current state or local codes and standards concerning energy consumption, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulation enforced by the Department of Building Inspection. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to mineral and energy resources.

Topics:	*Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR*	*Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR*	*Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact*	*LTS/ No Impact*
18. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. – **Would the project:**				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

For a discussion on Topic 18c, d, and e, please see the Certificate of Determination.

No Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR determined that no agricultural resources exist in the Area Plan; therefore the rezoning and community plans would have no effect on agricultural resources. No mitigation measures were identified in the FEIR.

No Peculiar Impacts

The project site contains two existing buildings and is located within the East SoMa Area Plan analyzed under the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. Therefore, no agricultural uses exist at the project site. For the above reasons, the proposed project would not result in peculiar impacts that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR related to agricultural resources.

Topics:	*Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR*	*Project Contributes to Sig. Impact Identified in FEIR*	*Project Has Sig. Peculiar Impact*	*LTS/ No Impact*
19. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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.)	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Significant Impacts Identified in FEIR

The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified significant impacts related to land use, transportation, cultural resources, shadow, noise, air quality, and hazardous materials. Mitigation measures reduced all impacts to less than significant, with the exception of those related to land use (cumulative impacts on PDR use), transportation (traffic impacts at nine intersections and transit impacts), cultural (demolition of historical resources), and shadow (impacts on parks).

No Peculiar Impacts

The proposed project would include exterior and interior building alterations and conversion of uses. As discussed in this document, the proposed project would not result in new, peculiar environmental effects, or effects of greater severity than were already and disclosed in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR.